

INTERNATIONAL GUIDE TO ELECTORAL STATISTICS
GUIDE INTERNATIONAL DES STATISTIQUES ÉLECTORALES

MAISON DES SCIENCES DE L'HOMME
SERVICE D'ÉCHANGE D'INFORMATIONS SCIENTIFIQUES

Publications Série B

GUIDES ET RÉPERTOIRES II

MOUTON
PARIS · LA HAYE

International guide to electoral statistics

Guide international des statistiques électorales

VOL. I: NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN WESTERN EUROPE

VOL. I: ÉLECTIONS NATIONALES EN EUROPE OCCIDENTALE

edited by / publié par

STEIN ROKKAN

University of Bergen and Yale University

JEAN MEYRIAT

École Pratique des Hautes Études et

Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, Paris

MOUTON

THE HAGUE · PARIS

Preface

The International Committee for Social Sciences Documentation has over recent years given an increasingly high priority to the development of comparative cross-cultural and cross-national research. The Committee has taken action on several fronts: it has not only been concerned to collect and disseminate information about what *has been done* in different countries but also to call the attention of scholars to what *can be done*. To alert social scientists to the possibilities and the potentialities of comparative research, the Committee in 1962 launched a plan for a series of *Guides to Data for Comparative Research*. These *Guides* were to describe, field by field and country by country, the existing sources of data for comparative analysis, discuss problems of access and analyzability, summarize studies already carried out and point to lacunae and new possibilities. The idea was to go beyond traditional bibliographical description and to focus on the *raw data for research*: how were the data recorded? how accessible were they? how could they be analyzed? The Committee hoped in this way not only to help students and research workers find their way to data of relevance in other countries but also to increase their understanding of the possibilities and limitations of comparative analysis.

The field chosen for the first set of such *Guides* was electoral *statistics*. The idea of such a guide had been launched in 1959 already by the Finnish political scientist Jan-Magnus Jansson. A plan for an *International Guide to Electoral Statistics* was drawn up in 1960 by Stein Rokkan and was discussed by a group of experts from a wide range of countries at the World Congress of Political Science in Paris in September 1961. A standard list of points to be covered for each country was circulated to close to 50 scholars in different parts of the world. The scholars assumed to be best acquainted with the electoral statistics of their country were asked to prepare national chapters in conformity with this standard list of contents. No direct remuneration could be offered for these expert services: it was emphasized that the enterprise was to rely on voluntary co-operation among scholars and represented a significant experiment for the Committee. It was of course hoped that financial support for further work along these lines could be found at a later stage but it was important for the Committee to demonstrate the possibilities of voluntary co-operation among experts in a field of joint concern.

This effort proved a success. The first draft chapters were submitted in 1962 and some twenty countries had been covered by early 1965. Given the voluntary charac-

ter of the enterprise it was difficult to get the authors to prepare their texts in quick succession and it was even more difficult, of course, to make them conform in all detail to the specifications in the standard list of contents. This meant that a great deal of editorial work had to be carried out by the Secretary General of the Committee.

This first volume covers the multi-party régimes of Western Europe: altogether fifteen countries. Steps towards the preparation of a second and a third volume are under way: these will cover multi-party régimes outside Europe. Draft chapters have already been submitted on Canada, Israel and Japan, and so has the first half (to 1920) of the extensive chapter on the United States. These, with chapters on Turkey, the Philippines and the majority of the Commonwealth countries, will constitute the second volume. The third volume will cover the electoral statistics of the Latin American countries with some history of regular political bookkeeping. Discussions have also been pursued toward the planning of a companion volume on the organization and analysis of *statistics of local elections*, at least for the countries where partisan competition has taken on some importance at this level of the political system. (The chapter on Sweden in the present volume already includes information about local elections because of the tie-in with elections to the First Chamber.)

The next set of volumes in the series will constitute an *International Guide to Mass Media Statistics*. For this enterprise support has come forth from UNESCO. A first volume, covering selected countries of Western Europe, is already in preparation. Plans for further sets of *Guides* have been discussed but not yet drawn up in detail. It is our intention to concentrate the series on the 'soft' statistics so far neglected within the UN machinery: information about such statistics is hard to come by, the sources are widely dispersed, and the analysis possibilities have rarely been exploited to the extent they warrant.

In presenting this first volume in our new series we are happy to acknowledge a number of intellectual and moral debts. We first of all must thank all the authors of the country chapters for their contributions to the joint efforts: not only for the long and tedious work of preparing their texts but also for their patience and understanding in coping with all our queries. We are indebted to friends at UNESCO, in the International Social Science Council and in the International Political Science Association for their constant encouragement of these efforts. Our thanks go quite particularly to the Boards and the staffs of the Chr. Michelsen Institute in Bergen and the International Committee in Paris for all help given us in this enterprise. We are ourselves more than anyone else aware of the lacunae and the imperfections of this first volume but we hope that the users in the social science community of the world will find the effort worth pursuing.

Paris and Bergen, 1 May 1967

STEIN ROKKAN
Professor of Sociology
UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

JEAN MEYRIAT
Secretary-General
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR
SOCIAL SCIENCES DOCUMENTATION

Table of contents / Table des matières

PREFACE	J. Meyriat	v
	S. Rokkan	
INTRODUCTION	S. Rokkan	i
AUSTRIA	R. P. Stiefbold, <i>University of California, Berkeley</i> .	15
	R. Metzler-Andelberg, <i>University of Graz</i>	
BELGIQUE	F. Zombek-Fuks, <i>Institut E. Vandervelde, Bruxelles</i>	47
	W. Fraeys, <i>Bruxelles</i>	
DENMARK	Institute of Political Science, <i>University of Aarhus</i>	58
FRANCE	A. Lancelot, <i>Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, Paris</i>	102
GERMANY	N. Diederich, <i>Institute of Political Science, Free University, Berlin</i>	128
GRÈCE	D. Kitsikis, <i>Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris</i>	163
ICELAND	O. R. Grimsson, <i>University of Manchester</i>	183
IRELAND	J. F. S. Ross†, <i>Southport, England</i>	195
ITALIE	G. Schepist, <i>Université de Rome</i>	206
NETHERLANDS	G. H. Scholten, <i>Institute of Political Science, University of Amsterdam</i>	232
	G. Ringnalda, <i>Institute of Political Science, University of Amsterdam</i>	
NORWAY	S. Rokkan, <i>Chr. Michelsen Institute and University of Bergen</i>	261
SWEDEN	E. Janson, <i>University of Gothenburg</i>	281
SUISSE	R. Ruffieux, <i>Université de Fribourg</i>	309
UNITED KINGDOM	D. E. Butler, <i>Nuffield College, Oxford</i>	330
	J. Cornford, <i>University of Edinburgh</i>	

Introduction

STEIN ROKKAN

Early developments

The regular production, dissemination and scrutiny of mass statistics is a hall-mark of the nation-state: the consolidation of the European administrative structures during the mercantilist era generated a series of efforts to standardize the collection and presentation of numerical information about each subject population and gave rise to the academic discipline of *statistica*, literally the *science of the state*.¹

The earliest efforts of nation-wide data gathering grew out of the eminently practical needs for information about military and economic potentials: the census was an essential tool in the establishment of national policies. Equally pragmatic considerations prompted the development of other bodies of statistics: registrations of marriages and births, divorce, disease, crime, mortality.

All these statistics underwent a great deal of change during the first century of regular official bookkeeping: changes in data-gathering procedures, in definitions and classifications, in modes of presentation and publication. But there was an unmistakable trend toward routinization and standardization over time: the gathering of such statistics was recognized as an administrative necessity and the utility of the data was enhanced through the emphasis on comparability over long spans of time.

Eminently pragmatic motives also prompted the development of another branch of national statistics: the statistics of elections, popular consultations and organs of representation. But the need for such statistics varied much more with the internal structure of the polity: censuses became part and parcel of the process of national administration but political enumerations only made sense in representative regimes and even within these only after the spread of partisan contests and the standardization of electoral practices. The counting of votes was the administrative alternative to conflict and intrigue: the organization of electoral statistics was a direct product of the efforts to routinize the resolution of conflicts within the body politic through the holding of regular elections, under the control of formally neutral bodies of officials. To achieve legitimacy the decisions of the electorate had to be documented and made available for scrutiny from all sides: the organization of regular electoral bookkeeping was a response to the widespread questioning of the electoral verdicts. The electoral records were essentially judicial documents: they were there to uphold claims on legitimate representation. The production of political statistics could

2 Introduction

not be divorced from the process of politics itself: the structure of local and national politics determined the character of electoral record-keeping.

This meant that the statistics of elections were essentially *national* in character: they differed from country to country in their degree of centralization, in the amount of detail given, in the style of presentation and analysis. A strong international movement for the standardization of censuses and the registration of marriages, births, diseases and deaths got under way in the middle of the 19th century: there was no question of any parallel movement for political statistics.

The decades after the upheavals of 1848 saw a remarkable increase in the production of literature on the franchise, on the organization of elections and on the behaviour of the electorates but the great majority of these writings stayed within the confines of the one nation. The controversies over the extension of the franchise inspired a few attempts at comparative tabulations but none of them went very far in analytical detail²: it took a long time before anyone even thought of subjecting electoral data to the sort of systematic comparison tried out on suicide statistics by Durkheim.

A few solid works of comparative scholarship saw the light but these were less concerned with statistical analysis than with the philosophical and the ideological justifications of alternative electoral systems and with accounts of sequences of development nation by nation. The great work of Georg Meyer³ is still an invaluable source of information for early European developments. The later compilation by Seymour and Frary⁴ adds an important Western perspective but does not maintain the same level of scholarship. The classical treatise on comparative electoral law came much later still. Karl Braunias's two-volume work *Das parlamentarische Wahlrecht*⁵ was brought out in 1932 and reflected quite a different stage in the history of mass politics: it gave less attention than Meyer to the early developments up to the universalization of the suffrage but concentrated its efforts of systematization on the great varieties of arrangements in the mobilized full-suffrage democracies of the decade after World War I. No work of such scope has been attempted after World War II: this is one of the great lacunae of contemporary scholarship.⁶

The early discussions of the pros and cons of different electoral systems suggested a number of challenging tasks of comparative statistical analysis but the technical difficulties of data access and data processing tended to discourage even the most assiduous of scholars. There was a scattering of discussions of methods and procedures of political statistics but these generally failed to tackle any of the challenging issues of comparative analysis.⁷ Curiously, the breakthrough toward a comparative perspective did not come in the wake of the many parallel movements towards universal manhood suffrage: it came as soon as the *women* had been given the vote in a wide variety of countries just before or just after the First World War. The emerging mass democracy had inspired a number of great treatises of comparative politics: Ostrogorski, Michels, Bryce⁸, but these gave only passing attention to numerical evidence. The decisive breakthrough toward systematic statistical comparisons came in the 1930s: the American political scientist Harold Gosnell, one of the pioneers of the Chicago school, brought together a vast body of information about European elections and tried to pinpoint a few regularities⁹ and his Swedish colleague Herbert

Tingsten followed this up through a series of much more detailed analyses of geographical, social and economic determinants of the behaviours of the enfranchized citizenry.¹⁰ Both of them focussed attention on the latest entrants into the electoral arena: the *workers* and, quite particularly, the *women*. In fact, the extension of the suffrage to women triggered off a series of new developments in electoral statistics: a great deal of public interest centered on the behaviour of the women at the polls and efforts were made in country after country to ensure the collection of the necessary data for detailed analyses of differences between the two sexes. Only two leading countries kept outside this movement: Great Britain and the United States. In the countries of the European Continent (equally in Australia and New Zealand) the electoral registers were set up to allow analyses of variations in *turnout* between the sexes and in a few countries, notably in Weimar Germany and in the First Austrian Republic, arrangements were even made for separate counts of *party votes* by sex.¹¹ These developments in official bookkeeping offered a tempting platform for comparative analysis. Tingsten based most of his comparisons on the tabulations already published by local or national statistical bureaux but in a couple of cases managed to get behind the screen of published tabulations to the raw data on the electoral registers. His concerns were essentially *developmental*: he was concerned with the analysis of the *processes of change* triggered off by the extension of the suffrage to all adults and he wanted to pinpoint the *geographical* spread of these changes.¹² For technical reasons the bulk of his analyses focussed on the *women*, the latest category of subjects granted rights of participation in the political system. But he was equally concerned with the behaviours of the *workers*: their entrance contributed much more decisively to the restructuring of national politics and their willingness to be mobilized in one direction or another offered a challenging theme of comparative research.

A number of attempts had been made in different countries to identify conditions making for rapid mobilization of the enfranchized working class.¹³ What distinguished Tingsten's contribution was not just the attempt at a systematization of findings across so many countries but even more his persistent search for regularities in *variations by type of localities within each country*: he did not content himself with the establishment of similarities or differences in national *averages* for each category of citizens but concentrated much more energy on the analysis of variations among *localities* within each nation.

Whenever the sources made it possible he grouped the data on electoral behaviour by *types of locality*: by voting districts in the larger cities and by commune or other units of local administration in the countryside. Tingsten became the father of *comparative political ecology*: he was the first to attempt the formulation of a general regularity in the contextual conditioning of electoral behaviour. His suggestion of a general 'law of the social centre of gravity' inspired a variety of further analyses: the notion that socially homogeneous environments offered the best conditions for political mobilization was not in any sense novel, but his demonstration of the possibilities of detailed testing of such hypotheses through the processing of mass data caught the imagination of a number of leading methodologists in the sociological profession and inspired a variety of further analyses.

4 Introduction

An intriguing merger of research traditions took place in the wake of Tingsten's pioneering efforts. The story is complex and cannot be summarized in a few paragraphs.¹⁴ In this quick introduction we cannot enter into details: we shall offer a simple scheme of alternative strategies and discuss trends towards a convergence of concerns in the comparative study of elections.

The central challenge: the secrecy of individual decisions

To the social scientist elections represent mass experiments of unprecedented scope:

- you define a given population through strict rules of inclusion and exclusion;
- you force all the members of the population to choose among the same basic alternatives: vote for party A, party B..., or abstain;
- you register each individual decision and you collect in the same run a variety of other data about each actor.

But there is one decisive limitation: the individual decisions are conscientiously *registered* but they are *counted as anonymous acts cut off from their origins*. The experiment produces vast masses of statistics for the social scientist but the rules of secrecy set barriers to his analyses: at least for the decisions between the parties, he must confine himself to the aggregate counts by locality or constituency and is cut off from the data at the level of the individual citizen.

This contrast sets the central challenge of electoral statistics: vast masses of well-established data in the aggregate, legal barriers against direct analysis at the individual level.

This contrast was in itself a product of the process of democratic development: the introduction of strict rules of secrecy was part and parcel of a general process of administrative standardization triggered off through the widening of the suffrage and the consequent efforts of mass mobilization.¹⁵ In the *régime censitaire* the vote was a publicly visible act: the citizen was accountable for his choice of candidate or party and had to be prepared to defend it in his dealings with his fellow men. In some cases voting was entirely oral and there was no record of individual votes. In other cases detailed registers of all the eligible voters were maintained for the recording of their votes: this source of data on early divisions in the body politic has only recently been opened up by historians and holds great promise for systematic research.¹⁶ With the extension of the suffrage to the dependent strata of the population this onus of choice produced strains in the body politic and tended to defeat the purposes of election: the peaceful resolution of conflicts over representation. There were marked differences in the reactions to these strains. Countries heavily dominated by landowners tended to maintain open voting even after the enfranchisement of the dependent strata: thus Denmark, Hungary and Prussia. Other countries introduced formal secrecy at an early stage but encountered great difficulties in the standardization of electoral practices.¹⁷ But whatever the details of application the rule of secrecy determined the character of the statistical product of the elections: the act of voting was severed from the enfranchized citizen and was only registered and counted as a contribution toward a territorial total. There were often no dif-

difficulties in establishing lists of individual voters for each party in the *rural* districts but this was vastly more difficult in the anonymous and multi-faceted *urban* communities.¹⁸ Whatever the actual possibilities of obtaining such information the rule of secrecy made it impossible to establish authentic statistics of candidate or party choice at the individual level: it was administratively possible to carry out analyses of individual variations in *turnout* but the *actual votes cast* were only reported by aggregates and could no longer be officially tabulated at the level of individuals on the registers.

This set a challenging task of statistical analysis: the aggregate results were known but the unknowns of the generating equations could only be solved through a variety of indirect procedures of estimation.

The history of electoral research is essentially the history of the strategies chosen in the search for such estimates.

Four such strategies can conveniently be distinguished:

- the Siegfried strategy of *electoral cartography*, the production of detailed maps of variations in territorial aggregates and the analysis of similarities and differences through the scrutiny of local evidence;
- the Tönnies – Rice – Heberle strategy of *political ecology*, the calculation of the correlations of the social, economic and cultural characteristics of each locality with the aggregate results of elections;
- the Lazarsfeld strategy of *community surveys*, the organization of direct interview inquiries with samples of local electorates and the analysis of the social, economic and cultural backgrounds of the voting decisions on the basis of such individual data;
- the Campbell strategy of *nation-wide surveys*, the conduct of interview inquiries with samples representative of entire national electorates and the analysis of average statistical associations and correlations across wide ranges of communities and constituencies, whether grouped by geographical regions or by type of locality.

The first two of these approaches were fully developed before the Second World War. André Siegfried's classic treatise on the West of France was published as early as in 1913 and is still a model of regional research. There was nothing new about the use of maps in political analysis¹⁹: the novelty of Siegfried's enterprise was the systematic collation of evidence, geographic, economic, cultural, historical, to account for contrasting local traditions of politics. He did not just compare one map with another: he ordered many of the data statistically and came very near to the type of correlational analysis favoured by Tönnies and Heberle²⁰ in Germany, Rice and his followers in the United States.²¹ The distance between the two strategies were particularly marked in the years after the Second World War: the French school of *géographie électorale* continued to produce maps by the hundreds while social science methodologists in other countries tended to concentrate much more attention on the logic of reasoning in studies of ecological variations. In recent years there have been many signs of a merging of the two traditions. Electoral geographers such as Alain Lancelot and Jean Ranger have shown great interest in alternative procedures of analysis²² and the political sociologist Mattei Dogan has demonstrated the great possibilities of simple statistical models for the calculation

6 Introduction

of the distributions at the origins of the aggregate results.²³ The work of French statisticians such as Joseph Klatzmann, Jacques Desabie and G. Vangrevelinghe have added further strength to this movement: they have suggested ways of getting beyond the timeworn methods of multiple regression analysis towards solutions through matrix analysis of systems of equations.²⁴

A parallel merger of traditions can be observed in the United States. The breakthrough in the mathematics of sampling and the growth of academic interest in standardized field operations set the stage for a remarkable innovation in the study of politics: the analyst was no longer content to order and collate the evidence produced by the political process itself but went out to elicit and collect data directly from the population he wanted to know about. The technique of the sample survey opened up a wide range of new avenues of analysis and called attention to new dimensions of the political process. In the early years there were important differences of strategy in the use of this technique: Lazarsfeld and the Columbia group wanted to reduce the range of political variability within the population under study and wanted to test out their hypotheses through sample surveys in *single communities* while Campbell and his team at Michigan wanted to study the whole range variations, political or otherwise, across the entire national electorate.²⁵ During the last years there have been a number of signs of a merging of these two traditions: a number of analyses have brought out the importance of local political contexts for electoral behaviour and more and more attempts have been made to map out the dimensions of variability in such contexts and to pin down the typical behavioral consequences of such variations.²⁶

What is even more important is that there has been persistent signs of a *rapprochement* between the essentially European tradition of political ecology and the typically American tradition of the sample survey. It is deeply significant that a great archive of electoral ecology is currently under development at Ann Arbor, the Mecca of survey research: the Inter-University Consortium set up to service the growing number of graduate schools of political science is no longer confining its holdings of data for reanalysis to past academic surveys but is building up a vast file of electoral records and census data for practically all counties of the United States since the 1820s.²⁷

The rationale of this development is twofold:

- first of all electoral analysts have become increasingly impressed by the stubborn *historical continuities* in local electoral behaviour and have become interested in pinning down the sources of these traditions through long-term time series analysis;
- and secondly, the analysis of aggregate records is no longer seen as ‘the poor man’s alternative’ to sample surveys but as a great intellectual challenge, as an incentive to the construction and testing of developmental models at a high level of theoretical articulation.

The contrast between the two traditions was at its peak in the early fifties: this was the heyday of pronouncements about the ‘ecological fallacy’ and the pitfalls of official statistics.²⁸ During the last decade, these overheated debates have given way to a variety of serious efforts to analyze the logical structure of inferences from one level of description to another and to compare systematically the available strategies

in the uses of aggregate data.²⁹ There is a great deal of intellectual excitement about these issues in the logic of research and some of the best brains in the profession have been at work on them in recent years. One important source of stimulation has been the *econometric* movement: there is the same emphasis on the use of the products of official statistical bookkeeping, the same concern with problems of aggregation and disaggregation, the same interest in processes of change over time. It is indeed not inconceivable that we shall see before long the development of 'politometrics' as a parallel to econometrics.

The need for cross-national stock-taking of the data resources for political analysis: the rationale for the International Guide

These developments have so far taken place in single-nation settings: there has been a great deal of interchange at the level of models and methods but no concerted efforts to make systematic use of the great wealth of historical electoral data in cross-national comparisons: no one has as yet dared to 'do a Tingle' for the era of the computer and the data bank. A movement is under way, however, and there is every reason to expect important initiatives in this direction within the next decade. The success of the Inter-University Consortium has stimulated a number of parallel efforts in Europe: given the long traditions of centralized electoral book-keeping the jobs of data assembly and data preparation will in many cases be found easier than in the States.³⁰ The increasing interest in the quantitative study of processes of nation-building is bound to lead to proposals for cross-national analyses of historical election statistics. Karl Deutsch has called for concerted efforts to establish a broad basis for comparative analyses of rates and patterns of 'social mobilization'³¹: in any such scheme the statistics of elections, parties and political personnel is bound to be given high priority. Gabriel Almond, Lucian Pye and Sidney Verba have tried to formulate a body of general propositions about steps in the development of nations and have identified six decisive 'crises' in the development of modern polities: the crises of identity, of legitimacy, of territorial penetration, of participation, of integration and of distribution.³² For all these critical periods time series data of some sort *can* be established for most modern nations but the conditions for the production of such data have varied a great deal and the strategy of analysis cannot be the same in all cases. To get beyond the impressionistic summaries so characteristic of much of the literature of comparative politics it will be essential to get down to such detailed studies of the available time series data, preferably through the establishment of data banks and the exploration of possibilities of computer processing.

But there are many difficulties to be tackled before any such programme of comparative developmental analysis can be got off the ground. The essential first step would seem to be to take stock of the data resources nation by nation and to review the analyses already carried out within each of them: this is what we hoped to achieve in launching our *International Guide to Electoral Statistics* and this is how we want our effort to be judged.

We are well aware that efforts are under way in several countries to ensure much

more detailed stocktaking than could be contemplated within this international context: the easier access to large-scale computer facilities for political analysts has prompted parallel initiatives in a number of countries already³³ and is bound to stimulate further entrepreneurship. Our concern has been to increase international cross-discussions of such developments and to give all the potential participants a chance to acquaint themselves with the peculiarities of the data resources of the other countries. We have not succeeded equally well on all points but we hope we have at least been able to add significantly to the small arsenal of tools at the disposal of the student of comparative politics.

Given the great heterogeneity of the statistical series we decided to organize the *Guide* country by country: at a future stage it might be possible to envisage the preparation of a systematic check list of data characteristics across all countries but this was out of the question in the first round.

A *standard list of contents* for each such country chapter was agreed on by a group of electoral analysts assembled at the World Congress of Political Science in Paris in September 1961.

It was agreed to include in each country chapter information on each of the following points (doc. IGES/2, Dec. 1961):

A. Chronology of the electoral system

In this section the recorded *national* elections (and *national* referenda, if any) should be grouped by *periods* according to a) extensions of the suffrage, or b) basic changes in the electoral system (single-member constituency to list system, or equivalent changes).

For each period, information should be given on:

- I. franchise qualifications;
- II. electoral procedures (single member or multimember; plurality run-off or PR; if PR, which calculation procedure);
- III. procedures of registration;
- IV. rules for advance voting, postal vote.

B. Descriptions of sources of data for each period

This section should give, for each of the periods distinguished in section A, or at least for the periods since the introduction of manhood suffrage, the following items of information:

- I. *Exact bibliographical references* to official statistical publications and other compilations of results.
- II. For each election or series of comparable elections (referenda) *descriptions of the organization of the statistics* and *specifications of the territorial units* for which data are given (entire constituencies, communes, voting districts, wards, etc.), preferably with indications of the *size ranges* of such units.
- III. Again for each election or series of elections (referenda) *specifications of the contents of major tabulations* with specifications of summaries for larger units, percentage distributions and other calculations. *Note*: indicate with a code the *language* or *languages* used in the tables (of particular interest if there are subtitles in English or French).

IV. When official publications or other compilations do not contain any information on the smaller counting units (*e.g.* communes), efforts should be made to indicate any *archival sources* for such data.

V. Whenever possible, indications should be given of the possibilities of obtaining *census* data for the same territorial units as those in the statistics for elections or referenda: this, of course, is of essential importance in judging of possibilities of ecological analysis.

VI. In addition, each contributor is asked to insert any further comments he thinks fit on the quality of data, the circumstances to be taken into account in any statistical analysis of the data, etc.

C. A review of analyses so far undertaken with data for each period

This section may also be organized by period although in most countries it may prove convenient to group all the analyses by category and within each category chronologically according to the election(s) covered.

A basic distinction should be made between:

I. analyses carried out by *national statistical* agencies as part of their regular 'book-keeping', and

II. analyses undertaken by *academic research organizations, parties or individual scholars*.

I. If the official analyses are of an elementary nature (*e.g.* rankings of communes by turnout level) they might as well be reported on under B III above, but if they include detailed ecological analyses, etc., they should be listed and annotated separately in section C. Thus, in the case of *Sweden*, it would seem most appropriate to give the contents of Part I (raw data) of the official statistics under B III and to review the analytical Part II (which gives analyses of turnout on the basis of register data, ecological analyses of factors in party strength, and, most recently, a report on a nation-wide survey of the electorate) in section C.

II. In most countries there will be a great number of non-official analyses and each contributor to the *Guide* must use his judgement in selecting the most important ones, whether on methodological or substantive criteria. *Nation-wide and regional analyses should generally be given priority to local ones*. The primary purpose of the *Guide* is to give readers a *representative selection* of analyses undertaken and to show them what approaches have been tried out in each country.

It may be found convenient to group the analyses by *subject-matter and procedure* as follows:

1. analyses of turnout variations;
2. analyses of variations in party strength;
3. analyses of the recruitment of candidates or electors (analyses of their sex, age, occupation, income, career in local politics, etc. by party or other grouping).

D. Optional: summary table for the national results of elections or referenda

Whenever this can be done without complex calculations and laborious footnotes, it is proposed that the country chapter include at the end an over-all table giving, for as long a period as feasible, the results of each national election for the entire

national territory: number of registered voters, number of votes cast, votes for each party (or groups of parties) in per cent of votes cast and/or in per cent of total electorate. For some countries such tables may prove too unwieldy and cost too much labour but all contributors are asked to consider the possibility of such a table seriously before rejecting the idea. There can be no doubt that students of elections will be pleased to have such a ready-reference feature included in the *Guide*.

These instructions clearly left a great deal of leeway to the country authors but it was simply judged impossible to go further in standardization in an enterprise based on voluntary co-operation.

One item of optional information was fortunately supplied without prompting from the great majority of contributors: the table for national election results. These were, it is true, presented in a variety of idiosyncratic ways and had to be recast to conform to one of two basic standards, but there can be no doubt that these extensive summaries of time series data, some of them made accessible for the first time ever, add significantly to the value of the country chapters for the student.

On other points there are still great variations in coverage. Some authors have covered all varieties of electoral studies: not only cartographic and ecological analyses but also sample surveys and campaign descriptions, while others have stuck strictly to the task of describing the research uses of the official records and the published counts. Here we have not tried to apply strict criteria but have left it to the country responsables to judge how relevant each item of research will be to students seeking information about possibilities of comparative analysis.

There is one particular point on which, in retrospect, we wish we had taken a strong line: this concerns the statistics on the recruitment of candidates and parliamentary personnel (section C. II. 3. in the standard list). Some of our chapters go very far towards covering the available literature in this field, others have left it out entirely. We regret this very much. This is an important field of research: a number of pathbreaking studies have been completed during recent years³⁴ and efforts are under way in several countries to establish *computer-formated archives of biographical data for political personnel*.³⁵ This is a development of great potential interest in comparative research and we hope to remedy the lacunae of this first effort through another volume currently under consideration within our series of *Guides to Data for Comparative Research: an International Guide to Biographical Statistics*.

With all its shortcomings this first volume must essentially be judged as one step in a long-term process of stocktaking for comparative cross-national research. It is our hope that this effort will stimulate further initiatives within and across a number of countries and that by the time we shall consider a follow-up volume for these fifteen countries of Western Europe, we shall be able to report on a mushrooming of archives for computer analyses of historical electoral statistics.

NOTES

1. See V. John, *Geschichte der Statistik*, Stuttgart, Enke, 1884; H. Westergaard, *Contributions to the History of Statistics*, London, King, 1932. For an illuminating account of the contrast between the English tradition of 'political arithmetic' and the German *Statistik-Staatenkunde*, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld, 'Notes on the History of Quantification in Sociology', pp. 147–203 in: H. Woolf, ed., *Quantification*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1961.
2. Examples of early compilations are: Ch. Benoist, *La crise de l'Etat moderne, De l'organisation du suffrage universel*, Paris, Didot (1895), 453 p. (See appendices, p. 313 sqq.); A. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *Les élections en Europe à la fin du 19e siècle*, Paris, Plon, 1902, VIII + 372 p.
3. Georg Meyer, *Das parlamentarische Wahlrecht*, Berlin, Haering, 1901, 735 p.
4. Ch. Seymour; D. P. Frary, *How the World Votes. The Story of Democratic Development in Elections*, Springfield, Mass., Nichols, 1918, 2 vol., XIV + 406, XIII + 355 p.
5. Karl Braunias, *Das parlamentarische Wahlrecht. Ein Handbuch über die Bildung der gesetzgebenden Körperschaften in Europa*, Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1932, 2 vol.
6. Given the immediate political interests of the European organizations in questions of electoral standardization this is indeed an astounding lacuna. Among the few attempts to fill this gap in the literature these deserve mention: F. A. Hermens, *Democracy or Anarchy?*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1941; new ed., *Europe between Democracy and Anarchy*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1951, XX + 291 p., and *The Representative Republic*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1958, XIV + 578 p. (The great defender of the Anglo-American system of single-member constituencies and plurality decisions, adamantly biased against PR systems.) – M. Duverger *et al.*, *L'influence des systèmes électoraux sur la vie politique*, Paris, A. Colin, 1950, 179 p. (General discussion mainly concerned with analyses of developments before 1939, in need of detailed revision and updating.) – Enid Lakeman; J. D. Lambert, *Voting in Democracies*, London, Faber and Faber, 1955, 303 p. (A passionate plea for the Hare system, offers a detailed classification of electoral systems with much solid information, less informed about PR list systems.) – Giovanni Schepis, *I sistemi elettorali*, Empoli, Ed. Caparrini, 1955, 356 p. (Details of calculation procedures, uneven accounts of positive legislation without any attempt at historical explanation.) – H. Unkelbach, *Grundlagen der Wahlsystematik*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1956, 215 p. (Refinements on the Hermens arguments, no detailed analyses of the actual workings of systems.) – W. J. M. Mackenzie, *Free elections*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1958, 184 p. (A standard work on electoral organisation at a high level of theoretical articulation, no country-by-country treatment.) – Institute of Electoral Research, London, *A Review of Elections 1954–1958, ... 1959, ... 1960, ..., 1961–1962*, London, The Institute ..., 1960 sqq. – Institute of Electoral Research, London, *Parliaments and Electoral Systems. A World Handbook*, London, The Institute ..., 1962, 128 p. (Useful compendia, but leaves out important details and gives very little background information.) – W. Birke, *European Elections by Direct Suffrage*, Leyden, Sijthoff, 1961, 124 p. (Covers sixteen countries of Western Europe, very superficial, without theoretical perspective.) – U. Kitzinger, *Britain, Europe and Beyond. Essays in European Politics*, Leyden, Sijthoff, 1964, 222 p. (See part III and appendix. Details of electoral systems in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg, post-war election results tabulated for sixteen Western European countries, percentages only.)
- For details of the discussion of the unification of electoral law in Europe see W. Birke, *op. cit.*, and *Les élections européennes au suffrage universel direct*, Bruxelles, Institut de Sociologie Solvay, 1960, 317 p.
7. The voluminous treatise on statistics by Georg von Mayr, *Statistik und Gesellschaftslehre*, Freiburg, Mohr, 1895–1917, 3 vol., was to have been followed up by a fourth volume on political statistics but this does not appear to have been published. A couple of German dissertations give useful details on early analyses of electoral data particularly: Ernst Bock, *Wahlstatistik. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Statistik*, Halle/Saale, 1919 (Diss. Halle-Wittenberg, 1913); H. Herz, *Über Wesen und Aufgaben der politischen Statistik*, Leipzig, Gräfe, 1932.

8. M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, London, Macmillan, 1902, 2 vol., LVIII+628, XLIII+793 p.; abridged ed. with an introduction by S. M. Lipset, Garden City, Doubleday, 1964, 351 p. – R. Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie*, Leipzig, W. Klinkhart, 1911, 404 p.; new ed. with appendix by W. Conze, Stuttgart, Kröner, 1957; English ed., *Political Parties*, Chicago, Hearst, 1915; new ed. with introduction by S. M. Lipset, New York, Collier, 1962. – James Bryce, *Modern Democracies*, London, Macmillan, 1927, 2 vol., XXVI+564, X+757 p.
9. Harold F. Gosnell, *Why Europe Votes*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930, XIV+247 p.
10. Herbert Tingsten, *Political Behavior, Studies in Electoral Statistics*, London, P. S. King, 1937, 231 p.; reprinted: Totowa, N.J., Bedminster Press, 1963.
11. For details see Tingsten, *op. cit.*, chap. 1, and M. Dogan, 'Le comportement politique des femmes dans les pays de l'Europe occidentale', pp. 147–186 in: *La condition sociale de la femme*, Bruxelles, Institut de Sociologie Solvay, 1956.
12. A general rationale for this developmental approach to the study of electoral records is given in S. Rokkan, 'Electoral Mobilization, Party Competition and National Integration', pp. 241–265 in J. La Palombara and M. Weiner, eds., *Political Parties and Political Development*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966.
13. Among the earliest examples: A. Braun, 'Die Reichstagswahlen von 1898 und 1903', *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 18, 1903, pp. 539–563; R. Blank, 'Die soziale Zusammensetzung der sozialdemokratischen Wählerschaft Deutschlands', *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 20, 1905, pp. 507–550 (appendix by Max Weber, pp. 550–553); R. Michels, 'Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie, Parteimitgliedschaft und soziale Zusammensetzung', *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 23, 1906, pp. 471–556; Knut Tynell, 'De olika befolkningsgruppernas deltagande i de allmänna valen', *Statsvet. Ts.* 13(2), 1910, pp. 81–96; J. Olsson, 'Den politiska partifördelningen inom de olika sociala klasserna i Sverige', *Statsvet. Ts.* 26(2), 1923, pp. 115–139.
14. For accounts of the history of electoral research see S. J. Eldersveld, 'Theory and Methods in Voting Behavior Research', *J. Politics* 13, 1951, pp. 70–87; R. Heberle, *Social Movements*, New York, Appleton, 1951, pp. 206–265; Georges Dupeux, 'Le comportement électoral', *Current Sociol.* 3(4), 1954–1955, pp. 281–344; R. Bendix, S. M. Lipset, 'Political Sociology', *Current Sociol.* 6(2), 1957, pp. 79–169; D. E. Butler, *The Study of Political Behaviour*, London, Hutchinson, 1958, 128 p.; O. Stammer, ed., *Politische Forschung*, Köln und Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1960, XII+272 p. (especially the article by S. Rokkan and H. Valen, pp. 103–136); A. Ranney, ed., *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1962, XIV+251 p. (especially articles by Campbell, Rokkan, Ranney, Butler and Pesonen); N. Diederich, *Empirische Wahlforschung*, Köln und Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1965, XII+240 p.
15. For an analysis of these developments see Stein Rokkan, 'Mass Suffrage, Secret Voting and Political Participation', *Archives européennes de sociologie* 2(1), 1961, pp. 132–154.
16. The most important work of this type has been done by J. R. Vincent at Cambridge, see his *Poll Books. How Victorians Voted 1830–1872*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1967, XII+194 p., cf. also *The Formation of the Liberal Party 1857–1868*, London Constable, 1966, XXVIII+281 p. Similar work has been done by E. Høgh for the Danish elections up to 1901 (not yet published) and by T. Solhaug for a local election in early 19th century Norway.
17. On the complex history of electoral administration in France see J. P. Charnay, *Le suffrage politique en France*, Paris, Mouton, 1965 (especially pp. 179–334 and 583–636) and *Société militaire et suffrage politique en France*, Paris, SEVPEN, 1964, 329 p. (See chap. 3 and 4.)
18. Cf. the discussion in André Siegfried, *Tableau politique de la France de l'Ouest sous la Troisième République*, Paris, A. Colin, 1913, 2nd ed., 1964, p. X.
19. Among early efforts of political cartography the curious work of the Norwegian geologist Amund Hansen deserves particular attention: in his *Norsk Folkepsykologi*, Kristiania, Dybwad, 1899, he presented maps of the division between 'Left' and 'Right' in Norway and

tried to relate the differences in local voting to differences in ethnic origins as measured by skull indexes and hair colour.

20. F. Tönnies, 'Korrelation der Parteien in der Statistik der Kieler Reichstagswahlen', *Jb-r Nat.-Oekon. Statist.* 122, 1924, pp. 633-672; cf. the discussion of the 'sociographic' school in A. Oberschall, *Empirical Social Research in Germany 1848-1914*, Paris, Mouton and Co., 1965, XII+153 p. (see chap. 3, pp. 37-63). Tönnies's work was followed up by Rudolf Heberle in *From Democracy to Nazism*, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1945, a work originally carried out in 1932-1934 but not published in German until 1963: *Landbevölkerung und Nationalsozialismus*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1963, 173 p.

21. Stuart A. Rice, *Farmers and Workers in American Politics*, New York, 1924, and *Quantitative Methods in Politics*, New York, 1928. For an account of this American development see Peter Rossi, 'Four Landmarks in Voting Research', pp. 5-54 in E. Burdick; A. J. Brodbeck, eds., *American Voting Behavior*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1959; also N. Diederich, *op. cit.*, chap. 3, pp. 61-116.

22. A. Lancelot; J. Ranger, 'Développements récents de la recherche électorale en France', *Il Politico* 29(4), 1964, pp. 763-787.

23. Mattei Dogan, 'Le vote ouvrier en France, analyse écologique des élections de 1962', *R. franç. Sociol.* 6(4), 1965, pp. 435-471; see also his parallel analysis of French and Italian ecological data in his chapter in S. M. Lipset; S. Rokkan eds., *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*, New York, Free Press, 1967, pp. 129-195.

24. J. Klatzmann, 'Comportement électoral et classe sociale', pp. 254-285 in: M. Duverger *et al.*, eds., *Les élections du 2 janvier 1956*, Paris, A. Colin, 1957, also his 'Géographie électorale de l'agriculture française', pp. 39-67 in: J. Fauvet, H. Mendras eds., *Les Paysans et la politique*, Paris, A. Colin, 1958; J. Desabie, 'Le référendum, essai d'étude statistique', *J. Société Statist. Paris* 100(7-9), 1959, pp. 166-180; G. Vangrevelinghe, 'Étude statistique comparée des résultats des référendums de 1958 et 1961', *J. Société Statist. Paris* 102(10-12), 1961, pp. 279-294.

25. The literature of these movements is voluminous and need not be accounted for here: the classical texts of the two traditions are P. F. Lazarsfeld *et al.*, *The People's Choice*, New York, Duell, 1944, XXXIV+178 p., and A. Campbell *et al.*, *The American Voter*, New York, Wiley, 1960, VIII+573 p.

26. See *The American Voter*, *op. cit.*, chap. 11, pp. 266-289, and the forthcoming volume by Warren E. Miller and D. E. Stokes, *Representation in the American Congress*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1969.

27. See R. Bisco, 'Social Science Data Archives: a Review of Recent Developments', *Amer. polit. Sci. R.* 60(1), 1966, pp. 93-109, and the chapter by W. E. Miller, 'Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, Current Data Holdings', pp. 95-102 in: S. Rokkan, ed., *Data Archives for the Social Sciences*, Paris-The Hague, Mouton and Co., 1966, 215 p.

28. The initial statement on the ecological fallacy is due to W. S. Robinson, 'Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals', *Amer. sociol. R.* 15, 1950, pp. 351-357.

29. Major contributions to this literature are Leo Goodman, 'Some Alternatives to Ecological Correlation', *Amer. J. Sociol.* 64, 1959, pp. 610-625; O. D. Duncan, R. P. Cuzzort and B. Duncan, *Statistical Geography, Problems in Analyzing Areal Data*, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1961, XIV+191 p.; R. Boudon, 'Propriétés individuelles et propriétés collectives', *R. franç. Sociol.* 4, 1963, pp. 275-299; and Donald Stokes, 'A Variance Components Model of Political Effects', pp. 61-85 in: *Mathematical Applications in Political Science*, Dallas, Arnold Foundations, 1965. These issues have been placed in a broader methodological context by Erik Allardt and Erwin Scheuch in their chapters in R. L. Merritt and S. Rokkan, eds., *Comparing Nations*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1966, XVI+584 p., and have been fitted into an interesting general classification of types of 'fallacies' by Hayward R. Alker in *Mathematics and Politics*, New York, Macmillan, 1965, chap. 5. Perhaps the best discussion of the effects of aggregations on the magnitude of correlation or regression coefficients is found in Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., *Causal Inferences in Nonexperi-*

mental Research, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1964, pp. 97–114, 'Changes in Units of Analysis'.

30. See articles by E. Allardt and O. Riihinen and S. Rokkan and H. Valen in: S. Rokkan, ed., *Data Archives*, *op. cit.*, and the information on the Datum archive at Bad Godesberg in Bisco, *op. cit.* Mattei Dogan has established a *Bureau d'Analyses Quantitatives Internationales* in Paris for the accumulation of ecological data for France, Belgium and Italy.

31. Karl Deutsch, 'Social Mobilization and Political Development', *Amer. polit. Sci. R.* 55, 1961, pp. 493–514. The case for the use of electoral data in developmental analysis has been made by Stein Rokkan in 'Electoral Mobilization...', *loc. cit.*, also S. Rokkan and H. Valen, 'The Mobilization of the Periphery', pp. 111–159 in: S. Rokkan, ed., *Approaches to the Study of Political Participation*, Bergen, Chr. Michelsen Institute, 1962.

32. Initial statements of this theory of successive 'crises' can be found in the introduction and the conclusion of L. Pye and S. Verba, eds., *Political Culture and Political Development*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1965, X+574 p. and in Lucian Pye, 'Political Systems and Political Development', pp. 93–101 in: S. Rokkan, ed., *Comparative Research Across Cultures and Nations*, Paris-The Hague, Mouton, 1968. A fuller statement will be presented in the forthcoming volume by Leonard Binder *et al.*, *Crises in Political Development*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

33. Among recent, partly computer produced, collections of electoral documents and data, these deserve particular attention: F. Sängler; K. Liepelt, *Wahlhandbuch 1965*, Frankfurt, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1965 (a 2500-page compendium giving not only all post-war election results but also social structure data on each *Wahlkreis*); Rodney Stiefbold *et al.*, eds., *Wahlen und Parteien in Österreich. Österreichisches Wahlhandbuch*, Wien, Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1966, 3 vol. (Details on elections of I. and II. Republics.)

34. Among the most important recent efforts of large-scale processing of data on political personnel these deserve particular attention: W. L. Guttsman, *The British Political Elite*, London, McGibbon and Kee, 1963, 398 p.; Austen Ranney, *Pathways to Parliament*, London, Macmillan, 1965, XVI+314 p.; Wolfgang Zapf, *Wandlungen der deutschen Elite*, München, Piper, 1965; G. Sartori, ed., *Il Parlamento italiano 1946–1963*, Napoli, Ed. Scientifiche Italiane, 1963, 412 p.; Erich Gruner und Karl Frei, *Die Schweizerische Bundesversammlung 1848–1920*, vol. I, *Biographien*, vol. II, *Soziologie und Statistik*, Bern, Francke, 1966, 1021, 253 p.; H. Valen, 'The Recruitment of Parliamentary Nominees in Norway', *Scandinavian Political Studies* 1, 1966, pp. 121–166.

35. The idea of such archives was first launched by Harold Lasswell *et al.*, *The Comparative Study of Elites*, Stanford, Hoover Institute, 1952, 72 p. A number of such archives are currently under development. Information on archives in the U.S.A. is given in William A. Glaser and Ralph L. Bisco, 'Plans of the Council of Social Science Data Archives', *Social Sciences Information* 5(4), Dec. 1966, pp. 71–96. In France an extensive file of biographical data on the parties of the Third and Fourth Republics has been established by Mattei Dogan. In Norway, an archive of data on members of the professions since the 18th century has been established by Vilhelm Aubert and Ulf Torgersen, see 'Akademikerne i norsk samfunnsstruktur 1720–1955', *Tss. Samfunnsforskning* 1, 1960, pp. 185–204, and by Tore Lindbekk, see *Mobilitets- og stillingsstrukturer i tre akademiske profesjoner 1910–1963*, Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1967, 304 p.

Within the Norwegian programme of electoral research an archive of parliamentary nominees has been set up by Henry Valen; this has recently been extended by S. Rokkan and associates to cover the entire parliamentary personnel since 1814, see S. Rokkan, 'Political Research in Norway 1960–65', *Scandinavian Political Studies* 1, 1966, pp. 266–280.

Austria

RODNEY P. STIEFBOLD

R. METZLER-ANDELBURG

INTRODUCTORY NOTES

This chapter describes the organization and content categories of Austrian electoral statistics since 1873, the first year in which direct elections took place to the Lower House of the bicameral national Parliament of Cisleithanian Austria. It also annotates a representative selection of electoral analyses and investigations for each of the three main electoral periods, and provides a brief discussion of the historical evolution of Austrian electoral systems.

A few clarifications and references at the outset will go a long way toward maximizing the potential usefulness of this essay for the scholar engaged in electoral research on Austrian data:

a. First, official statistical publications from 1873 to 1918, as well as the electoral laws which regulate the suffrage and vote-casting procedures and thus structure their content, have to do with a multinational Empire of 17 provinces and some 50 million inhabitants (by 1900). Contemporary Republican Austria is a country of some 7 million inhabitants and 9 provinces carved out of the German-speaking westernmost part of the former Austrian Empire, and out of the predominantly German-speaking westernmost counties of Hungary. This chapter focuses on contemporary Austria: in the electoral chronology, as in the choice of illustrative examples in the discussion below of electoral statistical publications, we refer only to that portion of Cisleithanian Austria of 1873–1918 which became subsequently the territory of Republican Austria under the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye of 10 September 1919, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

b. Official Austrian statistical publications unfortunately do not include a

* A first draft partial bibliography of electoral publications and notes was prepared by R. Metzler-Andelburg under the guidance of J. Mokre. Rodney Stiefbold was asked to translate this draft into English and to augment it with information collected in the course of his research on Austrian electoral history. The result was a completely revised and greatly expanded manuscript. R. Stiefbold wishes to thank A. Panzera of the Österreichischen Statistischen Zentralamt for his generous assistance, particularly in making available ÖSZ library resources and personnel during preparation of this chapter, and in securing access for the author to other materials scattered throughout Austria, and the Joint Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, whose grant made possible the field work on which this chapter is based.

section on changes in boundaries, partitions and mergers of the political or administrative territorial units which form the basis for electoral statistics, which have occurred since the previous election. Therefore, the following reference book has become virtually indispensable to the student of Austrian electoral statistics:

- [1] *Gebiets- und Namensänderungen in der Verwaltungseinteilung Österreichs, April 1945–21. März 1961* (mit einem Überblick über die Geschichte der Verwaltungsgliederung und die heute geltenden legislativen und amtlichen Grundlagen für Gebiets- und Namensänderungen). Bearbeitet und herausgegeben vom Österreichischen Statistischen Zentralamt. Wien, Carl Überreuter Verlag, 1962, 259 p.

This volume contains an annotated bibliography (pp. 20–22) of commune directories (*Ortsverzeichnisse*) published by various central and provincial statistical offices since 1869; a brief but excellent survey of the basic political administrative territorial units in Austria and German-speaking western Hungary as they have evolved since 1861 and earlier; and the only comprehensive review of the unusually frequent intra-Austrian territorial changes from 1945 to 1961.

The political-administrative organization of Burgenland, which became an Austrian province in 1921 and which until then had been merely the westernmost counties and part-counties of the three Hungarian provinces of Moson, Sopron and Vasvár, is described in:

- [2] BURGHARDT, Andrew, *The Political Geography of Burgenland*. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Publication 587, June 1958, 352 p. (Previously submitted as Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Wisconsin, March 1958). A map showing the precise boundary changes may be found on p. 201, with discussion.

c. Since the Census Act of 1869, official national censuses have been conducted at more or less regular ten-year intervals as prescribed by law, beginning in 1880. Terminal dates have been: 31 December for 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1910; 31 January 1920; 7 March 1923; 22 March 1934; 1 June 1951; and 21 March 1961. The census terminated 17 May 1939 is considerably less relevant since it, unlike the others, does not provide data by territorial units comparable to or identical with those employed at the nearest national parliamentary election. The 1939 census was based on the then existing administrative boundaries of the Third Reich, which cut across many of the traditional Austrian administrative boundaries.

d. The central statistical office has been called by three different names during the periods described below: from 1873 to 1921 the Kaiserlich-Königliche Statistische Zentral-Commission; from 1921 to 1938 the Bundesamt für Statistik der Republik Österreich; and since 1945 the Österreichisches Statistisches Zentralamt. In all official statistical publications listed below the title of the responsible office has been omitted to avoid unnecessary repetition. For each period the Ministry of the Interior was the last authority for decisions bearing on the extent and detail of statistical forms used for parliamentary elections, and since 1953 the Ministry has been listed on the title page of all official publications.

e. From 1873 to 1918 (last election: 1911) the electoral statistics described in

this article are for elections to the 'Haus der Abgeordneten' (House of the Representatives), the Lower House of the bicameral 'Reichsrat' (National or Imperial Council). We have, however, followed traditional practice in referring to these elections as 'Reichsrat elections'. The Upper House, or 'Herrenhaus' (House of Lords), was composed of a variable number of men holding their positions in part by *ex-officio* right, in part by hereditary station, and in part by special Imperial appointment; since 1920 the Upper House, except for the years 1934–1945, has been called the Bundesrat and consists of delegates elected by the provincial diets.

The Provisional National Assembly, composed of the German-speaking deputies elected to the Reichsrat in 1911, met from October 21, 1918 to February 5, 1919, followed by the Constitutive National Assembly elected on February 16, 1919, which drafted a new constitution for the Republic of Austria. That constitution, promulgated on October 1, 1920, took effect on the first day of the first session of the National Assembly elected on October 17, 1920, after which the National Assembly was designated the 'Nationalrat' (National Council). Statistical publications refer to the October 17, 1920 elections as the first Nationalrat elections of Republican Austria. National parliamentary elections to the Nationalrat, the Lower House of the bicameral Parliament of Republican Austria, have taken place in 1923, 1927, 1930, 1945, 1949, 1953, 1956, 1959, 1962 and 1966. In 1934 the Austrian constitution was suspended and the Nationalrat replaced by a corporate interest group Chamber, the Bundestag, to which no popular elections were held. Austria was absorbed into the Third Reich in 1938, and a Nazi plebiscite and parliamentary 'election' were held on April 10, 1938. The first Nationalrat elections of the 'Second Republic' of Austria (for the Fifth Legislative Session of Republican Austria) were held on November 25, 1945; the first Nationalrat elections held after the Austrian State Treaty rid Austria of her postwar military occupation on May 15, 1955, took place on May 13, 1956.

f. As used in the following charts, tables and content notes, the term 'elector' means a person having the right to vote, while 'voter' refers to an elector who participates in the election, i.e. who is recorded as having cast a vote. 'Population' or 'inhabitants' are general descriptive terms, while 'electorate' refers only to the total number of electors in the total population. The terms 'primary elector' or 'primary voter' (both *Urwähler*) are used for the period 1873 through 1900/01 to designate those persons having the right to vote in the rural communes in elections of members of the electoral college of the rural curia (i.e. having only an indirect right to vote in national Reichsrat elections). The members of this electoral college for the rural curia were called *Wahlmänner* (1 for every 500 *Urwähler*) and are herein designated 'electors', since they had a *direct* right to vote in Reichsrat elections. Finally, the words 'constituency' and 'election district' (called *Wahlbezirke* until 1918, and *Wahlkreise* since then) are used interchangeably. The terms for Austrian governmental territorial units are rendered as follows: province (*Land*); constituency as noted; constituency group (*Wahlkreisverband*, since 1923); city (*Stadt mit eigenem Statut*); rural county (*politischer Bezirk*); court district (*Gerichtsbezirk*); commune (*Gemeinde*); and polling place, ward or precinct (*Wahlort* until 1919, *Wahlsprenkel* since 1919).

A. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

The first more or less direct elections to an Austrian national Parliament, apart from the elections of 1848, took place in 1873, the temporary culmination of an abortive series of attempts to develop responsible parliamentary institutions which had grown out of the double tradition of the provincial diets – themselves hardly representative descendents of the medieval Estates – on the one hand, and of the revolutionary disturbances of 1848 and their aftermath on the other hand.

Two prefatory reminders may be useful: a) The real turning point in Austrian constitutional history was the October Diploma of 1860, by which Emperor Francis Joseph I recognized the principle of constitutional government. The curial system of representation from 1873–1900/01 was based in large part on the provincial constitutions and electoral regulations set by Imperial decree in 1861, consisting essentially only of extension and modification of provincial provisions; b) These same electoral regulations were also infused with much of the rationale of the Kremsier Draft Constitution of 1848, particularly during later nineteenth century modifications of the electoral system. Thus, in a very real sense, Austrian electoral history was dominated throughout the first period by both traditions – that of the provincial diets as they had evolved historically and as defined again in 1861, and that of the revolutionary period of 1848 and after.

The most encyclopedic book on the electoral system, being a compilation of primary sources and secondary analyses of electoral statistics, politics and legal developments in Austria since 1918, is:

- [3] STIEFBOLD, Rodney; LEUPOLD-LOEWENTHAL, Arlette; RESS, Georg; LICHEM, Walter; MARVICK, Dwaine (eds.), *Wahlen und Parteien in Österreich: Österreichisches Wahlhandbuch*. Vol. 1: *Wahlrecht*. Wien, Österreichischer Bundesverlag / Verlag für Jugend und Volk, 1966, 512 p. (Published for the Institute for Advanced Studies and Scientific Research, Vienna).

In addition, the following books may also be consulted:

BEAUMONT, W., 'Le suffrage universel en Autriche: la Loi du 26 janvier 1907'. *Annales des sciences politiques* 22, 1907, pp. 618–640.

BOYER, Ludwig, *Wahlrecht in Österreich*. Vol. 1. Wien, Austria Edition, 1961, 303 p.

BRAUNIAS, Karl, *Das parlamentarische Wahlrecht. Ein Handbuch über die Bildung der gesetzgebenden Körperschaften in Europa*. Berlin, de Gruyter, 1932, 2 vol. (chap.: 'Österreich', Vol. 1, pp. 406–435).

FRITZER, Karl, *Die Wahlgesetze*. Wien, Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1957.

GOETZ, Helga, 'Die Entwicklung des parlamentarischen Wahlrechtes im alten Österreich'. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Innsbruck, 1950.

JENKS, William A., *The Austrian Electoral Reform of 1907*. New York, Columbia University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1950, 227 p. (Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. 559).

Electoral Chronology, 1873-1966: Cisleithanian and Republican Austria

<i>Period, frequency and number of elections</i>	<i>Suffrage Requirements</i>	<i>Voting Procedures</i>
1873-1900/01, every 6 years, from 1897 only 4 years. 6 elections held.	1873-1897: 4 electoral classes or curiae: a) great landowners who paid minimum tax of 50-200 Gulden on estates held by noble or feudal tenure; b) members of Chambers of commerce and trade; c) 24 year old male inhabitants of cities, markets and industrial towns and d) of rural communes who paid min. direct annual tax of 5-15 Gulden. In 1873 and 1879 tax minimum based on non-uniform provincial electoral laws, by 1885 on uniform national minimum of 5 Gulden, reduced by 1897 to 4 Gulden.	1873-1891: direct elections by electors of first three curiae (landowners, cities, chambers). Indirect for rural communes, where electors elected by absolute majority of primary electors by commune. No. of electors proportionate to No. of male inhabitants paying minimum tax (1:500). Single member constituencies the general rule for urban and rural curiae; multi-member for landowners; mixed for chambers of commerce and trade. Deputies of all curiae require absolute majority of votes cast on first ballot or on second ballot runoff between top two. Voting by secret ballot or orally, acc. to provincial law.
	1897: new 5th Curia of 72 seats (total No. mandates raised from 353 to 425), in which suffrage universal and equal (no minimum tax) for male citizens over 24 years resident in given commune for minimum of 6 months prior to election. Electors of four previous curiae gain a second vote.	1897: direct elections in rural curia in Lower Austria. Direct elections in Lower Austria and city of Graz (10 constituencies total) in the new 5th Curia. Indirect in all other 5th Curia constituencies of later Republican Austrian territory.
1907, 1911, every 5 years. 2 elections held.	Universal equal manhood suffrage after abolition of curial system in 1907 Reform Law; residence requirement: one year; age requirement 24 years or more.	1907, 1911: direct secret elections, single-member constituencies, absolute majority system, voting by secret ballot; voting compulsory by provincial law in Upper and Lower Austria, Salzburg, Vorarlberg.

<i>Period, frequency and number of elections</i>	<i>Suffrage Requirements</i>	<i>Voting Procedures</i>
<p>Since 1919:</p> <p>1919, election to National Constituent Assembly. 2 elections held.</p> <p>1920-30, Nationalrat, elections every 3 years, except 4 years from 1923-27. 4 elections held.</p> <p>1934-44, Authoritarian Interregnum, no free elections held.</p> <p>1945-66, every 3 to 4 years, except full 4 years session from 1945-49. 7 elections held.</p>	<p>1919-1966: universal, equal adult suffrage for all citizens 20 years and over by January 1 of election year, no minimum residence requirement. In 1930 and 1945 minimum age 21 years and over before election day</p>	<p>Direct, secret proportional elections in multi-member constituencies.</p> <p>1919: d'Hondt rule single stage of distribution;</p> <p>1920: second stage distrib. at national level, also d'Hondt rule, No. of seats not to exceed No. obtained by given party in first stage distribution.</p> <p>1923 and after: first stage distrib. in 25 election districts by Hagenbach-Bischoff system; remainder votes distrib. in 4 'constituency group's by d'Hondt rule to parties which obtained at least one mandate at first stage. No list alliances allowed except 1919. Preferential voting within one list since 1949. Compulsory voting by provincial law in Tyrol and Vorarlberg since 1919, in Styria since 1949.</p>

KITZINGER, Uwe, 'The Austrian Electoral System'. *Parliamentary Affairs* 12 (3-4), 1959, pp. 392-404.

MEYER, Georg, *Das parlamentarische Wahlrecht*. Berlin, Haering, 1901, 735 p. (chap.: 'Österreich' and 'Ungarn', pp. 205-217 and 266-291).

REICHBERG, Heinrich, *Die statistischen Unterlagen der österreichischen Wahlreform 1907*. Brünn, 1907.

SEYMOUR, Charles; FRARY, Donald P., *How the World Votes. The Story of Democratic Development in Elections*. Springfield, Mass., Nichols, 1918, 2 vol. (See Vol. 2, pp. 41-78).

WEBER, Karl, 'Die österreichische Sozialdemokratie und das allgemeine Wahlrecht'. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Vienna, 1957.

B. DESCRIPTION OF ELECTORAL STATISTICS BY MAJOR PERIODS SINCE 1873

I. The period of curial (class) representation 1873-1900/01

1. Official statistical records of election results

During the initial period following the introduction of the principle of constitutional government in the Austrian Empire by the October Diploma of 1860 and the February Patent of 1861, deputies to the *Reichsrat* were elected by the provincial diets, which in effect functioned as electoral colleges. The first elections to be recorded in a centrally organized official statistical publication were therefore the provincial elections of 1867 and 1871/72, the cumulative results of which were published in *Mitteilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik* by the Imperial Statistical Office, as follows:

1867

- [4] 'Beiträge zur Statistik der Landtagswahlen im Jahre 1867'. *Mitteilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik* 14 (1), 1867, pp. 17-55.

1871/72

- [5] 'Statistik der Landtagswahlen in den Jahren 1871-1872'. *Mitteilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik* 19 (4), 1872, pp. 130-157.

These publications contain no discussion of the data presented. Standard data sheets were distributed to the provincial election authorities by the Imperial Central Statistical Commission. For each election district in each curia and province the following data were recorded: number of deputies to be elected; number of electors and primary electors; number of voters, and voters as percent of the electorate; and the number and percent of total votes received by each successful candidate. The cumulative data by province and curia included the number of deputies to be elected; the number of electors and primary electors; the number of electors and primary electors represented by each deputy; the number of voters, and voters as percent of electorate; and the percent of the total votes received by the successful candidates. In 1867 the cumulative data also recorded the number of candidates who received any votes at all, and the average number of candidates proposed for each deputy post available.

The first direct elections to the Reichsrat took place in 1873, when a new electoral law withdrew the right of electing deputies from the provincial diets and conferred that right instead, without establishing a new electorate, upon those elements of the provincial populations eligible to vote in provincial diet elections.

1873

- [6] 'Vergleichende Statistik der direkten Reichsratswahlen in Österreich'. Abhandlung von SCHIMMER, G. A. in: *Statistische Monatsschrift* 3 (2), 1877, pp. 249-273.

Same data forms as in 1871/72. New: population; effective vs. potential electorate by district and province for each of four curiae; No. of inhabitants per deputy in urban and rural curiae; constituency with largest and with smallest population, in urban and rural curiae for each province.

1879

- [7] NEUMANN-SPALLART, F. X., SCHIMMER, G. A., *Die Reichsratswahlen vom Jahre 1879 in Österreich*. Stuttgart, Verlag Julius Maier, 1880, 80 p. incl. appendix on electoral law, 4 maps.

(This volume published privately because Imperial Statistical Commission did not have an appropriate statistical journal or the means to do otherwise. Both authors are public officials, and the vol. was meant to be quasi-official.) Same data forms. New: basic data on primary electors in the rural communities, with effective vs. potential electorate recomputed accordingly. Also new: list of deputies by district, giving name, occupation, No. and percentage of total votes cast for individual deputies; and 4 maps, representing No. of electors per 100 inhabitants and No. of voters per 100 electors for urban and rural curiae by district.

1885

- [8] 'Statistik der Reichsratswahlen im Jahre 1885'. *Österreichische Statistik* 9 (5), 1885, XVI+18 p., 2 maps.

Same basic data as 1879. New: summary tables showing occupation and class structure of deputies; trend tables show all basic data in parallel columns for each district and each curiae for 1873, 1879, 1885. Map representing eligibility in urban and rural curiae by district as in 1879; and new map showing turnout for all four curiae (as percentage of electorate) by district.

1891

- [9] 'Die statistischen Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen des Jahres 1891'. Abhandlung von SCHMID, Ferdinand, in: *Statistische Monatsschrift* 17, 1891, pp. 386-427.

Same data as 1885, minus: list of deputies and occupations with summary table, vote concentration data for individual candidates, maps. New: first differentiation of results by political parties; first data on valid and invalid votes; first data on runoff elections. All new data are given by election district for separate curiae, and cumulated by province.

1897

- [10] 'Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen im Jahre 1897'. *Österreichische Statistik* 49 (1), 1897, XXX+70 p., 2 maps.

First collection of basic statistics by communes where votes cast (*Wahlorte*, or 'wards'). New data columns: No. of Fifth Curia electors, who are members of another curia, who enjoy communal suffrage, who pay under 5 Gulden annual tax; No. of landowners who cast vote personally, who delegate vote casting responsibility; No. of electors in first four curiae who enjoy suffrage by tax minimum qualification, by personal characteristic qualification. All these data by ward. (Ministry of Interior refused to sanction data gathering at ward level for primary electors in rural communes and Fifth Curia districts where voting indirect, however.) 2 maps, same as in 1885, but adding data on Fifth Curia to each; new bar graph showing above-cited data on origins of Fifth Curia cumulated by provinces.

1900/01

- [11] 'Die Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen für das Jahr 1900/01'. *Österreichische Statistik* 59 (3), 1901, XXXII + 73 p., 2 maps.

Same data as for 1897; same map.

Most of the foregoing election results are summarized for provinces and curiae in the following publications:

1873, 1879 and 1885

- [12] 'Reichsratswahlen in den Wahlperioden 1873, 1879, 1885'. *Österreichisches statistisches Handbuch* 4, 1885. Wien, Hoelder, 1886, pp. 245–248.

No. of deputies to be elected; ratio of deputies to electors in special interest curiae, to inhabitants in urban and rural curiae; No. of electors by curia and province; effective vs. potential electorate in urban and rural curiae by province; voters by curiae (including primary voters in rural communes), in absolute No. and as percentage of electorate, by curiae and provinces.

1885, 1891 and 1897

- [13] 'Die Reichsratswahlen in den Wahlperioden 1885, 1891, 1897'. *Österreichisches statistisches Handbuch* 16, 1897. Wien, Gerold, 1898, pp. 332–336.

No. of deputies and ratio of deputies to electors only; No. of electors; No. of voters and primary voters (abs. and %): all preceding data by curiae including new Fifth Curia, and by province. Differentiation of direct and indirect votes by curiae for political parties for 1891 and 1897.

1891, 1897 and 1900/01

- [14] 'Die Reichsratswahlen in den Wahlperioden 1891, 1897, 1900/01'. *Österreichisches statistisches Handbuch* 20, 1901. Wien, Gerold, 1902, pp. 404–408. Same as [No. 13]. New: No. of deputies in each party, and their dispersion among the five curiae.

2. Organization by territorial units

Austrian electoral laws and electoral statistics before 1918 were the product of a multinational Empire; since then they refer to Republican German-speaking Austria alone, as defined in 1919 by the Treaty of Saint Germain. Consequently the statistical publications cited above contain data for a number of territorial units not included within contemporary Austria: South Tyrol, South Styria, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Galicia, Bukovina, Dalmatia and the Coastland (Gorz, Istria,

Trieste). Conversely, they do not contain data for the present-day Austrian province of Burgenland, created in 1921 from a few of the westernmost Hungarian counties (see above p. 16). The following table sets out the major differences between the territorial extent of Republican and Cisleithanian Austrian provinces, in terms of the urban and rural election districts which composed the latter during the first main period of Austrian electoral history (1873–1900/01).

Province	<i>Number of Cisleithanian Austrian election districts within the territory of contemporary Republican Austria, in the:</i>				
	<i>Rural Curia</i> 1873	<i>1900</i>	<i>Urban Curia</i> 1873	<i>1900</i>	<i>General Curia</i> 1897 and 1900
Lower Austria	10 ^a	8 ^a	17	19	9
Vienna			(12)	(12)	
Upper Austria	7	7	2	2	3
Salzburg	2	2	2	2	1
Vorarlberg	2	2	1	1	1
Carinthia	4 ^b	4 ^b	3	3	1
Tyrol					
'North' Tyrol	3 ^c	3 ^c	1	1	1
'East' Tyrol	1 ^c	1 ^c	1 ^d	1 ^d	(1) ^e
Styria	6 ^f	6 ^f	6 ^g	6 ^g	3 ^h
Republican Austrian Territory, Totals:	35	33	33	35	20

a. The *Gerichtsbezirk* of Feldsberg, now part of Czechoslovakia, is included in one of these districts (Mistelbach).

b. This figure includes the *Gerichtsbezirk* of Tarvis, now part of Italy; and small areas of Eisenkappel and Bleiburg, now parts of Yugoslavia.

c. Contemporary 'North' Tyrol – all of the Republican Austrian province of Tyrol except the *Gerichtsbezirke* of Matrei and Lienz – includes three former Cisleithanian Austrian rural districts: Innsbruck, Schwaz, and Imst except for the two *Gerichtsbezirke* of Glurns and Schlanders. Contemporary 'East' Tyrol includes the former and present *Gerichtsbezirke* of Matrei and Lienz, which formed part of the Cisleithanian Austrian rural district of Bruneck. Not included in the territory of Republican Austria are the Cisleithanian rural districts of Bruneck, excepting the *Gerichtsbezirke* of Matrei and Lienz, and Bozen (i.e., the area known as 'South' Tyrol), and the Cisleithanian rural districts of Trient, Cles, and Rovereto (i.e. the Italian province of Trentino). 'South' Tyrol (the Italian province of Bolzano) and the Italian province of Trentino have been amalgamated by Italy into the autonomous Region Trentino/Alto Adige.

d. Among the four Cisleithanian urban districts in contemporary 'East' Tyrol, 'South' Tyrol or Trentino, only the commune of Lienz (from the urban district of Brixen) is now part of Republican Austria.

e. In Cisleithanian Austria contemporary 'East' Tyrol, 'South' Tyrol and Trentino formed a single Fifth Curia election district, of which only 'East' Tyrol is now part of Republican Austria.

f. Cisleithanian Styria included three additional rural districts – Marburg, Pettan, Celli – which are now part of Yugoslavia.

g. Cisleithanian Styria included two additional urban districts – Marburg, Cilli – which are now part of Yugoslavia.

h. The Cisleithanian Austrian Fifth Curia election districts of Bruck and Graz lie wholly within contemporary Styria, but parts of the Cisleithanian district of Feldbach are now part of Yugoslavia.

Throughout the period 1873–1891 the smallest counting unit for which data were reported was the election district (*Wahlbezirk*). The First Curia (the great landowners) elected their deputies on one ticket for the entire province, except in Tyrol, where ecclesiastical electors chose their single deputy separately. Except for the first district in Vienna, which returned four representatives in the urban curia, and Linz, which returned two, the *Wahlbezirke* in the urban and rural curiae were single-member constituencies. As the above chart demonstrates, there were roughly 35 rural districts and 37 urban districts in the area of present-day Republican Austria in 1873, an apportionment only once altered (in 1886, in Lower Austria) prior to the advent of universal manhood suffrage in 1907. The Fifth Curia reform, in effect for the first time in the 1897 elections, added 20 single-member constituencies to the territory of later Republican Austria; and resulted in new election data forms, extending data collection – except with respect to the primary electors and primary voters in the rural (Fourth) and general (Fifth) Curiae – to the level of the election wards (*Wahlorte*), which were located in the main communes within the various election districts, and which with the advent of universal manhood suffrage in 1907 became practically synonymous with each individual commune.

In all of Cisleithanian Austria there were by the last elections of the period of curial representation (1900/1901) 85 deputies chosen by the great landowners, 21 by the Chambers of trade and commerce, 118 (in 111 districts) by the urban curia, 129 by the rural curia, and 72 by the general (Fifth) Curia. In Salzburg, Tyrol and Vorarlberg the cities and the Chambers of trade and commerce voted together; in Vorarlberg there was no curia of great landowners; and in Tyrol the curia of great landowners was divided into two electoral bodies, one of ecclesiastics and one of the landed nobility.

In general, representation in the urban and rural curiae was gerrymandered to German-speaking Austria's advantage within Cisleithanian Austria, this by means of the property qualifications and by overweighting the towns. Election districts in the urban curia were drawn in consideration of geography and language, in the rural curia in consideration of geography, language and the size of population. Since the differentiation of 'rural' from 'urban' districts rested throughout the period 1873–1900/01 to a great extent on the boundaries delimited by the provincial electoral laws of 1861, it frequently occurred that heavily populated industrial suburbs (particularly of Vienna) were gerrymandered into 'rural' election districts.

The number of electors in each curia, and the relative importance of the individual elector or voter varied enormously. The following ratios of deputies to electors are based on Cisleithanian Austria as a whole:

<i>Curia</i>	1873	1900/01
Great landowners	1:59	1:64
Chambers of commerce	1:23	1:26
Urban	1:1580	1:4193
Rural	1:8400	1:12290
General	—	1:69503

In 1873 in Lower Austria, one urban deputy represented 44,636 people, one rural deputy 111,519 people; while in Vorarlberg the corresponding figures were 1: 13,528 for the cities, 1: 44,548 for rural districts. After the 1891 census these figures increased to 1: 77,461 and 1: 144,832 for Lower Austria, and to 1: 25,246 and 1: 45,172 for Vorarlberg. In 1873 there were 8.5 electors per 100 inhabitants in the urban curia in Baden in Lower Austria, 1.3 in Villach in Carinthia; in the rural curia, there were 12.1 electors per 100 inhabitants in Krems in Lower Austria, 3.3 in Klagenfurt in Carinthia. These inequalities remained throughout the nineteenth century.

The Fifth Curia reform did not appreciably alter the inequalities of representation under the curial system: thus in 1900 one Fifth Curia deputy represented nearly 70,000 electors in Styria and Carinthia, only 25,000 in Vorarlberg. Those previously excluded from the other four curiae composed 60% of the new universal curia, but this curia elected only 17% of the entire Reichsrat. The other four curiae, with 40% of all the electors in all curiae, and 40% of those in the universal curia, elected 83% of all the deputies. Thus the fact that the electorate was increased for all of Cisleithanian Austria from 1.7 million to 5.3 million was relatively insignificant. In Vorarlberg nearly 50% of the Fifth Curia voters (1900/01: 53.6%) already had the suffrage in another curia, while in Tyrol and Carinthia two-thirds of them, in Styria 65%, and in Salzburg, Lower and Upper Austria about 60% were enfranchised for the first time.

3. *Summary of standard contents for smallest territorial units*

The official publications cited above provide the following data broken down by election districts for the rural, urban and (after the Fifth Curia reform of 1896) general curiae, the only electoral classes not exclusively reserved to special interest groups within the population:

a. *Population*

Total population at the preceding census (1873–1900).

b. *Electors*

Number of electors (1873–1900);

Number of primary electors (1873–1900);

Number of electors per 100 inhabitants (1873–1900, except 1891);

Number of primary electors per 100 inhabitants (1879, 1885, 1897, 1900).

c. *Voters*

Number of voters (1873–1900);

Voter turnout as percent of electorate (1873–1900, except 1891);

Number of primary voters (1879–1900);

Primary voter turnout as percent of primary electorate (1873–1900, except 1891).

d. *Votes*

Number of valid and invalid votes cast (1891–1900);

Number of votes cast for candidates of each party presenting candidates in that constituency (1891–1900);

Number of votes and percent of total votes cast for individual successful candidates in that constituency (1873–1885);

'Votes' data at runoff elections (1891–1900).

e. Deputies

Number of mandates in that constituency (1873–1900);

Name, constituency, occupation and total vote for individual deputies (only 1879 and 1885).

f. Cartographic presentations (maps)

Number of electors or primary electors per 100 inhabitants (1879, 1885, 1897, 1900);

Voter turnout as percent of electorate or primary electorate (same).

Beginning in 1897 and continued at the elections of 1900/01 – the last before universal manhood suffrage – the above data were also provided by election wards. Additional data indicating the source of eligibility of Fifth Curia voters (as described in the content notes on official sources above) were also provided in 1897 and 1900.

4. Analyses and investigations

The earliest – and most important – studies of electoral statistics known for the period of curial representation under the absolute majority system are the official analyses prepared by G. A. Schimmer of the Imperial Central Statistical Commission, and cited above [Nos. 6 to 8]. The analytical text sections of the 1873, 1879 and 1885 reports focus particularly on the problem of the potential versus the actual electorate, extremes in the size of population of individual constituencies, and voter turnout. The 1873 volume provides a number of tables comparing the indirect elections of 1867 and 1871/2 with the first direct election of 1873; the 1885 volume gives trend data for the elections of 1873, 1879 and 1885 for most tables. The 1873 and 1879 volumes provide extensive analytical comparisons with several other European countries. Except for the 1891 report, [No. 9], which is important only because it is the first to provide data grouped by political parties, none of the other official reports compares favorably with the first three by G. A. Schimmer.

An important study of the provincial elections of 1895/96, providing the first official data grouped by political parties and the most extensive statistical examination of a political election during the period of curial representation is:

- [15] 'Die statistischen Ergebnisse der Landtagswahlen des Jahres 1895 und 1896'. *Statistische Monatsschrift* 23, 1897, pp. 90–147.

Further data on the 1895/96 provincial elections, an excellent brief discussion of the effects of the 1896 reduction in the tax minimum on the size of the electorate in the 1897 election, and an important discussion of the new data forms necessitated by the Fifth Curia reform of 1896 and by expanded data-gathering for the first four curiae, are provided in:

- [16] SCHIFF, Walter, 'Bericht über die Tätigkeit des statistischen Seminares im Jahre 1896/97'. *Statistische Monatsschrift* 23, 1897, pp. 833–842.

Although the official statistical publications made no effort to group elected deputies by political party or to study regional or curial variations in political party strength prior to the election of 1891, several Austrian newspapers and periodicals did attempt rudimentary analyses.

A geographer published a volume of data and maps after the 1879 elections:

- [17] LE MONNIER, F. VON, *Die österreichischen Reichsratswahlen im Jahre 1879*. Wien, 1879, n.p.

See also:

- [18] HICHSMAN, A. L., *G. Freytags Reichsrats-Wahlkarte aller 5 Curien von Österreich, nebst statistischen Daten über die Wahlen in den Jahren 1873 bis 1897*. Wien, Freytag und Berndt, 1897.

II. The period of universal manhood suffrage: absolute majority system, 1907 and 1911

1. Official statistical records of election results

1907

- [19] 'Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen 1907'. *Österreichische Statistik* 84 (2), 1908, pp. 1–148.

All data by province, rural and urban election districts, administrative counties (*politische Bezirke*) and court districts (*Gerichtsbezirke*): population; No. of electors; No. of inhabitants and No. of electors per deputy; No. of electors per 100 inhabitants; No. of votes cast, No. of valid, No. of invalid; voter turnout as % of electorate; No. of valid votes cast for candidates of each party. Summary data by province same as [No. 20] below. Summary for Reichsrat of deputies by party fraction and occupation.

- [20] 'Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen im Jahre 1907'. *Österreichisches statistisches Handbuch* 26, 1907 Wien, Karl Gerolds Sohn, 1908, pp. 406–409.

All data by province: No. of mandates, in urban and rural districts; No. of electors; total No. of votes cast, No. valid, No. invalid, No. blank; No. of inhabitants per deputy; No. of electors per deputy; No. of electors per 100 inhabitants; voter turnout as % of electorate; No. of valid votes cast for candidates of parties of each nationality; No. and % of total valid votes cast for candidates of each party within each nationality grouping in urban and rural districts and in all districts together.

1911

- [21] 'Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen 1911'. *Österreichische Statistik* 7 (1), 1912; p. 1–206 (map).

Same as [No. 19], but all data also by smaller units (election wards, or *Wahl-orte*; in fact in most cases the individual *Gemeinden*, or communes). New: map showing voter turnout as % of electors, for election districts, court districts and communes, all differentiated by provinces with and without compulsory voting.

- [22] 'Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen im Jahre 1911'. *Österreichisches statistisches Handbuch* 30, 1911. Wien, Karl Gerolds Sohn, 1912, pp. 408–411.

Same as [No. 20]