



Elections 2016: The TUSC results

Overview – page 3

Summary points – page 7

A note on statistical methods – page 8

Table One: The directly-elected mayoral results – page 9

Table Two: Council ward results 'league table' – page 11

Table Three: TUSC local election results by council – page 13

Table Four: Scotland and Wales – page 17

Table Five: Candidates not part of the TUSC umbrella – page 19

Clive Heemsker
TUSC National Election Agent
May 10th 2016

Overview

Elections took place on Thursday May 5th 2016 for the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales, the Greater London Authority (Mayor and Assembly), and for 124 local authorities in England, including mayoral elections in Bristol, Liverpool and Salford.

The Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition (TUSC) stood six candidates for constituency seats in the Scottish parliament, three regional lists for the Welsh assembly, candidates for the mayors of Liverpool and Bristol, and 310 local council candidates. These later comprised of 302 candidates contesting seats in 52 authorities with scheduled elections in May, five candidates standing in by-elections in councils without full elections this year, and three TUSC candidates contesting parish council seats.

Overall TUSC candidates won a total of 43,309 votes in these elections, comprised of 3,540 votes in Scotland, 2,040 votes in Wales, 6,826 votes in the two mayoral contests, and 30,903 in the English council elections.

Details of the results achieved are given in the statistical tables that follow and some significant features of these are presented in the summary points which conclude this introductory overview.

A new political context

The most salient feature of TUSC's 2016 elections campaign was the fact that it was conducted in a completely different political context compared to that which prevailed in the first five years of our coalition's existence.

TUSC was set-up in 2010 to enable trade unionists, community campaigners and socialists to stand candidates under a common anti-austerity and socialist banner, with an agreed minimum platform of core policies (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/policy>). Establishing an electoral coalition of this character, involving a mix of constituent organisations and individuals, was conceived as a step towards solving the vacuum of working class political representation that has existed since the triumph of 'New Labour'.

Many activists appreciated the opportunity to contest elections on this basis, including welcoming the autonomy TUSC candidates have to run their own campaigns while being part of a national challenge to establishment politicians. Before this year's elections nearly 2,000 candidates had appeared on the ballot paper under the TUSC umbrella.

But this year there was a completely new political situation inaugurated by the election of Jeremy Corbyn as the Labour Party leader in September 2015.

The TUSC national steering committee, which has the final say on approving election candidates, was determined not to undermine Jeremy's leadership or the anti-austerity struggle that lay behind his victory. Indeed, building that struggle is the only way his leadership can be sustained against the right-wing forces that still remain within the Labour Party and which are particularly entrenched amongst its elected representatives, in parliaments, assemblies and council chambers.

So an even more important part of TUSC's electoral intervention this year was to try and ensure that prospective candidacies had been thought through – targeted – and were part of a serious campaign, nationally and locally, against cuts to local public services and the general austerity agenda.

Success in the local government unions

An early success occurred in January when the UNITE union's National Industrial Sector Committee for Local Government workers agreed a resolution calling on Labour-controlled councils to no longer meekly pass on the Tories' cuts to local government funding.

Instead, the motion argued, by using reserves and councils' borrowing powers, they should set legal no cuts budgets to buy time to build a mass campaign to force the Tories to retreat and properly fund local government.

Without exaggerating TUSC's role in this development, it was significant that the motion quoted research on council reserves that had been published only by TUSC, in late November (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/350.pdf>), and that TUSC had been pioneering this strategy in our previous electoral interventions.

This was followed in February by the Local Government Service Group Executive (SGE) of UNISON, the union representing the majority of local government workers, making a similar call, while the Glasgow local government branch of UNISON, the largest in Scotland, produced a special edition of its branch newsletter to members making a detailed case for a no cuts budget (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/361.pdf>).

This growing trade union support for a fighting strategy that could roll back the attack on local councils was a vindication of the argument that TUSC has been patiently making in our electoral campaigns. Councillors don't just have to implement the Tory cuts and austerity is a political choice in the council chamber as much as it is in Westminster.

The arguments on what councils could do to resist the cuts, based on the experiences of TUSC-supporting councillors, were further developed in the briefing pack, *Preparing a No Cuts People's Budget* (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/355.pdf>).

Seeking a dialogue with Labour candidates

Although the big majority of Labour councillors did not support Jeremy Corbyn for leader in last summer's contest, the TUSC steering committee recognised that there was now a greater possibility than previously that some would be prepared to resist austerity, argue for a fighting strategy within their Labour group, and potentially not vote for cuts in the council chamber.

So before local TUSC groups made decisions about standing they needed to seek a dialogue with Labour councillors and prospective candidates. To this end the national steering committee produced a model letter to Labour councillors (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17116/12-09-2015/model-letter-to-labour-councillors>) for local groups to use.

In addition, the TUSC steering committee, in consultation with Coventry TUSC supporters, decided not to stand a candidate in a council by-election there in February – although socialist councillors have been elected in Coventry in the past – to make sure that any possibility of a discussion with Labour, locally and nationally, was not impeded (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17165/21-01-2016/dave-nellists-by-election-appeal-to-corbyn-lets-discuss-how-to-fight-the-cuts>).

And lastly, to make sure as far as possible that TUSC would not authorise candidates to stand against those Labour candidates who were prepared to fight, some more detailed questions were added by the national steering committee to the local elections application form compared to previous years (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/358.doc> in the section headed, *Election Campaign Details*).

Impact on candidate numbers

The final safeguard was the TUSC national steering committee. As in previous elections all candidate applications were placed before the steering committee for approval. The committee operates by consensus not majority voting – nothing is agreed if a committee member or constituent organisation has strong objections – and, as stated in the TUSC rules, ultimately it has the final say on coalition seats and candidates.

This year, seven applications to be a TUSC candidate in the local elections were not approved on the basis of information received about the Labour candidates in the seats it was being proposed

to contest. On the same basis no consensus was reached on an application to stand for the mayor of Salford and therefore a TUSC candidacy in that contest was not agreed.

There was also a higher than normal withdrawal rate of TUSC candidates who had been approved by the national steering committee. There are always some candidates who do not make it onto the ballot paper for administrative or personal reasons. But this year there were also a number of late withdrawals in situations when the Labour candidate (belatedly) replied to the TUSC letter.

One consequence of this tighter approach to the local elections in particular, and the new political context generally, was that this year TUSC was not able to reach the broadcasting authorities' threshold for a party election broadcast for the English local elections and 'fair media coverage' (see below).

The new context was a factor in there being no TUSC candidates in London this year although other considerations were also at play. These included the enormous costs of contesting the full slate of GLA positions (£39,000 in deposits alone), and the remoteness in public perception of the GLA assembly members in the authority's 'super-constituencies' – probably vying with MEPs as the most anonymous politicians in Britain – from the provision of public services.

The result was that, after discussions in London, no applications were received by the national steering committee to contest either the mayoral election or the assembly seats.

The Greens and the vacuum

The TUSC 2016 election challenge was still a significant intervention – contesting 13% of the wards in the scheduled council elections, the sixth-largest presence on the ballot paper – but the scale of TUSC's electoral reach was clearly more limited.

One consequence was to allow the Green Party, which stood its highest number of council candidates ever, to pose unchallenged as the anti-austerity alternative in some local authorities. Indeed, although they suffered a net loss of three council seats, the Greens generally benefited from the media breakthrough they achieved in last year's general election.

In all three mayoral elections outside London, for example, the Green candidates increased their absolute vote compared to 2012 and their percentage share, by 1.2% in Bristol, 5.6% in Liverpool, and 5.7% in Salford. In London the Greens increased their absolute share of the mayoral vote by 34% compared to 2012.

That is why it was a significant achievement that, despite the enormous disparity in profile, for every two and a half Green voters in the wards where TUSC fielded a candidate there was one elector prepared to vote for the 100% anti-austerity TUSC candidate.

The mayoral campaigns

The two mayoral elections contested by TUSC were a success. In Liverpool the Unison national executive member Roger Bannister came in fourth ahead of Britain's governing party, with 4,950 votes (a 5.1% share). For the second time, following Tony Mulhearn in 2012, TUSC has outpolled the Tories in Britain's eighth biggest city.

In Bristol the TUSC candidate, Tom Baldwin, scored a respectable 1,876 first preference votes, coming in behind the 'big five' parties and the sitting Bristol First mayor, George Ferguson. TUSC stood for the inaugural Bristol mayoral election in 2012, coming in then with 1,412 votes (in tenth position out of 15 candidates) behind a number of 'independents'. This time Tom comfortably outpolled all the independent candidates.

There was also a positive knock-on effect on the votes achieved by the TUSC candidates in the Bristol council elections. With 45% of the wards contested by TUSC, 2,827 votes were won, with an average vote of 4.1%.

One obstacle to TUSC's mayoral campaigns, however, was the political censorship exercised by the Returning Officers of both Liverpool and Bristol councils on the mayoral election booklets that are delivered to every elector.

All references to Liverpool Labour had to be removed from Roger Bannister's draft election address and Tom Baldwin was not allowed to point out in his address the fact that both Labour and Green councillors had participated in a cross-party cabinet which has implemented drastic cuts in the city (see <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17225/27-04-2016/no-politics-please-its-election-time-tusc-protests-at-mayoral-booklets-censorship>).

The April meeting of the TUSC national steering committee agreed to write to the Returning Officers asking for an explanation for their decisions and will consider what further action to take at its post-election review meeting.

Media coverage

The BBC and Ofcom produce guidance policy for election coverage, including a minimum threshold of the number of seats a party must stand in – one sixth – before they qualify for a party election broadcast and what the broadcasters term 'fair media coverage'.

TUSC engaged in some debate with the BBC and ITV on their interpretation of the criteria in relation to the English local elections. May 5th saw 2,742 councillors elected in 2,171 wards across 124 local councils, with the marked discrepancy between seats and wards arising because there was a more than usual number of councils (18) that were holding 'all-up' elections this year where every councillor is elected. This included councils that were abolishing annual elections, in a shameful erosion of democracy, to move to elections held once every four years. In the equivalent elections in 2012 over 300 fewer councillors were elected (2,407 in total) in more councils (128).

If the threshold criteria had been calculated as the number of wards in which a party has at least one candidate standing (one-sixth being 362) TUSC could have striven to reach this figure. The eventual figure set, however, of 457 candidates, would have been difficult with the approach TUSC adopted this year to the elections, flowing from the new political context.

In previous years the BBC's Chief Political Advisor Ric Bailey had defended the broadcast media's virtual boycott of TUSC by writing that "part of the logic of the threshold is that to justify coverage on UK-wide outlets, a significant proportion of those watching or listening *should have the opportunity to vote for the party concerned*" (8th May 2014). A council ward, of course, is a geographical and population-based unit and would have been a fit measure of this criterion, but it was not to be. (See <http://www.tusc.org.uk/17192/14-03-2016/as-tusc-candidate-numbers-grow-a-battle-looms-for-fair-media-coverage>).

Not having met the threshold as set there was – predictably – literally no mention whatsoever of TUSC's election challenge in the national media, broadcast and print. Once again we can say that TUSC polled a far bigger share of the vote than its share of media coverage.

But there was in fact very little coverage of the local elections generally – even though over 16 million people had the opportunity to vote in the English council elections – as the media concentrated on the London, Scotland and Wales elections (combined, covering a smaller electorate) and only referred to 'the locals' in relation to Westminster concerns.

The Birmingham Post was perhaps being more perceptive than they realised when they acknowledged on election day that TUSC "are again the sixth party in these elections, as well as arguably the fiercest defenders of local government itself".

Summary points

Table One gives the complete results of the mayoral elections in Bristol and Liverpool. Tables Two and Three list results from the English council elections, a 'league table' of all TUSC results of five percent or more, and a complete breakdown of TUSC results by council. Excel spreadsheets are available of the results in each ward contested by a TUSC candidate, including the votes of the other candidates.

Significant features of the results include:

- The total vote for all TUSC candidates on May 5th was 43,309, comprised of 3,540 votes for the Scottish parliamentary candidates, 2,040 votes for the TUSC lists for three Welsh assembly regions, 30,903 votes for the council candidates, and 6,826 votes for the two mayoral candidates.
- The TUSC candidate for the mayor of Liverpool, the Unison national executive member Roger Bannister, polled 4,950 votes (a 5.1% share), over 1,400 votes ahead of the Tories. Roger had already beaten UKIP – despite an almost daily presence in the establishment media to boost them, they were unable to find a candidate for mayor in Britain's eighth biggest city.
- TUSC councillor Kevin Bennett narrowly failed to be re-elected in his Fairfield & Howley ward on Warrington borough council, polling 921 votes, just 76 votes behind the third-placed Labour candidate. Warrington TUSC candidate Bob Taylor won a parish council seat in the town.
- After Kevin, the best council election scores were achieved in Knowsley's Shevington ward (23.5%), Warrington's Poulton South ward (20.8%), St Michaels in Coventry (19.8%), Halewood South in Knowsley (17.3%), Monk Bretton in Barnsley (13.7%) and High Fell in Gateshead (12%).
- A total of 59 TUSC candidates polled over 5% in their ward contests.
- In the Coxford ward held by the Southampton rebel councillors Don Thomas and the TUSC national steering committee member Keith Morrell, the independent anti-cuts candidate Tammy Thomas polled 1,317 votes (38.6%), coming in 393 votes ahead of Labour (27%).
- TUSC council candidates polled over 1,000 votes in ten councils, led by Sheffield with 3,109 votes, Coventry (3,108), Bristol (2,827 votes for candidates in 16 wards), Liverpool (2,292 votes in 17 wards), Warrington (1,719), Knowsley (1,644), Southampton (1,060), Wakefield (1,044), Salford (1,037) and Plymouth (1,033).
- The best average percentage share of the vote score across a council in which TUSC stood in at least a third of the seats was achieved in Barnsley, where TUSC averaged 5.3%, followed by Coventry (5.1% average across the city), Wakefield (4.6%), Rugby (4.3%), Bristol (4.1%), Stevenage (4.1%), and Gateshead (4%).
- Across the 289 wards contested by TUSC in the scheduled council elections, 13% percent of the total, the mean average vote for TUSC candidates was 3.4%.
- In more than one in four of the council wards where TUSC fielded a candidate on May 5th, TUSC attracted more support than the Liberal Democrats. In one in three wards TUSC either outpolled UKIP or they couldn't find a candidate. And for every two and a half Green voters in the wards where TUSC fielded a candidate, there was one TUSC voter.

A note on statistical methods

Excel spreadsheets are available of the results for TUSC candidates for each council where a seat was contested, grouped into regions. These include a figure for the percentage of the vote won by TUSC in each ward.

How this later figure is worked out is straightforward in a contest for one seat – the percentage figure for the TUSC candidate being the percentage of all the votes cast.

But what about multi-seat contests, where two or three councillors were elected from the same ward? Particularly, for example, where the council only publishes the votes cast for each candidate but not the turnout, or the size of the electorate? How to present such results, particularly where a party fields just one candidate in a two or three-seat contest, is a controversial question of psephology.

TUSC has now been using the same method to calculate votes in multi-seat wards since 2011, which has the advantage of allowing a comparison across different year's election results.

In an example from the elections of that year, in Leicester's Rushey Mead ward the single TUSC candidate polled 272 votes, ahead of one Liberal Democrat candidate but behind the other two. It was a fact that 4.9% of the 5,524 people who voted in Rushey Mead used one of their three votes for TUSC. But they actually cast a total of 13,917 votes (which meant that 2,655 potential votes were not used). So how should TUSC's share of support in the ward be calculated? It could have been presented as a percentage of the total votes cast, 1.9%. On the other hand, if all the ward's candidates' votes were presented as a percentage of the 5,524 actual voters, the total number of votes would be 300%.

So the method used is to record the TUSC vote (or the highest TUSC vote in a multi-candidate ward) as a percentage of the aggregate of the highest votes of all the parties contesting the ward, the highest vote being taken as a maximum expression of a particular party's support.

In the Rushey Mead example there wasn't much deviation from the percentage of ballots cast method. The aggregate of the highest Labour vote (2,789), the highest Independent (1,039), the Tories' highest vote (861), the top Lib Dem vote (556), and TUSC's 272 votes, came to a total of 5,517. On this calculation, TUSC again polled 4.9% in the ward.

This method is neither a 'correct' nor 'incorrect' way of presenting the support there for TUSC. It is just another method, with its limitations openly acknowledged.



Elections 2016: Directly-elected Mayoral results

There were four directly-elected Mayoral contests this year, for the Greater London Authority and for the cities of Bristol, Liverpool and Salford.

TUSC stood a candidate in two of these elections – Tom Baldwin in Bristol and Roger Bannister in Liverpool – and the first preference results from these contests are listed below.

Notably in Liverpool, for the second time following the 2012 elections, TUSC outpolled the Tories, the governing party, in Britain's eighth biggest city. TUSC has similarly outperformed UKIP in Liverpool, beating them in 2012 and again this year, in that they were unable to even find a candidate to stand.

Liverpool

Joe Anderson, Labour – 51,332 (52.6%)

Richard Kemp, Liberal Democrat – 20,598 (21.1%)

Tom Crone, Green – 10,609 (10.9%)

Roger Bannister, TUSC – 4,950 (5.1%)

Alan Hutchinson, Independent – 3,964 (4.1%)

Tony Caldeira, Conservative – 3,533 (3.6%)

Paul Rimmer, English Democrats – 2,590 (2.6%)

Total valid votes: 97,576

2012 result:	Labour 58,448; Independent 8,292; Liberal Democrats 6,238; Green 5,175; TUSC
TUSC candidate	4,792 (4.8%) ; Liberal Party 4,442; Conservatives 4,425; UKIP 2,352; English
Tony Mulhearn	Democrats 1,400; Independent 1,362; British National Party 1,015; National Front
	566.
	<i>Total valid votes 98,507</i>

Elections 2016: Directly-elected Mayoral results

Bristol

Marvin Rees, Labour – 56,729 (40.4%)

George Ferguson, Bristol First (sitting mayor) – 32,375 (23.1%)

Charles Lucas, Conservative – 19,617 (14.0%)

Tony Dyer, Green – 10,000 (7.1%)

Kay Barnard, Liberal Democrat – 8,078 (5.8%)

Paul Turner, UKIP – 7,115 (5.1%)

Tom Baldwin, TUSC – 1,876 (1.3%)

Stoney Garnett, Independent – 1,384 (1.0%)

Christine Townsend, Independent – 1,010 (0.7%)

Tony Britt, Independent – 877 (0.6%)

Paul Saville, Independent – 545 (0.4%)

John Langley, Independent – 367 (0.3%)

Mayor Kudehinbu, Independent – 341 (0.2%)

Total valid votes: 140,314

2012 result:	Bristol First 31,321; Labour 25,896; Conservative 8,136; Liberal Democrat 6,202;
TUSC candidate	Green 5,248; Independent 2,404; Independent 1,855; Respect 1,568;
Tom Baldwin	Independent 1,413; TUSC 1,412 (1.6%) ; Independent 1,037; Independent 994;
	Independent 761; Independent 494; Independent 411
	<i>Total valid votes: 89,152</i>



Elections 2016:

TUSC council ward results 'league table'

Below is a league table of all the results of five percent or more achieved by TUSC candidates in the English local council elections on May 5th.

A total of 59 TUSC candidates reached this benchmark, out of the 289 wards contested by TUSC in the scheduled local elections. The mean average vote for TUSC council candidates overall was 3.4%.

The results are listed in percentage order, giving the votes won by the TUSC candidate and with the percentage vote in parentheses (see Note on Statistical Methods on how this was calculated in multi-seat wards).

	Local authority	Ward	Vote
1	Warrington	Fairfield & Howley	921 (30.0%)
2	Knowsley	Shevington	326 (23.5%)
3	Warrington	Poulton South	360 (20.8%)
4	Coventry	St Michaels	635 (19.8%)
5	Knowsley	Halewood South	442 (17.3%)
6	Barnsley	Monk Bretton	273 (13.7%)
7	Gateshead	High Fell	198 (12.0%)
8	Burnley	Queensgate	163 (11.5%)
9	Coventry	Radford	313 (11.0%)
10	Rotherham	Boston Castle	477 (10.9%)
11	Liverpool	Belle Vale	360 (10.7%)
12	North East Lincolnshire	Immingham	282 (10.6%)
13	Liverpool	Kirkdale	276 (10.1%)
14	Rotherham	Rotherham West	348 (9.7%)
15	Wolverhampton	Heath Town	177 (9.3%)
16	Bradford	Bowling & Barkerend	351 (8.9%)
17	Knowsley	Prescot North	222 (8.9%)
18	Coventry	Lower Stoke	286 (8.5%)
19	Stevenage	Shephall	111 (8.3%)
20	Bristol	Filwood	221 (8.0%)
21	Liverpool	Norris Green	197 (7.8%)
22	Stevenage	St Nicholas	129 (7.7%)
23	Southampton	Woolston	213 (7.6%)
24	Rugby	Wolston & The Lawfords	136 (7.6%)
25	Wakefield	Wakefield East	243 (7.3%)
26	Warrington	Bewsey Whitecross	129 (7.3%)
27	Wakefield	Pontefract South	271 (6.7%)
28	Coventry	Whoberley	223 (6.5%)
29	North Tyneside	Battle Hill	169 (6.5%)
30	Bristol	Lockleaze	230 (6.4%)
31	Sheffield	Manor/Castle	227 (6.4%)
32	Kingston-upon-Hull	Myton	127 (6.2%)
33	Bristol	Eastville	282 (6.1%)

34	Coventry	Westwood	222 (6.1%)
35	Plymouth	Plympton St Mary	209 (6.1%)
36	Stevenage	Bandley Hill	96 (6.1%)
37	Salford	Winton	143 (6.0%)
38	Barnsley	Kingstone	107 (6.0%)
39	Gloucester	Westgate	114 (6.0%)
40	Bristol	Ashley	411 (5.9%)
41	Warrington	Great Sankey South	138 (5.9%)
42	Birmingham	South Yardley	372 (5.8%)
43	Warrington	Latchford East	83 (5.8%)
44	Bristol	St George Central	201 (5.7%)
45	Salford	Eccles	173 (5.7%)
46	Liverpool	Yew Tree	171 (5.6%)
47	Coventry	Foleshill	190 (5.5%)
48	Coventry	Sherbourne	142 (5.5%)
49	Gateshead	Pelaw & Heworth	118 (5.5%)
50	Rugby	Admirals & Cawston	100 (5.5%)
51	North East Lincolnshire	East Marsh	87 (5.5%)
52	Wakefield	Wakefield Rural	246 (5.4%)
53	Southampton	Harefield	171 (5.3%)
54	Liverpool	Picton	134 (5.2%)
55	Manchester	Baguley	127 (5.2%)
56	Rugby	New Bilton	71 (5.2%)
57	Coventry	Cheylesmore	210 (5.0%)
58	Sheffield	Park & Arbourthorne	220 (5.0%)
59	Warrington	Latchford West	88 (5.0%)



Elections 2016:

TUSC local election results by council

Below are the TUSC council election results aggregated on a local authority basis, listed in a regional breakdown including regional totals. The number of candidates TUSC stood is given in the first column, followed by the number of wards (with a figure for the percentage of wards contested by TUSC in each council, rounded to the nearest five percentage point, in column three).

The fourth column gives the aggregate vote for all the TUSC candidates, and the last column shows the mean average share of the vote in the wards contested in each authority.

TUSC council candidates polled over a thousand votes in ten councils. The best average percentage share of the vote score across a council in which TUSC stood in at least a third of the seats was achieved in Barnsley (5.3%), followed by Coventry (5.1%), Wakefield (4.6%), Rugby (4.3%), Bristol (4.1%), Stevenage (4.1%), and Gateshead (4%).

Eastern

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Peterborough	1	1	5%	108	4.3%
Stevenage	11	11	85%	707	4.1%
St Albans & District	1	1	5%	23	1.0%
Three Rivers	1	1	5%	19	1.2%
Watford	5	5	40%	331	3.1%
Total	19	19	-	1,188	

East Midlands

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Derby	8	8	50%	441	1.8%
Lincoln	4	2	20%	254	3.7%
Total	12	10	-	695	

North West

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Burnley	1	1	5%	163	11.5%
Knowsley	5	3	20%	1,644	16.6%
Liverpool	18	17	55%	2,292	3.9%
Manchester	16	16	50%	974	2.1%
Pendle	1	1	5%	30	1.2%
Rochdale	1	1	5%	69	2.1%
Salford	18	18	90%	1,037	2.3%
Warrington	6	6	25%	1,719	12.5%
Wigan	1	1	5%	54	1.4%
Wirral	7	7	30%	394	1.7%
Total	74	71	-	8,376	

Elections 2016:

TUSC local election results by council

Northern

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Carlisle	6	6	35%	182	2.3%
Gateshead	7	7	30%	543	4.0%
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	3	3	10%	100	1.2%
North Tyneside	3	3	15%	287	3.8%
South Tyneside	1	1	5%	78	3.6%
Sunderland	1	1	5%	116	4.1%
	21	21	-	1,306	

Southern

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Basingstoke & Deane	1	1	5%	47	2.5%
Oxford	2	2	10%	57	3.5%
Portsmouth	1	1	5%	30	1.2%
Reading	1	1	5%	55	2.9%
Southampton*	13	11	70%	1,060	2.5%
Wokingham	1	1	5%	43	1.5%
	18	16	-	1,292	

* In Southampton TUSC also backed four independent anti-cuts candidates who polled 2,202 votes between them. This included the Cxford ward held by the Southampton rebel councillors Don Thomas and Keith Morrell, where Tammy Thomas won the seat from Labour with 1,317 votes (38.6%). In Bargate ward the anti-cuts independent candidate polled 243 votes, in Redbridge 413 and in Shirley 229.

South West

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Bristol	18	16	45%	2,827	4.1%
Cheltenham	1	1	5%	21	1.8%
Gloucester	4	2	10%	354	4.9%
Plymouth	18	18	90%	1,033	2.0%
Stroud	4	2	10%	182	2.7%
	45	39	-	4,417	

West Midlands

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Birmingham	12	12	30%	937	1.5%
Coventry	18	18	100%	3,108	5.1%
Dudley	1	1	5%	15	0.6%
Newcastle-under-Lyme	3	3	15%	65	2.0%
Nuneaton & Bedworth	4	4	25%	193	2.9%
Rugby	5	5	35%	381	4.3%
Wolverhampton	1	1	5%	177	9.3%
Worcester	2	2	15%	50	1.3%
	46	46	-	4,733	

Elections 2016:

TUSC local election results by council

Yorkshire & Humberside

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	% of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Barnsley	7	7	35%	728	5.3%
Bradford	1	1	5%	351	8.9%
Calderdale	1	1	5%	21	0.7%
Kingston-upon-Hull	1	1	5%	127	6.2%
Kirklees	4	4	15%	404	2.0%
Leeds	9	9	25%	387	1.0%
North East Lincolnshire	12	12	100%	833	3.1%
Rotherham	3	3	15%	960	8.0%
Sheffield	23	23	80%	3,109	2.7%
Wakefield	6	6	30%	1,044	4.6%
	67	67	-	7,964	

By-elections in councils without full elections

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Hackney	1	1	136	2.6%
Lancashire CC	1	1	60	1.7%
Spelthorne	1	1	30	1.7%
Surrey CC	1	1	33	1.0%
Torbay	1	1	27	1.1%
	5	5	286	

Town and parish council elections

	No. of candidates	No. of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
Abbots Langley PC	1	1	59	3.6%
Grappenhall & Thelwall	1	1	155	13.2%
Poulton with Fearnhead	1	1	432	35.0%
	3	3	646	

TOTALS

Local authorities	No. of candidates	No. of wards	Aggregate vote	Ave share of vote
	310	297	30,903	3.4%



Elections 2016: TUSC results in Scotland and Wales

Below are the results recorded by the six Scottish Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition (Scottish TUSC) candidates who contested constituency seats in the Scottish parliament elections.

The Scottish TUSC steering committee decided to only contest constituency seats in these elections after it became clear that Solidarity and the newly-created RISE registered party were not prepared to co-ordinate their campaigns – with each other or with TUSC – and instead were both going to stand in the eight regional list elections.

There was an additional political argument for this decision, which was that by focusing on constituency contests between Labour and the Scottish National Party (SNP) it was easier to pressure the individual candidates from both parties directly on whether they would be prepared to use their parliamentary position to defy the austerity agenda.

Welsh assembly regional seats

In South Wales, by contrast, there appeared to be no competitive constituency seats (although, in the event, Plaid Cymru defeated Labour in Rhondda) which meant that Labour had no prospect of winning regional list seats (and still did not win a regional seat in South Wales Central, despite the loss of the Rhondda constituency).

This opened up the possibility of UKIP winning assembly seats from the regional lists, which could not be stopped by a Labour vote on the second regional list ballot paper.

In that context, in Wales TUSC stood in the three South Wales regional list elections, polling 736 votes in South Wales Central (0.3%), 618 (0.3%) in South Wales East, and 686 (0.4%) in South Wales West.

Scottish parliament election results

Constituency	Candidate's name	Vote	
Dundee East	Leah Ganley	437	1.5%
Dundee West	Jim McFarlane	642	2.3%
Glasgow Cathcart	Brian Smith	909	3.0%
Glasgow Pollok	Ian Leech	555	2.0%
Glasgow Shettleston	Jamie Coccozza	583	2.3%
Renfrewshire North & West	Jim Halfpenny	414	1.3%
		3,540	



Elections 2016:

Candidates not in the TUSC umbrella

TUSC is a coalition of constituent organisations alongside individual trade unionists, socialists and working class community campaigners, who may be members of various socialist organisations or none. Similar to previous years just under 20% of candidates in this year's elections replied to the question on the TUSC candidate application form, 'are you a member of a political party', with the words, 'none'.

Regarding other organisations, the TUSC national steering committee has a standing policy of encouraging them to participate in our coalition – with the full rights that would entail (see *How TUSC Functions* at <http://www.tusc.org.uk/txt/368.pdf>) – or at least co-ordinate an electoral intervention.

In the past, as a sign of our preparedness to co-operate, TUSC has agreed joint names to go onto the Electoral Commission's register, to be available for candidates to use, with Solidarity – Scotland's Socialist Movement, and Left Unity (the joint name, Left Unity – Trade Unionists and Socialists, still remains registered).

But despite this open approach four organisations – the Communist Party of Britain, Respect, Solidarity and the newly-formed RISE – chose to contest elections on May 5th outside the TUSC umbrella.

The Communist Party of Britain

The Communist Party of Britain stood in all five of the regional list seats in the Welsh Assembly elections and in the regional list seat in North East Scotland.

In the Welsh Assembly elections they polled 423 votes (0.2%) in Mid and West Wales; 586 (0.3%) in North Wales; 520 (0.2%) in South Wales Central; 492 (0.2%) in South Wales East; and 431 (0.2%) in South Wales West.

In the Scotland North East regional list election the Communist Party polled 510 votes (0.2%).

Respect

It appears that Respect only stood candidates this year in London. George Galloway stood for Mayor, with a two-page election address in the Mayoral Election booklet distributed to every Londoner, and polled 37,007 votes (a 1.4% share).

Respect also stood a list, again headed by George Galloway, for the London-wide Assembly member's election, which scored a higher 1.6% share, 41,324 votes.

And in three of the constituency elections there were also Respect candidates standing, polling 5,170 votes (3.0%) in Brent and Harrow; 6,772 votes (3.2%) in the City and East constituency; and 5,068 (2.2%) in London North East.

Solidarity and Rise

As stated earlier, the Scottish TUSC steering committee decided to only contest constituency seats in the Scottish parliament elections after it became clear that Solidarity and the newly-created

RISE registered party were not prepared to co-ordinate their campaigns with TUSC – or each other – and instead were both going to stand in the eight regional list elections.

Their results in the eight regions were:

Central Scotland – Solidarity 2,684 votes (1.0%); Rise 1,636 votes (0.6%)

Glasgow – Solidarity 3,593 votes (1.4%); Rise 2,454 votes (1.0%)

Highlands and Islands – Rise 889 votes (0.4%); Solidarity 793 votes (0.4%)

Lothian – Rise 1,641 votes (0.5%); Solidarity 1,319 votes (0.4%)

Mid Scotland and Fife – Rise 1,073 votes (0.4%); Solidarity 1,049 votes (0.4%)

North East Scotland – Solidarity 992 votes (0.3%); Rise 599 votes (0.2%)

South Scotland – Solidarity 1,294 votes (0.4%); Rise 1,097 votes (0.3%)

West Scotland – Solidarity 2,609 votes (0.8%); Rise 1,522 votes (0.5%)

Other organisations

In the six years of our existence a number of other organisations have conducted electoral campaigns outside the TUSC umbrella, including Left Unity, the National Health Action Party (NHA), the Socialist Labour Party (SLP), Lewisham People Before Profit (PBP) and Birmingham Communities Against Cuts. All of them have been approached at various times to participate in TUSC.

Regarding this year's elections, while there was an appeal posted on the NHA party website for funds to support NHA members standing in the local council polls, with a promise to publish the candidates' profiles in late March, there has been no indication since that any NHA member contested this year's elections in the party's name.

There is also no information publicly available on whether there were SLP candidates contesting this year's elections while Left Unity decided at its last conference that it would not contest national elections for the immediate future. Lewisham PBP announced on its website that it was not standing candidates and was supporting the Green Party candidate for London mayor.