

Varieties of Opposition to Gender Equality in Europe

Edited by Mieke Verloo

GENDER AND COMPARATIVE POLITICS

‘We need to understand why opposition to gender equality is growing in Europe. With its superb range and innovative analysis, this book will inspire new thinking and new practices in response to this trend.’

– *Sylvia Walby, Distinguished Professor of Sociology and UNESCO
Chair of Gender Research, Lancaster University, UK*

‘This truly timely book fixates “opposition to gender equality” as an acute research priority. It deplores the fragmented state of our understanding yet makes great amends, scrutinizing varieties of opposition to equality through a series of strong case studies from different parts of Europe. The book’s ambition is huge and very much appreciated: it launches a brand new theory-grounded research program of great significance for gender+ equality scholarship in the years to come. An extremely important book!’

– *Hege Skjeie, Professor of Political Science,
University of Oslo, Norway*

‘When hundreds of protesters in Poland, France, and Italy are protesting against “gender ideology”; when the erosion of democratic institutions, as is happening in Hungary, becomes a matter of political reality; and radical right political parties are on the rise in Europe, the crucial question is: what went wrong? This excellent collection provides important answers in the context of gender+ equality policies, which have been one of the main target of these illiberal political changes. While gender+ equality policies have always faced opposition, this well-researched book not only shows that we are facing a new chapter in this oppositional project but also offers analytical and theoretical tools to counter its complex dynamics. For this reason, this volume is an indispensable and crucial read not only for scholars, but also for activists, politicians, and anyone fighting for social justice.’

– *Roman Kuhar, Professor of Sociology and Dean of the
Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia*

‘Building on the social movement theory and social complexity theory, this book offers an original framework for understanding the varieties of opposition to the project of gender equality in Europe. The empirical chapters support the key conceptual points: that opposition to gender equality is dynamic, multi-dimensional, intersectional, and influenced by context-specific factors. The innovative framework contributes to an understanding of how the rise of opposition forces to gender equality is closely linked to class and an understanding of how to counter these oppositional forces. The book convincingly argues that future analysis of opposition to gender equality needs to focus more on intersectionality, especially regarding race and ethnicity.’

– *Birte Siim, Professor, Department of Culture and
Global Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

VARIETIES OF OPPOSITION TO GENDER EQUALITY IN EUROPE

In contrast to the wealth of studies on progress towards gender equality, opposition to gender equality is rarely studied, which makes it difficult to understand the positive and negative dynamics of gender equality as a political project.

The first of its kind, this timely collection examines the potential and challenges of our current scholarship on understanding opposition to gender+ equality in Europe. Divided into three parts, Mieke Verloo and her team of international experts begin *Varieties of Opposition to Gender Equality in Europe* by theorizing the dynamics of opposition to gender equality policies in Europe. Part Two highlights oppositional actors (politicians, governments, citizens, policy makers, churches) and political arenas (parliament, courts, Internet), as well as different and opposing visions of gender+ equality. Part Three concludes with a framework for understanding oppositional dynamics on gender equality change.

Setting the agenda for future research, this book will be useful for students of gender and politics, social movements, European integration, and policy studies, as well as for high-level policymakers, students, and feminist activists alike. It will be an inspiration to thinkers and doers and to scholars and political actors.

Mieke Verloo is Professor of Comparative Politics and Inequality Issues at Radboud University in the Netherlands, and Non-Residential Permanent Fellow at the IWM, Institute for Human Sciences, in Vienna. She is the winner of the 2015 ECPG Gender and Politics Career Achievement Award. She was scientific director of large research projects on gender equality policymaking in Europe that designed methods to analyze the various meanings of gender equality policies across Europe, as well as their intersectional dimensions. She has extensive consultancy and training experience on gender mainstreaming and intersectionality for several European governments and institutions. Her latest research is on the rise and dynamics of opposition to gender+ equality in Europe.

Gender and Comparative Politics

Edited by Karen Celis (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) and

Isabelle Engeli (University of Bath)

The comparative research conducted in the field of gender and politics today is more than ever resulting in innovative theory building, applying novel research designs, and engaging with mainstream political science. The study of gender and politics has moved from the margins of political science to the center. Given the highly critical and activist roots of the gender and politics scholarship, it quasi naturally embraces intersectionality. The Routledge *Gender and Comparative Politics* book series aims to reflect this rich, critical, and broad scholarship covering the main political science sub-disciplines with, for instance, gender-focused research on political economy, civil society, citizenship, political participation and representation, governance, and policy making.

1 Feminist Activism at War

Belgrade and Zagreb Feminists in the 1990s

Ana Miškovska Kajevska

2 Making Gender Equality Happen

Knowledge, Change and Resistance in EU Gender Mainstreaming

Rosalind Cavaghan

3 The Gender Politics of Domestic Violence

Feminists Engaging the State in Central and Eastern Europe

Andrea Krizsán and Conny Roggeband, with contributions

from Raluca Maria Popa

4 Varieties of Opposition to Gender Equality in Europe

Edited by Mieke Verloo

VARIETIES OF OPPOSITION TO GENDER EQUALITY IN EUROPE

Edited by Mieke Verloo

First published 2018
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

The right of Mieke Verloo to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Verloo, Mieke, 1950- editor.

Title: Varieties of opposition to gender equality in Europe / edited by Mieke Verloo.

Description: New York, NY : Routledge, 2018. | Series: Gender and comparative politics | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017048626 | ISBN 9781138649606 (hardback) | ISBN 9781138649613 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781317232919 (epub) | ISBN 9781317232902 (mobipocket/kindle)

Subjects: LCSH: Sex discrimination against women—Europe. | Sex discrimination against women—Government policy—Europe. | Feminism—Europe. | Equality—Europe.

Classification: LCC HQ1237.5.E85V37 2018 | DDC 305.42094—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017048626>

ISBN: 978-1-138-64960-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-64961-3 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-62574-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo

by Apex CoVantage, LLC

CONTENTS

Notes on contributors ix

PART 1

Conceptualizing Opposition and Oppositional Dynamics 1

- 1 Introduction: Dynamics of Opposition to Gender+ Equality in Europe 3
Mieke Verloo
- 2 The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Making Sense of Opposition to Feminisms from a Social-Movement Perspective 19
Conny Roggeband
- 3 Understanding the Dynamics of Opposition to Gender-Equality Change: Lessons from and for Social Complexity Theory 38
Mieke Verloo

PART 2

Varieties of Opposition to Gender+ Equality in Europe 55

- 4 Patriarchy Fights Back: Violent Opposition to Gender Equality in Online Contexts 57
Sofia Strid

5	Indirect Opposition: Diffuse Barriers to Gender+ Equality in the European Union <i>Petra Ahrens</i>	77
6	Contesting Gender Equality in Domestic-Violence Policy Debates: Comparing Three Countries in Central and Eastern Europe <i>Andrea Krizsán and Raluca Maria Popa</i>	98
7	A Feminist Opposition to Gender Equality? Making Sense of the Social Democratic Party's Internal Struggle over Extending Parental-Leave Quotas in Sweden <i>Christina Bergqvist, Elin Bjarnegård, and Pär Zetterberg</i>	117
8	Subversion from Within: Opposition to Gender Equality in the Court of Justice of the European Union <i>Elisabeth Holzleithner</i>	135
9	Unpacking Oppositional Success: The French Laboratory <i>David Paternotte</i>	154
10	Popular Opposition to Economic Gender Equality and Homosexual Lifestyles <i>Niels Spierings</i>	172
11	Suspending Democracy, Harming Gender Equality: The 2013 Law on Pregnancy Termination in Macedonia <i>Ana Miškovska Kajevska</i>	195

PART 3

	Conclusions and Discussion: A Framework for Understanding Oppositional Dynamics on Gender-Equality Change and Possible Actions Against Opposition	213
--	--	------------

12	How to Study Varieties of Opposition to Gender+ Equality in Europe? Lessons from this Book, Conceptual Building Blocks, and Puzzles to Address <i>Mieke Verloo</i>	215
----	---	-----

	<i>Index</i>	231
--	--------------	-----

CONTRIBUTORS

Petra Ahrens holds a Marie-Sklodowska-Curie-Fellowship titled “Effects of Institutional Change on Participatory Democracy and the Involvement of Civil Society Organisations” (DemocInChange) at the University of Antwerp. She works on gender politics in the European Union; inequalities in organisations, in particular gendered power relations and political strategies like gender mainstreaming; and gender equality and social politics in Germany. She studies inequalities in organisations and exclusionary practices of EU policy making by combining research on social movements, participatory democracy, and intersectionality. Her PhD thesis is published as “Actors, Institutions, and the Making of EU Gender Equality Programs” with Palgrave Macmillan (2017). Next to her scientific career, she worked as a policy consultant in gender equality policy. She is co-editor of the German feminist journal *Femina Politica*, and of the new *European Journal of Politics and Gender*.

Christina Bergqvist is a professor of political science in the Department of Government at Uppsala University in Sweden. Her research focuses on political representation and women’s political agency and gender and the social-democratic welfare state in the Nordic countries. She also does research on the interaction between social policy change and gender equality change.

Elin Bjarnegård is associate professor in political science and senior lecturer in development studies in the Department of Government at Uppsala University in Sweden. She is also affiliated to the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at the same university as well as to the Electoral Integrity Project at the University of Sydney. Her research and teaching interests span the field of comparative politics with a particular focus on gender. She is presently involved in three different

research projects: one on masculinities, nationalism, and military service in Southern Thailand; one on gender aspects of election violence; and one on gender politics and electoral authoritarianism.

Elisabeth Holzleithner is professor of legal philosophy and legal gender studies and head of the Department of Legal Philosophy at Vienna University. Her research has a strong focus on human rights, political philosophy, and theories of justice (her book *Gerechtigkeit* was published in 2009), as well as legal gender and queer studies and the links between law, literature, and (popular) culture. She won the 2017 Österreichischer Frauenring Award for feminist engagement. At her faculty, she is deputy director of the Doctoral Studies Programme Law, and Deputy Director of the Studies Programme Law. Her latest publication, “Gender Equality and Physical Requirements,” is in *European Equality Law Review*.

Andrea Krizsán is research fellow at the Center for Policy Studies of Central European University since 2001. She is interested in understanding progressive policy change in countries of Central and Eastern Europe and works on different equality policy fields including gender equality policy, policies on gender-based violence, policies addressing ethnic inequalities, and intersectionality. Her current research aims to understand the politics of policy backsliding in times of crisis and forms of resistance to such reversal. Her most recent book, with Conny Roggeband, analyses domestic violence policy reforms in five Central and Eastern European countries. Her publications include articles on the politics of violence against women, ethnicity and intersectionality, and edited volumes on women’s movements mobilizing for policy change (2015), ethnic monitoring and data collection (2001), and institutionalizing intersectionality (co-edited with J. Squires and H. Skjeie in 2012).

Ana Miškovska Kajevska is a researcher and activist, affiliated with the Department of Political Science of the University of Amsterdam. She holds a PhD degree in social sciences and a MSc degree (cum laude) in sociology and gender studies from the same university. Her dissertation on the war-related feminist activism in Belgrade and Zagreb in the 1990s won the 2015 Gender and Politics PhD Prize of the European Consortium for Political Research. In 2017, it was published with Routledge as *Feminist Activism at War: Belgrade and Zagreb Feminists in the 1990s*. Her analysis of the LGBT movement in Macedonia appeared in Bilić, B. (ed.), *LGBT Activism and Europeanisation in the Post-Yugoslav Space: On the Rainbow Way to Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan (2016). Miškovska Kajevska’s work also addresses gender equality, sexuality, and postwar societal reconstruction, including dealing with the past.

David Paternotte is associate professor in sociology at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, where he convenes the Atelier Genre(s) and Sexualité(s) and is the

co-editor of the journal *Sextant*. His dissertation examined the advocacy of same-sex marriage in Belgium, France, and Spain. Nowadays, he studies the processes of Europeanisation, globalisation, and NGO-isation of LGBT activism. He has recently started a project on new forms of opposition to gender, feminist claims, and LGBTQI rights, with a focus on the Catholic Church. In addition to journal articles in the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *Social Politics*, *Sexualities*, or *Social Movement Studies*, he is the co-editor of several volumes, including *The Lesbian and Gay Movement and the State: Comparative Insights into a Transformed Relationship* (Ashgate, 2011, with M. Tremblay and C. Johnson), *LGBT Activism and the Making of Europe: A Rainbow Europe?* (Palgrave, 2014, with P. Ayoub), the *Ashgate Research Companion to Lesbian and Gay Activism* (Ashgate, 2015, with M. Tremblay), and *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing Against Equality* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2017, with Roman Kuhar).

Raluca Maria Popa is a gender equality expert who has worked with several international organizations on issues related to women's access to justice and ending violence against women. She contributed to the development and promotion of regional human rights standards, importantly the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention). She is a PhD candidate in comparative gender studies at the Central European University, Budapest with a thesis preliminarily entitled "State Feminism within State Socialism. Rethinking Communist Women's Activism in Romania, 1946–1989." She has published articles in *Journal Européen des droits de l'homme/European Journal of Human Rights*, *Violence against Women*, *Social Politics*, *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, and *Roma Women's Journal/Nei Sara Kali*, as well as chapters in several edited volumes. Her research interests include women's movements in Central and Eastern Europe, the gender history of state socialism, gender-based violence and international women's rights, and contemporary feminist activism.

Conny Roggeband lectures at the Department of Political Science of the University of Amsterdam. Her research interests include gender mainstreaming and equality policies, gender-based violence, social movements, and transnational feminist networking. Her most recent books are *The Gender Politics of Domestic Violence: Feminists Engaging the State in Central and Eastern Europe* (Routledge, 2017), co-authored with Andrea Krizsán, and *The Handbook of Social Movements Across Disciplines* (Springer, 2017), co-edited with Bert Klandermans.

Niels Spierings is assistant professor in sociology at Radboud University, and member of the Radboud Social Cultural Research Institute. He works on issues of inequality and participation, with particular foci on gender, politics, and Islam. Geographically, he mainly studies Muslim societies, the Middle East, and Western Europe. In his work, statistics and survey research are combined with case studies,

interviews, and big data analysis. In his current work, some important themes are: democracy and gender equality in the Middle East; social media in (Dutch) politics; populism, gender, and LGBT equality in European countries; gender equality and political participation among European migrants; of the economic position of women in developing economies; and feminism and intersectionality in quantitative research. He has a Dutch Research Council VENI grant to study “Understanding the Influence of Islamic Religiosity on Democratic Attitudes in the Arab Middle East.”

Sofia Strid is associate professor in gender studies and senior lecturer in political science at Örebro University, Sweden. She is co-director of GEXcel International Collegium for Advanced Transdisciplinary Gender Studies, a researcher at the Centre for Feminist Social Studies, and the editor of the *Nordic Journal of Gender Studies* (www.tegeve.se). She is the vice chair of the Nordic Association for Women’s and Gender Studies. Strid’s research departs from feminist social theory and centres on gendered and intersectional violence, violence as a post-disciplinary research field, and violence as opposition to gender equality. She has recently co-published *The Concept and Measurement of Violence Against Women and Men* (lead author Sylvia Walby, Policy Press, 2017). Her research is financed by, for example, the European Commission, European Parliament, the European Institute for Gender Equality, and the Swedish Research Council.

Mieke Verloo is professor of comparative politics and inequality issues at Radboud University in the Netherlands, and non-residential permanent fellow at the IWM, Institute for Human Sciences, in Vienna. She is the winner of the 2015 ECPG Gender and Politics Career Achievement Award. She was scientific director of large research projects on gender equality policymaking in Europe (see www.mageeq.net and www.quing.eu) that designed methods to analyze the various meanings of gender equality policies across Europe, as well as their intersectional dimensions. She has extensive consultancy and training experience on gender mainstreaming and intersectionality for several European governments and institutions. Her research focuses on feminist politics, gender equality policies, and intersectionality. Her latest research is on the rise and dynamics of opposition to gender+ equality in Europe.

Pär Zetterberg is researcher in the department of government at Uppsala University in Sweden. His research focuses mainly on political recruitment and political representation in a comparative perspective. Particular attention is paid to the examination of how gender inequalities in politics are reproduced and overcome. He is also interested in research on how young people develop political attitudes and behavior. Ongoing research projects are about gender politics in semi-democracies, gender aspects of election violence, and social science education and youths’ political attitudes.

PART 1

Conceptualizing Opposition and Oppositional Dynamics



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1

INTRODUCTION

Dynamics of Opposition to Gender+ Equality in Europe

Mieke Verloo

Across Europe, examples of recent cases of opposition to gender+ equality are not hard to find. It can be direct, violent, and extremely visible, like when Swedish feminists receive online death threats (Sveland 2013; Strid this book) or like in France, where thousands demonstrated against “gender theory” and school programs tackling sex and gender stereotypes in 2014 (Borrillo 2015; Paternotte this book). It can be linked to the rise of the far right in Europe, as when the Sweden Democrats (one such party) strongly objected to the gender-conscious pedagogy adopted by public childcare facilities to help children handle, and reflect on, dualistic gender norms (Towns, Karlsson, and Eyre 2014). It can be ongoing, as is the case with Ireland’s abortion opposition (Kozłowska, Béland, and Lecours 2016; Qulity, Conlon, and Kennedy 2015). It can involve various types of actors, not just politicians and social-movement activists, but also bureaucrats and courts (Ahrens and Holzleithner in this book). At times opposition is also indirect and less visible, as in the case of successful UK shelters for victims of domestic violence being wiped out by outsourcing to non-expert commercial actors (Ishkanian 2014) or when regulations that impose gender mainstreaming in policymaking are set aside by those who are supposed to implement them (Ahrens 2017; Ahrens this book; Cavaghan 2017). Whatever the form, these varieties of opposition to gender+ equality in Europe are strongly linked to citizens’ attitudes towards gender and sexual equality (Spierings this book). As for the potential effects of this opposition, it matters tremendously how strong a country’s democratic institutions are and what power is in the hands of the respective allies and opponents of the feminist project (Verloo this book; Krizsán and Popa this book, Miškovska Kajevska this book).

Studying Opposition to Gender Equality in Europe

As strange as it may be, opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality is a relatively new subject in the study of the rise and fall of gender+ equality policies in Europe. Yet the crucial role of opposition should come as no surprise, as feminism by definition started as a movement or a political project that challenged the status quo, which has led it to face fierce opposition since its very beginnings (when or wherever one pinpoints it). Though over time the political victories of feminism have been many, whether they concerned women's right to education, political representation, or women making their own decisions about their body, sexuality, or sexual activity, no feminist victory has ever been complete or everlasting. Whether one looks at basic educational or political rights, economic or bodily autonomy, it is not hard to find countries in this 21st-century world where women's access to society or gender equality is non-existent, extremely limited, or incomplete. This is because the political efforts and victories of feminism have never eliminated their opposition, nor have they rendered opposition to feminism powerless. Opposition to feminism even seems to be growing (Council of Europe 2016a; Grzebalska and Soós 2016).

So, while opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality is not new at all, this book is part of a new and profoundly necessary surge of attention to opposition in research and in political analysis. Whether to better engage politically with ever more tenacious opposition movements or better understand their workings in a neoliberal networked society, we need to understand opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality more profoundly. Scholarly, there is much to gain from studying counterforces to the political project of feminism. As a recent field of study, gender and politics (Dahlerup 2010) has made tremendous progress in understanding what the causes and consequences are of gender inequality in politics, but gender and politics scholarship also has several problems and challenges: it frequently suffers from a progress bias, often has a too formal understanding of politics and at times it is locked in issue specificity, lacks an intersectional focus on gender equality, and is still very fragmented and one-dimensional in character.

The scholarly ambition of this book, then, is to understand the political dynamics of the rise and fall of gender+ equality projects by focusing on the various configurations of oppositional activities in Europe; in short, to better understand the dynamics of gender+ equality change through its varieties of opposition. The focus is on Europe for two reasons: The first is Europe's long and diverse history of engagement with feminism. The strength of its engagement is visible in the European Union's reputation and track record as an innovator and promoter of gender+ equality against a background of ongoing actual gender+ inequalities across Europe (EIGE 2013; 2015). It also shows in the Council of Europe's ongoing efforts to gender mainstream all its activities on democracy and human rights (Council of Europe 2016b). Yet even if both the European Union and the Council of Europe set standards to the member states' legal and policy choices,

the engagement with feminism and the meaning given to gender equality vary tremendously across European countries (Verloo 2007).

The second reason is related to the existing literature, which, though it has flagged the relevance of the *context* of feminist politics to its potential success or failure in principle, has so far left the specifically Western and European elements of this context undertheorized. The Eurocentric and Westerncentric nature of much of the scholarship has meant that these aspects of the context are taken for granted rather than articulated, described, and analyzed. While this is always problematic, it is particularly dangerous now that 21st-century Europe is facing an accumulation of new and old dangers. Of these, the decline of democracy, the transition back to illiberalism, and rising neoliberalism, neo-nationalism, and political violence in Europe are particularly in need of more attention.

Politically, this book thus wants to engage with the contemporary European developments and structural settings that underpin this current intensification of oppositional dynamics on feminist politics and gender+ equality, and will have key roles in the present and future strengthening of such oppositions. To understand these dynamics, it is important to focus on the interaction between structure and agency. Oppositional activities develop in the structural settings of interdependent domains such as polity, economy, violence, civil society, education, and sexuality. The current background against which the oppositional dynamics play out in the context of Europe shows a complex configuration of changing structural elements: a worrying decline of democracy; a reduction in government power; an increased marketization of politics and public services; a serious reduction of the political space for civil society; intensifying political hierarchies and polarizations; growing political surveillance and violence; strengthened academic capitalism; ongoing gender-based violence; and renewed attempts at controlling and restricting sexual and bodily autonomy. These structural changes not only present bureaucratic gatekeepers that have always been hesitant to embrace gender equality with more opportunities to block or hinder gender-equality progress, but they also open up many new avenues for opposition, facilitating the emergence or intensification of the activities of two sets of actors in particular: actors that are linked to far-right, extreme right, or populist radical right parties and movements, and actors that are linked to organized (and especially centralized) religions. Both sets of actors have recently created larger political spaces for themselves in Europe, although their actual political engagement and power differ across countries. More classic groups of actors that are active in politics in Europe such as employers and trade unions can also still be found frustrating and blocking attempts to advance gender+ equality.

With this book, we intend to address questions such as: What facilitates, fosters, hinders, generates, or eliminates opposition? Which feminism is being opposed exactly? Are some feminisms more vulnerable to opposition? Are some measures and policies more contested than others? Or more opposed by specific actors? Are any particular persons targeted by this opposition, and if so, why? And are some

forms and types of opposition potentially more successful than others? Can opposition maybe also foster greater feminist strength? In this book, we thus intend not just to address the specifics of how opposition functions in our current times, but we will also take on more theoretical challenges to understand what are the most productive ways in which we can theorize opposition, this also in order to be better equipped to analyze the actors, strategies, and dynamics of opposition.

In order to further articulate these questions and contribute answers, this book will present a more precise conceptualization of opposition and oppositional dynamics, revealing which actors can be active, which have been observed to be dominant where, and what the structural features are that strengthen or foster oppositional dynamics. It will pinpoint the current shortcomings in scholarship on feminist politics and gender+ equality policies, and highlight which existing or emerging scholarship has the potential to contribute to studying oppositional dynamics to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies. In its conclusions, this book will present ideas about how to more fully understand the positive and negative dynamics of gender+ equality change.

In this first chapter, the focus is on defining the problem at stake, both in its scholarly and political dimensions. This means defining what we understand as “opposition to gender-equality change”; figuring what out the problem is with opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies in Europe; improving our scholarship so as to contribute to a feminist politics that has effective strategies, tools, and techniques to engage with, and address, such oppositions. This chapter ends with a brief description of the following chapters and their place in this ambition.

What Is Opposition to Feminist Politics and Gender+ Equality?

For the purposes of this book, opposition to gender+ equality will be defined as *any activity in which a perspective opposing feminist politics and gender+ equality policy is articulated in a way that can be expected to influence or is actually influencing politics or policymaking at any stage.*

Defining it like this—rather than, for instance, merely as any social movement explicitly opposing gender-equality—involves making key choices about the visibility of opposition, about what is gender, about the location of opposition in political and policy processes, and about its potential impact. To see opposition as an *activity* means focusing on what is done by actors, not on what is caused by abstract structures. The theoretical reason for this is that structures can only be the cause of anything if they lead to actors’ actual engagement or activities in a certain direction (or to the absence thereof). Moreover, to see it as an activity *in which a perspective opposing feminist politics or gender+ equality policies is articulated* means seeing opposition as not only intentional—since such articulation can very well be

a side-effect of other dominant intentions—but restricting our understanding of opposition to those activities that can be found or analyzed to oppose an element (or multiple elements) of feminist politics or gender+ equality policies, a feature that is necessary to enable solid empirical research. Going beyond gender+ equality, whether as a normative value or as an existing state of reality, this definition describes what is being opposed as *feminist politics and gender+ equality policies*, a more dynamic focus that includes what is affecting and what is potentially changing gender+ equality outcomes. The choice to name both *politics and policies* is also deliberate, highlighting that it is not only policymaking that brings forward societal change but also feminist politics more broadly, as it includes actors from movements, political parties, and social and political institutions, as well as bureaucrats, scholars, and individual citizens. It would therefore be a mistake to restrict relevant opposition to only those activities that directly oppose bureaucratic or legislative proposals for instance, excluding oppositional activities that articulate a broader intention to hinder feminist politics or a more far-reaching ideology against feminist objectives. The choice to use *gender+* as a label for the policies flags the importance of paying attention to the intersectional inequalities that are interwoven with gender inequality, and this intersectional understanding extends to the understanding of feminist politics as necessarily intertwined and engaged with other structural inequalities shaping gender inequality. The phrase “*articulated in a way that either can be expected to influence or is actually influencing*” is included to focus on what matters most and enable theorizing on which kinds of opposition could potentially be successful. To understand the potential influence of any given opposition, it is important to comprehend feminist politics and gender+ equality policies as interventions in specific societies. Even in the context of Europe, this means vast differences in the actual ongoing gender+ inequalities and the political and policymaking opportunities and legacies. Contextuality needs to be part of theorizing because the potential impact of oppositional activities depends on the social, political, and historical context. Given that feminist politics is politics and gender+ equality policies are a form of policy, what happens to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies will always be subject to the usual dynamics of political and policy processes. That is why the last part of the definition, “politics or policymaking at any stage”, stresses that opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies can appear at each stage of these processes, in the agenda-setting stage as well as in the development, improvement, implementation, or evaluation stages—the type of actors that can be expected to be active differs depending on the stage under consideration (e.g. lobbyist in the policy-development stage, street-level bureaucrats in the implementation stage), and the type of opposition that occurs can be expected to vary across stages too. This book is intended to explore just such issues, such as which relevant actors or forms of opposition are linked to specific policy stages, in order to improve our understanding of the dynamics of gender+ equality change.

Why Study Opposition to Feminist Politics and Gender+ Equality in Europe Today?

As noted earlier, there are two reasons to study opposition to gender+ equality change in Europe:¹ there is a strong political drive related to worrying current developments in Europe and another more academic drive to push forward existing scholarship.

Looking at current developments in Europe and the more visible opposition in recent years, it is important to realize that opposition to gender+ equality change is not new at all. From a historical perspective, opposition to gender+ equality change can be found from the earliest days of feminism in Europe, as is testified by the long delays in changing laws that were exposed as gender unequal early on or in rectifying legislation and regulations that had a detrimental impact on women's lives. Examples abound: Olympe de Gouges' advocacy for women's rights and social justice (she was also a strong advocate against slavery) in the context of the French Revolution that is said to have signaled the start of European democracy was effectively silenced through her death by guillotine in 1793 (Scott 1992). It took the Netherlands 20 years to make marital rape a legal "possibility", only concluding the political struggle in 1992 after its first emergence on the political agenda in 1972 (Roggeband 2002). Ireland still does not have a law that gives women access to legal abortion because decades of feminist struggles have not been able to counter the ongoing opposition, while in other countries where abortion is a legal option, access to it is problematic because of a lack of facilities or because of opt-out possibilities for medical personnel (Githens and McBride Stetson 2013). There are also various obstruction methods, including violence (Krook 2016), hindering countries' compliance with legally adopted quota regulations, resulting in impotent quotas that cannot increase the share of elected women.

The historical nature of opposition to feminist politics shows that, as is often the case with "new" topics in academia, it is not so much the social phenomenon in itself that is new, but the academic attention to the phenomenon (Verloo 2001). The new or renewed attention to opposition to feminist politics, however, is also based on broader and increasing political worries about the decline of general political opportunities favorable to social justice, such as the substantial destruction of the welfare state and the changing landscape of politics and democracy in Europe (Merkel 2014). Recent scholarship has three main axes of attention regarding the current political dangers and challenges in Europe.

One is about the emergence, spread, and growth of far right, extreme right, and populist radical right parties in Europe, particularly analyzing the positions that these parties take on gender+ equality and the consequences that their politics of racializing based on migration background and religion have for gender+ equality (see the special issue of *Patterns of Prejudice* on gender and the radical right, edited by Akkerman 2015; Spierings and Zaslove 2015; Spierings et al. 2015;

Mayer, Ajanovic, and Sauer 2014; Meret and Siim 2012; Mulinari and Neergaard 2014; Kinnvall 2015; Köttig, Bitzan, and Petö 2016). Another can be found in the renewed surge in scholarship on class inequality and gender triggered by the financial and economic crisis, the growing dominance of neoliberal capitalism, austerity measures leading to the marketization of new domains such as academia, the retrenchment of the welfare state in Europe, and the ongoing exclusion of racialized others (Rubery 2015; Walby 2015; Karamessini and Rubery 2013; Klatzer and Schlager 2014; Leschke and Jepsen 2014; Thorsdottir 2014; Villa and Smith 2014; Ferree and Zippel 2015; Bassel and Emejulu 2014). Perhaps influenced by this new attention to the actors and factors hindering progress towards gender equality, and certainly fueled by the emerging scholarship on sexual equality, the last years also saw growing scholarship on the role of organized religion in opposing feminist and sexual-equality politics (Tremblay, Paternotte, and Johnson 2011); Paternotte, van der Dussen, and Piette 2015; Kuhar and Paternotte 2017).

While there are strong political motives driving the increased attention to opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality, there are also more academic motives, as such a focus on opposition can illuminate our theoretical understanding of gender+ equality change. And there in fact is much room for advancement on theory. Though gender+ equality change theory has made tremendous progress over the last 20 years, the current theory is still fragmented and compartmentalized, both in its attention to issues and in its theoretical paradigms—not to mention that it is also still under-intersectionalized. While comparative studies on issue-specific gender-equality change have provided important theoretical concepts and, at times, hypotheses, they often remain locked in issue specificity, focusing on quota (Krook 2010; Celis, Krook, and Meier 2011; Franceschet, Krook, and Piscopo 2012), abortion and reproductive rights (Githens and McBride Stetson 2013; Engeli 2012), or on violence (Weldon 2002). There also is a certain progress bias inherent in a dominant focus on identifying positive drivers of change such as feminist actors in civil society and in formal politics and policymaking (Weldon 2002; Johnson 2006). It is not that the existing theory pays no attention to veto points, lack of political will, watering down or perverting feminist initiatives, or straightforward obstruction (see, for instance, Waylen 2014; Prügl 2011; Outshoorn 1991; Verloo 2005), but that the forms opposition takes are not theorized enough.

Though there are exceptions where issue-specific research leads to theory building with a much wider impact (especially on violence, see Crenshaw 1991; Walby et al. 2015), what often remains unexplored in issue-specific research is the extent to which issues are linked to different social and political domains, and thereby to different actor configurations, discourses, and material-resource opportunities. The research's theoretical paradigms and empirical comparative work are equally fragmented. A large collaborative project such as the “state feminism project” (McBride and Mazur 2010) has theorized progress towards feminist goals, and does so mainly around two sets of actors (women's policy agencies and

women's movements). The landmark comparative work of Htun and Weldon (2010) on progress towards women's rights necessarily had to use "thin" data to determine its substantial indicators. Other large comparative research projects such as MAGEEQ and QUING have predominantly focused on discursive politics, filling an existing gap in knowledge about gender+ equality policies, but at times losing sight of the roles of actors, resources, and political opportunities. The scarce attention to intersectional inequalities in both research and theorizing on gender-equality change also presents a substantial challenge to our understanding of the dynamics of gender+ equality change, as we are left wondering when and where are which other inequality dimensions decisive for gender inequality outcomes. If we are to understand and prevent the social exclusions resulting from particular gender+ equality politics, we need to answer this question, combining, translating, and integrating insights from existing theoretical and empirical research.

Linked to the problems of fragmentation and the lack of attention for political and structural intersectionality, there is one more issue that has to be highlighted in discussing the existing theorizing on this topic: these theories' blind spot for the contexts in which gender-equality change attempts take place. More specifically, research about Europe too often takes democracy and the welfare state for granted, therefore failing to theorize the importance of both democracy and welfare state with their corresponding master frames, opportunity structures, and actors. Europe is hardly ever analyzed as a set of countries that are positioned differently on democracy, nor are the European varieties of democracies analyzed in their ongoing dynamic changes. Recent shocks such as the exclusion of Hungary from the Freedom House list of democratic free countries have apparently not yet been processed, and promising theories on democracy such as Tilly (2007) and Walby (2009) have not been used much in comparative political research. The bulk of research on gender and democracy in Europe has a numerical fallacy in its dominant focus on the number of women in parliaments and governments (Lombardo et al. 2007). Research on gender-equality policies, on the other hand, more often relates to varieties of welfare states, but these studies are mostly restricted to the old Europe (almost 30 years after the end of the Cold War!). It is very rare to see comparisons across all EU countries, and even rarer to see them expanded to the wider set of Council of Europe member states. There is a clear need to recognize the variety of European democracies as a crucial factor impacting on the countries' differential chances of bringing forward gender+ equality (see also Chapters 2 and 3 in this book).

Moreover, politics and gender research in the European context have mainly studied religion as a component of inequality reproduction, as linked to racialization, as linked to immigration in Europe (Korteweg and Triadafilopoulos 2013), as related to clashes between religious and other rights, or in the context of multiculturalism and gender (see Lépinard 2012; Lettinga and Saharso 2014; Rosenberger and Sauer 2013; Siim 2014). The attention has been focused on

marginalized and racialized faiths in Europe such as Islam, and only recently is there attention for the role of organized religion—mainly the Catholic Church and the Holy See—in opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies (van de Wal and Verloo 2009; Kuhar and Paternotte 2017; Paternotte, Piette, and van der Dussen 2016). Though there is also some attention for the role of the Orthodox Church as an organized actor against gender and sexual equality (see Spehar 2012; Rivkin-Fish 2013; Drezgić 2015), it is still limited. Yet, in view of the current developments in Europe, it is urgent that we include dimensions of democracy, organized religion, and the welfare state into our understandings of contextualized oppositional dynamics of gender+ equality change.

Who Are the Most Important Actors Engaging in Oppositional Activities?

Existing scholarship has not yet identified the most important actors acting in opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies. Without drawing borders between them too strictly, oppositional actors can be expected to come from three different areas. The first is the formal domain of the polity, of political decision-making, policy development, and implementation, involving actors from parliament, government, courts, and the state bureaucracy. Organized religion also is part of this domain, as it “governs” its members in various ways and is often intertwined with the state (Walby 2009). Even if these actors at times might act favorably to gender+ equality change, we can expect them to be oppositional actors because of the ongoing existence of gender inequality regimes, which tells us that continuing gender inequality has to be in the interest of the actors who are currently powerful in the polity. Such actors can also be expected to have enough resources to engage in opposition activities.

The second area where oppositional actors can be found is the domain of civil society. These are actors such as social movements, interest groups, and other parts of civil society engaging with the state in political processes and in decision-making contestations. Within this second area, a distinction has to be made between the actors working for and those against equality and social justice. Those who work for equality and social justice mainly focus on gender, or predominantly on one specific other structural inequalities (such as class or race), and they may have varying levels of institutionalization (Verloo 2006). While opposition can clearly be expected from groups engaging in anti-equality activities, opposition can also come from actors in favor of equality and social justice when those feel the need to compete with feminist endeavors.

The last area is comprised of all other domains of society, where powerful domain actors may use their power to engage in activities that oppose feminist politics and gender+ equality policies in that domain. Given the tenacity of economic gender inequality, the economy is a crucial domain from which oppositional actors can be expected, as many powerful actors from corporations

and industry might see gender+ equality as going against their (profit-making) interest.

Introducing the Book and Its Chapters

Looking at opposition to gender+ equality in Europe, and how we can best understand and study it, our challenges are both theoretical and empirical. This book addresses the strong need to understand gender+ equality politics as intersectional and dynamic, driven by both actor- and structure-based dynamics, by both discursive and material power mechanisms, and as interventions in specific societies. The most promising theoretical strands to address these issues are social-movement theories and social complexity theory, this book contends, and these theories will be further presented and discussed by Roggeband in Chapter 2 and by me in Chapter 3.

As a whole, this book aims to showcase and understand the differentiation in oppositional actors and activities, and the oppositional dynamics at different stages of the political and policy process, including which actors oppose gender+ equality. In doing this, the book presents knowledge about the overall chances for feminist politics and gender+ equality policies to succeed or fail.

The book consists of three parts. Part I describes the challenges and opportunities that come with this book's ambition to understand the dynamics of opposition to gender-equality policies in Europe. The conceptual challenges are many. This part addresses how a concept such as opposition links with scholarship on social movements and the countermovements they at times generate. Part I also presents theoretical ideas that help understand opposition as dynamics, as interactions between what happens in society and in policy making, as interactions between gender-equality actors and actors pushing against gender equality, and as a phenomenon that can change form and substance along the various stages of policy making.

This first chapter addresses these challenges and presents some preliminary conclusions (such as a definition of opposition to gender equality). Conny Roggeband and Mieke Verloo, in Chapter 2, "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Making Sense of Opposition to Feminisms from a Social-Movement Perspective" and in Chapter 3, "Understanding the Dynamics of Opposition to Gender-Equality Change: Lessons from and for Social Complexity Theory", then each take on a particular set of theories that can be expected to offer building blocks for a comprehensive understanding of opposition to gender equality in Europe. While Roggeband draws lessons from social movement theory, showing what is and what is not useful for the purposes of this book, Verloo presents an operationalization of Sylvia Walby's social complexity theory. Jointly, these theoretical contributions are the main resources for the overall conclusions of the book in Part III.

Part II has eight empirical contributions, case studies on opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality in Europe that each address crucial dimensions

for understanding the dynamics of opposition to gender+ equality in Europe. In Chapter 4, “Patriarchy Fights Back: Violent Opposition to Gender Equality in Online Contexts”, Sofia Strid not only details the intensity and prevalence of online violence against feminist politics but also theorizes what can explain this form of opposition. Strid conceptualizes this oppositional violence as a means of the relatively powerful to maintain their economic, social, and political power positions.

Chapter 5 tackles forms of opposition that are less visible and present their own particular challenges. In “Indirect Opposition: Diffuse Barriers to Gender+ Equality in the European Union”, Petra Ahrens uses an extensive analysis of EU policymaking to develop a typology of three indirect forms of opposition to gender equality that can be helpful for a more comprehensive conceptualization. In Chapter 6, “Contesting Gender Equality in Domestic-Violence Policy Debates: Comparing Three Countries in Central and Eastern Europe”, Andrea Krizsán and Raluca Maria Popa focus on the action—reaction dynamics between opponents of domestic-violence policies and social-movement actors, showing how opposition to framing domestic violence as a gender-equality problem affects feminist mobilization. In Chapter 7, “A Feminist Opposition to Gender Equality? Making Sense of the Social Democratic Party’s Internal Struggle Over Extending Parental-Leave Quotas in Sweden”, Christina Bergqvist, Elin Bjarnegård, and Pär Zetterberg focus on the tension in left-oriented parties between social-justice claims based on class and based on gender. They show that proponents and opponents of parental-leave quota extensions in Sweden had very divergent understandings of the problems at stake and widely different motivations for their strategies. Combined with differences in their intra-party power positions, this led to a defeat for the proponents of the fathers-leave quota.

Elisabeth Holzleithner’s Chapter 8, “Subversion from Within: Opposition to Gender Equality in the Court of Justice of the European Union”, shows how the European Court’s interpretations of European laws on sexual and gender equality define the success or failure of governmental opposition to gender and sexual equality. In Chapter 9, David Paternotte presents “Unpacking Oppositional Success: The French Laboratory”, in which he carefully analyzes the many factors that contributed to the remarkable success of the *Manif Pour Tous*, a movement against sexual and gender equality originating in France. In Chapter 10, “Popular Opposition to Economic Gender Equality and Homosexual Lifestyles”, Niels Spierings analyzes oppositional attitudes to gender and sexual equality, revealing more than just the positive trends and analyzing who are the strongest opponents. In the last empirical chapter, “Suspending Democracy, Harming Gender Equality: The 2013 Law on Pregnancy Termination in Macedonia”, Ana Miškovska Kajevska convincingly analyzes how the absence of democracy directly leads to increased power for opposition to abortion rights.

Together, the case studies cover all regions of Europe. Across the chapters, the authors showcase the variety of actors engaging in opposition: politicians,

experts, and civil-society groups (Krizsán and Popa); femocrats and policymakers (Ahrens); male and female politicians (Bergqvist et al.); courts and governments (Holzleithner); reactionary individuals and media (Strid); the Catholic Church and related groups (Paternotte); and citizens (Spierings). Krizsán and Popa, Paternotte, as well as Holzleithner pay extensive attention to discursive dynamics and how these impact on the opposition's (potential) success. In these case studies, all authors engage with the question of how to grasp the dynamics of opposition as linked to the role of various actors and to the interplay between material and discursive mechanisms.

Part III then presents a framework for understanding oppositional dynamics to feminist politics and gender+ equality policy change, and thus improve our assessment of which actions could best address (and defeat) which forms of opposition. In the final chapter, "How To Study Varieties of Opposition To Gender+ Equality in Europe? Lessons from this Book, Conceptual Building Blocks, and Puzzles to Address", I then assess the value of the theoretical elements presented in Part I (actors and mechanisms, variations of hidden opposition and silencing, high-potential building blocks from social movement and social complexity theory) against the empirical material presented in Part II. This chapter identifies which of these building blocks seem most promising and why, also flagging the challenges and puzzles ahead. By covering the lessons that can be learned from both the theory and the case studies about opposition to feminist politics and gender+ equality policies, this book hopes to better understand opposition successes and highlight valuable routes for possible action against opposition.

In addressing these questions, this final chapter aims at being an inspiration for further research and for further debate about the rise and fall of gender+ equalities in contemporary Europe.

Note

- 1 In line with Schimmelpfennig (2016), Europe here is meant as "including all countries that stand a theoretical chance to become EU members. This includes Turkey, the countries of the Southern Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia), and the Western former Soviet republics (Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine) but not Russia, i.e. currently 44 European countries. The European micro-states are excluded, too." (:19)

References

- Ahrens, P. 2017. *Actors, institutions, and the making of EU gender equality programs*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Akkerman, T. 2015. "Gender and the radical right in Western Europe: A comparative analysis of policy agendas." *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(1–2): 37–60.
- Bassel, L. and A. Emejulu. 2014. "Solidarity under austerity: Intersectionality in France and the United Kingdom." *Politics & Gender* 10(01): 130–136.
- Borrillo, D. 2015. "Mariage pour tous et filiation pour certains: les résistances à l'égalité des droits pour les couples de même sexe." *Droit et cultures. Revue internationale interdisciplinaire* 69: 179–220.

- Cavaghan, R. 2017. *Making gender equality happen: Knowledge, change and resistance in EU gender mainstreaming*. New York: Routledge.
- Celis, K., M. L. Krook and P. Meier. 2011. "The rise of gender quota laws: Expanding the spectrum of determinants for electoral reform." *West European Politics* 34(3): 514–530.
- Council of Europe. 2016a. Background Note on Sexist Hate Speech. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000168059ad42>. Accessed on 4 August 2016.
- Council of Europe. 2016b. Gender equality and women's rights. Council of Europe standards. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168058feef>. Accessed on 6 June 2016.
- Crenshaw, K. 1991. "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color." *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 1241–1299.
- Dahlerup, D. 2010. "The development of gender and politics as a new research field within the framework of the ECPR." *European Political Science* 9: S85–S98.
- Drezgić, R. 2015. "Orthodox Christianity and gender equality in Serbia: On reproductive and sexual rights." In *Gender (In)equality and gender politics in Southeastern Europe*, edited by C. M. Hassenstab and S. P. Ramet, 297–317. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Engeli, I. 2012. "Policy struggle on reproduction: Doctors, women, and Christians." *Political Research Quarterly* 65(2): 330–345.
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). 2013. Gender Equality Index Report, Vilnius. Available at <http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Gender-Equality-Index-Report.pdf>. Accessed on 15 October 2015.
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). 2015. Gender Equality Index 2015 – Measuring gender equality in the European Union 2005–2012, Vilnius. Available at <http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/mh0215616enn.pdf>. Accessed on 15 October 2015.
- Ferree, M. M. and K. Zippel. 2015. "Gender equality in the age of academic capitalism: Cassandra and Pollyanna interpret university restructuring." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 22(4): 561–584.
- Franceschet, S., M. L. Krook and J. M. Piscopo, eds. 2012. *The impact of gender quotas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Githens, M., and D. McBride Stetson. 2013. *Abortion politics: Public policy in cross-cultural perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Grzebska, W. and E. Soós. 2016. "Conservatives vs. the "Culture of Death", Renner Institute Vienna.
- Htun, M., and S. L. Weldon. 2010. "When do governments promote women's rights? A framework for the comparative analysis of sex equality policy." *Perspectives on Politics* 8(01): 207–216.
- Ishkanian, A. 2014. "Neoliberalism and violence: The Big Society and the changing politics of domestic violence in England." *Critical Social Policy* 34(3): 333–353.
- Johnson, M. P. 2006. "Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence." *Violence Against Women* 12(11): 1003–1018.
- Karamessini, M. and J. Rubery. 2013. *Women and austerity: The economic crisis and the future for gender equality*. London: Routledge.
- Kinnvall, C. 2015. "Borders and fear: Insecurity, gender and the far right in Europe." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(4): 514–529.
- Korteweg, A. C., and T. Triadafilopoulos. 2013. "Gender, religion, and ethnicity: Intersection and boundaries in immigrant integration policy making." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 20(1): 109–136.

- Kozłowska, I., D. Béland and A. Lecours. 2016. "Nationalism, religion, and abortion policy in four Catholic societies." *Nations and Nationalism* 22(4): 824–844.
- Klatzer, E., and C. Schlager. 2014. "Gender and macroeconomics: Economic governance in the European Union—reconfiguration of gendered power structures and erosion of gender equality." In *The SAGE handbook of feminist theory*, edited by M. Evans, C. Hemmings, M. Henry, H. Johnstone, S. Madhok, A. Plomien, and S. Wearing, 483–499. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Krook, M. L. 2010. *Quotas for women in politics: Gender and candidate selection reform worldwide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krook, M. L. 2016. "Contesting quotas: dynamics of resistance." *Politics, Groups and Identities* 4(2): 268–283.
- Köttig, M., R. Bitzan and A. Pető. 2016. *Gender and far right politics in Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte. 2017. *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Lépinard, É. 2012. "Dangerous encounters: Gender and multiculturalism in Europe and beyond." *Perspectives on Europe* 42(1): 64–69.
- Leschke, J. and M. Jepsen. 2014. "Is the economic crisis challenging the prevailing gender regime? A comparison of Denmark, Germany, Slovakia, and the United Kingdom." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 21(4): 485–508.
- Lettinga, D., and S. Saharso. 2014. "Outsiders within: Framing and regulation of Headscarves in France, Germany and The Netherlands." *Social Inclusion* 2(3): 029–039.
- Lombardo, E., V. Jalušič, M. Pantelidou Maloutas and B. Sauer. 2007. "Taming the male sovereign? Framing gender inequality in politics in the European Union and the member states." In *Multiple meanings of gender equality*, edited by Mieke Verloo, 79–109. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Mayer, S., E. Ajanovic and B. Sauer. 2014. "Intersections and inconsistencies. Framing gender in right-wing populist discourses in Austria." *NORA—Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 22(4): 250–266.
- McBride, D. E. and A. G. Mazur. 2010. *The politics of state feminism: Innovation in comparative research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Meret, S. and B. Siim. 2012. "Gender, populism and politics of belonging: Discourses of right-wing populist parties in Denmark, Norway and Austria." In *Negotiating Gender and Diversity in an Emergent European Public Sphere*, edited by B. Siim and M. Mokre, 78–96. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Merkel, W. 2014. "Is there a crisis of democracy?" *Democratic Theory* 1(2): 11–25.
- Mulinari, D. and A. Neergaard. 2014. "We are Sweden Democrats because we care for others: Exploring racisms in the Swedish extreme right." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 21(1): 43–56.
- Outshoorn, J. 1991. "Is this what we wanted? Positive action as issue perversion." *Equality Policies and Gender*, edited by E. Meehan and S. Sevenhuijsen, 104–122. London: SAGE.
- Paternotte, D., V. Piette and S. van der Dussen. 2016. *Habemus Gender! Déconstruction d'une riposte religieuse*. Sextant. Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Paternotte, David, Sophie van der Dussen, and Valérie Piette (eds.). 2015. *Habemus Gender* (special issue). *Sextant* 31.
- Prügl, E. 2011. "Diversity management and gender mainstreaming as technologies of government." *Politics & Gender* 7(1): 71–89.
- Quilty, A., C. Conlon, and S. Kennedy. 2015. *The abortion papers Ireland*. Cork: Cork University Press.

- Rivkin-Fish, M. 2013. "Conceptualizing feminist strategies for Russian reproductive politics: Abortion, surrogate motherhood, and family support after socialism." *Signs* 38(3): 569–593.
- Roggeband, C. M. 2002. *Over de grenzen van de politiek: een vergelijkende studie naar de opkomst en ontwikkeling van de vrouwenbeweging tegen seksueel geweld in Nederland en Spanje*. Uitgeverij Van Gorcum.
- Rosenberger, S. and B. Sauer, eds. 2013. *Politics, religion and gender: Framing and regulating the veil*. London: Routledge.
- Rubery, J. 2015. "Austerity and the future for gender equality in Europe." *ILR Review* 68(4): 715–741.
- Schimmelpfennig, F. 2016. Graded Membership in the European Union: Good Governance and Differentiated Integration, KFG Working Paper Series, No.73, June 2016, Kolleg-Forschergruppe (KFG) "The Transformative Power of Europe", Freie Universität Berlin.
- Scott, J. 1992. "A woman who has only paradoxes to offer." Olympe de Gouges claims rights for women. In *Rebel daughters: Women and the French revolution*, edited by S. E. Melzer and L. W. Rabine, 102–121. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siiim, B. 2014. "Political intersectionality and democratic politics in the European public sphere." *Politics & Gender* 10(1): 117–124.
- Spehar, A. 2012. "This far, but no further? Benefits and limitations of EU gender equality policy making in the Western Balkans." *East European Politics & Societies* 26(2): 362–379.
- Spierings, N., A. Zaslove, L. M. Mügge and S.L.de Lange. 2015. "Gender and populist radical-right politics: An introduction." *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(1–2): 3–15.
- Spierings, N. and A. Zaslove. 2015. "Conclusion: Dividing the populist radical right between 'liberal nativism' and traditional conceptions of gender." *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(1–2): 163–173.
- Sveland, M. 2013. *Hatet. En bok om antifeminism*. Stockholm: Leopard förlag.
- Tilly, C. 2007. *Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thorsdottir, T. K. 2014. "Iceland: From feminist governance to gender-blind austerity?" *Gender, Sexuality, and Feminism* 1(2).
- Towns, A., E. Karlsson, and J. Eyre. 2014. "The equality conundrum. Gender and nation in the ideology of the Sweden Democrats." *Party Politics*, 20(2): 237–247.
- Tremblay, M., D. Paternotte and C. Johnson. 2011. *The lesbian and gay movement and the state. Comparative insights into a transformed relationship*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- van der Wal, F. and M. Verloo. 2009. "Religion, church, intimate citizenship and gender equality. An analysis of differences in gender equality policies in European Catholic countries." Radboud University: IMR Working Paper POL 12–02.
- Verloo, M. 2001. *Another velvet revolution? Gender mainstreaming and the politics of implementation*. Vienna: Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.
- Verloo, M., 2005. "Displacement and empowerment: Reflections on the concept and practice of the Council of Europe approach to gender mainstreaming and gender equality." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12(3): 344–365.
- Verloo, M. 2006. "Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3): 211–228.
- Verloo, M. 2007. *Multiple meanings of gender equality: a critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe*. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Villa, P. and M. Smith. 2014. "Towards a gender-equitable macroeconomic framework for Europe." Beyond Austerity, towards Employment: A Gender Aware Framework: 25.

- www.feps-europe.eu/assets/fd49512d-a460-49be-8f69-09ff7ba12c2e/2013-11-21-beyond-austerity-brussels-programme-briefs.pdf#page=26. Accessed 25 October 2015.
- Walby, S. 2009. *Globalization and inequalities: Complexity and contested modernities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Walby, S. 2015. *Crisis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Walby, S., P. Olive, J. Towers, B. Francis, S. Strid, A. Krizsán, E. Lombardo, C. May-Chahal, S. Franzway, D. Sugarman, B. Agarwal and J. Armstrong. 2015. *Stopping rape: towards a comprehensive policy*. Chicago: Policy Press.
- Waylen, G. 2014. "Informal institutions, institutional change, and gender equality." *Political Research Quarterly* 67(1): 212–223.
- Weldon, S. L. 2002. *Protest, policy, and the problem of violence against women: A cross-national comparison*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Introduction

- Ahrens, P. 2017. *Actors, institutions, and the making of EU gender equality programs*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Akkerman, T. 2015. Gender and the radical right in Western Europe: A comparative analysis of policy agendas. *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(12): 3760.
- Bassel, L. and A. Emejulu . 2014. Solidarity under austerity: Intersectionality in France and the United Kingdom. *Politics & Gender* 10(01): 130136.
- Borrillo, D. 2015. Mariage pour tous et filiation pour certains: les résistances à l'égalité des droits pour les couples de même sexe. *Droit et cultures. Revue internationale interdisciplinaire* 69: 179220.
- 15 Cavaghan, R. 2017. *Making gender equality happen: Knowledge, change and resistance in EU gender mainstreaming*. New York: Routledge.
- Celis, K. , M. L. Krook and P. Meier . 2011. The rise of gender quota laws: Expanding the spectrum of determinants for electoral reform. *West European Politics* 34(3): 514530.
- Council of Europe. 2016a. Background Note on Sexist Hate Speech. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168059ad42>. Accessed on 4 August 2016.
- Council of Europe. 2016b. Gender equality and women's rights. Council of Europe standards. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168058feef>. Accessed on 6 June 2016.
- Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 12411299.
- Dahlerup, D. 2010. The development of gender and politics as a new research field within the framework of the ECPR. *European Political Science* 9: S85S98.
- Drezgi, R. 2015. Orthodox Christianity and gender equality in Serbia: On reproductive and sexual rights. In *Gender (In)equality and gender politics in Southeastern Europe*, edited by C. M. Hassenstab and S. P. Ramet , 297317. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Engeli, I. 2012. Policy struggle on reproduction: Doctors, women, and Christians. *Political Research Quarterly* 65(2): 330345.
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). 2013. *Gender Equality Index Report*, Vilnius. Available at <http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Gender-Equality-Index-Report.pdf>. Accessed on 15 October 2015
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). 2015. *Gender Equality Index 2015 Measuring gender equality in the European Union 20052012*, Vilnius. Available at <http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/mh0215616enn.pdf>. Accessed on 15 October 2015.
- Ferree, M. M. and K. Zippel . 2015. Gender equality in the age of academic capitalism: Cassandra and Pollyanna interpret university restructuring. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 22(4): 561584.
- Franceschet, S. , M. L. Krook and J. M. Piscopo , eds. 2012. *The impact of gender quotas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Githens, M. , and D. McBride Stetson . 2013. *Abortion politics: Public policy in cross-cultural perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Grzebalska, W. and E. Sos . 2016. *Conservatives vs. the Culture of Death*, Renner Institute Vienna.
- Htun, M. , and S. L. Weldon . 2010. When do governments promote women's rights? A framework for the comparative analysis of sex equality policy. *Perspectives on Politics* 8(01): 207216.
- Ishkanian, A. 2014. Neoliberalism and violence: The Big Society and the changing politics of domestic violence in England. *Critical Social Policy* 34(3): 333353.
- Johnson, M. P. 2006. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 12(11): 10031018.
- Karamessini, M. and J. Rubery . 2013. *Women and austerity: The economic crisis and the future for gender equality*. London: Routledge.
- Kinnvall, C. 2015. Borders and fear: Insecurity, gender and the far right in Europe. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 23(4): 514529.
- Korteweg, A. C. , and T. Triadafilopoulos . 2013. Gender, religion, and ethnicity: Intersections and boundaries in immigrant integration policy making. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 20(1): 109136.

- 16 Kozłowska, I. , D. Bland and A. Lecours . 2016. Nationalism, religion, and abortion policy in four Catholic societies. *Nations and Nationalism* 22(4): 824844.
- Klatzer, E. , and C. Schlager . 2014. Gender and macroeconomics: Economic governance in the European Union reconfiguration of gendered power structures and erosion of gender equality. In *The SAGE handbook of feminist theory*, edited by M. Evans , C. Hemmings , M. Henry , H. Johnstone , S. Madhok , A. Plomien , and S. Wearing , 483499. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Krook, M. L. 2010. *Quotas for women in politics: Gender and candidate selection reform worldwide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krook, M. L. 2016. Contesting quotas: dynamics of resistance. *Politics, Groups and Identities* 4(2): 268283.
- Kttig, M. , R. Bitzan and A. Pet . 2016. *Gender and far right politics in Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte . 2017. *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Lpinard , . 2012. Dangerous encounters: Gender and multiculturalism in Europe and beyond. *Perspectives on Europe* 42(1): 6469.
- Leschke, J. and M. Jepsen . 2014. Is the economic crisis challenging the prevailing gender regime? A comparison of Denmark, Germany, Slovakia, and the United Kingdom. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 21(4): 485508.
- Lettinga, D. , and S. Saharso . 2014. Outsiders within: Framing and regulation of Headscarves in France, Germany and The Netherlands. *Social Inclusion* 2(3): 029039.
- Lombardo, E. , V. Jalui , M. Pantelidou Maloutas and B. Sauer . 2007. Taming the male sovereign? Framing gender inequality in politics in the European Union and the member states. In *Multiple meanings of gender equality*, edited by Mieke Verloo , 79109. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Mayer, S. , E. Ajanovic and B. Sauer . 2014. Intersections and inconsistencies. Framing gender in right-wing populist discourses in Austria. *NORANordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 22(4): 250266.
- McBride, D. E. and A. G. Mazur . 2010. *The politics of state feminism: Innovation in comparative research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Meret, S. and B. Siim . 2012. Gender, populism and politics of belonging: Discourses of right-wing populist parties in Denmark, Norway and Austria. In *Negotiating Gender and Diversity in an Emergent European Public Sphere*, edited by B. Siim and M. Mokre , 7896. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Merkel, W. 2014. Is there a crisis of democracy? *Democratic Theory* 1(2): 1125.
- Mulinari, D. and A. Neergaard . 2014. We are Sweden Democrats because we care for others: Exploring racisms in the Swedish extreme right. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 21(1): 4356.
- Outshoorn, J. 1991. Is this what we wanted? Positive action as issue perversion. *Equality Policies and Gender*, edited by E. Meehan and S. Sevenhuijsen , 104122. London: SAGE.
- Paternotte, D. , V. Piette and S. van der Dussen . 2016. *Habemus Gender! Dconstruction dune riposte religieuse*. Sextant. Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Paternotte, David , Sophie van der Dussen , and Valrie Piette (eds.). 2015. *Habemus Gender* (special issue). Sextant 31.
- Prgl, E. 2011. Diversity management and gender mainstreaming as technologies of government. *Politics & Gender* 7(1): 7189.
- Quilty, A. , C. Conlon , and S. Kennedy . 2015. *The abortion papers Ireland*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- 17 Rivkin-Fish, M. 2013. Conceptualizing feminist strategies for Russian reproductive politics: Abortion, surrogate motherhood, and family support after socialism. *Signs* 38(3): 569593.
- Roggeband, C. M. 2002. *Over de grenzen van de politiek: een vergelijkende studie naar de opkomst en ontwikkeling van de vrouwenbeweging tegen seksueel geweld in Nederland en Spanje*. Uitgeverij Van Gorcum.
- Rosenberger, S. and B. Sauer , eds. 2013. *Politics, religion and gender: Framing and regulating the veil*. London: Routledge.
- Rubery, J. 2015. Austerity and the future for gender equality in Europe. *ILR Review* 68(4): 715741.
- Schimmelpfennig, F. 2016. *Graded Membership in the European Union: Good Governance and Differentiated Integration*, KFG Working Paper Series, No.73, June 2016, Kolleg-Forscherguppe (KFG) The Transformative Power of Europe, Freie Universität Berlin.

Scott, J. 1992. A woman who has only paradoxes to offer. Olympe de Gouges claims rights for women. In *Rebel daughters: Women and the French revolution*, edited by S. E. Meizer and L. W. Rabine, 102121. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siim, B. 2014. Political intersectionality and democratic politics in the European public sphere. *Politics & Gender* 10(1): 117124.

Spehar, A. 2012. This far, but no further? Benefits and limitations of EU gender equality policy making in the Western Balkans. *East European Politics & Societies* 26(2): 362379.

Spierings, N., A. Zaslove, L. M. Mgge and S.L.de Lange. 2015. Gender and populist radical-right politics: An introduction. *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(12): 315.

Spierings, N. and A. Zaslove. 2015. Conclusion: Dividing the populist radical right between liberal nativism and traditional conceptions of gender. *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(12): 163173.

Sveland, M. 2013. *Hatet. En bok om antifeminism*. Stockholm: Leopard frlag.

Tilly, C. 2007. *Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thorsdottir, T. K. 2014. Iceland: From feminist governance to gender-blind austerity? *Gender, Sexuality, and Feminism* 1(2).

Towns, A., E. Karlsson, and J. Eyre. 2014. The equality conundrum. Gender and nation in the ideology of the Sweden Democrats. *Party Politics*, 20(2): 237247.

Tremblay, M., D. Paternotte and C. Johnson. 2011. The lesbian and gay movement and the state. Comparative insights into a transformed relationship. Farnham: Ashgate.

van der Wal, F. and M. Verloo. 2009. Religion, church, intimate citizenship and gender equality. An analysis of differences in gender equality policies in European Catholic countries. Radboud University: IMR Working Paper POL 1202.

Verloo, M. 2001. Another velvet revolution? Gender mainstreaming and the politics of implementation. Vienna: Institut fr die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.

Verloo, M., 2005. Displacement and empowerment: Reflections on the concept and practice of the Council of Europe approach to gender mainstreaming and gender equality. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12(3): 344365.

Verloo, M. 2006. Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 13(3): 211228.

Verloo, M. 2007. Multiple meanings of gender equality: a critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe. Budapest: CEU Press.

Villa, P. and M. Smith. 2014. Towards a gender-equitable macroeconomic framework for Europe. Beyond Austerity, towards Employment: A Gender Aware Framework: 25. 18 www.feps-europe.eu/assets/fd49512d-a460-49be-8f69-09ff7ba12c2e/2013-11-21-beyond-austerity-brussels-programme-briefs.pdf#page=26. Accessed 25 October 2015.

Walby, S. 2009. *Globalization and inequalities: Complexity and contested modernities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walby, S. 2015. *Crisis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walby, S., P. Olive, J. Towers, B. Francis, S. Strid, A. Krizsn, E. Lombardo, C. May-Chahal, S. Franzway, D. Sugarman, B. Agarwal and J. Armstrong. 2015. *Stopping rape: towards a comprehensive policy*. Chicago: Policy Press.

Waylen, G. 2014. Informal institutions, institutional change, and gender equality. *Political Research Quarterly* 67(1): 212223.

Weldon, S. L. 2002. *Protest, policy, and the problem of violence against women: A cross-national comparison*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Benford, R. D., and D. A. Snow. 2000. Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1): 611639.

Blais, M. and F. Dupuis-Dri. 2012. Masculinism and the antifeminist countermovement. *Social Movement Studies* 11(1): 2139.

Chafetz, J. Saltzman, and A. G. Dworkin. 1987. In the face of threat: Organized antifeminism in comparative perspective. *Gender & Society* 1(1): 3360.

Chappell, L. 2006. Contesting womens rights: Charting the emergence of a transnational conservative counter-network. *Global Society* 20(4): 491520.

Crowley, J. E. 2009. Fathers rights groups, domestic violence and political countermobilization. *Social Forces* 88(2): 723755.

Dragiewicz, M. 2008. Patriarchy reasserted. Fathers rights and anti-VAWA activism. *Feminist Criminology* 3(2): 121144.

Eisenstein, Z. 1981. Antifeminism in the politics and election of 1980. *Feminist Studies* 7(2): 187205.

Esacove, A. W. 2004. Dialogic framing: The framing/counterframing of Partial-Birth abortion. *Sociological Inquiry* 74(1): 70101.

Ferree, M. Marx and C. Mueller . 2004. Feminism and the International Womens Movement. In *Blackwell companion to social movements*, edited by D. Snow , S. Soule and H. Kriesi , 576607. London: Blackwell Publishers.

Fetner, T. 2001. Working Anita Bryant: The impact of Christian anti-gay activism on lesbian and gay movement claims. *Social Problems* 48(3): 411428.

Foust, C. R. , and Simon, J. M. 2015. Memories of movement in a postfeminist context: Conservative fusion in the rhetoric of Tammy Bruce and Dr. Laura Schlessinger. *Western Journal of Communication* 79(1): 121.

Kretschmer, K. 2014. Shifting boundaries and splintering movements: Abortion rights in the feminist and new right movements. *Sociological Forum* 29(4): 893915.

Lind, B. , & Stepan-Norris, J. 2011. The relationality of movements: Movement and countermovement resources, infrastructure, and leadership in the Los Angeles Tenants Rights Mobilization, 19761979. *American Journal of Sociology* 116(5): 15641609.

Lo, Clarence Y. H. 1982. Countermovements and conservative movements in the contemporary US. *Annual Review of Sociology* 8: 107134.

Mann, R. M. 2008. Mens rights and feminist advocacy in Canadian domestic violence policy arenas contexts, dynamics, and outcomes of antifeminist backlash. *Feminist Criminology* 3(1): 4475.

Marshall, S. E. 1985. Ladies against women: Mobilization dilemmas of antifeminist movements. *Social Problems* 32(4): 348362.

McCaffrey, D. 2000. Competitive framing processes in the abortion debate: Polarization-vilification, frame saving, and frame debunking. *The Sociological Quarterly* 41(1): 4161.

37 McCarthy, J. D. , & Zald, M. N. 1977. Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 12121241.

McCright, A. M. , and R. E. Dunlap . 2000. Challenging global warming as a social problem: An analysis of the conservative movements counter-claims. *Social Problems* 47(4): 499522.

McRobbie, A. 2011. Beyond post-feminism. *Public Policy Research* 18(3): 179184.

Meyer, D. S. and S. Staggenborg . 1996. Movements, countermovements, and the structure of political opportunity. *American Journal of Sociology* 101(6): 16281660.

Mottl, T. L. 1980. The analysis of countermovements. *Social Problems* 27(5): 620635.

Ruibal, A. 2014. Movement and counter-movement: A history of abortion law reform and the backlash in Colombia 20062014. *Reproductive Health Matters* 22(44): 4251.

Tarrow, S. G. 2011. *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, J. 1998. Feminist tactics and friendly fire in the Irish Womens Movement. *Gender & Society* 12(6): 674691.

Turner, R. H. , and L. M. Killian . 1972. *Collective behavior*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Vanderford, M. L. 1989. Vilification and social movements: A case study of pro-life and pro-choice rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 75(2): 166182.

Vargas, V. and S. Wieringa . 1998. The triangle of empowerment: Processes and actors in the making of public policy for women. In: *Womens Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean*, ed. G. Lycklama a Nijeholt , V. Vargas , and S. Wieringa . New York: Garland, 348.

Whittier, N. 2014. Rethinking coalitions: Anti-pornography feminists, conservatives, and relationships between collaborative adversarial movements. *Social Problems* 61(2): 175193.

Wojnicka K. 2016. Masculist groups in Poland: Aids of mainstream antifeminism. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 5(2): 3649.

Woodward, A. (2003). European gender mainstreaming: promises and pitfalls of transformative policy. *Review of Policy Research*, 20(1): 6588.

Zald, M. N. and B. Useem . (1982). Movement and countermovement: Loosely coupled conflict. *CRSO Working Paper No. 276*.

Zald, M. N. , and B. Useem . 1987. Movement and countermovement interaction: Mobilization, tactics, and state involvement. *Social Movements in an Organizational Society* 271.

Zald, M. N. 1996. Culture, ideology, and strategic framing. In *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*, edited

Understanding the Dynamics of Opposition to Gender-Equality Change

- gh, A. 2015. Redemocratization efforts in Hungary as a second try: Civil society organizations and mass movements. *Problems of Social Policy* 31(4): 936.
- Anthias, F. 2014. The intersections of class, gender, sexuality and race: The political economy of gendered violence. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 27(2): 153.
- Bassel, L. and A. Emejulu . 2017. *The politics of survival: Minority women, activism and austerity in France and Britain*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- 52 Bellamy, R. , W. Merkel , R. Bhargava , J. Bidadanure , T. Christiano , U. Felt , C. Hay , L. Lamboy , T. Pogrebinschi , G. Smith , G. Talshir , N. Urbinati and M. Verloo . 2017. *Challenges of Inequality to Democracy*. Chapter 14. www.IPSP.org
- Bracke, S. , and D. Paternotte . 2016. Unpacking the sin of gender. *Religion and Gender* 6(2): 143154.
- Cals, M. B. , L. Smircich ., J. Tienari and C. F. Ellehave . 2010. Observing globalized capitalism: Gender and ethnicity as an entry point. *Gender, Work & Organization* 17(3): 243247.
- EIGE 2015. *Gender equality index 2015. Measuring gender equality in the European Union 20052012*. Vilnius: EIGE.
- Farris, S. R. 2017. *In the name of womens rights: The rise of femonationalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Finnemore, M. , and K. Sikkink . 1998. International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization* 52(4): 887917.
- Franceschet, S. , M. L. Krook and J. M. Piscopo (eds.). 2012. *The impact of gender quotas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, N. 2009. Feminism, capitalism, and the cunning of history. *New Left Review* 56: 97117.
- Gessen, M. 2016. *Putin: The rule of the family*. New York: The New York Review of Books.
- Hobson, C. 2011. Towards a critical theory of democratic peace. *Review of International Studies* 37(4): 19031922.
- Hozic, A. H. and J. True (eds.) 2016. *Scandalous economics: Gender and the politics of financial crises*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kanter, R. M. 1977. *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kantola, J. and E. Lombardo (eds.) 2017. *Gender and the economic crisis in Europe: Politics, institutions and intersectionality*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kauffman, S. A. 1993. *The origins of order: Self-organization and selection in evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kay, A. 2005. A critique of the use of path dependency in policy studies. *Public Administration* 83(3): 553571.
- Korolczuk, E. 2016. The Vatican and the birth of anti-gender Studies. *Religion and Gender* 6(2): 293296.
- Kovts, E. 2017. The emergence of powerful antigender movements in Europe and the crisis of liberal democracy. In *Gender and far right politics in Europe*, edited by M. Kttig , R. Bitzan and A. Pet , 175189. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krook, M. L. 2015. Empowerment versus backlash: gender quotas and critical mass theory. *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 3(1): 184188.
- Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte . 2017. *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Magyar, B. 2016. *Post-communist mafia state: The case of Hungary*. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Mahoney, J. 2000. Path dependence in historical sociology. *Theory and Society* 29(4): 507548.
- Morlino, L. 2012. *Changes for democracy: Actors, structures, processes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nam, M. 2012. Mafia states: Organized crime takes office. *Foreign Affairs* 91: 100111.

Odekerken, M. W. A. en prof. dr. A.F.M. Brenninkmeijer 2017. Een dreigend klimaat. Verslag van het onderzoek Bedreigingen van Nederlandse journalisten. NVJ: Utrecht.

OFaircheallaigh, C. 2014. IR theory and domestic adoption of international norms. *International Politics* 51(2): 155176.

53 Pet, A. , W. Grzebalska , How Hungary and Poland have silenced women and stifled human rights, *The Huffington Post*, 16 October 2016.

Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Piketty, T. 2015. About capital in the twenty-first century. *The American Economic Review* 105(5): 4853.

Puar, J. K. 2007. *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rupnik, J. 2016. Surging illiberalism in the East. *Journal of Democracy* 2(4): 7787.

Scharff, C. 2016. *Repudiating feminism: Young women in a neoliberal world*. London: Routledge.

Scheppele, K. L. 2013. The rule of law and the Frankenstate: why governance checklists do not work. *Governance* 26(4): 559562.

Scheppele, K. L. 2016. Foreword. In *Post-communist mafia state: The case of Hungary*, edited by B. Magyar , xvxxiv. Budapest: CEU Press.

Sedelmeier, U. 2017. Political safeguards against democratic backsliding in the EU: The limits of material sanctions and the scope of social pressure. *Journal of European Public Policy* 24(3): 337351.

Scott, J. W. 2011. *The fantasy of feminist history*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Strolovitch, D. 2013. Of mancessions and hcoveries: Race, gender, and the political construction of economic crises and recoveries. *Perspectives on Politics* 11(1): 167176.

Verloo, M. 2006. Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 13(3): 211228.

Verloo, M. (ed.) 2007. *Multiple meanings of gender equality: A critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Verloo, M. 2011. Keynote lecture, Gender equality policies as interventions in a changing world. Second Gender and Politics ECPR conference, Budapest, January 13, 2011.

Verloo, M. 2013. Intersectional and cross-movement politics and policies: Reflections on current practices and debates. *Signs* 38(4): 893915.

Verloo, M. (forthcoming) *Episteme, polity and inequality regimes: new dynamics and configurations*. Politics and Governance.

Vincze, E. 2014. The racialization of Roma in the new Europe and the political potential of Romani women. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 21(4): 435442.

Walby, S. 2007. Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 37(4): 449470.

Walby, S. 2009. *Globalization and inequalities: Complexity and contested modernities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walby, S. 2011. *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walby, S. 2013. Finance versus democracy? Theorizing finance in society. *Work, Employment & Society* 27(3): 489507.

Walby, S. , P. Olive , J. Towers , B. Francis , S. Strid , A. Krizsn , E. Lombardo , C. May-Chahal , S. Franzway , D. Sugarman , B. Agarwal and J. Armstrong . 2015a. *Stopping rape: Towards a comprehensive policy*. Chicago: Policy Press.

Walby, S. 2015b. *Crisis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walby, S. 2016. Is the crisis cascading into violence? Lecture at ESA Vienna.

Wapner, P. 1995. Politics beyond the state: Environmental activism and world civic politics., *World Politics* 47(3): 311340.

Weldon, S. L. , and M. Htun . 2013. Feminist mobilisation and progressive policy change: why governments take action to combat violence against women. *Gender & Development* 21(2): 231247.

54 Winker, G. and N. Degele . 2011. Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: Dealing with social inequality. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 18(1): 5166.

Yoder, Janice D. 1991. Rethinking tokenism: Looking beyond numbers. *Gender & Society* 5(2): 178192.

Yuval-Davis, N. , G. Wemyss , and K. Cassidy . 2017. Introduction to the special issue: racialized bordering discourses on European Roma. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40(7):

Patriarchy Fights Back

- Adams, A. E. , C. M. Sullivan , D. Bybee , and M. R. Greeson . 2008. Development of the scale of economic abuse. *Violence Against Women* 14(5): 563588.
- Amundsdotter, E. , M. Ericson , U. Jansson and S. Linghag . 2015. *Motstånd och strategier i jämställdhetsarbete*. Karlstad: Karlstad University Press.
- Baas, D. and C. Holmn . 2013. Namn p anonyma anvandare knackta. *Expressen.se*, December 10. Accessed May 24, 2017. www.expressen.se/nyheter/expressen-avslojar/namn-pa-anonyma-anvandare-knackta/.
- Bratt, M. and R. Hagnestad . 2015. Att gra ett troll. Sdertrn: Sdertrns hgskola.
- Brownmiller, S. 1975. *Against our will: Men, women and rape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bachrach, P. and M. S. Baratz . 1970. *Power and poverty: Theory and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bank of England. 2013. Jane Austen to Feature on Bank of England Banknotes. Bank of England News Release. London: Bank of England. Accessed January 16, 2017. www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/Pages/news/2013/093.aspx.
- Baumgardner, J. 2011. *F em! : Goo Goo, Gaga, and some thoughts on balls*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.
- Bergqvist, C. , E. Bjarnegrd , and P. Zetterberg . 2016. When class trumps sex: The social democratic intra-party struggle over extending parental leave quotas in Sweden. *Social Politics* 23(2): 169191.
- Bukhari, G. 2014. *Technology driven violence against women*. Pakistan: Bytes for All.
- 73 Cockburn, C. 2013. War and security, women and gender. *Gender and Development* 21(3): 433452.
- Council of Europe. 2016. Background Note on Sexist Hate Speech. Prepared by the Gender Equality Unit, February 1. Accessed January 15, 2017. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168059ad42>.
- Criado-Perez, C. 2015. *Do it like a woman*. London: Portobello Books.
- Dir 2014:74. Ett modernt och starkt straffrättsligt skydd fr den personliga integriteten. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet.
- Dobash, R. P. , E. Dobash , M. Wilson , and M. Daly . 1992. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems* 39(1): 7191.
- Evensen, R. 2015. *Kniv i feministfitta: Yttrandefrihet och inte ofredandehovrätten friar*. Dagens juridik online, September 30. Accessed October 2, 2016. www.dagensjuridik.se/2015/09/kniv-i-feministfitta-yttrandefrihet-och-inte-ofredande.
- Faludi, S. 1992. *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Feminist Frequency. 2012. Image based harassment and visual misogyny. *Feminist Frequency*, July 1. Accessed January 21, 2017. <https://feministfrequency.com/2012/07/01/image-based-harassment-and-visual-misogyny/>.
- Feminist Frequency. 2015. One week of harassment on Twitter. Tumblr. Accessed July 10, 2017. <https://femfreq.tumblr.com/post/109319269825/one-week-of-harassment-on-twitter>.
- Goodchild, S. 2000. Women are more violent, says study. *The Independent*, November 12. Accessed October 2, 2016. www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/women-are-more-violent-says-study-622388.html.
- Hall, M. and J. Hearn . 2017. *Revenge pornography: Gender, sexuality, and motivations*. London: Routledge.
- Hallhagen, E. 2013. Allt ljus p hatet: Rasism och antifeminism. *Svenska Dagbladet*, March 7. Accessed June 7, 2017. www.svd.se/allt-ljus-pa-hatet-rasism-och-antifeminism.
- Hardaker, C. and M. McGlashan . 2016. Real men dont hate women: Twitter rape threats and group identity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 91: 8093.
- Hattstone, S. 2013. Twitter has enabled people to behave in a way they wouldnt face to face. *The Guardian*, April 20. Accessed July 10, 2017. www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2013/aug/04/caroline-criado-perez-twitter-rape-threats.
- Hearn, J. , S. Strid , M. Verloo , and L. Husu . 2016. Interrogating violence against women and state violence policy. *Current Sociology* 64(4): 551567.

Hearn, J. and W. Parkin . 2001. Gender, sexuality and violence in organizations. London: Sage.

Hern, A. 2014. Feminist games critic cancels talk after terror threat. The Guardian, October 5, 2014. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/oct/15/anita-sarkeesian-feminist-games-critic-cancels-talk.

Herring, S. 2013. Gender and power in on-line communication. In Handbook of language and gender, edited by J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff . Oxford: Blackwell.

Herring, S. and S. Kapidzic . 2015. Teens, gender, and self-presentation in social media. In International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, edited by J. D. Wright . Oxford: Elsevier.

Husu, L. 2001. Sexism, Support and Survival. Academic Women and Hidden Discrimination in Finland. Social Psychological Studies 6. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Jonsson, S. 2014. Nthattets vrsta sida r sexualiserade hot mot kvinnor. Dagens Nyheter, May 15. Accessed June 26, 2017. www.dn.se/kultur-noje/kulturbedatt/nathattets-varsta-sida-ar-sexualiserade-hot-mot-kvinnor/?forceScript=1&variantType=large#receipt-page.

74 Kellion, L. 2014. Feminist video-games talk cancelled after Massacre threat. BBC News, October 15. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.bbc.com/news/technology-29626809.

Kelly, L. 1988. Surviving sexual violence. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kelly, L. 2013. Moving in the shadows: Introduction. In Moving in the shadows: Violence in the lives of minority women and children, edited by Y. Rehman , L. Kelly and H. Siddiqui . London: Routledge.

Krook, M. L. 2017. Violence against women in politics. Journal of Democracy 28(1): 7488.

Linghag, S. , M. Ericson , E. Amundsdotter , and U. Jansson . 2016. I och med motstnd. Tidskrift fr genusvetenskap 37(3): 728.

Martin, F. 2015. Getting my two cents worth: Access, interaction, participation and social inclusion in online news commenting. International Symposium on Online Journalism 5(1): 80105.

Morell, C. 1981. Black Friday and violence against women in the suffragette movement. London: Womens Research and Resource Centre.

NIKK (Nordisk information om kunskap och kn). 2017. Hat och hot p ntet. En kartlggning av den rttsliga regleringen i Norden frn ett jmstlldhetsperspektiv. Gteborg: NIKK och Nordiska ministerrdet.

OMeara, S. 2012. Internet trolls up their harassment game with beat up Anita Sarkeesian. The Huffington Post, July 2. Accessed June 26, 2017. www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2012/07/06/internet-trolls-online-beat-up-anita-sarkeesian-game_n_1653473.html.

Pincus, I. 2002. The politics of gender equality policy. Implementation and non-implementation in three Swedish municipalities. rebro University: rebro Studies in Political Science 5.

Renzetti, C. M. 2008. Feminist theories of interpersonal violence. In Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Violence, edited by C. M. Renzetti and J. L. Edleson . London: SAGE.

Rees, T. 1998. Mainstreaming equality in the European Union. London: Routledge.

Riley, C. and S. Strid . 2016. From Pamphlets to #: Womens Opposition to Violent Transpatriarchies Through Publishing. Paper presented at the Feminist Politics and the Mainstreaming of Gender: Cross-Sectoral and Transversal Dialogues on the Challenges for Feminist Politics, Practice and Research in Sweden and the UK, rebro, Sweden, May 17.

SGF (Sveriges genusforskarfrbund). 2016. Vld och trakasserier mot genusforskare. Report presented at the G16: National Gender Research Conference, Linkping, Sweden, November 2021.

Sinmaz, E. and S. Griffiths . 2014. Rise of the female Relationship Terrorists. The Daily Mail, July 25. Accessed October 2, 2016. www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2669408/Rise-female-relationship-terrorists-Study-finds-women-controlling-aggressive-partners-men.html.

SOU 2016:7 (Statens offentliga utredningar). 2016. Integritet och straffskydd. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet.

SR (Sveriges Radio [Swedens Radio]). 2013. Mn utstts fr minst lika mycket vld i hemmet som kvinnor. Broadcast October 7. Accessed October 2, 2016. <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=5667696>.

Strid, S. , S. Walby and J. Armstrong . 2014. Intersectionality and multiple inequalities. Visibility and voice in gender-based violence policy in Britain. Social Politics 20(4): 558581.

Sveland, M. no date. Bakom det s kallade Nthattet finns ett kvinnohat. The Maria Sveland Blog. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.mariasveland.se/aktuellt/bakom-det-sa-kallade-nathattet-finns-ett-kvinnohat/.

75 Sveland, M. 2007. *Bitterfittan*. Stockholm: Leopold frlag.

Sveland, M. 2013. *Hatet: En bok om antifeminism*. Stockholm: Leopold frlag.

Sveland, M. 2015. *Befrielsen*. Stockholm: Leopold frlag.

The Guardian. 2014a. Two jailed for Twitter abuse of Feminist Campaigner. The Guardian, January 24. Accessed October 2, 2016. www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/jan/24/two-jailed-twitter-abuse-feminist-campaigner.

The Guardian. 2014b. Two face jail over Twitter abuse of Banknote Campaigner. The Guardian, January 24. Accessed 10 July 2017. www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jan/24/two-face-jail-twitter-abuse.

Thente, J. 2014a. Nthatarna ger uttryck fr de bortsorterades rst. Dagens Nyheter, April 22. Accessed June 26, 2017. www.dn.se/kultur-noje/kulturbedatt/nathatarna-ger-uttryck-for-de-bortsorterades-rst/.

Thente, J. 2014b. Inte bara nthatarna hatar. Dagens Nyheter, May 5. Accessed June 26, 2017. www.dn.se/kultur-noje/kulturbedatt/inte-bara-nathatarna-hatar/.

UN. 1993. General Assembly Resolution 48/104 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women.

UN. 2013. Report of the Working Group on the Issue of Discrimination Against Women in Law and in Practice. UN Human Rights Council Twenty-third session. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session23/A.HRC.23.50_EN.pdf.

UN. 2006. In-depth study on all forms of violence against women. Report to the Secretary General. Sixty-first session. Advancement of women: advancement of women. A/61/122/Add.1. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/419/74/PDF/N0641974.pdf?OpenElement>.

UN Broadband Commission. 2015. *Cyber violence against women and girls: A worldwide wake-up call*. New York: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and the United Nations Development Programme.

Valenti, J. 2015. Game over. The Guardian, August 29. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/aug/29/anita-sarkeesian-gamergate-interview-jessica-valenti?CMP=tw_t_a-technology_b-gdntech.

Verloo, M. 2013. Opposition to Gender Equality in Europe. Panel 229 at the ECPR, Bordeaux, September 47.

Verloo, M. 2014. Oppositional Dynamics to Gender Equality Change. Panel 227 at the ECPR, Glasgow, September 36.

Walby, S. 1998. *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Walby, S. 2009. *Globalisation and inequalities. Complexity and contested modernities*. London: SAGE.

Walby, S. 2011. *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walby, S., J. Armstrong, and S. Strid. 2012. Intersectionality and the quality of the gender equality architecture. *Social Politics* 19(4): 446-481.

Walby, S., P. Olive, J. Towers, B. Francis, S. Strid, A. Krizsn, E. Lombardo and J. Armstrong. 2014. *Stopping rape: Towards a comprehensive policy*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Walby, S., J. Towers, S. Balderston, C. Corradi, B. Francis, M. Heiskanen, K. Helweg-Larsen, L. Kelly, L. Mergaert, P. Olive, E. Palmer, H. Stckl, and S. Strid. 2017. *The concept and measurement of violence against women and men*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Wall, L. 2014. *Gender equality and violence against women: Whats the connection?* ACSSA Research Summary. Melbourne: Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault.

Warshmellow [David Chen]. 2015. *FemfreqOne week of harassment on Twitter*. GitHub, March 2. Accessed December 2, 2017.

76 Westerlund, M. and J. Weimers. 2013. Vi mste vga prata om kvinnors vld mot mn. Swedens Television, April 17. Accessed October 2, 2016. www.svt.se/opinion/vi-maste-vaga-prata-om-kvinnors-vald-mot-man.

Wingfield, N. 2014. Anita Sarkeesian, video game critic, cancels speech after threats of Massacre. New York Times, October 15. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.nytimes.com/2014/10/16/technology/gamergate-women-video-game-threats-anita-sarkeesian.html.

Yamato, J. 2016. Anita Sarkeesian on life after Gamergate: I Want to Be a Human again. The Daily Beast, September 23. Accessed January 21, 2017. www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/09/23/anita-sarkeesian-on-life-after-gamergate-i-want-to-be-a-human-again.html.

Young, C. 2014. The surprising truth about women and violence. Time, June 25. Accessed October 2, 2016. <http://time.com/2921491/hope-solo-women-violence/>.

Indirect Opposition

Ahrens, P. 2017. Actors, institutions and the making of EU gender equality programs. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ahrens, P. , A. Scheele , and A. van der Vleuten . 2016. 20 Jahre Vertrag von Amsterdamreelle Vision oder reale Desillusion europischer Gleichstellungspolitik? *Femina Politica* 25(2): 920.

Callerstig, A.-C. 2014. Making equality work: Ambiguities, conflicts and change agents in the implementation of equality policies in public sector organisations. Linkping: Linkping Studies in Arts and Science, No. 607.

Corbin, J. , and A. Strauss . 2008. Basics of qualitative research. Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 3rd edition.

do Mar Pereira, M. 2012. Feminist theory is proper knowledge, but : The status of feminist scholarship in the academy. *Feminist Theory* 13(3): 283303.

European Commission. 2006. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A Roadmap for equality between women and men (20062010). COM (2006) 92 final.

Giddens, A. 1984. The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hafner-Burton, E. and M. A. Pollack . 2009. Mainstreaming gender in the European Union. Getting the incentives right. *Comparative European Politics* 21(7): 114138.

Jacquot, S. 2015. Transformations in EU gender equality. From emergence to dismantling. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kantola, J. 2010. Gender and the European Union. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kantola, J. and E. Lombardo , eds. 2017. Gender and the economic crisis in Europe. politics, institutions and intersectionality. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Liebert, U. 2002. Europeanising gender mainstreaming: Constraints and opportunities in the multilevel euro-polity., *Feminist Legal Studies* 10: 241256.

Lombardo, E. and P. Meier 2006. Gender mainstreaming in the EU: Incorporating a feminist reading? *European Journal of Womens Studies* 13(2): 151166.

Lombardo, E. , P. Meier and M. Verloo , eds. 2009. The discursive politics of gender equality: Stretching, bending and policymaking. London: Routledge.

Mergaert, L. and E. Lombardo 2014. Resistance to implementing gender mainstreaming in EU research policy. In *The persistent invisibility of gender in EU policy*, edited by E. Weiner and H. MacRae , European Integration online Papers (EIoP), Special issue 1, 18(5): 121. <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2014-005a.htm>.

Pincus, I. 2009. Men, power and the problem of gender equality policy implementation. In *The political interests of gender revisited: redoing theory and research with a feminist face*, edited by A. G. Jnasdttir and K. B. Jones , 149166. Tokyo, New York, Paris: United Nations University Press.

Saltzman Chafetz, J. and A. Gary Dworkin . 1987. In the face of threat: Organized antifeminism in comparative perspective. *Gender & Society* 1(1): 3360.

97 Saurugger, S. 2014. Theoretical approaches to European integration. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schmidt, V. A. 2008. Discursive institutionalism: The explanatory power of ideas and discourse, *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 303326.

Squires, J. 2005. Is mainstreaming transformative? Theorising mainstreaming in the context of diversity and deliberation. *Social Politics* 12(3): 366388.

Thomas, R. , and A. Davies . 2005. Theorizing the micro-politics of resistance: New public management and managerial identities in the UK public services. *Organization Studies* 26(5): 683706.

Van den Brink, M. and Y. Benschop . 2012. Slaying the Seven-Headed Dragon: The Quest for Gender Change in Academia. *Gender, Work, and Organization* 19(1): 7192.

Van der Vleuten, A. 2007. The price of gender equality. Member states and governance in the European Union. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Verloo, M. (ed.) 2007. Multiple meanings of gender equality. A critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Walby, S. 2005. Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics* 12(3): 321-343.

Weiner, E. and H. MacRae . 2014. The persistent invisibility of gender in EU policy. Introduction. In *The persistent invisibility of gender in EU Policy*, edited by E. Weiner and H. MacRae . European Integration Online Papers(EIoP), Special issue 1. 18 (3): 120.

Woodward, A. 2008. Too late for gender mainstreaming? Taking stock in Brussels. *European Social Policy* 18(3): 289-302.

Contesting Gender Equality in Domestic-Violence Policy Debates

Almeida, P. D. 2010. Social movement partyism: Collective action and political parties. In *Strategic alliances: New studies of social movement coalitions*, edited by N. Van Dyke and H. McCammon , 170-196. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Blu, O. , A. Braga , and A. Iancu , eds. 2011. *Impactul crizei economice asupra femeilor* [The impact of the economic crisis on women]. Bucharest, Romania: Maiko.

Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 1241-1299.

Ferree, M. M. 2003. Resonance and radicalism: Feminist framing in the abortion debates of the United States and Germany. *The American Journal of Sociology* 109(2): 304-344.

Ferree, M. M. , A. W. Gamson , J. Gerhards , J. and D. Rucht . 2002. *Shaping abortion discourse: Democracy and the public sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gal, S. and G. Kligman . 2000. *The politics of gender after socialism: An historical comparative essay*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Grabowska, M. 2012. Bringing the Second World in: Conservative revolution(s), socialist legacies, and transnational silences in the trajectories of Polish feminism. *Signs* 37(2): 385-411.

Gruziel, D. 2015. Polish women's movements efforts to change domestic violence state policies between 2001-2012. In *Mobilizing for policy change: Women's movements in Central and Eastern European domestic violence policy struggles*, edited by A. Krizsn , 123-183. Budapest: Central European University.

Hester, M. 2011. The three planet model: Towards an understanding of contradictions in approaches to women and children's safety in contexts of domestic violence. *British Journal of Social Work* 41(5): 837-853.

Hester, M. , L. Kelly and J. Radford (eds.) 1995. *Women, violence, and male power: Feminist activism, research, and practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Htun, M. , and Weldon, S. 2012. The civic origins of progressive policy change: Combating violence against women in global perspective, 1975-2005. *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 548-569.

Johnson, M. P. 2006 Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 12(11): 1003-1018.

Johnson, J. E. 2009. *Gender violence in Russia: The politics of feminist intervention*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Johnson, J. E. and L. Brunell . 2006. The emergence of contrasting domestic violence regimes in post-communist Europe. *Policy & Politics* 34(4): 575-595.

115 Keinz, A. 2009. Negotiating democracy's gender between Europe and the nation. *Focaal-European Journal of Anthropology* (53): 3855.

Keck, M. and K. Sikkink . 1998. *Transnational networks on violence against women*. In *Activists beyond borders*, 165-199. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kelly, L. 1996. When woman protection is the best kind of child protection: Children, domestic violence and child abuse. *Administration* 44(2): 118-135.

Kligman, G. 1998. *The politics of duplicity: Controlling reproduction in Ceausescu Romania*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Koopmans, R. and P. Statham . 2000. Migration, ethnic relations, and xenophobia as a field of political contention: An opportunity structure approach. In *Challenging immigration and ethnic relations politics: Comparative European perspectives*, edited by R. Koopmans and P. Statham , 135-6. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kovats, E. and M. Poim . 2015. Gender as symbolic glue. The position and role of conservative and far right parties in the anti-gender mobilizations in Europe. FEPSFoundation for European Progressive Studies.

Krizsn, A. , & Popa, R. M. 2014. Frames in contestation: Gendering domestic violence policies in five central and eastern European countries. *Violence Against Women* 20(7): 758782.

Krizsn, A. , Paantjens, M. , and Lamoén, I. van. 2005. Domestic violence: Whose problem? Policies addressing domestic violence in Hungary, the Netherlands and the EU. *The Greek Review of Social Research* 117 B: 6392.

Krizsn, A. , M. Bustelo and A. Hadjigianni . 2007. Domestic violence: A public matter. In *Multiple meanings of gender equality. A critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe*, edited by M. Verloo , 141186. Budapest: CEU Press.

Krizsn, A. , T. Dombos , E. Kispeter , L. Szabo , J. Dedic , M. Jaigma , R. Kuhar , A. Frank , B. Sauer , and M. Verloo . 2010. Framing gender equality in the European Union and its current and future Member States. Deliverable No. 61: Final LARG Report. QUING Project. IWM Vienna. Available at: www.quing.eu/files/results/final_larg_report.pdf

Krizsn, A. and C. Roggeband . 2017. *The gender politics of domestic violence: Feminists engaging the state in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York: Routledge.

Kuhar, R. 2015. Playing with science: Sexual citizenship and the Roman Catholic Church counter-narratives in Slovenia and Croatia. *Womens Studies International Forum* 49: 8492.

Marshall, S. 1995. Confrontation and co-optation in anti-feminist organizations. In *M. Feminist organizations. Harvest of the new womens movement*, edited by M. Ferree and P. Martin , 323337. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Matray, A. 2012. *Feminist Framing Strategies 19942011. Domestic violence frames of Hungarian feminist NGOs in inclusion in and exclusion from domestic violence policy processes*. S0828289 Master Thesis. Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Nijmegen.

Mazur, A. 2002. *Theorizing feminist policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCammon, H. J. and K. E. Campbell . 2002. Allies on the road to victory: Coalition formation between the suffragists and the Womans Christian Temperance Union. *Mobilization: An International Journal* 7: 231251.

McCammon, H. , C. Sanders Muse , H. D. Newman , and T. M. Terrell 2007. Movement Framing and Discursive Opportunity Structures: The Political Successes of the U.S. Womens Jury Movements. *American Sociological Review* 72: 725749.

Merry Engle, S. 2009. *Gender violence: A cultural perspective*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

116 Meyer, D. S. and S. Staggenborg . 1996. Movements, countermovements, and the structure of political opportunity. *American Journal of Sociology* 101: 16281660.

Miroiu, M. 1999. *Societatea retro*. Bucharest: Trei.

Miroiu, M. 2004. *Drumul catre Autonomie. Teorii Politice Feministe. [The Road to Autonomy. Feminist Political Theory]*. Iai: Polirom.

Patternote, D. 2014, May 8. Christian trouble: The Catholic Church and the subversion of gender. CritCom. A forum for research and commentary on Europe [online article]. Available at <http://councilforeuropeanstudies.org/critcom/christian-trouble-the-catholic-church-and-the-subversion-of-gender/>

Popescu, Liliana . 2004. *Political sexelor [sex politics]*. Bucuresti: Maiko.

Schechter, S. 1982. *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the battered womens movement*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Schneider, E. M. 1994. The violence of privacy. In *The public nature of private violence*, edited by M. Finneman and R. Mykitiuk , 3659. New York: Routledge.

Sokoloff, N. J. and I. Dupont . 2005. Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence Against Women* 11(1): 3864.

Stratigaki, M. 2004. The co-optation of gender concepts in EU policies: The case of reconciliation of work and family. *Social Politics* 11(1): 3056.

Tsebelis, G. 2002. *Veto players: How political institutions work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

UNIFEM 2006. *The story behind the numbers: Women and employment in Central and Eastern Europe*. Bratislava.

Van Dyke, N. and H. J. McCammon (eds.) 2010. *Strategic alliances: Coalition building and social movements*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Verloo, M. 2005. Mainstreaming gender equality in Europe. A critical frame analysis approach. *The Greek Review of Social Research* (117 B): 1134.

Viterna, J. , & Fallon, K. M. 2008. Democratization, womens movements, and gender-equitable states: A framework for comparison. *American Sociological Review* 73(4): 668689.

Walby, S. 2013. *Crisis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Weldon, S. L. 2002. *Protest, policy, and the problem of violence against women: A cross-national comparison*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

A Feminist Opposition to Gender Equality?

Berit Andnor , Minister of Social Affairs in the Social Democratic Government. Interview on November 8, 2012.

Mikael Damberg , Chairman of the Stockholm County Social Democratic Party District. Interview on November 21, 2012.

Thomas Eneroth , Social Democratic MP and head of the Parliamentary Committee of Social Insurance. Interview on November 15, 2012.

Jan Larsson , State Secretary under Prime Minister Gran Persson. Interview on November 8, 2012.

Wanja Lundby-Wedin , Chair of LO, the Swedish Trade Union Confederation. Interview on November 7, 2012.

Anne Ludvigsson , Vice-Chair of S-women. Interview on January 23, 2012.

Jens Orback , Minister of Gender Equality. Interview on November 15, 2012.

Nalin Pekgul , Chair of S-women. Interview on February 14, 2012.

Anna Thoursie , Secretary for the Public Committee on Parental Leave. Interview on December 21, 2011.

Karl-Petter Thorwaldsson , Chair for the Public Committee on Parental Leave. Interview on January 26, 2012.

Marita Ulvskog , Social Democratic MP, Secretary General of the party. Interview on November 29, 2012.

Sven-Erik sterberg , Junior Minister of Finance. Interview on November 28, 2012.

Thomas stros , Minister of Industry and Trade. Interview on November 16, 2012.

Benford, R. D. and D. A. Snow . 2000. Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611639.

Bergqvist, C. , T. Olsson Blandy and D. Sainsbury . 2007. Swedish state feminism: Continuity and change. In *Changing state feminism*, edited by J. Kantola and J. Outshoorn . Basingstoke, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bergqvist, C. , E. Bjarnegrd , and P. Zetterberg . 2013. Analysing failure, understanding success: A research strategy for explaining gender equality policy adoption. *NORANordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 21: 280295.

Bergqvist, C. , E. Bjarnegrd , and P. Zetterberg . 2016. When class trumps sex: The social democratic intra-party struggle over extending parental leave quotas in Sweden, *Social Politics* 23(2): 169191.

Besley, T. and A. Case . 1995. Does electoral accountability affect economic policy choices? Evidence from Gubernatorial term limits. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110: 769798.

Borchorst, A. and B. Siim . 2008. Woman-friendly policies and state feminism. *Theorizing Scandinavian gender equality. Feminist Theory* 9: 207224.

134 Brors, H. 2005. Persson stiller sig ovanfr kongressen [Persson puts himself above the congress]. *Dagens Nyheter*, April 5, A12.

Franceschet, S. and J. M. Piscopo . 2008. Gender quotas and womens substantive representation: lessons from Argentina. *Politics & Gender* 4: 393425.

Frskringskassan. 2012. Parental benefit. Fact sheet FK 4070_Fa.

Hallerberg, M. and S. Basinger . 1998. Internationalization and changes in tax policy in OECD countries: The importance of domestic Veto players. *Comparative Political Studies* 31: 321352.

Hirdman, Y. 1998. *Med Kluven Tunga. LO och Genusordningen*. Stockholm: Atlas.

Hobson, B. 2003. *Recognition struggles and social movements: Cultural claims, contested identities, power and agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Htun, M. and S. L. Weldon . 2010. When do governments promote womens rights? A framework for the comparative analysis of sex equality policy. *Perspectives on Politics* 8: 207216.

Jenson, J. and R. Mahon . 1993. Representing solidarity: Class, gender and the crisis in social-democratic Sweden. *New Left Review* 1/201: 121.

Kettunen, P. 2012. Reinterpreting the historicity of the nordic model. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies* 2.

Lowry, R. C. , J. E. Alt , and K. E. Ferree . 1998. Fiscal policy outcomes and electoral accountability in American states. *American Political Science Review* 92: 759774.

Pekgul, N. , A. Sjdin , M. Streijffert , H. Eriksson , E. Nordmark , and A. Carnhede . 2005. Vi krver kad kvotering [We demand extended quota], *Svenska Dagbladet*, October 20.

Reuterswrd, C. , P. Zetterberg , S. Thapar-Bjrkert , and M. Molyneux . 2011. Abortion law reforms in Colombia and Nicaragua: Issue networks and opportunity contexts. *Development and Change* 42: 805831.

SOU 2005:73. 2005. Reformerad frldrafrskring. Krlek, omvrdrnad, trygghet [A reformed parental leave insurance: Love, care, security]. *Statens offentliga utredningar [Public Inquiry]*. Stockholm: Fritzes.

Statistics Sweden. 2014. Women and men in Sweden, facts and figures 2014. rebro: SCB, Statistiska Centralbyrn.

Tsebelis, G. 1995. Decision making in political systems: Veto players in presidentialism, parliamentarism, multicameralism and multipartyism. *British Journal of Political Science* 25: 289325.

Walby, S. 2011. *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Zohlnhfer, R. 2003. Partisan politics, party competition and Veto players: German economic policy in the Kohl era. *Journal of Public Policy* 23: 123156.

Subversion from Within

Beger, N. 2000. Queer readings of Europe: Gender identity, sexual orientation and the (im)potency of rights politics at the European Court of justice. *Social and Legal Studies* 9(2): 249270.

153 Burri, S. and S. Prechal . 2014. EU Gender Equality Law. Update 2013. European Commission, http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/your_rights/eu_gender_equality_law_update2013_en.pdf [26.01.2017]

Chalmers, D. , G. Davies and G. Monti . 2010. *European Union law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, R. and C. Weiss . 2016. Gender stereotyping in the military. Insights from court cases. In *Stereotypes and human rights law*, edited by E. Brems and A. Timmer , 175198. Antwerp: Intersentia.

Cowell, A. 2011. The draft ends in Germany, but questions of identity endure. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/01/world/europe/01germany.html>

Ellis, E. and P. Watson . 2012. *EU antidiscrimination law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Falkner, G. , O. Treib and E. Holzleithner . 2008. Living rights or dead letters? Compliance in the European Union. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Goldberg, C. 2011. Discrimination by comparison. *Yale Law Journal* 120(4): 728812.

Holzleithner, E. 2017. Gender equality and physical requirements in employment. *European Equality Law Review* 3(1): 1322.

Kronsell, A. 2012. Sexed Bodies and Military Masculinities: Gender path dependence in EUs common security and defense policy. *Men and Masculinities* 19(3): 311336.

Lombardo, E. , P. Meier , and M. Verloo . 2010. Discursive dynamics in gender equality politics: What about feminist taboos? *European Journal of Womens Studies* 17(2): 105123.

Lorde, A. 1981. The masters tools will never dismantle the masters house. In *This bridge called my back. Writings by radical women of power*, edited by C. Moraga and G. Anzalda , Fourth Edition , 9497. New York: State University of New York Press.

MacKinnon, C. A. 1991. Reflections on sex equality under the law. *Yale Law Journal* 100(5): 12811328.

McGlynn, C. 2000. Ideologies of motherhood. *European Law Journal* 6(1): 2944.

Ministry of Defence. 2016. Ban on women in close combat roles lifted. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/ban-on-women-in-ground-close-combat-roles-lifted>

Murdoch, J. and D. Price . 2001. *Courting justice: Gay men and Lesbians v. the Supreme Court*. New York: Basic Books.

Robson, R. 2009. *Compulsory matrimony*. In *Feminist and queer legal theory. Intimate encounters, uncomfortable conversations*, edited by M. Albertson Fineman , J. E. Jackson , and A. P. Romero , 313328. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate Press.

Unpacking Oppositional Success

Aguilar Fernandez, S. 2010. *El activismo político de la Iglesia católica durante el gobierno de Zapatero (2004-2010)*. *Papers* 95(4): 11291155.

Ayoub, P. and O. Brzezinska . 2015. *Caught in a web? The Internet and the deterritorialization of activism*. In *Ashgate Research Companion to Gay and Lesbian Activism*, edited by D. Paternotte and M. Tremblay , 209224. Farnham: Ashgate.

Baubrot, J. 2015. *Les sept laïcités françaises. Le modèle français de laïcité n'existe pas*. Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Braud, C. 2014. *Un front commun des religions contre le mariage pour tous?* *Contemporary French Civilization* 39(3): 335349.

Braud, C. and P. Portier . 2015. *Métamorphoses catholiques: Acteurs, enjeux et mobilisations depuis le mariage pour tous*. Paris: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'Homme.

Binet, E. and C. Rotman . 2016. *La bataille du mariage pour tous*. Paris: Books Editions.

Blanc, C. 2015. *Réseaux traditionalistes catholiques et rinformation sur le web: mobilisations contre le mariage pour tous et pro-vie*. *tic&soc* 9(12). <http://ticetsociete.revues.org/1919>

Borrillo, D. 2014. *Biologie et filiation: les habits neufs de l'ordre naturel*. *Contemporary French Civilization* 39(3): 303319.

Borrillo, D. and E. Fassin (eds.) 1999. *Au-delà du pacs. L'expertise familiale l'preuve de l'homosexualité*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Borrillo, D. and P. Lascombes . 2002. *Amours gales? Le Pacs, les homosexuels et la gauche*. Paris: La Découverte.

Brustier, G. 2014. *Le Mai 68 conservateur. Que restera-t-il de la Manif pour Tous?* Paris: Cerf.

Carnac, R. 2014. *L'Église catholique contre la théorie du genre: construction d'un objet politique dans le débat public français contemporain*. *Synergies Italie* 10: 125143.

Cervulle, M. and F. Paillet . 2014. *#mariagepourtous: Twitter et la politique affective des hashtags*. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* 4. <http://rfsic.revues.org/717>.

Chappell, L. 2006. *Contesting women's rights: Charting the emergence of a transnational conservative counter-network*. *Global Society* 20(4): 491520.

Chatel, L. 2014. *Les fous de Dieu*. Paris: Temps Présent.

Chetcuti, N. and F. Teicher . 2016. *Ordre de genre, ordre sexuel et antisémitisme. La convergence des extrêmes dans les mouvements d'opposition à la loi sur le mariage pour tous en France en 2014*. *Estudos da Religio* 30(1): 93109.

Clanch, P. 2014. *Mariage pour Tous: Divorce chez les cathos*. Paris: Plon.

Cornejo Valle, M. and J. I. Pichardo . 2017. *From the pulpit to the streets: ultra-conservative religious positions against gender in Spain*. In *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*, edited by R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte , 233253. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Crettiez, X. and I. Sommier (eds.) 2003. *La France rebelle: Tous les foyers, mouvements et acteurs de la contestation*. Paris: Michalon.

Duyvendak, J. W. 1995. *The power of politics: New social movements in France*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Engeli, I. and N. Eggert . 2015. *Rainbow families and the state: How policies shape reproductive choices*. In *Ashgate Research Companion to Gay and Lesbian Activism*, edited by D. Paternotte and M. Tremblay , 323338. Farnham: Ashgate.

European Commission. 2015. *Discrimination in the EU in 2012: Report, Special Eurobarometer 437*. Brussels: European Commission.

Fassin, E. 1999. *P.A.C.S. socialista: la gauche et le juste milieu*. *Le Banquet* 1213.

Fassin, E. 2000. *Usages de la science et science des usages: propos des familles homoparentales*. *L'Homme* 154155: 391408.

Fassin, E. 2001. Same sex, different politics: Gay Marriage debates in France and the United States. *Public Culture* 13 (2): 215232.

Fassin, E. 2014a. Same-sex marriage, nation, and race: French political logics and rhetorics. *Contemporary French Civilization* 39(3): 281301.

Fassin, E. 2014b. Extrêmes droites en tous genres. *Lignes* 45: 3242.

Garbagnoli, S. 2016. Against the heresy of immanence. Vatican's gender as a new rhetorical device against the denaturalisation of the sexual order. *Religion & Gender* 6(2): 187204.

Garbagnoli, S. 2017. Italy as a lighthouse and a trailblazer. On the success of Ideologia Gender between the anthropological question and the national identity. In *Anti-gender 170 campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*, edited by R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte, 151175. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Graff, A. 2014. Report from the gender trenches: War against genderism in Poland. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 21(4): 431442.

Graff, A. and E. Korolczuk. 2017. Worse than communism and nazism put together: war on gender in Poland. In *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*, edited by R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte, 175195. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gross, M. 2015. Le rapprochement du Grand Rabinat et de l'Eglise catholique contre la thorie du genre: union sacre ou strategie politique? *Sextant* 31: 145158.

Hodi, A. and A. tulhofer. 2017. Embryo, Teddy Bear-Centaur and the constitution: Mobilizations against Gender Ideology and sexual permissiveness in Croatia. In *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*, edited by R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte, 5979. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kaoma, K. 2016. The Vatican anti-gender theory and sexual politics: An African response. *Religion & Gender* 6(2): 282292.

Kovats, E. and M. Poom. 2015. Gender as symbolic glue: The position and role of conservative and far right parties in the anti-gender mobilization in Europe. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung/Brussels: Fondation for European Progressive Studies.

Kraus, F. 2012. Les lectorats sociologiques: Gays, bis et lesbiennes. Des minorités sexuelles ancrées gauche. Paris: CEVIPOF.

Kuhar, R. 2015. Playing with science: Sexual citizenship and the Roman Catholic church counter-narratives in Slovenia and Croatia. *Womens Studies International Forum* 49: 8492.

Kuhar, R. 2017. Changing your gender several times a day! The anti-gender movement in Slovenia. In *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*, edited by R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte, 215233. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte (eds.) 2017. *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Larisse, A. 2015. Reception de la thorie du genre par les autorités religieuses musulmanes en France: alliances, dissidences, silences et (non) débats en interne. *Sextant* 31: 151176.

Laurent, S. 2013. Derrière la grande illusion de la Manif pour tous. *Le Monde*, 21 March.

Lpinard, E. 2007. *Legalité introuvable: La parité, les féministes et la République*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Lindell, H. 2014. *Les Veilleurs: Enquête sur une résistance*. Paris: Salvator.

Paternotte, D. 2011. *Revendiquer le mariage gay: Belgique, France, Espagne*. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles.

Paternotte, D. 2015a. Blessing the crowds: Catholic mobilizations against gender in Europe. In *Anti-Genderismus. Sexualität und Geschlecht als Schauplätze aktueller politischer Auseinandersetzungen*, edited by S. Hark and P.-J. Villa, 129147. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Paternotte, D. 2015b. Global times, global debates? Same-sex marriage worldwide. *Social Politics* 22(4): 653674.

Paternotte, D. 2017. Défendre la famille, (re)vanquise l'Europe, Problèmes d'histoire des religions 24: 209222.

Perreau, B. 2014a. The political economy of marriage for all. *Contemporary French Civilization* 39(3): 352367.

Perreau, B. 2014b. The politics of adoption: Gender and the making of French citizenship. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Perreau, B. 2016. *Queer theory: The French response*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Raisons politiques. 2014. Special issue Les sciences sociales sont-elles nationalistes 54.

Robcis, C. 2013. *The laws of kinship*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Robcis, C. 2015. Catholics, the theory of gender and the turn to the human in France: a new Dreyfus affair? *Journal of Modern History* 87(4): 892923.

Rochefort, F. 2014. Mariage pour tous: genre, religions et secularization. In *Quest-ce que le genre?* edited by L. Laufer and F. Rochefort , 213. Paris: Payot.

Sarkozy, N. 2016. *La France pour la vie*. Paris: Plon.

Scott, J. W. 2005. *Parit! Sexual equality and the crisis of French universalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scott, J. W. 2007. *Politics of the veil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, M. 2015. *The culture of knowledge: Constructing expertise in legal debates on marriage and kinship for same-sex couples in France and the United States*. PhD dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California Los Angeles.

Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, M. and J. Tricou . 2017. Resisting gender theory in France: A fulcrum for religious action in a secular society. In *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*, edited by R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte , 7999. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tartakowsky, D. 2014. *Les droites et la rue. Histoire d'une ambivalence. De 1880 nos jours*. Paris: La Decouverte.

Trmolet de Villers, V. and R. Stainville . 2013. *Et la France se reveilla. Enquete sur la rvolution des valeurs*. Paris: Editions du Toucan.

Tricou, J. 2015. *La cathosphere, monte en puissance de nouvelles autorits religieuses?*. *tic&socit* 9 (12), <http://ticetsociete.revues.org/1899>.

Tricou, J. 2016a. *Combat culturel, Nouvelle vanglisation ou auto-proslytisme? Des prtres lpreuve de la Manif pour Tous*. In *Proslitismes religieux*, edited by Fatiha Kaoues and Myriam Laakili : 2959. Paris: CNRS Editions.

Tricou, J. 2016b. *Entre masque et travestissement: rsistances des catholiques aux mutations de genre et dtournement de pratiques de luttes mancipatrices au sein de la manif pour tous: le cas des hommes*. *Estudos de religio* 30(1): 4573.

Vaggione, J. M. 2012. *La cultura de la vida: desplazamientos estratgicos del activismo catlico conservador frente a los derechos sexuales y reproductivos*. *Religio & Sociedade* 32(2): 5780.

Winock, M. 1997. *Le Sicle des intellectuels*. Paris: Seuil.

Popular Opposition to Economic Gender Equality and Homosexual Lifestyles

Baber, K. and C. Tucker . 2006. The social roles questionnaire: A new approach to measuring attitudes toward gender. *Sex Roles* 54(78): 459467.

Banaszak, L. and E. Plutzer . 1993a. Contextual determinants of feminist attitudes: National and subnational influences in Western Europe. *American Political Science Review* 87: 147157.

Bejarano, C. , S. Manzano , and C. Montoya . 2011. Tracking the Latino gender gap: Gender attitudes across sex, borders, and generations. *Politics & Gender* 7(4): 521549.

Bolzendahl, C. and D. Myers . 2004. Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 19741998. *Social Forces* 83(2): 759789.

Brewster, K. and I. Padavic . 2000. Change in gender-ideology, 19771996: The contributions of Intracohort change and population turnover. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(2): 477487.

Bryman, A. and D. Cramer . 2010. Constructing variables. In *The handbook of data analysis*, edited by M. Hardy and A. Bryman . London: SAGE.

193 Cotter, D. , J. Hermesen and R. Vanneman . 2011. The end of the gender revolution? Gender role attitudes from 1977 to 2008. *American Journal of Sociology* 117(1): 259289.

Davis, S. and T. Greenstein . 2009. Gender ideology: Components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 87105.

Davis, N. and R. Robinson . 1991. Mens and womens consciousness of gender inequality: Austria, West Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. *American Sociological Review*: 7284.

Denton, M. L. 2004. Gender and marital decision making: Negotiating religious ideology and practice. *Social Forces* 82(3): 11511180.

Diehl, C. , M. Koenig and K. Ruckdeschel . 2009. Religiosity and gender equality: comparing natives and Muslim migrants in Germany. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(2): 278301.

ESS Round 17: European Social Survey Round 17 Data. Data file edition 7.1, 6.4, 3.4, 3.5, 4.3, 3.2, 2.1, Norwegian Social Science Data Services, NorwayData Archive and distributor of ESS data.

Fish, S. 2002. Islam and authoritarianism. *World Politics* 55(01): 437.

Fodor, . and A. Balogh . 2010. Back to the kitchen? Gender role attitudes in 13 East European countries. *Zeitschrift fr Familienforschung* *Journal of Family Research* 22(3): 289307.

Gveli, A. and L. Platt . 2011. Understanding the religious behaviour of Muslims in the Netherlands and the UK. *Sociology* 45(6): 10081027.

Huber, J. and G. Spitze . 1981. Wives employment, household behaviors, and sex-role attitudes. *Social Forces* 60: 150169.

Hushek, D. , H. de Valk and A. Liefbroer . 2011. Gender-role behavior of second-generation Turks: The role of partner choice, gender ideology and societal context. *Advances in Life Course Research* 16(4): 164177.

Inglehart, R. 1997. *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. and P. Norris . 2003a. *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, R. and P. Norris . 2003b. The true clash of civilizations. *Foreign Policy*, 6370.

Jelen, T. , J. O'Donnell and C. Wilcox . 1993. A contextual analysis of Catholicism and abortion attitudes in Western Europe. *Sociology of Religion* 54(4): 375383.

Kriesi, H. , R. Koopmans , J. Duyvendak and M. Giugni . 2015. *New social movements in Western Europe: A comparative analysis*. London: Routledge.

Leyenaar, M. 2004. *Political empowerment of women: The Netherlands and other countries*. New York: Springer.

Lincove, J. 2008. Growth, girls education, and female labor: A longitudinal analysis. *The Journal of Developing Areas* 41(2): 4568.

Mason, K. , J. Czajka and S. Arber . 1976. Change in US womens sex-role attitudes, 19641974. *American Sociological Review*: 573596.

Mason, K. and Y. Lu . 1988. Attitudes toward womens familial roles: Changes in the United States, 19771985. *Gender and Society* 2: 3957.

Moaddel, M. 2006. The Saudi public speaks: Religion, gender, and politics. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38(01): 79108.

Norris, P. and R. Inglehart . 2001. Cultural obstacles to equal representation. *Journal of Democracy* 12(3): 126140.

Norris, P. and R. Inglehart . 2012. Muslim integration into Western cultures: Between origins and destinations. *Political Studies* 60(2): 228251.

194 Paxton, P. and S. Kunovich . 2003. Womens political representation: The importance of ideology. *Social Forces* 82(1): 87113.

Pettersson, T. 2008. Basic values and civic education: A comparative analysis of adolescent orientations towards gender equality and good citizenship. In *Human values and global governance: Studies in development, security and culture*, edited by B. Hettne , 103120. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Plutzer, E. 1988. Work life, family life, and womens support of feminism. *American Sociological Review* 53: 640649.

Read, J. 2003. The sources of gender role attitudes among Christian and Muslim Arab-American women. *Sociology of Religion* 64(2): 207222.

Rizzo, H. , K. Meyer and Y. Ali . 2002. Womens political rights: Islam, status and networks in Kuwait. *Sociology* 36(3): 639662.

Rder, A. 2014. Explaining religious differences in immigrants gender role attitudes: the changing impact of origin country and individual religiosity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(14): 26152635.

Sequino, S. and J. Lovinsky . 2009. *The impact of religiosity on gender attitudes and outcomes*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Spierings, N. 2015. Gender equality attitudes among Turks in Western Europe and Turkey: The interrelated impact of migration and parents attitudes. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(5): 123.

Spierings, N. 2016. Multilevel analysis as a tool to understand the Spatio-temporality of gender. *Politics & Gender* 12(3). Online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X16000398>

Spierings, N. and M. Janssen . 2016. Gender in het huidige sociologieonderwijs: Thema en/of perspectief? *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies* 19(2): 165185.

Spierings, N. and A. Zaslove . 2015. Conclusion: Dividing the populist radical right between liberal nativism and traditional conceptions of gender. *Patterns of Prejudice* 49(12), 163173.

Thornton, A. and L. Young-DeMarco . 2001. Four decades of trends in attitudes toward family issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*

63(4): 10091037.

Treas, J. and E. Widmer . 2000. Married womens employment over the life course: Attitudes in cross-national perspective. *Social Forces* 78(4): 14091436.

Umar, M. 2001. Education and Islamic trends in northern Nigeria: 1970s1990s. *Africa Today* 48(2): 127150.

Valentine, S. 2001. Development of a brief multidimensional aversion to women who work scale. *Sex Roles* 44(1112): 773787.

Verkuyten, M. and A. Yildiz . 2010. Religious identity consolidation and mobilization among Turkish Dutch Muslims. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40(3): 436447.

Wilcox, C. 1991. Support for gender equality in West Europe. *European Journal of Political Research* 20(2): 127147.

Wilcox, C. and T. Felen . 1993. Catholicism and opposition to gender equality in Western Europe. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 5(1): 4057.

Winker, G. and N. Degele . 2011. Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: Dealing with social inequality. *European Journal of Womens Studies* 18(1): 5166.

Yilmaz, K. 2009. The emergence and rise of conservative elite in Turkey. *Insight Turkey* 11(2): 113136.

Yu, W. and P. Lee . 2013. Decomposing gender beliefs: Cross-national differences in attitudes toward maternal employment and gender equality at home. *Sociological Inquiry* 83(4): 591621.

Suspending Democracy, Harming Gender Equality

A1on. 2013, June 7. Todorov prifati amandmanski intervencii na zakonot za prekinuvanje bremenost. Retrieved from <http://a1on.mk/wordpress/>

Acevska, A. 2009, January 21. Vladata protiv abortus. A1. Retrieved from www.a1.com.mk [no longer available online; available on file with author].

Association for Emancipation, Solidarity and Equality of WomenESE et al. 2016, May 5. Shadow report for consideration by the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at its 58th Session (624 June, 2016). Retrieved from <http://tbinternet.ohchr.org>

Benson Gold, R. and Nash, E. 2013. TRAP laws gain political traction while abortion clinicsand the women they serve pay the price. *Guttmacher Policy Review* 16(2): 712.

Bijeli, N. and Hodi, A. 2014. Siva zona: Pitanje abortusa u Republici Hrvatskoj. Zagreb: CESI.

Bonfiglioli, C. 2016. The first UN world conference on women (1975) as a Cold War encounter: Recovering anti-imperialist, non-aligned and socialist genealogies. *Filozofija i društvo* 27(3): 521541.

Cvetkovska, S. 2013, September 7. Kampanjata za abortus zla namera so nai pari. Nova TV. Retrieved from <http://novatv.mk>

David, P. H. (ed.) 1999. From abortion to contraception: A resource to public policies and reproductive behavior in Central and Eastern Europe from 1917 to the present. Westport and London: Greenwood Press.

Dnevnik. 2009, January 22. Revita ke gi ui enite protiv abortusot. Retrieved from www.dnevnik.mk

Duvnjak, G. 2016, June 7. Intervju: Principot na vladeenje na pravoto e seriozno naruen. *Utrinski vesnik*. Retrieved from www.utriski.mk

Falanga. 2013, October 2. RRD [sic] go povlee spotot protiv abortus, VMRO-DMPNE i RDRM [sic] nezadovolni. Retrieved from <http://falanga.com.au/>

Finer, L. and Fine, J. B. 2013. Abortion law around the world: Progress and pushback. *American Journal of Public Health* 103(4): 585589.

Gaber-Damjanovska, N. 2016. Vo odbrana na Ustavot i civilizaciskite vrednosti. Skopje: Makedonski centar za megunarodna sorabotka.

Gagnon, V. P. Jr. 2004. The myth of ethnic war: Serbia and Croatia in the 1990s. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Helsinki komitet za ovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija. 2010. Godien izvetaj 2009. Skopje. Retrieved from www.mhc.org.mk

209 Helsinki komitet za ovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija. 2013. Kvartalen izvetaj za ovekovite prava vo Republika Makedonija apriljuni 2013. Retrieved from www.mhc.org.mk

Helsinki komitet za ovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija. 2014. Godien izvetaj za sostojbite vo oblata na ovekovite prava vo Republika Makedonija vo 2013 godina. Skopje.

Retrieved from www.mhc.org.mk

HERAAsocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istrauvanje. 2013a, June 18. Reakcija vo vrška so potpiuvanjeto na tetniot zakon za prekinuvanje na bremenosta od Pretsedatelot Ivanov. Retrieved from www.facebook.com/hera.macedonia/notes

HERAAsocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istrauvanje. 2013b, June 19. Reakcija na sooptenieto na kabinetot na Pretsedatelot Ivanov. Retrieved from www.facebook.com/hera.macedonia/notes

HERAAsocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istrauvanje. 2009. Strateka ramka 20092013. Retrieved from www.hera.org.mk

HERAAsocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istrauvanje and ZGOMZdruenie na ginekolozi opstetiari na Makedonija. 2011, January 18. Sootpenie do mediumite od pres konferencijata odrana na 18.01.2011. Retrieved from www.hera.org.mk

HERAHealth Education and Research Association. 2016, May. Updated information for the consideration of the Committee on Economic, Youth Platform for Comprehensive Sexuality Education, ReactorResearch in Action, and Coalition Sexual and Health Rights of Marginalized Communities. Social and Cultural Rights regarding the review of the combined second, third and fourth periodic reports of Republic of Macedonia under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 58th Session (6 June 201624 June 2016). Retrieved from <http://tbinternet.ohchr.org>

Ivanovski, T. 2016. Recenzija: Po odnos na izdvoenite mislenja po odlukite na Ustavniot sud na Republika Makedonija, podneseni od prof. d-r Nataa Gaber-Damjanovska. In Vo odbrana na Ustavot i civilizaciskite vrednosti, edited by N. Gaber-Damjanovska , 78. Skopje: Makedonski centar za megunarodna sorabotka.

J. J. 2009, January 30. Kontroverzната Revita dodeli nagradi za zatita na nerodenite deca. Utrinski vesnik. Retrieved from www.utrinski.mk

Jordanovska, M. 2013, December 10. Negragansko optestvo: Politizacija na nevladinite organizacii vo Makedonija. Balkan Insight. Retrieved from www.balkaninsight.com

Jovanovska, J. 2009, January 29. Front za poddrka na abortusot. Utrinski vesnik. Retrieved from www.utrinski.mk

Jovanovska, J. 2011, January 10. Vladata pak mu se nafarli na abortusot. Utrinski vesnik. Retrieved from www.utrinski.mk

Jovanovska-Veljanovska, J. 2013, May 29. to predviduva noviot zakon. Utrinski vesnik. Retrieved from www.utrinski.mk

Kampanji na Vlada na RM. 2015, January 30. Kampanja: AbortusCenzura (Mother Teresa 1). Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/mzj33qwl1Ws>

Koalicija za zatita i promocija na seksualnite i zdravstvenite prava na marginaliziranite zaednici. 2009a. Godien izvetaj za seksualni i zdravstveni prava na marginaliziranite zaednici. Skopje: Trajanoski, .

Koalicija za zatita i promocija na seksualnite i zdravstvenite prava na marginaliziranite zaednici. 2009b, January 26. Ja zaboravivme praktikata na vlastodrecot auesku!. Utrinski vesnik. Retrieved from www.utrinski.mk

Kolozova, K. 2008, November 14. Beseda protiv besedata na g. Ilarion. Dnevnik. Retrieved from www.dnevnik.mk

210 Komisija za zatita od diskriminacija. 2014, April 3. Mislenje. Retrieved from www.kzd.mk

Komisija za zdravstvo. 2013, June 5. Javna rasprava po Predlogot na zakonot za prekinuvanje na bremenost, po skratena postapka. Retrieved from www.sobranie.mk

Lj. B. 2009, February 12. NVO protiv zabranata na abortusot. Dnevnik. Retrieved from www.dnevnik.mk

Marjanovi, V. 2009, January 22. Abortus ne, edukacija na enata da!. Veer. Retrieved from <http://vecer.mk/arhiva>

Marui, S. J. 2013, June 10. Macedonia Adopts Controversial Abortion Law. Balkan Insight. Retrieved from www.balkaninsight.com

Mikovska Kajevska, A. 2000, August 24. Ragam, znai postojam. Denes. 2829.

Mikovska Kajevska, A. 2013, June 12. enite vo Ivanov gledaat spas za zakonot za abortus. Nova TV. Retrieved from <http://novatv.mk>

Mikovska Kajevska, A. 2016. Growing oppression, growing resistance: LGBT activism and europeanisation in Macedonia. In LGBT activism and Europeanisation in the post-Yugoslav space: On the Rainbow way to Europe, edited by B. Bili , 81116. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

MKD. 2013, May 6. Za vladikata Petar enata e vinovna za razvodite. Retrieved from www.mkd.mk

Mladenovska, P. 2013, June 10. Pratenicite go izglasaa noviot zakon za abortus. Radio Slobodna Evropa. Retrieved from www.slobodnaevropa.mk

Mnogudetni semejsva MKD. 2014, July 3. Treto deteMajka. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/cXMhE5Ai0lc>

M. V. 2013, June 6. Zajakot se krie vo sovetuvanjeto so koe enata ke se odvraka od abortusot. PlusInfo. Retrieved from www.plusinfo.mk

Najevska, M. 2013, May 29. Predlog zakon za prekinuvanje na bremenostapo skratena postapka. Retrieved from www.kvadraturanakrugot.crnaovca.mk

Norberg, A. 2016. To Adopt or Not to Adopt an Abortion Policy: A Case Study of the Abortion Reform Processes in Spain and Portugal (Unpublished masters thesis). Uppsala University, Uppsala.

NVO Infocentar. 2015. Monitoring na odnosite so javnosta na izvrnata vlast: Vladata informira ili propagira? Izvetaj br. 4: Monitoring na vladinite mediumske kampanji. Skopje: Marii, B., Petkovski, Lj., and Bejkova, B.

Pandevska, M. 2011, January 18. Propaganda i uslovi. Dnevnik. Retrieved from www.dnevnik.mk

Pepovska, B. 2009, January 30. Ne pravime razlika megu legalen i nelegalen abortus. Utrinski vesnik. Retrieved from www.utrinski.mk

Petri, N. 1976. Pravo oveka da slobodno odluuje o raanju u Socijalistickoj Federativnoj Republici Jugoslaviji. Beograd: Savezni Savet za planiranje porodice and Praktina ena. PlusInfo. 2013, June 18. Kabinetot na Ivanov vraka na H.E.R.A.zakonot za abortus nesporen. Retrieved from www.plusinfo.mk

Popovska, T. 2011, January 11. Vladinata kampanja moe da se izrodi vo zabrana na abortusot. Dnevnik. Retrieved from www.dnevnik.mk

Radio MOF. 2013, November 26. Koj si igra majtap so Sovetot za radiodifuzija?!. Retrieved from www.radiomof.mk

Republika. 2016, November 21. Mokno video na VMRO-DPMNE: Znae to e podobro, za tebe, za Makedonija!. Retrieved from: <http://republika.mk>

Ristova-Asterud, K. 2014. Za (ne)ustavnosta na zakonot za prekin na bremenosta od 2013 godina (del prvi). Pravnik 23(272): 4852.

211 Ristova-Asterud, K. 2015. Za (ne)ustavnosta na zakonot za prekin na bremenosta od 2013 godina (del vtori). Pravnik 24(273): 4853.

Ristova-Asterud, K. , H.E.R.A.Asocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istrauvanje, Koalicija Seksualni i zdravstveni prava na marginaliziranite zaednici, ReaktorIstrauvanje vo akcija and Helsinki komitet za ovekovi prava na Republika Makedonija. 2013, September 27. Inicijativa za poveduvanje postapka za ocenuvanje na ustavnosta. Retrieved from www.mhc.org.mk

Rizvanovik, S. 2013, May 29. 24 Analiza. 24 vesti. Retrieved from <http://24vesti.mk/>

Roman, S. 2009. Geneza pravice do umetne prekinutve nosenosti v nekdanji Jugoslaviji. Ars&Humanitas 3(12): 301325.

Sapunov, S. , Janeva, N. , Gerasimovska Kitanovska, B. , Jovanovski, B. , iivalieva, S. , Tozija, F. , Kosevska, E. and Stankova, K. 2009, February 4. Abortusot e pravo na sekoja ena. [available on file with author]

Senior Experts Group. 2015, June 8. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Recommendations of the Senior Experts Group on systemic Rule of Law issues relating to the communications interception revealed in Spring 2015. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/>

Simonovik, B. 2013, May 29. Debata za promenite vo zakonot za abortus. Alsat. Retrieved from www.alsat.mk

Sluben vesnik na Republika Makedonija (52/1991). 1991, November 22. Ustav na Republika Makedonija. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sluben vesnik na Republika Makedonija (13/2006). 2006, February 1. Zakon za sloboden pristap do informacii od javen karakter. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sluben vesnik na Republika Makedonija (82/2008). 2008, July 8. Zakon za zatita na pravata na pacientite. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sluben vesnik na Republika Makedonija (87/2013). 2013, June 17. Zakon za prekinuvanje na bremenosta. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sluben vesnik na Republika Makedonija (148/2014). 2014, October 10. Pravilnik za sodrinata i nainot na sovetuvanjeto na bremenata ena pred prekinuvanjeto na bremenosta. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sluben vesnik na Socijalisticka Federativna Republika Jugoslavija (9/1974). 1974, February 21. Ustav na Socijalisticka Federativna Republika Jugoslavija. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sluben vesnik na Socijalistika Republika Makedonija (18/1976). 1976, June 9. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za prekin na bremenosta. Retrieved from www.slvesnik.com.mk

Sobranie na R. Makedonija. 2013a, June 10. Stenogram od sednica br. 62, toka 36. Retrieved from www.sobranie.mk

Sobranie na R. Makedonija. 2013b, n.d. Izvetaj za rabotata na Sobranieto na Republika Makedonija za periodot 01.01/201331.12/2013. Retrieved from www.sobranie.mk

Sobranie na R. Makedonija. 2016, n.d. Izvetaj za rabotata na Sobranieto na Republika Makedonija za periodot 01.01.201617.10.2016. Retrieved from www.sobranie.mk

Sovet za radiodifuzija. 2013, October 1. Izvestuvanje. Retrieved from <http://arhiva.sdsd.org.mk>

Stojanovski, F. 2011, February 26. Makedonija: Reakcii na vladinata kampanja protiv abortusot. Global Voices. Retrieved from <https://mk.globalvoices.org/>

Stubbs, P. 2013. Flex actors and philanthropy in (post-)conflict arenas: Soros Open Society Foundations in the post-Yugoslav space. *Croatian Political Science Review* 50: 114138.

212 The Economist. 2017, April 28. Macedonian nationalists storm the parliament to hold on to power. 2017. The Economist.

Tilly, C. 2007. Democracy. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tomi, V. 1987. enata i optestvoto. Skopje: Misl.

Vankovska, B. 2013, June 3. Otvoreno pismo do pratenikite i do pratenicite. Nova Makedonija. Retrieved from www.novamakedonija.com.mk

Vaseva, M. 2014, November 6. Majka Tereza od Triumfalnata porta porauva: Abortusot e zakana za mir vo svetot. PlusInfo. Retrieved from <http://plusinfo.mk>

Vest. 2009, January 24. Opagaat abortusite vo Makedonija. <http://star.vest.com.mk/>

Vlada na Republika Makedonija. 2012, October 23. Gruevski: VMRO istoriski prepoznatliv kod na makedonskiot narod. Retrieved from <http://vlada.mk/>

Vlada na Republika Makedonija. 2013a, May 21. Predlog-zakon za prekinuvanje na bremenost, po skratena postapka. Retrieved from www.sobranie.mk

Vlada na Republika Makedonija. 2013b, June. Dopolnet predlog na zakon za prekinuvanje na bremenost. Retrieved from www.sobranie.mk

vmrodpne macedonia. 2016, November 20. Prodoluva napred po patot na dostoinstvoto i monostite. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/h7z4Cbv3-qw>

VMRO-DPMNE. 2004, October 15. Statut. Retrieved from <http://vmro-dpmne.org.mk>

VMRO-DPMNE. 2016, December 17. Integralen tekst od obrakanje na Nikola Gruevski, Pretsedatel na VMRO-DPMNE. Retrieved from <http://vmro-dpmne.org.mk>

Walby, S. 2015. Crisis. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

World Health Organization. 2012. Safe abortion: technical and policy guidance for health systems. Geneva. Retrieved from www.who.int

How to Study Varieties of Opposition to Gender+ Equality in Europe?

Crenshaw, K. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *U. Chi. Legal F.*, p.139.

Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 12411299.

Porta, D. della. 1996. Social movements and the state: Thoughts on the policing of protest. In *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*, edited by D. McAdam , J. D. McCarthy and M. N. Zald , 6292. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Emejulu, A. and L. Bassel . 2015. Minority women, austerity and activism. *Race & Class* 57(2): 8695.

Emejulu, A. and L. Bassel . 2017. Whose crisis counts? Minority women, austerity and activism in France and Britain. In *Gender and the economic crisis in Europe*, edited by E. Lombardo and J. Kantola , 185208. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Farris, S. R. 2015. Migrants regular army of labour: gender dimensions of the impact of the global economic crisis on migrant labor in Western Europe. *The Sociological Review*, 63(1): 121143.

Ferree, M. M. 2003. Resonance and radicalism: Feminist framing in the abortion debates of the United States and Germany. *The American Journal of Sociology* 109(2): 304-344.

Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte . 2017. *Anti-gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mazur, A. G. 2016. Toward the systematic study of feminist policy in practice: An essential first step. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 38(1): 64-83.

Strolovitch, D. Z. 2008. *Affirmative advocacy: Race, class, and gender in interest group politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Takcs, J. 2015. *Homophobia and genderphobia in the European Union: Policy contexts and empirical evidence*. Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies.

Tilly, C. 2007. *Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verloo, M. 2001. *Another Velvet revolution? Gender mainstreaming and the politics of implementation*. IWM Working Paper No. 5/2001: Vienna.