

# **Composition and turnout – a class issue**

## **Popular support for the European Parliament**

**Swedish delegation  
EUL/NGL Group in the EU Parliament**

**Written by:  
Jan Å Johansson  
Jonas Sjöstedt MEP**

The authors would like to thank, amongst others, the staff of the European Parliament library for their help in finding election statistics from the different EU countries and to Steve McGiffen for help with translation Swedish-English.

# Contents

1.	Preamble.....	5
2.	The composition of the EU Parliament after the election of 1999.....	5
3.	The background of the Members of the EU Parliament.....	5
4.	The turnout in the EU Parliament election.....	7
4.1.	Notional composition of the EU Parliament if the will of the voters were proportionally reflected in the allocation of seats.....	7
5.	Who voted?.....	9
5.1.	United Kingdom.....	9
5.1.1.	The election system of the United Kingdom.....	9
5.1.2.	Conclusions and comments United Kingdom.....	14
5.2.	Germany.....	14
5.2.1.	Comparisons between electoral districts in different Länder (States) and cities.....	14
5.2.1.1.	Land North Rhine-Westphalia.....	14
5.2.1.2.	Hamburg.....	15
5.2.1.3.	Cologne (Köln).....	15
5.2.1.4.	Dortmund.....	16
5.2.1.5.	Munich (München).....	16
5.2.2.	Conclusions and comments on Germany.....	17
5.3.	France.....	17
5.3.1.	Comparisons between electoral districts in different cities and the turnout in the French Overseas Territories.....	18
5.3.1.1.	Paris.....	18
5.3.1.2.	Lyon.....	19
5.3.1.3.	Marseille.....	19
5.3.1.4.	Corsica and the French Overseas Territories.....	19
5.3.2.	Conclusions and comments France.....	20
5.4.	The Netherlands.....	20
5.4.1.	Comparison between communities in the Netherlands – turnout and the percentage support for different parties.....	20
5.4.2.	Rotterdam.....	22
5.4.3.	Conclusions and comments the Netherlands.....	22
5.5.	Sweden.....	22
5.5.1.	Stockholm.....	24
5.5.2.	Gothenburg.....	25
5.5.3.	Malmö.....	26
5.5.4.	Other cities.....	26
5.5.5.	Conclusions and comments Sweden.....	27
5.6.	Spain.....	27
5.6.1.	Comparison between different cities.....	27
5.6.1.1.	Madrid.....	28
5.6.1.2.	Barcelona.....	28
5.6.1.3.	Seville.....	29
5.6.1.4.	Valencia.....	29
5.6.1.5.	Zaragoza.....	30
5.6.2.	Conclusions and comments Spain.....	30
5.7.	Portugal.....	30
5.7.1.	Comparison between different cities.....	30

5.7.1.1. Lisbon.....	30
5.7.1.2. Porto.....	32
5.7.2. Conclusions and comments Portugal .....	32
5.8. Ireland .....	32
5.9. The other EU countries.....	33
6. Conclusions and comments .....	34

## Tables:

1. The composition of the EU Parliament in January 2000
2. Members of the EU Parliament by profession, 1999 and 1996
3. The composition of the EU Parliament if those eligible voters that did not vote or spoiled their papers were allocated to the "Empty chairs party"
4. The EU Parliament. Attendance at the votes at the session of January 2000 in relation to the share of the total electorate in the EU countries
5. United Kingdom: Highest and lowest turnout per constituency and the election result for the largest party or parties in the general election (i.e. to the House of Commons) of 1997
6. United Kingdom: Highest and lowest turnout by constituency (House of Commons constituency) and the result for the largest party in each constituency respectively in the general election of 1997
7. Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Land North Rhine-Westphalia's electoral districts
8. Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Hamburg electoral districts
9. Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Cologne (Köln) electoral districts
10. Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Dortmund electoral districts
11. Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Munich (München) electoral districts
12. France: Arrondissement in Paris with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages for parties in these arrondissements
13. France: Electoral districts in Lyon with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages for parties in these electoral districts
14. France: Electoral districts in Marseille with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages for parties in these electoral districts
15. France. Turnout in Corsica and in the French Overseas Departments
16. The Netherlands: Highest and lowest turnout in the communities and the election result for the seven biggest parties
17. The Netherlands: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the election result for the parties' among the electoral districts in Rotterdam

18. Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in those electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Stockholm
19. Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in those electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Gothenburg
20. Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in those electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Malmö
21. Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Södertälje
22. Sweden: Election results in different cities. A comparison between Danderyd and Botkyrka
23. Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral district in Madrid
24. Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral district in Barcelona
25. Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral district in Seville
26. Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Valencia
27. Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral district in Zaragoza
28. Portugal: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Lisbon
29. Portugal: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Porto
30. Ireland: Constituencies and turnout in the EU Parliament election 1999

## 1. Preamble

This report aims to raise concerns as to how representative democracy can develop into plutocracy and elite government and to pose the question of whether it is possible to transfer democracy to EU level?

Our findings demonstrate that the political mandate for the EU Parliament has very shallow roots among the voters, especially those in lower income groups. Despite this, many Brussels federalists, not least the majority in the EU Parliament, would like to see even more political power moved from the member states to Brussels and, by preference, to the EU Parliament.

## 2. The composition of the EU Parliament after the election 1999

**Table 1:**

### **The composition of the EU Parliament in January 2000**

European People's Party (Christ. Dem.) and European Democrats PPE/DE.....	233
Party of European Socialists PES .....	180
European Liberal Democrat and Reform Party.....	51
Greens/European Free Alliance (regionalists) .....	48
European United Left/Nordic Green Left .....	42
Union for a Europe of Nations (non-socialist/EU critics).....	30
Technical Group of Independent Members - mixed group.....	18
Europe of Democracies and Diversities (EU critics).....	16
Non-attached Members .....	8
Total number of members .....	626

In total, from the 15 member states, there are approximately 120 different national parties with at least one member in the EU Parliament.

## 3. The background of the Members of the EU Parliament

Out of 626 Members of the EU Parliament during the period 1994 to 1999, there were only four with a non-European background. Two of these were from the French Overseas Departments French Guyana and Guadelope. One British MEP had a Somalian father and British mother and a fourth (in origin) non-European MEP, a Spanish citizen and Muslim from one of the Spanish enclaves in Africa, arrived in 1996 as a replacement member representing Izquierda Unida, the United Left.

After the election of 1999 the EU Parliament has a total of eleven MEPs of African or Asian descent. Five of them are from France, four from the United Kingdom and two from Germany. Four belong to the Socialist group (PES), three to the United Left group (GUE-NGL), three to the Christian Democratic/Conservative group (EPP) and one to the Green group (Greens-EFA).

The interesting question is why only three out of fifteen member states have MEPs from immigrant backgrounds. Many more member states have significant groups of voters with immigrant backgrounds, of whom, however, a proportion have no right to vote.

The rest of the MEPs (615 of them) are in general drawn from the white Western European middle- and upper class. A majority have an academic education. Many MEPs are political professionals with long careers in politics behind them before they were elected as MEPs. In general they have made a political career at regional level or via their national Parliament. Some have even been ministers. Those that not were professional politicians when elected to the EU Parliament were recruited by their political parties, almost without exception, from successful careers as lawyers, physicians, university professors, business people and so on.

**Table 2:**

**Members of the EU Parliament by profession, 1999 and 1996**

	July 1999	Feb 1996
Politicians.....	198.....	121
Civil servants.....	99.....	134
Legal professions, lawyers.....	54.....	63
Journalists.....	38.....	40
Business people.....	35.....	30
University employees (academic staff).....	32.....	40
University professors .....	26.....	25
Teachers .....	30.....	46
Engineers.....	24.....	34
Employees of NGO:s & trade unions .....	20.....	8
Economists .....	18.....	15
Farmers.....	13.....	16
Cultural sector (writers, artists).....	11.....	8
Physicians.....	9.....	20
Non-professional workers .....	8.....	12
Diplomats .....	2.....	4
Veterinarians .....	2.....	3
Architects .....	2.....	3
Clergy .....	2.....	2
Students .....	1.....	2
Rally driver .....	1.....	0
Military officer.....	1.....	0

Remarks:

The border between being a politician by profession and previous professional career can in some cases be blurred. We have tried therefore to look at the different backgrounds and professions of the Members of the Parliament at the time of their election to the EU Parliament.

It can clearly be seen that the MEPs do not proportionally reflect the social background of the total population that they represent. Whilst this is also true of national MPs, in the EU Parliament the situation is somewhat worse.

It is of course difficult to generate confidence in elected representatives who are drawn almost entirely from an elite.. The eight "non-professional workers" listed above as having had a seat in the EU Parliament in July 1999 had the following jobs: metal worker, assembly worker, clerk, nurse's assistant, shop worker, doctor's assistant/receptionist (two persons) and air hostess. Four of them belong to the United Left group (GUE-NGL), one is in the Socialist group (PES) and three in the Christian Democratic/Conservative group (EPP).

As critics of the EU system have said, it seems today that there is scant possibility for metal worker Smith, community worker Svensson or shop employee Muller to gain a seat in the EU Parliament. One obvious problem is the opportunity to develop language skills: the meetings are interpreted, but in the work that is done in the corridors and at dinner parties no interpreters are present.

Only those drawn from a certain group have any real chance of election. In the EU Parliament election of 1999 there was a candidate for the Swedish Moderates named Walburga Douglas, daughter to Otto von Habsburg. Her campaign ads said that she had "worked in the European Parliament for 12 years, speaks five languages and know the system." Background is here a great advantage. Of course, social representativeness and democratic representation are not the same thing, but the advantages of an elite origin are clear.

#### **4. The turnout in the EU Parliament election**

In general the turnout dropped in 1999 in nearly every country. In a few countries the turnout increased, but in all of these countries (with the exception of Portugal) local elections were held at the same time. The common election day for the EU election and local elections without doubt helped to raise the turnout. That the turnout in total in the EU 15 reached 49.8% (according to the EU Parliament "Result and elected" - Revised edition 28.07.99) can be partly attributed to the fact that three member states (Belgium, Luxembourg and Greece) have compulsory voting.

However, those voters that do not take part in the election do not get the attention they deserve. Non-voters and those who spoil their papers are seldom taken into account in statistics. In the election campaign there is a lot of talk about mobilising voters, but when the election result is presented it is only the votes given to the parties that are counted.

##### **4.1. Notional composition of the EU Parliament if the will of the voters were proportionally reflected in the allocation of seats**

What would happen if all together all non-voters, blank voters and those that cast a non-valid vote were represented in the Parliament by an "Empty Chairs Party"? Empty chairs would be an ever-present reminder to the elected politicians that it is unfortunately now only a minority of the eligible voters that bothers to vote.

Below we have recalculated the election result and added the "Empty Chairs Party" for those voters in the group mentioned above. When the political parties' percentages of the total numbers of voters are counted it can be seen that smaller parties virtually disappear and that the big parties are, in reality, not that big. Even the bigger parties could have problems attracting enough votes to surmount the thresholds for representation.

Our calculation is approximate, a proportional calculation. However, most countries use the d'Hondt quota, a mathematical formula known to favour larger parties and one which in this case would strengthen the "Empty Chairs Party" still more.

In general a clear picture can be seen - the "Empty Chairs Party" dominates in certain member states.

**Table 3:**

**The composition of the EU Parliament if those eligible voters that did not vote or spoiled their papers were allocated to the "Empty Chairs Party"**

	B	Dk	D	GR	E	F	IRL	I	L	NL	A	P	FIN	S	UK	
<b>EPP/ ED</b>	5	1	23	7	18	6	3	21	2	3	3	3	1	2	5	103
<b>PES</b>	4	1	15	6	15	11		11	1	2	4	4	1	2	1	78
<b>ELDR</b>	6	3			2			4	1	2			1	1		20
<b>Greens/ EFA</b>	4				1			1	1	1	1		1			10
<b>EUL/ NGL</b>		1		4	3			4				1		2		15
<b>UEN</b>						7	4	6				1				18
<b>TOL/ IND</b>	2							8			2				1	13
<b>EDD</b>		2														2
<b>Empty Chairs</b>	4	8	61	8	25	63	8	32	1	23	11	16	12	15	80	367
	25	16	99	25	64	87	15	87	6	31	21	25	16	22	87	626

This is of course a hypothetical example. It is not in the interests of those that take the decisions which determine election systems to create a system that would be unfair towards themselves and their parties. For example in the United Kingdom before the EU election the traditional electoral system with single seat constituencies where the candidate with a relative majority wins was abolished in favour of a system with constituencies of between four and ten mandates. Certainly the result of the EU election was a surprise in that Labour had such extensive losses as much as for the low turnout; nevertheless Labour would not have created a new election system that would risk a total deletion of their delegation to the EU Parliament.

As the table shows, the EU Parliament would consist of only 259 MEPs if the "Empty Chairs Party" were "represented". This means that the EU Parliament, the only EU institution elected by the people, is not that deep rooted. On this evidence, the system of co-decision should be excluded. For an affirmative vote under co-decision, 314 votes in the EP are required, a number



which should not be available. The 626 MEPs were elected as described above with 49.8% turnout in the 1999 election in the 15 member states. Since there is no pairing system between the political groups in the Parliament, the mobilisation of members to the votes at the session is very important. 100% attendance at the votes is never reached, an ordinary session may attract a maximum of perhaps around 560 MEPs. Thus at best only around 90% of the members, elected from a 49.8% turnout, attend.

Our calculation of the voting attendance at the session of January 2000 gave the following result:

**Table 4:**

**The EU Parliament. Attendance at the votes at the session of January 2000 in relation to the share of the total electorate in the EU countries**

	Average attendance	Percentage of the members	Percentage of the total electorate represented
Monday 17.01 .....	330.....	52.7.....	26.25
Tuesday 18.01 .....	503.....	80.4.....	40.04
Wednesday 19.01 .....	543.....	86.7.....	43.20
Thursday 20.01 12.00.....	466.....	74.4.....	37.07
Thursday 20.01 17.30.....	174.....	27.8.....	13.84
Friday 21.01 RC.....	106.....	16.9.....	8.43
Friday 21.01 EV .....	63.....	10.1.....	5.01

n.b. On Friday two votes were held by roll call (RC) and two votes by electronic voting (EV). The attendance differed greatly between RC and EV at these. On other days the difference was far less pronounced.

## 5. Who voted?

We have made calculations in those areas of the bigger cities in different EU countries which had, respectively, the lowest and the highest turnout to see if it is possible to construct a profile of stay-at-home voters. We chose the bigger cities because it is easier to separate different social groups by district.

There have been difficulties in getting local and EU election statistics from some countries. We have nevertheless succeeded in gathering results from Sweden, Great Britain, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Portugal and Ireland.

### 5.1. United Kingdom

#### 5.1.1. The election system of the United Kingdom

In the 1999 EU Parliament election the United Kingdom for the first time had a proportional election system (with the exception of N. Ireland, which had employed such a system for all elections for some time). The proportional system was divided between nine constituencies in England, one in Scotland, one in Wales and one in Northern Ireland. Under this system the

mobilisation of voters became more important. Previously British election strategists could divide the country into "safe" Labour or Conservative constituencies on the basis of political loyalties reflecting socio-economic differences. A high surplus of Labour votes in, for example, the mining areas had no importance for the election in neighbouring constituencies. Elections to the House of Commons are in reality decided in a couple of hundred marginal constituencies.

With the proportional system the mobilisation of voters even in safe constituencies is of much more importance for the distribution of mandates. There remain constituencies where Labour or the Conservatives are stronger, but in contrast to the traditional English system the relative winner does not take all the seats.

In the United Kingdom as a whole the turnout was 24.0%. This figure varies, however, between different part of the country. In Northern Ireland the turnout was 57.0% (the domestic debate for and against the peace agreement seems to have mobilised the voters) but in the rest of the UK the turnout was 23.1%. This can be further divided between England (22.7%), Wales (28.1%) and Scotland (24.7%). In the election of 1994 the turnout was 36.4% overall. With N. Ireland again recording the highest figure.

**Table 5:****United Kingdom: Highest and lowest turnout per constituency and the election result for the largest parties' in the general election (i.e. to the House of Commons) of 1997**

<u>Highest</u>	<u>Largest party 1997</u>	<u>Turnout 1999</u>
Carmarthen East & Dinefwr	Lab 42.9, PC 34.6	40.2%
Merionnydd Nant Conwy	PC 50.7	39.4%
Brecon & Radnorshire	Lib D 40.8	39.2%
Caernarfon	PC 51.1	38.6%
Ceredigion	PC 41.6	37.8%
Ynys-Mon	PC 39.5	36.4%
Cotswold	Con 46.4	34.7%
East Devon	Con 43.4	34.4%
Monmouth	Lab 47.7, Con 39.2	34.3%
Leominster	Con 45.3	33.9%
Totnes	Con 36.6, Lib D 34.9	33.6%
Torridge & West Devon	Lib D 41.9, Con 38.5	33.5%
Bexhill & Battle	Con 48.2	33.4%
Conwy	Lab 35.1, Lib D 31.2	33.3%
West Worcestershire	Con 45.0	33.0%
North Devon	Lib D 50.8, Con 39.4	32.8%
Preseli Pembrokeshire	Lab 48.3	32.7%
Somerton & Frome	Lib D 39.5, Con 39.3	32.7%
Mole Valley	Con 48.0	32.4%
New Forest West	Con 53.0	32.3%

<u>Lowest</u>	<u>Largest party 1997</u>	<u>Turnout 1999</u>
Kingston upon Hull North	Lab 65.9	14.1%
St Helens South	Lab 68.6	14.0%
Kingston upon Hull West & Hessle	Lab 58.7	13.9%
Knowley North & Sefton East	Lab 69.9	13.9%
Salford	Lab 68.9	13.8%
Liverpool, Wavertree	Lab 64.5	13.8%
Pontefract & Castleford	Lab 75.7	13.5%
Sheffield, Brightside	Lab 73.5	13.5%
Knowsley South	Lab 77.1	13.5%
Makerfield	Lab 73.6	13.1%
Manchester, Gorton	Lab 65.3	13.0%
Barnsley Central	Lab 77.0	13.0%
West Bromwich West	Lab (the Speaker)	12.9%
Walsall North	Lab 56.6	12.8%
Kingston upon Hull East	Lab 71.3	12.6%
Bootle	Lab 82.8	12.6%
Manchester, Central	Lab 71.0	12.1%
Liverpool, West Derby	Lab 71.2	11.2%
Liverpool, Walton	Lab 78.4	10.7%
Liverpool, Riverside	Lab 70.8	10.3%

Parties:

Lab = Labour

C = Conservative

Lib D = Liberal Democrats

PC = Plaid Cymru (Welsh Nationalists)

Richard Corbett of "New Labour", one of the most devoted federalists in the EU Parliament and also an "important" man in institutional issues in the Socialist group (PES) in the EU Parliament, was elected in a by-election in December 1996 for Merseyside West, Liverpool. The turnout at that election was just above 11%. After the change in the electoral system, Corbett now represents the region Yorkshire and Humber. It is interesting how difficult Corbett finds it to persuade the voters to send him back to Brussels and Strasbourg to continue his work for a more federalist EU. The political mandate for Corbett to work for Brussels federalism cannot be regarded as well anchored back home in his constituency.

**Table 6:**  
**United Kingdom: Highest and lowest turnout by constituency (House of Commons constituency) and the result for the largest party in each constituency respectively in the general election of 1997**

<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>Largest party 1997</u>
East Midlands		
Highest: West Derbyshire	29.8%	Con 42.4
Lowest: Leicester West	16.3%	Lab 55.2
Eastern		
Highest: North Norfolk	32.2%	Con 36.4, Lib D 34.3
Lowest: Thurrock	14.8%	Lab 63.3
London		
Highest: Richmond Park	31.6%	Lib D 44.7, Con 39.6
Lowest: Vauxhall	15.6%	Lab 63.8
North East		
Highest: Hexham	30.3%	Con 38.8, Lab 38.3
Lowest: Tyne Bridge	14.5%	Lab 76.8
North West		
Highest: Westmorland & Lonsdale	30.5%	Con 42.2, Lib D 33.4
Lowest: Liverpool, Riverside	10.3%	Lab 70.8
South East		
Highest: Bexhill & Battle	33.4%	Con 48.2
Lowest: Slough	15.4%	Lab 56.6
South West		
Highest: Cotswold	34.7%	Con 46.4
Lowest: Bristol South	17.7%	Lab 60.1
West Midlands		
Highest: Leominster	33.9%	Con 45.3
Lowest: Walsall North	12.8%	Lab 56.6
Yorkshire & The Humber		
Highest: Richmond	30.7%	Con 48.8
Lowest: Kingston upon Hull East	12.6%	Lab 71.3
Wales		
Highest: CarmarthenEast & Dinefwr	40.2%	Lab 42.9, PC 34.6
Lowest: Swansea East	18.0%	Lab 75.4
Scotland		
Highest: Galloway&UpperNithsdale	32.3%	Lib D 43.9, Con 30.5
Lowest: Glasgow Shettleston	15.6%	Lab 73.2

### 5.1.2. Conclusions and comments United Kingdom

It must be remembered that the election result of 1997 was a catastrophe for the Conservatives and a great success for Labour and to a lesser extent for the Liberal Democrats. Even with that in mind the picture of the EU election is clearly one of a relatively high mobilisation of votes in traditionally Conservative areas and an extremely low turnout in safe Labour areas.

## 5.2. Germany

The turnout in Germany sank from a relatively high level of 60.0% in 1994 down to 45.2% 1999. It is important to point out about Germany that the political map differs a lot between the Länder in the west part of Germany and the Länder in ex-German Democratic Republic (GDR).

### 5.2.1. Comparisons between electoral districts in different Länder (States) and cities

We have chosen only countries and cities in the former West Germany. This is because voters in Eastern Germany, former GDR, vote quite differently to those in the original Federal Republic (West), with participation in politics and party life in the ex-GDR influenced by the fact that of the dictatorship which existed until the fall of the Berlin wall 1989.

#### 5.2.1.1. Land North Rhine-Westphalia

Table 7:

**Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Land North Rhine-Westphalia's electoral districts**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>SPD</u>	<u>CDU</u>	<u>Greens</u>
Whole North Rhine-Westph.	43.8	37.3	47.3	7.1
of which:				
Munster City	53.2	28.1	48.9	13.9
Bonn City	51.8	26.7	48.7	12.9
Rheinisch-Bergischer Kreis	50.4	30.8	50.9	8.2
----				
Oberhausen City	36.3	51.0	35.2	6.1
Gelsenkirchen City	34.9	51.1	35.0	5.4
Herne City	34.7	51.8	34.2	5.4

The electoral districts at Land level have between 125 000 and 213.000 eligible voters.

SPD = Social Democrats

PDS = Party for Democratic Socialism

Greens

CDU = Christian Democrats

CSU = Christian Democrats in Bavaria

### 5.2.1.2. Hamburg

**Table 8:**

**Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Hamburgs electoral districts**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>SPD</u>	<u>CDU</u>	<u>Greens</u>	<u>PDS</u>
Whole Hamburg	37.0	37.2	40.2	12.0	3.3
of which:					
Wellingsbützel	56.3	23.5	57.5	10.4	1.4
Blankenese	55.6	20.4	57.4	11.8	1.3
Othmarschen	55.2	20.4	57.3	11.6	1.4
Nienstedten	55.0	20.0	58.7	12.0	1.3
Volksdorf	54.6	27.3	46.7	15.0	2.6
----					
Klostertor/Hammerbrook	25.9	30.7	25.2	25.2	9.4
Billbrook	25.6	56.5	26.9	1.9	4.6
Veddel	25.5	50.2	25.8	9.0	6.4
Wilhelmsburg	25.2	48.9	36.1	5.7	2.8
Kl Grasbrook/Steinwerder	15.0	35.0	42.5	5.0	5.0

### 5.2.1.3. Cologne (Köln)

**Table 9:**

**Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Cologne (Köln) electoral districts**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>SPD</u>	<u>CDU</u>	<u>Greens</u>
Whole of Cologne	41.2	35.2	40.7	14.2
of which:				
Hahnwald	53.9	9.8	71.8	2.9
Marienburg	51.3	18.1	58.7	9.4
Braunsfeld	51.3	28.4	47.7	13.7
Lindenthal	50.8	23.3	49.2	16.3
Klettenberg	50.4	30.2	36.6	22.0
----				
Blumenberg	30.4	44.9	31.8	12.5
Kalk	29.7	45.9	30.0	14.0
Vingst	29.7	48.2	35.5	8.3
Höhenberg	29.7	49.5	32.0	8.5
Chorweiler	23.1	44.1	42.6	4.2

#### 5.2.1.4. Dortmund

**Table 10:**

**Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Dortmunds electoral districts**

	Turnout	SPD	CDU	Greens	PDS
Whole Dortmund	41.6	47.3	34.7	8.9	1.2
of which:					
Hombruch	50.0	40.0	40.2	10.1	1.8
Aplerbeck	46.8	44.4	38.0	9.2	1.4
Hörde	45.6	45.1	36.6	8.7	1.0
Innenstadt – Ost	45.5	37.2	40.7	11.8	2.5
Innenstadt – West	41.9	42.7	30.6	15.7	4.0
----					
Eving	38.0	59.3	27.3	5.0	1.5
Lutgendortmund	37.2	52.4	31.6	7.2	2.0
Huckarde	36.7	56.3	31.1	4.7	1.7
Mengede	35.6	53.8	32.5	5.5	1.6
Innenstadt – Nord	31.8	49.3	26.2	12.4	4.8

#### 5.2.1.5. Munich (München)

**Table 11:**

**Germany: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentage for the parties' among Munichs (München) electoral districts**

	Turnout	SPD	CSU	Greens
Whole München	59.0	29.1	48.4	11.9
of which:				
Allach – Untermenzing	64.0	25.2	57.0	8.4
Pasing – Obermenzing	63.2	24.7	52.8	11.9
Trudering – Riem	62.1	22.1	60.6	8.1
Thalkirschen	62.0	27.1	53.4	9.4
Bogenhausen	61.5	27.3	51.5	10.1
----				
Ludwigvorstadt – Isarvorstadt	56.5	29.1	35.2	23.4
Feldmoching – Hasenberg	56.2	28.8	56.5	5.7
Obergiesing	56.1	32.8	45.5	10.8
Schwanthalerhöhe	53.7	31.0	36.5	19.9
Milbertshofen – Am Hart	53.6	32.9	47.6	8.4

The listed German cities were chosen because they are in different electoral districts as well as because the election result in detail was relatively easy to obtain.



In these large German cities the electoral districts number between about 10.000 and 60.000 eligible voters. In some separate cases in Cologne (Köln) some of the electoral districts have only 1.000 to 2.000 eligible voters, but these are exceptions.

### **5.2.2. Conclusions and comments Germany**

Even though of tables are based on very large electoral districts in the largest cities of Western Germany a picture occur that SPD is strong in electoral districts with a low turnout and CDU/CSU are strong in electoral districts with a high turnout. A more equally distributed turnout over all electoral districts would SPD first of all gain a lot of votes on.

### **5.3. France**

In the newspaper *Le Monde* (15 June 1999) a profile was given for those 52.99% (only a preliminary figure was then available; in the final result the actual total was discovered to be 53.24%) of the electorate who abstained in the EU election. With one exception, a referendum referenda in 1988 about new statutes for New Caledonia, this was the lowest turnout in any election or referendum since 1982.

The profile of those that abstained showed that:

- there were more women (56%) than men (49%).
- most of the non-voters were not strong sympathisers of any party. Communist Party sympathisers were most likely to vote.
- 56% had voted no to the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, 42% had voted yes.
- 68% of agricultural sector workers and 59% of non-professional workers did not vote. The other occupational groups were just behind.

The most interesting question was why these people did not vote. Their answers were:

- 45% wanted to show their dissatisfaction with the political parties.
- 25% because the election did not interest them.
- 24% because they found no suitable list.
- 11% wanted to show their dissatisfaction with the Euro.
- 7% never vote at all.

In southern France a significant number of working people vote for Le Pen's National Front, FN and the FN is even regarded as the largest working class party in this part of the country. In the EU Parliament election the FN was split when Bruno Mégret, former vice president of FN, founded a new party.

Since some voters who originally voted for left parties have for some years expressed their dissatisfaction by voting extreme right and since French political party life is divided, it is harder to interpret the French election statistics. Nevertheless, we can again see a certain pattern.

### 5.3.1. Comparisons between electoral districts in different cities and the turnout in the French Overseas Departments

We have selected the three largest cities in France and the French Overseas Departments to study the turnout and the percentages for the largest parties.

#### 5.3.1.1. Paris

The non-socialist parties are usually stronger in Paris than the left parties. In the local elections 1995 the Left only won two of 20 *arrondissements*, as against none in the local election before that.

**Table 12:**

**France: *Arrondissements* in Paris with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages for the parties in these *arrondissements***

	Turnout	LO- LCR	PCF	PS	Greens	RPR -DL	UDF	RPFIE	FN	MN
Whole P.	52.97	5.2	4.7	20.2	17.0	17.2	10.9	12.2	4.4	3.0
of which:										
6	58.25	3.0	2.9	19.3	17.4	18.7	15.9	12.8	2.9	2.4
5	57.72	5.2	4.2	20.7	20.2	16.8	10.8	11.7	3.0	2.1
11	57.36	7.1	6.4	23.7	22.2	11.8	7.9	9.2	4.3	2.5
7	56.80	2.0	1.4	13.9	10.5	25.6	18.1	16.1	3.8	3.1
17	54.94	3.6	2.9	15.8	12.9	22.2	13.1	15.5	4.8	3.4
----										
1	51.24	5.5	5.0	22.2	22.6	13.0	9.3	10.8	3.8	2.2
10	50.78	7.0	6.9	22.0	22.5	12.0	7.5	9.9	4.5	3.0
20	50.16	8.1	7.4	23.4	19.9	10.9	7.1	9.6	5.3	3.2
18	49.24	7.2	5.9	21.7	20.1	12.2	6.9	10.7	6.6	3.5
19	47.65	7.0	7.0	23.7	18.8	12.5	7.0	10.0	5.7	3.2

Parties:

LO-LCR = Workers Fight/Revolutionary Communist League (communist-trotskyist)

PCF = French Communist Party

PS = Socialist Party

Greens (Verts) = Greens led by Cohn-Bendit

RPR-DL = Rally for the Republic/Liberal Democracy (conservative liberal)

UDF = Union for the French Democracy (conservative liberal)

RPFIE = Rally for France and the Independence of Europe (EU-sceptic conservative led by Pasqua)

FN = Front National (xenophobic)

MN = National Movement (xenophobic, split from FN led by Bruno Mégret)

On average the left parties and the Greens took a higher percentage in total in *arrondissements* with lower turnout and for the conservative and liberal parties it is the opposite.

### 5.3.1.2. Lyon

**Table 13:**

**France: Electoral districts in Lyon with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages for the parties in these electoral districts**

	Turnout	LO- LCR	PCF	PS	Greens	RPR -DL	UDF	RPFIE	FN	MN
Whole L.	51.72	4.9	4.7	20.2	12.7	14.3	13.1	14.8	6.1	3.8
of which:										
6	52.52	2.9	2.2	14.9	9.1	21.4	17.4	19.0	4.6	3.2
1	52.14	6.3	6.1	18.6	23.9	10.9	11.0	10.9	4.8	2.0
----										
9	43.40	6.2	5.8	25.3	12.3	10.2	9.2	12.1	8.4	5.1
8	43.22	5.7	7.0	24.3	10.1	11.0	9.5	13.3	8.8	5.0

### 5.3.1.3. Marseille

**Table 14:**

**France: Electoral districts in Marseilles with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties in these electoral districts**

	Turnout	LO- LCR	PCF	PS	Greens	RPR -DL	UDF	RPFIE	FN	MN
Whole M.	41.25	5.1	9.4	20.5	8.9	11.4	6.9	13.4	9.2	8.4
of which:										
4	45.80	4.0	5.6	17.7	10.5	16.4	10.2	15.9	7.4	6.8
3	43.77	5.2	8.6	20.2	9.1	12.6	7.3	15.1	8.8	7.7
----										
8	36.15	6.4	19.9	20.6	5.7	5.2	3.5	8.6	10.6	10.8
6	35.17	5.0	9.4	20.7	8.7	11.0	6.8	13.7	8.5	8.7

### 5.3.1.4. Corsica and the French Overseas Departments

The enthusiasm for the EU project and the EU Parliament seems also to be very limited in Corsica and in the French Overseas Departments.

**Table 15:****France. Turnout at Corsica and in the French Overseas Departments**

	Percent Total votes	Percent Valid votes
Haute-Corse	32.36	31.47
Corse-du-sud	30.90	29.98
Wallis et Fortuna	58.90	58.35
La Réunion	33.11	30.51
Polynésie-Francaise	31.16	29.51
Mayotte	28.75	28.26
Nouvelle-Calédonie	27.92	26.83
Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon	26.96	24.35
Guyane	14.33	13.17
Guadelope	11.75	10.11
Martinique	11.59	10.16

**5.3.2. Conclusions and comments France**

Neither in France are the politicians able to mobilise any larger enthusiasm for the EU project. This in spite of that as well as leading socialist politicians as right wing politicians have been the engines in the political process at highest level in EU to promote Brussels federalism. Contempt for politicians has grown in the country and earlier it was first of all the extreme right that gained on that. In the EU Parliament election 1999 the trotskists had success in attacking the "plural left government" from the left.

**5.4. The Netherlands**

In spite of the fact that the Netherlands' citizens are regarded as the most pro-EU of the 15 member states, interest in the EU election was very low. In the election of 1999 the turnout sank from the 1994 35.6% to 29.9%. EU elections record the lowest turnout of any of the range of elections held.

If we look only at settlements of between 1.000 and 500.000 and compare turnout and the percentages for the parties a pattern emerges.

#### 5.4.1. Comparison between communities in the Netherlands – turnout and the percentage for different parties

**Table 16:**

**The Netherlands: Highest and lowest turnout in the communities and the election result for the seven biggest parties**

	Turnout	SP	GL	PvdA	CDA	VVD	D66	SGP GPV RPF
Netherlands	29.9	5.0	11.9	20.1	26.9	19.7	5.0	8.7
of which:								
Bredewiede	64.5	1.9	5.0	22.3	36.0	16.4	3.7	13.5
Rozendaal	54.4	1.1	11.6	9.1	16.6	46.3	11.2	2.7
Graafstroom	51.0	1.2	3.6	9.6	30.1	11.4	1.5	41.8
Schiermonnik.	49.2	3.2	15.4	25.1	24.1	23.1	5.0	3.5
Staphorst	48.8	0.6	1.5	7.1	16.5	8.7	1.5	63.6
Zuidhorn	48.7	2.9	9.1	17.5	29.1	11.7	3.6	25.2
Maarn	47.3	2.2	11.7	16.2	20.9	33.1	5.8	8.2
Rijssen	47.2	1.4	2.1	7.6	18.2	5.0	0.8	64.5
Ijsselmuiden	47.0	0.8	2.5	6.5	32.7	6.5	1.1	49.4
Ameland	46.9	2.7	7.0	26.5	37.8	19.6	3.2	1.9
Landgraf	22.6	12.2	9.7	18.6	42.2	10.8	3.8	0.5
Rotterdam	22.4	8.1	13.1	27.4	16.5	18.3	7.5	5.8
Kerkrade	21.9	11.1	9.4	22.8	42.0	8.0	2.9	0.8
Medemblik	21.7	5.6	14.0	19.5	26.3	23.2	5.4	4.1
Purmerend	21.6	5.7	14.6	29.3	13.1	24.4	6.5	2.3
Den Helder	21.2	4.4	9.3	22.9	19.8	27.5	5.0	8.0
Hellvoetsluis	21.0	6.3	13.0	25.9	13.3	27.9	6.6	4.1
Rucphen	20.7	3.3	5.7	21.3	40.7	20.2	4.3	0.7
Spijkenisse	19.4	7.5	10.5	28.6	15.8	23.0	6.1	5.4
Edam-Volen.	19.0	2.7	11.6	18.0	35.5	23.1	4.2	1.7

Parties:

SP = Socialist Party (Left, EU-critical party)

GL = Green Left

PvdA = Labour Party

CDA = Christian Democrats

VVD = Conservative liberal

D 66 = Social liberal

SGP/GPV/RPF = Christian social conservative

As shown in the table the three left wing parties in general have a significantly higher result in communities with a low turnout compared with communities with a high turnout. The liberal and

Christian parties also do well in their respective strongholds where they are able to mobilise their voters.

#### 5.4.2. Rotterdam

**Table 17:**

**The Netherlands: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the election result for the parties' among the electoral districts in Rotterdam**

	Turnout	SP	GL	PvdA	CDA	VVD	D66	SGP GPV RPF
The City	22.4	8.1	13.1	27.4	16.5	18.3	7.5	5.8
of which:								
H'berg-S	33.06	5.5	11.8	18.0	19.6	29.7	7.6	5.0
Pr Alexand	26.97	7.7	11.8	26.2	17.6	20.1	6.3	7.7
Pernis	26.53	3.6	5.5	21.7	40.8	10.2	3.4	12.6
Centrum	25.61	6.3	15.1	25.1	11.1	25.0	11.1	2.2
Kral-Croos	24.55	5.9	13.4	21.8	11.8	30.4	9.1	3.9
----								
Ijsselmon	20.30	8.6	9.8	32.2	19.1	13.7	5.0	8.6
Charlois	19.42	11.9	11.2	33.8	17.7	9.9	5.7	6.6
Hoogvliet	18.92	7.5	10.4	35.3	17.3	13.8	5.3	7.2
Delfshav	18.07	9.4	19.3	29.2	13.9	10.0	10.5	3.8
Feijenoord	15.69	10.2	12.6	34.9	15.4	10.1	8.5	4.3

The result is not totally clear if we look only at the figures for each party. However, if the total percentages for the three left parties are compared with the total percentages of the four right and centre parties it shows that the left is stronger in electoral districts with lower turnout.

On average the 13 electoral districts have 33.000 eligible voters, varying from Pernis with around 3.600 to Pr Alexander with about 65.000.

#### 5.4.3. Conclusions and comments the Netherlands

Also in the Netherlands, which is regarded as a very EU-positive country, the politicians have very little support behind their EU policy. The left wing voters stay at home to a greater extent than the liberal and Christian democratic voters.

#### 5.5. Sweden

Compared to most other countries, Sweden has in the past been characterised by very high electoral turnouts. In the national elections of 1994 and 1998, however, turnout fell. In the two EU Parliament elections the turnout was extremely low, and research has shown that some voters stayed away for political reasons. They simply do not agree with Sweden's membership of the EU.

According to the Swedish Television Exit Poll (Valu 99) of those non-professional workers who voted 35% voted Social Democratic, 26% for the Left Party and 13% for the Green Party. Of members of the blue collar trade union LO who voted, 40% opted for the Social Democrats, 28% the Left Party and 11% the Green Party. Of those who were unemployed and voted, 26% voted for the Social Democrats, 29% the Left Party and 16% the Green Party.

But who were those making the 61.2% of the eligible voters that did not vote at all?

### 5.5.1. Stockholm

**Table 18:**

**Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in those electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Stockholm**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>Fp</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>V</u>
Whole city	44.0	28.6	19.7	19.9	14.3
of which:					
Bromma 18	71.0	49.9	31.0	4.4	2.2
Västerled 15	65.8	47.2	30.5	7.2	2.5
Västerled 3	64.0	47.7	29.8	6.2	3.6
Västerled 2	63.6	50.1	26.5	5.8	2.0
S:t Görän 7	63.6	46.1	19.6	13.5	5.4
Västerled 12	63.1	56.8	22.5	5.4	2.5
Västerled 16	62.7	46.0	26.9	4.9	3.8
Kungsholmen 11	62.7	37.5	29.8	15.0	5.3
Västerled 14	61.5	46.6	30.4	5.6	2.9
Västerled 13	61.2	54.2	21.5	7.9	2.1
Oscar 2	60.8	57.7	20.9	7.8	3.0
Oscar 5	60.3	64.7	16.4	5.1	2.2
----					
Kista 7	22.9	12.2	8.9	33.6	28.5
Kista 10	22.7	13.5	10.3	29.5	27.6
Spånga 17	21.3	11.0	4.5	47.7	20.7
Kista 11	21.0	11.5	8.9	37.0	25.0
Kista 9	20.0	10.9	13.2	40.2	17.2
Spånga 10	19.1	6.1	9.7	34.2	29.1
Spånga 13	19.1	5.7	8.5	44.1	26.6
Spånga 23	19.1	10.9	12.1	30.5	25.9
Spånga 22	18.6	10.4	5.9	31.9	28.2
Spånga 15	18.5	4.3	9.9	42.6	24.1
Spånga 21	17.3	8.8	4.4	40.2	24.8
Spånga 19	16.0	10.6	10.6	37.6	28.4

Parties:

M = the Moderate, conservative

Fp = People's Party, liberal

S = Social Democrats

V = the Left Party



## 5.5.2. Gothenburg

**Table 19:**

**Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in those electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Gothenburg**

	Turnout	M	Fp	S	V
Whole city	42.4	23.0	16.6	21.6	18.3
of which:					
Örgryte 7	65.5	46.8	25.3	4.7	5.3
Älvsborg 2	62.7	54.7	21.2	4.8	3.1
Björkekärr 4	61.9	22.6	18.8	25.3	13.8
Askim 7	61.4	60.0	19.2	3.2	1.9
Älvsborg 5	61.0	34.0	20.0	16.1	8.7
Örgryte 6	60.7	43.6	22.9	7.9	3.9
Askim 5	60.6	54.7	20.8	5.8	3.5
Näset 1	60.3	31.3	23.1	17.4	6.0
Annedal 5	59.4	29.2	28.0	11.5	11.1
Askim 8	59.4	44.5	24.6	9.2	3.7
----					
Tynnered 1	20.9	15.4	15.4	23.1	28.9
Bergsjön 8	20.1	7.3	15.1	38.0	25.1
Angered 8	19.7	9.3	15.0	43.5	16.1
Gunnared 6	19.4	12.6	7.4	38.5	30.7
Gunnared 8	19.2	8.3	4.4	41.7	29.4
Gunnared 7	18.4	8.5	8.0	39.7	26.1
Angered 3	18.3	4.6	11.9	39.1	29.8
Biskopsgården 11	18.2	1.7	8.4	43.8	29.2
Bergsjön 1	17.9	7.2	9.2	27.6	33.6
Gunnared 1	16.0	8.6	4.3	38.5	35.0

### 5.5.3. Malmö

**Table 20:**

**Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in those electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Malmö**

	Turnout	M	Fp	S	V
Whole city	39.6	27.4	14.0	32.4	10.9
of which:					
Hyllie 4	61.4	52.2	15.6	17.4	2.9
Hyllie 6	60.1	51.7	18.2	15.4	1.5
Limhamn 1	59.3	62.5	23.3	4.8	0.8
Limhamn 2	58.9	47.4	21.6	14.0	4.0
Slottsstaden 12	58.6	50.9	16.7	15.7	3.3
Limhamn 11	57.3	43.9	23.9	15.9	3.7
Husie 4	55.9	31.7	16.5	32.0	5.3
Limhamn 10	55.7	46.5	20.7	16.4	5.5
Slottsstaden 10	54.5	50.3	17.1	16.0	3.6
Limhamn 8	54.5	39.9	21.5	20.0	4.7
----					
V Skrävlinge 11	22.9	11.2	3.9	46.0	18.9
Möllevången 12	20.7	12.6	12.6	30.9	20.6
Fosie 5	20.4	17.2	7.1	50.5	15.7
V Skrävlinge 3	19.7	4.8	3.0	59.6	15.7
Hyllie 5	18.9	11.9	6.4	46.5	16.3
V Skrävlinge 1	17.0	17.1	4.7	52.9	15.9
V Skrävlinge 6	15.4	13.8	6.1	56.9	13.3
V Skrävlinge 2	13.9	9.0	8.2	50.8	21.3
V Skrävlinge 10	10.5	6.3	2.5	76.3	6.3

### 5.5.4. Other cities

#### Södertälje

**Table 21:**

**Sweden: Comparison of the four largest parties' percentage in electoral districts with the highest and the lowest turnout in Södertälje**

	Turnout	M	Fp	S	V
Whole city	34.6	19.7	15.0	27.2	14.8
of which:					
Södertälje 16	47.0	24.4	18.9	19.1	10.8
Södertälje 18	44.6	27.6	15.5	20.4	14.0
----					
Södertälje 51	19.7	5.2	22.2	36.6	16.3
Södertälje 31	19.2	6.5	16.5	37.4	18.7

In Umeå the Left Party (V) had an extraordinary election, receiving 42.2% of the votes while the Social Democrats scored 19.6%. Berghem Norra had the highest turnout with 49.8%, compared with 40.8% in the whole community. In this electoral district the Left Party received 37.8%, the Moderates 12.1% and the People's Party (Fp) 14.9%. Lowest turnout was in Östra Ersboda with 31.1%, where the Left Party received 51.5%, the Moderates 5.6% and the People's Party 8.0%.

**Table 22:**

**Sweden: Election results in different cities. A comparison between Danderyd and Botkyrka**

	<u>Danderyd</u>	<u>Botkyrka</u>
Turnout	58.7	33.4
The Moderates	56.0	19.6
People's Party (Fp)	20.6	17.9
Social Democrats	6.8	28.2
Left Party (V)	3.1	14.7
---		
Lowest turnout in a district	51.3	21.1
Highest turnout in a district	68.6	46.0

**5.5.5. Conclusions and comments Sweden**

In Sweden it was clear by the day after the election that it was the "better off" groups in the society that voted. On the common election day for the national Parliament, the regional councils and municipal councils Sweden has a high turnout compared internationally. Our figures for the larger cities in Sweden undoubtedly show that the voters in election districts where the Social Democrats and the Left Party are strong were those that stayed at home. Yet the Green Party, the Social Democrats and the Left Party accumulated a majority among those who did vote. Further research will show how people changed party between the national Parliament election and the EU Parliament election. The Swedish exit poll (Valu 99) showed, for example, that there was a small part of the usually Moderate voters opposed to the single currency and because of that voted for the Left Party in the EU Parliament election.

**5.6. Spain**

In Spain the turnout increased in the EU election. This was probably due to the fact that local elections were held on the same day, which helped mobilise voters. Turnout increased from 59.1% to 64.4%.

**5.6.1. Comparison between different cities**

We have below chosen some of the largest cities in Spain and compared their election results. The electoral districts are much larger than, for example, in Sweden. Nevertheless, a quite obvious pattern emerges. Certain big cities have not been included because of the existence of strong regional parties that do not quite fit the left-right political scale or, if they regard themselves as

doing so, many of their voters ignore this and vote instead on the question of regional independence.

### 5.6.1.1. Madrid

**Table 23:**

**Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Madrid**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>PP</u>	<u>PSOE-Prog</u>	<u>IU</u>
Whole Madrid	62.13	52.55	34.39	7.35
of which:				
Salamanca	66.84	71.01	19.79	3.94
Chamberí	66.52	68.73	20.76	4.49
Moncloa-Aravaca	66.18	62.20	26.22	5.74
Chamartín	65.79	70.63	19.91	4.35
----				
Puerta-Vallecas	57.93	29.56	54.43	11.08
Vicálvaro	57.74	35.09	47.22	11.58
Villa-Vallecas	57.60	37.49	47.88	9.38
Centro	57.50	52.21	32.23	8.08

Parties:

PP = Peoples Party, conservative

PSOE-Prog = Socialist Party with allied progressives

IU/IULV-CA = United Left

CIU = Catalan regional party, liberal/conservative

### 5.6.1.2. Barcelona

**Table 24:**

**Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Barcelona**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>PP</u>	<u>PSOE-Prog</u>	<u>CIU</u>
Whole Barcelona	52.70	20.60	34.78	26.17
of which:				
Sarriá-S.Gerv.	57.90	32.63	15.51	36.89
Les Corts	56.55	27.13	25.13	31.79
Eixample	55.09	20.71	25.95	34.12
-----				
Nou Barris	50.38	20.02	51.99	13.03
Sants-Montjuic	50.37	17.54	37.68	25.01
Ciutat Vella	43.54	17.20	39.48	22.89

### 5.6.1.3. Seville

**Table 25:**

**Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Seville**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>PP</u>	<u>PSOE-Prog</u>	<u>IULV-CA</u>
Whole Seville	57.16	38.71	42.08	7.36
of which:				
Triana	62.24	58.05	26.19	5.20
Nervión	60.13	47.06	34.76	5.90
Casco Antiguo	59.64	57.27	24.67	6.14
Sur	57.19	41.86	40.85	7.16
Macarena	55.41	26.91	50.56	9.21
Este	52.92	21.09	57.99	8.83

### 5.6.1.4. Valencia

**Table 26:**

**Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Valencia**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>PP</u>	<u>PSOE-Prog</u>
Whole Valencia	63.80	52.85	29.77
of which:			
Pobl. Del Nord	70.68	50.34	25.97
Pla del Real	70.06	70.59	16.66
Extramurs	69.41	65.40	19.74
----			
Rascanya	60.13	44.77	37.89
Benicalap	59.67	43.72	38.02
Pobl. Maritims	59.51	42.62	36.51

### 5.6.1.5. Zaragoza

**Table 27:**

**Spain: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Zaragoza**

	Turnout	PP	PSOE-Prog
Whole Zaragoza	59.03	44.08	30.51
of which:			
Centro	66.65	66.99	16.02
Universidad	63.71	57.97	21.24
Aljafería	60.27	37.00	34.62
----			
Torrero	56.35	33.05	36.54
Barr.Zona Oeste	55.78	40.95	33.82
Vía Hispanidad	54.44	35.80	36.76

### 5.6.2. Conclusions and comments Spain

In some Spanish cities the voting pattern is less evident. However, we have found no city where the PP is stronger in areas with low turnout and PSOE-Prog stronger in areas with high turnout.

The research in Spain is based on somewhat larger electoral districts (on average about 25.000 eligible voters, but the size can sometimes vary from a couple of thousand up to 50.000).

### 5.7. Portugal

In Portugal the turnout also increased some from 35.5% to 40.3%. The candidacy of the Socialist Party grey eminence and Portugal's former president Mario Soares probably had a mobilising effect on the Socialist voters and the party had a very good election. Nevertheless the tables below demonstrate a pattern of low turnout in the electoral districts that vote to the left.

#### 5.7.1. Comparison between different cities

We compared the electoral district's of Portugal's two largest cities.

### 5.7.1.1. Lisbon

**Table 28:**

**Portugal: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Lisbon**

	<u>Turnout</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>PPD/PSD</u>	<u>PCP-PEV</u>	<u>CDS-PP</u>
Whole Lisbon	41.85	39.65	29.79	12.17	8.50
of which:					
Alvalade	48.04	29.89	40.73	7.81	12.35
Sao Francisco Xavier	47.74	27.80	41.74	7.61	12.51
Sao Domingo d Benfica	46.17	34.86	35.34	10.04	8.22
Sao Joao de Deus	45.91	29.24	41.93	7.08	12.44
Sao Mamede	45.55	32.82	37.21	7.86	11.13
----					
Encarnacao	37.24	43.51	25.56	12.46	7.81
Sao Paulo	36.23	45.15	23.13	14.59	8.73
Santa Justa	33.89	46.04	23.02	10.89	9.65
Socorro	33.55	45.72	23.14	12.98	7.39
Marvila	32.62	52.16	15.98	15.96	6.66

Note:

Turnout is defined as the number of voters casting a valid vote.

Parties:

PS = Socialist Party

PPD/PSD = Social Democrats (liberal/conservative)

PCP/PEV = Communist Party and the Greens

CDS/PP = People's Party, a right wing party

### 5.7.1.2. Porto

**Table 29:**

**Portugal: Electoral districts with the highest respectively the lowest turnout and the percentages of the parties' among the electoral districts in Porto**

	Turnout	PS	PPD/PSD	PCP-PEV	CDS-PP
Whole Porto	43.03	42.21	31.30	11.13	8.13
of which:					
Foz do Douro	48.45	39.22	34.85	8.34	9.98
Aldoar	47.38	45.80	28.40	9.94	6.99
Paranhos	45.92	41.56	32.16	10.59	8.12
Novogilde	45.04	24.04	46.04	3.57	19.13
Lordelo do Ouro	44.55	43.89	28.76	11.66	8.87
----					
Campanha	39.75	50.77	23.29	13.85	5.49
Sao Nicolau	39.67	50.79	23.78	14.29	5.53
Miragaia	39.47	50.86	19.95	16.52	5.75
Sé	38.71	55.58	19.44	14.97	5.12
Santo Ildefonso	37.81	39.85	34.12	10.80	8.49

Note:

Turnout is defined out of the number of voters that gave a valid vote.

### 5.7.2. Conclusions and comments Portugal

Even though there are signs that the Socialist Party succeeded in mobilising its voters better than did, for example, the Social Democrats (PPD/PSD), our research shows that the turnout in general was lower in left wing districts than in right wing districts.

In spite of the fact that Portugal receives significant subsidies from the EU and that the EU symbol is widely displayed to mark all EU-sponsored projects, the voters do not seem to be all that impressed.

### 5.8. Ireland

The political landscape in Ireland differs from the other EU countries because of the political development during and after the war of independence from United Kingdom. The two main political parties, Fianna Fail and Fine Gael, were formed after the signing of the Independence Treaty. Today both parties are seen as a mixture of centre-right. The EU election was boosted by the fact that local elections were held on the same day. The highest turnout was in the smallest of the four constituencies and the lowest in the capital Dublin.

Thanks to the local elections the turnout in the EU election went up from 44.0% in 1994 to 50.5% in 1999.



**Table 30:**

**Ireland: Constituencies and turnout in the EU Parliament election 1999**

<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Turnout</u>
Connacht/Ulster	62.88%
Munster	56.18%
Leinster	50.55%
Dublin	36.14%

Of the four seats in the Dublin constituency one went to Labour (their only one in Ireland) and one to the Greens.

**5.9. The other EU countries**

For different reasons we have deliberately excluded certain countries. First of all Belgium, Luxembourg and Greece have been left out, since these countries have compulsory voting. In Denmark's case, the politics of EU elections differ from all other elections because the resistance movement against the EU is represented by two special lists - the June Movement and the People's Movement against EU. These two groupings receive votes from both left and right wing voters, though there is evidence that the former group predominates. In addition, the right wing populist Danish People's Party had for the first time a list in the EU Parliament election. The party is considered as a right wing party, but had an ex-social democrat as their leading candidate. It seems probable that that all sorts of people voted for this party.

In Austria the right wing party *die Freiheitlichen* receives support from all social groups. Some polls have shown that *die Freiheitlichen* attracts more votes from working people than do the Social Democrats.

All of these circumstances make it hard in these two countries to interpret social patterns in the turnout in relation to left and right wing voters, and because of this we have excluded the two countries from our research.

A third group of countries we had to exclude from our research because of a lack of statistics. For example, from Finland we have not found election results divided by district within the cities or nationally. The election statistics for the rural areas of Finland have not revealed from which we can draw conclusions without further study.

For Italy we did not find statistics from the local level to such an extent that we could draw conclusions. We have checked the electoral districts in the city of Turin (Torino) and in these statistics it was not possible to see a pattern. Italy has a divided party system that was drastically reconstructed in the years 1993-1994. In the EU election 1999 a number of well-known people such as ex-EU Commissioner Bonino and present EU Commission President Prodi formed new parties and lists in the centre of the scale and achieved considerable success. Italy has a high turnout, although this is falling. In the EU election of 1999 the turnout was 70.8% and in 1994 it was 74.8%.

## 6. Conclusions and comments

We have concentrated the research on the turnout in the larger cities. Lack of time and resources has made it impossible to investigate smaller cities, rural areas and so on where the different parties have their strongholds. The large cities' streams of voters have simply been easier to analyse.

A more or less obvious result is shown in this report. We can establish the fact that:

1. *People in the upper class and the upper middle class are those that are recruited by the political parties to sit in the EU Parliament.* In total there are only eight non-professional workers in the EU Parliament after the election of 1999.
2. *The political mandate for the EU Parliament is indeed very weak-rooted among the voters.* If all non-voters, those that vote blank or give an invalid vote were counted together as voting for "the Empty Chairs Party", this party would obtain 367 of 626 seats in the EU Parliament. The EU Parliament would then not have the 314 votes required according to the Treaty before co-decision is possible.
3. *Of those that do not vote in the EU Parliament election it is very likely that a majority are EU sceptic and to the left of the political scale.* Our research into a large number of big cities in the EU member states shows that the turnout is lowest in constituencies/electoral districts where a large majority votes to the left. The turnout is the highest where a large majority votes to the right. If the turnout were more equally distributed between the constituencies/electoral districts, the left wing parties would be much bigger in the EU Parliament. Today the left parties in the EU countries suffer because their potential voters stay at home in the election.
4. *The difference in turnout between well-off and poorer areas shows also that there are reasons to question whether enthusiasm for the EU project is a class issue.*

To arrange local elections or other types of regional elections/referenda on the same date as the EU Parliament election would increase the turnout. The EU federalists can of course say that this would mean that the voters lost the focus on the "European issues". But EU federalists have few other possibilities in their attempts to increase the interest in the EU Parliament election. As things stand, many voters do not focus at all on this election.



Europeiska förenade vänstern/Nordisk grön vänster  
*Parlamentariska gruppen* - EUROPAPARLAMENTET

**Rue Wiertz 43  
B-1047 Bruxelles  
Tel: (32-2)28-42683/42686  
Fax: (32-2)28-41774/41780  
E-mail: [guengl@europarl.eu.int](mailto:guengl@europarl.eu.int)  
<http://www.europarl.eu.int/gue>**