Introduction

Equality is the base for strengthening a democracy. A democracy is always stronger, more robust, fuller of life, when it champions equality. I am referring to all types of equality: equality of opportunity, equality of rights, gender equality, equality under the law. This word fills a democracy with strength, faith, and hope.

—Dilma Rousseff (2016) during a meeting called “Women in Defense of Democracy,” one day after the Chamber of Deputies started her impeachment process.

On October 31, 2010, Brazilians elected their first woman president. Dilma Rousseff’s victory marked the third consecutive election of a president from the Partido dos Trabalhadores (Worker’s Party, or PT), following the two terms of Luiz Inácio “Lula” da Silva, the country’s first “worker” president (someone not from the established business or intellectual elite). The election of a woman president to a position with extensive policymaking power and authority in one of the world’s largest economies is noteworthy in itself. But what transpired during the six years of Rousseff’s tenure makes her presidency especially important to the study of Brazilian politics and women in executive power.

Three years of high popularity and a strong economy were followed by three years of economic and political chaos. Rousseff won a highly contested reelection bid in October 2014, but the political and economic crisis eventually led to her impeachment in August 2016. Situated against the backdrop of Rousseff’s election, reelection, and impeachment, this book scrutinizes the ways Rousseff’s presidency shaped women’s political empowerment in Brazil. This book poses two main questions: First, in what ways did Rousseff use her powers to enhance women’s political empowerment? Second, to what extent did gender play a role in her presidency, including the political crisis and Rousseff’s ensuing impeachment? Our introduction first offers the theoretical and methodological contributions of this book, followed by a brief outline of the chapters to come.
Theoretical and Empirical Contributions


Though women presidents and prime ministers receive far less attention than their legislative or cabinet counterparts, this topic of analysis is experiencing substantial growth (Montecinos 2017; Bauer and Tremblay 2011; Baturo and Gray 2018). Subjects of interest include women’s paths to power (King 2002; Clemens 2006; Skard 2014; Jalalzai 2013; Thames and Williams 2013), female candidacies (Murray 2010; Lee 2017; Hahm and Heo 2018; Carreras 2017), and women’s behaviors as officeholders (Saint-Germain 1993; Jalalzai 2016; Shair-Rosenfield and Stoyan 2018). Women have led countries that vary considerably in terms of democratic strength and stability, and women’s achievement of political, social and economic equality in the larger society (Jalalzai 2013; Alexander and Jalalzai 2018; Bauer and Tremblay 2011; Montecinos 2017). Several politically volatile or transitional countries have also been governed by women (Montecinos 2017; Raicheva-Stover and Ibroscheva 2014; Jalalzai 2013). The literature also suggests women have tended to take different pathways than men to gain more authoritative positions, such as being from political dynasties and/or being political activists (Derichs, Fleschenberg, and Hüstebeck 2006; Besley and Reynal-Querol 2017; Thames and Williams 2013; Jalalzai 2013; Baturo and Gray 2018; Jalalzai and Rincker 2018).

The importance of Dilma Rousseff’s presidency, therefore, arises in part from her departure from previously identified patterns regarding women’s powers and paths. She exercised dominant authority as president of Brazil, was elected to this position (and reelected) rather than being appointed or arising through presidential succession, and did not rely on being “the wife of” or “daughter of” a powerful male politician to make it to the top (see also Jalalzai 2016). Her case, however, illustrates that gaining power is but one important hurdle that women need to surmount and dominant presidents do not necessarily enjoy full autonomy to govern or generate enough support to
accomplish their agendas. Moreover, presidents are also not insulated from premature removal though the expectation in democracies is that impeachment would be carefully approached via constitutional procedures.

The extent to which sexism shapes women executive candidate bids, their officeholding and political demise are still relatively underexplored topics. Most existing analyses of female presidential candidates concern the United States (Carroll and Dittmar 2013; Falk 2010; Heldman, Conroy, and Ackerman 2018; Lawrence and Rose 2009; Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010), although exceptions exist (Murray 2010; Montecinos 2017; Jalalzai 2013, 2016). Given this continued gap, increased in-depth analysis of cases outside the American context would provide a more thorough understanding of whether women possibly face greater scrutiny for their lackluster performances or alleged engagement in inappropriate behavior compared to their male counterparts, particularly in contexts of political scandal or crisis (see Carlin, Carreras, and Love 2019; Reyes-Housholder 2020). Scholars examining women executives also offer few definitive conclusions when assessing gendered differences in ways that women and men exercise their authorities as opposed to factors propelling them to power. The next section evaluates the prevailing approaches and findings regarding the potential significance of having women at the helm, followed by an outline of our theoretical approach.

**The Difference Women Make—Representation Theory**

The representation of women in politics is one of the main foci of gender and politics research. The presence of women in the formal political process (through elections and appointments) and its impact on the political system has produced a considerable amount of scholarship as well as influenced institutional changes and policymaking throughout the world in the past decades. The bulk of this research has focused on the role of women in parliaments and its impact on representation for two key reasons: the greater theoretical connection between representation and legislative positions, and the increased data availability on the subject given the greater quantities of women legislators.

This literature on women’s representation in the legislature typically engages Hanna Pitkin’s groundbreaking work, *The Concept of Representation* (1967) to verify potential representational benefits. Pitkin (1967, 209) defines political representation as “acting in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them” and outlines four interrelated types of representation. Formalistic representation scrutinizes the rules or procedures related to the position (Dovi 2002; Schwindt-Bayer and Mishler 2005). Descriptive representation concerns the attributes of officeholders, such as women legislators...
Beyond Representation Theory: Women’s Political Empowerment

We view representation theory as a critical framework for understanding the importance of having women positioned in the political process. Representation theory, however, primarily references the role of legislators (Runciman and Brito Vieira 2008).¹ In our analysis of Rousseff’s presidency, we emphasize advancing women’s political empowerment rather than representation. This offers a complementary approach to evaluate the effects of women executives that better captures the broader significance specific to women heads of state and government. Women executives may help facilitate women’s political empowerment, defined as “the enhancement of assets, capabilities, and achievements of women to gain equality to men in influencing and exercising political authority worldwide” (Alexander, Bolzendahl, and Jalalzai 2018, 4).

Women executives, particularly presidents exercising dominant authority in their systems, are fitting subjects to analyze as they perform three key functions related to women’s empowerment: appointing, policymaking, and symbolizing. Women executives are better positioned than their legislative and ministerial counterparts to more directly affect women constituencies. This influence is magnified by their domestic and international visibility.

Empowerment through Appointment

A very visible and direct way women executives empower women is through appointing other women to key posts in the political system. Though their male colleagues can also do this (see Barnes and Taylor-Robinson 2018), women may especially be likely to appoint women to positions of political significance. The literature points to various reasons why women executives may select more women to political positions. Women may be more aware of

¹ Though Pitkin (1967, 12) addresses the executive in terms of symbolic representation: “An idea or a person can be made present, not by a map or portrait, but by a symbol, by being symbolized or represented symbolically . . . a modern monarch, or indeed any head of state, can be said to ‘represent or embody’ be a symbol for, ‘the unity of the people of the state.’”
women’s political marginalization and try to redress this by being more inclusive (Krook and O’Brien 2012). They are also more prone to engage within female networks, increasing their likelihood of knowing potential women appointees (Franceschet 2016; Krook and O’Brien 2012; Reyes-Housholder 2016). Possibly, the public anticipates or insists that women executives strive for gender parity. Women as presidential candidates may also be more inclined to pledge to select more equal numbers of women and men as appointees, furthering their follow-through once elected.

We argue also that analyzing empowerment through executive appointment is advantageous in that cabinet ministers can further empower women through their own influence on the policy process (Atchison 2015; Annesley, Engeli, and Gains 2015). Therefore, chief executives possess greater capacity than individual legislators and individual cabinet members at influencing both gender composition of political institutions and policy priorities.

Even if presidents do strive to enhance gender diversity through their appointments, many conditions shape cabinet composition. The formal and informal rules affect both the supply of women and demand for women (Annesley, Beckwith, and Franceschet 2019; Franceschet, Annesley, and Beckwith 2017). In Latin America, presidents are relatively unfettered in cabinet selection in that the legislature usually does not need to formally approve their choices. While the pool of eligible cabinet members in parliamentary systems is typically limited to sitting legislators, this is not the case in presidential systems (Annesley 2015). During periods of coalition governance, however, some ministerial posts must be reserved for their governing partners (Annesley 2015; Hiroi 2013; Figueiredo 2011; Limongi and Figueiredo 1998). This factor constrains cabinet selection in various presidential systems and particularly in Brazil, and we elaborate on how this can undermine the appointment of women to cabinet positions (Chapter 3). Party ideology also affects gender diversity within cabinets. Presidents from left-leaning parties in Latin America tend to have a significantly higher percentage of women in their cabinets (Reyes-Housholder 2016).

While three recent male presidents (Carlos Alvarado in Costa Rica, Ivan Duque in Colombia, and Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua) composed parity cabinets in recent years (“Gender Parity Cabinets Are on the Rise” 2018), the literature shows that women presidents in Latin America have appointed more women to cabinet positions compared to their male colleagues (Jalalzai 2016; Reyes-Housholder 2016). They do not always promote women to more prestigious portfolios (Jalalzai 2016); women still may be selected to head more stereotypically “feminine” ministries (Reyes-Housholder 2016).

One often engaged example is Michelle Bachelet’s first cabinet, composed of as many women as men. A criterion guiding her selections included a
preference for having ministers who had not previously served in the government (Weeks and Borzutzky 2013). Bachelet opposed some coalition partner choices given that few women were placed as high-ranking players (Staab and Waylen 2014). The literature shows limits to this commitment to gender parity, however. Women’s levels declined during her first term (Jalalzai 2016; Reyes-Housholder 2016). A commitment to gender parity did not surface as she formed her cabinet during her second mandate both in terms of quantity and quality of appointments (Franceschet 2016; Jalalzai 2016). Gender parity in the cabinet did not appear to be a priority during the presidencies of Chinchilla (Costa Rica), Fernández (Argentina), and the other women presidents in the region that served before (Jalalzai 2016).

As we turn to the case of Rousseff, our initial analysis confirmed that she selected more women to her cabinet compared to her male predecessors and appointed women to more influential positions (Jalalzai and dos Santos 2015; Jalalzai 2016). The number of women declined as her presidency continued, however, especially during her second term, and they held less prestigious positions than they had during earlier points of Rousseff’s presidency. How this downturn was affected by the need to balance ever-increasing diverse ideological demands and the political crisis, however, must be better understood (see Macaulay 2017).

Following Rousseff’s impeachment, Michel Temer, the vice president who took office after her impeachment from the MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement) did not appoint a single woman to his cabinet as he first came to office (Arbex and Bilenky 2016). This break from seemingly established norms guiding women’s cabinet inclusion (Franceschet, Annesley, and Beckwith 2017; Annesley, Beckwith, and Franceschet 2019) highlights the importance of better understanding how women’s appointment to cabinet positions relates to women’s empowerment. Viewing women’s empowerment as a process of agentic transformation and keeping in mind that “women’s empowerment is achieved as part of the political process, not one particular moment” (Alexander, Bolzendahl, and Jalalzai 2018, 5), this book investigates how a woman president may empower women and the consequences of these actions on the political process during and after a woman president’s term in tandem with the multitude of conditions at work that influence these tendencies and abilities.

**Empowering through Policymaking**

Presidents of Latin American countries, including Brazil, exercise several important policy authorities including issuing executive orders or decrees (Shair-Rosenfield and Stoyan 2018; Reich 2002; C. Pereira, Power, and
This includes the ability to propose or implement measures advancing women’s equality. We recognize that policymaking does not occur in a vacuum. Several conditions affect opportunities to support measures designed to address women’s status. Specific rules for advancing legislation interact with partisanship and party systems, legislative/executive relations, and conflicting constituency demands.

We argue, however, that women executives may be particularly inclined to use their policy related authorities on behalf of women in the larger society. This stems from their potential greater awareness of gender inequities compared to their male colleagues. They also may face greater demands from female constituents or activists (Reyes-Housholder 2016, 2019). Conceivably, women national leaders are more receptive to such demands, though this may come with its own set of complications and pressures considering the various conditions noted. More research also suggests that the public is more critical of the policy performance of women presidents in contexts of scandal, corruption, and threats to security (Carlin, Carreras, and Love 2019; Reyes-Housholder 2020), which may serve to dissuade women from advancing more controversial measures including those related to gender equality.

Research examining the substantive impact of the most recent women presidents in Latin America is growing. Former Chilean president Michelle Bachelet advocated for legislative gender quotas, reproductive rights, and pay equity (Peña, Aguayo, and Orellana 2012; Stevenson 2012; Thomas 2016; Waylen 2016). Laura Chinchilla, the former president of Costa Rica, tended to reinforce women’s traditional roles as mothers rather than transcend gender boundaries (Jalalzai 2016). We see little prioritization of policies empowering women in Argentina under Cristina Fernández’s administration. For example, though she is from a leftist party, she opposed abortion reform (Piscopo 2014). Though liberalization was initiated by other actors, she did, however, support LGBTQ rights (Encarnación 2011, 2013). In most ways, she tended not to advocate measures beyond more traditional gendered conceptions of women and their family roles (Jalalzai 2016).

Initial analysis of Dilma Rousseff’s presidency indicated that she had expanded many of the policies established by former president Lula to explicitly benefit women, and made gender connections to policies that have generally lacked gendered attention (Jalalzai and dos Santos 2015; Jalalzai 2016). She did not attempt policy change on other issues, including abortion, placing her at odds with feminist groups (Jalalzai and dos Santos 2015; Jalalzai 2016; Macaulay 2017; Encarnación 2017; Machado 2016). We note that our analysis of Rousseff was based solely on her first term as president (Jalalzai and dos Santos 2015). It is critical to examine if and how she engaged promoting women’s rights through her policymaking authority during her second term,
particularly during the crisis period and how this approach differed from her successors, Michel Temer and Jair Bolsonaro.

This book uses Rousseff’s presidency as a case study and focuses on specific women-related policies to better understand if and how Rousseff was willing and able to expand women’s empowerment through policymaking. Does she expand women’s assets, capabilities, and achievements of through the exercising her political authority as president (Alexander, Bolzendahl, and Jalalzai 2018, 4)? To answer this question, we offer comparisons between Rousseff’s government and her predecessor (Lula) and successors (Temer and Bolsonaro). By recognizing “political authority as the legitimate access to state mediated power” (Alexander, Bolzendahl, and Jalalzai 2018, 6), we emphasize the relationship between the president, the legislature, cabinets, and civil society in furthering women’s empowerment through policymaking, as well as the consequences of a deep political crisis on policymaking and women’s empowerment.

**Empowerment through Symbolizing**

The last aspect of empowerment we address is symbolizing. As members of a politically excluded group, women seeing other women in the highest political offices may enhance their political agency (Mansbridge 1999; Lombardo, Meier, and Meier 2016; Simien 2015). The visibility of presidents compared to other political actors (members of cabinets or legislators for instance) is particularly high. Seeing women included in the most “masculine” of domains challenges prevailing conceptions of women operating on the political margins. Their presence can also emit broader positive cues regarding democracy and hasten political engagement of traditionally disempowered groups. Moreover, women’s selections of other women to high offices (such as cabinet ministers) can further generate important symbols to the public (Franceschet, Annesley, and Beckwith 2017), in addition to these same officials fostering positive policy impacts.

Compared to scholarship focusing on the link between women executives and policy effects and cabinet integration, less literature addresses their symbolic import. In a global analysis of surveys before and after women take power, women and men are more supportive of female leaders in countries that have been governed by women. This cannot be explained by already high levels of public support for women leaders in these countries; several women have been appointed or elected in countries absent widespread public approval for women’s political incorporation. Respondents also demonstrate higher levels of political interest in countries led by women. Women’s presence has a stronger positive effect on women in terms of their likelihood to vote in national and local elections (Alexander and Jalalzai 2018).
Analyzing public opinion in seventeen Latin American countries, Reyes-Housholder and Schwindt-Bayer (2016) find a positive association between women’s intentions to vote, their involvement in political campaigns, and participation in local meetings in countries with women presidents. They also prove more supportive for women’s political role. At the same time, they do not confirm that countries with women presidents have populations with higher rates of political efficacy, interest, or news engagement, or that the public views their governments as more responsive (Reyes-Housholder and Schwindt-Bayer 2016, 116). Surveys in Costa Rica and Argentina tended to confirm negative effects linked to Chinchilla’s and Fernández’ presidencies. Rousseff’s presidency offered more consistent, albeit minor, positive shifts in her first term as president while Bachelet’s in Chile showed few stable or significant effects (Jalalzai 2016). Elite interviews, however, revealed more consistently positive influences of Rousseff’s and Bachelet’s presidencies. Again, however, we note that previous research lacks information on how the crisis and impeachment affected perceptions of Rousseff’s leadership. This is a very important gap that needs to be addressed, for reasons discussed subsequently.

While the other aspects of empowerment seem to offer more control to the individual actions taken by the executive (though again, limitations exist), women perhaps exert less control in terms of symbolizing. We can analyze speeches or declarations to verify whether women leaders call attention to being symbols of women. At the same time, based on the context, women’s status as political minorities (even if positioned at the apex of power) may generate negative views regarding women’s fitness to lead because they are held to different standards than their male counterparts (see Carlin, Carreras, and Love 2019). The public expects women to offer moral leadership. Expectations that women will be less corrupt sometimes propels women to power in the first place, particularly if women candidates skillfully exploit gender stereotypes related to being more honest. This, however, comes with potentially heightened scrutiny when they ultimately wield power (Reyes-Housholder 2020). Barnes, Beaulieu, and Saxton (2018) present evidence that segments of the population that are “hostile sexists” (versus “benevolent sexists”) will especially punish women more for not displaying gendered traits such as being more honest and less corrupt. Gendered perceptions of women’s leadership may give way to negative assessments of women’s governance and leadership in some circumstances. This can be especially acute if political opponents successfully manipulate public perceptions of women’s capacity to lead, if media outlets provide gendered coverage of electoral campaigns and executive leadership, and if political crises affect the public perception of women leaders.

In this book we propose novel ways to conceptualize and measure women’s symbolic empowerment and their relationship to the presidency. As elaborated
in more detail in the conclusion, we propose that women presidents may influence symbolic empowerment of distinct groups of women, with varied levels of success. We are especially interested in the impact of a political crisis and impeachment proceedings on Rousseff’s capacity and reach as a symbol for women, and the ways in which a possible backlash against women’s empowerment can manifest itself symbolically in the society.

**Methodological Contributions**

This book utilizes a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods. We rely on fieldwork notes (from participant observation) and interviews conducted by the authors in 2010, 2012, 2016, 2017, and 2018. Fieldwork and interviews can be divided into two distinct periods: the optimist period of Rousseff’s election and “long honeymoon” (2010–2013) and the politico-economic crisis and its aftermath (2014–2018). Analyzing this long period is essential to providing a more comprehensive assessment of perceptions of Rousseff’s leadership and potential effects of her presidency on women’s political empowerment. This time frame allows us to discern whether any positive impacts on empowerment arising from Dilma Rousseff’s presidency were short-lived or withstood her removal from power.

Fieldwork and participant observation included state party conventions in 2010, the PT National Convention that officialized Rousseff’s campaign in 2010, various political rallies during the 2010 campaign (in the Federal District and Goiás state), observation and informal conversations (before, during, and after) at the 2013 protests in three different cities (Brasília, Recife, and Rio de Janeiro), observation and informal conversations (before, during, and after) pro-impeachment and anti-impeachment protests in Brasília in 2016, and the PT National Convention of 2017. Our interviews conducted during two distinct periods (2010–2012 and 2016–2018), total 152 different individuals. The profile of interviewees varies greatly and includes candidates and elected politicians at all levels of government, activists and members of civil society organizations, cabinet members, bureaucrats inside government institutions (legislative, executive, and judiciary), journalists, and academics. The interviews from the 2010–2012 period were conducted in two states: Federal District and Goiás. Interviews conducted during the 2016–2018 period were conducted in a total of five states: Bahia, Federal District, Goiás, Rio de Janeiro, and São Paulo. We sought a diversity of ideological voices in our interviews but tried to emphasize individuals who could speak directly to issues of women’s empowerment (see the appendix for a more detailed discussion of the interviews).
We also analyze representative survey data, policy documents, budgetary allocations, personnel data, speeches, and media depictions from Dilma Rousseff’s presidency (2011–2016) in comparison to Lula’s presidency (2003–2010) and Michel Temer’s presidency (2016–2018). As such, we answer our main questions by implementing a wide array of techniques. Where appropriate (and when information is available) we also provide some initial comparisons between Rousseff’s administration and the presidency of Jair Bolsonaro that started in January 2019, always focusing on ways in which women’s empowerment is sought or addressed by the presidents and their administrations.

This book also constitutes the first detailed and comprehensive work in political science analyzing Dilma Rousseff’s presidency through the totality of her tenure. The institutional crisis that started in 2013–2014 provides an interesting backdrop to the study of women’s political empowerment in a contested presidency. This work is a case study of the effects of Dilma Rousseff’s tenure as president (2011–2016) and how her election and six years in power affects women’s political empowerment in the Brazilian political system. This book also provides a gendered analysis of the impeachment process and its aftermath. We also pay close attention to how women’s empowerment interacted with gender and gendered institutions before, during, and after Dilma Rousseff’s presidency. More specifically, we analyze the backlash against women’s empowerment and its connection to having a woman in the presidency.

Earlier examinations lacked a deeper discussion of the political crisis that started in 2013 with widespread protests preceding the 2014 FIFA World Cup. This book digs deeper into the consequence of these protests on Dilma Rousseff’s government, focusing especially on the effect of the political crisis on women’s empowerment during Rousseff’s tenure, and on the role gender played in the protests and impeachment process.

This book presents how Rousseff’s approach to the presidency when dealing with issues regarding women’s empowerment differed from Lula’s (her predecessor) and our comparison between Lula’s and Rousseff’s government is important in determining how the gender of the president affects women’s presence in politics and the advancement of women related policy in Brazil while holding party constant. The appraisal made between Rousseff’s and Temer’s (as well as Bolsonaro’s) governments offers the opportunity of scrutinizing how a switch in party leadership and gender at the executive level directs changes in a government’s overarching philosophy regarding policies and the country’s direction.

While the number of women elected as presidents and prime ministers is still small, the recent rise of women in the executive pushes scholars to ask
questions about governance and empowerment that consider the role of gender, women leaders, and the political system. Within the gender and politics literature, the development of new approaches to understanding women’s empowerment has allowed for this area of political science to contribute greatly in the development of new theories, challenging of ontological and epistemological understandings of the political process. This book contributes to the progress of gender and politics literature, specifically, but also the political science discipline as a whole.

Rousseff’s case is particularly instructive because it considers the complicated nature of women’s executive leadership and women’s empowerment. In many respects, this analysis of Rousseff’s rise to power and ultimate fall provides a cautionary tale of a woman cracking the presidential glass ceiling in a context where men continue to dominate the political landscape. This is a story of high stakes. Not only did Rousseff’s impeachment result in her untimely loss of her presidency, but potentially erased women’s gains in Brazilian society.

Outline of the Book

This book is divided in two parts. The first (Chapters 1 and 2) provides background on key events that shaped Dilma Rousseff’s rise and fall from power in relation to gender, while the second (Chapters 3, 4, and 5) focuses on ways in which Rousseff used her presidential authorities to attempt to empower women while analyzing areas where she succeeded and failed in doing so.

Chapter 1 examines Rousseff’s rise to power, election, and reelection. It mainly engages the ways in which gender infused both the 2010 and 2014 campaigns and media portrayals of the electoral contests. In 2010, Dilma Rousseff’s election is credited to the very popular President Lula, who was vital to her rise to power and eventually becoming the PT’s presidential candidate. Gender played a very important role in the framing of her candidacy. Through content analysis of campaign material, we identify the use of the moniker the “Mother of Brazil.” This was a deliberate strategy of the 2010 campaign to downplay Rousseff’s harshness and normalize her as a woman, mother, and grandmother (Jalalzai and dos Santos 2015). We identified several examples of Rousseff responding to a “double bind,” needing to convince the public and political elites that she was both competent and “feminine.” By 2014, Rousseff was a known quantity and was no longer associated as Lula’s heir. Rousseff and the PT were already facing increased scrutiny and public discontent as the crisis period started to take hold. The campaign strategy shifted from focusing on Rousseff’s maternal qualities to her being a warrior woman (mulher guerreira). Rousseff only very narrowly won reelection.
and the opposition soon seized this opportunity to mount attacks on Rousseff’s governance, many of which were gendered.

Chapter 2 examines the impeachment, offering a brief overview of key events between 2013 and 2016 leading to the end of Rousseff’s presidency. We provide a conceptual exploration of misogyny, violence against women in politics (VAWP), and women’s empowerment. We find that misogyny was an important element during the crisis that culminated in Rousseff’s impeachment. We argue that Brazil’s male dominated political system contributes greatly to the normalization of misogyny and sexist behavior, affecting President Dilma Rousseff in distinct ways. Moreover, we use the political crisis and impeachment to assess how women’s political empowerment can lead to backlash aimed directly at disempowering women. We engage misogynistic tropes present throughout the impeachment process, and demonstrate that misogyny, though not the sole motivator for President Rousseff’s removal, was an important element in attempting to disempower her (by putting Rousseff in her place) and other women seeking to enter masculine spaces in Brazilian society.

Focusing on the concept of empowerment through appointment, Chapter 3 assesses the ways in which Dilma Rousseff’s presidency affected women’s presence in political offices, particularly the cabinet. We analyze whether Rousseff empowered women through selecting women to ministerial posts and to ones affording more influence. We also examine women’s inclusion in Lula’s (also from the PT) and Michel Temer’s (of the MDB) cabinets, as well as Jair Bolsonaro’s (then of the PSL [Social Liberal Party]) initial cabinet appointments. In doing so, we scrutinize how the institutional characteristics of Brazil’s coalition presidency, internal party dynamics, and political instability interact with gender to influence women’s cabinet inclusion between 2003 and 2019 and contrast Rousseff’s “honeymoon” (2011–2013) and turbulent (2013–2016) periods. President Rousseff placed more women in her cabinet and tended to appoint them to more influential positions (i.e., ministries with closer and direct connections to the presidency) compared to her male counterparts. This tendency, however, lessened as the crisis took hold. Overall, women still enjoyed record-setting levels in the cabinet during Rousseff’s presidency than during any other administration before and since. While we recognize partisanship and ideological differences, we also identify gender as a factor shaping women’s inclusion in the cabinet.

Chapter 4 focuses on women’s empowerment through policymaking. We analyze how Rousseff’s administration navigated the complicated subject of women-related policy, especially in a country that is deeply conservative, religious and with varied understandings of women’s rights and women’s policies. We use Mala Htun and S. Laurel Weldon’s (2010, 2018) typology
of women’s rights policies to analyze four policies, determining the impact Rousseff’s presidency had on the development and implementation of these policies. We analyze these policies across presidencies, comparing Rousseff’s efforts to those of her predecessor and fellow PT member Lula and her successors Michel Temer of MDB and Jair Bolsonaro of PSL. Following these four issue areas across administrations underline the complexity of proposing and implementing women-related policies and the role of partisanship, the women’s movement, the country’s economic performance, and religion on the success and failure of these types of measures.

After her election in 2010 Dilma Rousseff made it clear that she wanted the legacy of Brazil’s first woman president to last beyond her tenure. In her inaugural speech, President Rousseff stated that she wished to be a symbol to all other Brazilian women—a positive influence in the lives of all women. Chapter 5 investigates ways in which Rousseff attempted to serve as a symbol for women and, in doing so, empower other women politically. We examine her public declarations and speeches referencing symbolizing women and also focus on perceptions related to Rousseff’s symbolizing women held by political elites (including those involved in social movements). We pay close attention to the sociohistorical context of the Brazilian women’s movement and political debates surrounding women’s empowerment, feminism, and gender equality. As in other chapters, we are mindful of differences between Rousseff’s first and second terms. We further argue that her impeachment, contextualized within the “culture wars” of Brazil in 2000 and 2010s and the rise of right-wing populism throughout the world, incurred both negative and positive symbolic effects on women’s empowerment in the country. The misogynist attacks Rousseff endured inspired women within diverse feminist communities to work together and rally on behalf of Rousseff. This mobilization called greater attention to the continued inequities women in Brazil face. Overall, we argue that Rousseff’s presidency offers long-lasting positive symbolic implications for women’s empowerment in Brazilian politics.

In the conclusion, we place Rousseff’s presidency in relation to women’s empowerment in a comparative perspective, particularly in light of other women presidents that recently rose to power in Latin America in Argentina, Chile, and Costa Rica. We also situate our findings within the larger literature on women executives worldwide. We offer overall conclusions, particularly in terms of how Rousseff’s presidency illustrates the complex role of gender in presidential politics. Finally, we provide an overview of topics that scholars focus on to continue to move the gender and executive scholarship forward.

After the impeachment, scholars will scrutinize the legacy of Dilma Rousseff’s presidency. This book evaluates her legacy to the Brazilian political system by assessing specifically how her presidency impacted the lives of women
in Brazil. By focusing on women’s empowerment, this book contributes both to the study of Brazilian politics and the study of women presidents in Latin American and beyond. Rousseff’s story is a complicated one—women’s gains can be quickly undone, particularly when the rise of a woman president occurs in a country in which men still dominate the political landscape, women face extreme violence, and corruption proves endemic. Nevertheless, our analyses throughout the book suggest that Dilma Rousseff enhanced women’s empowerment in her appointing women to office, advancing policies empowering women, and serving as symbol for women.