

Left Unity National Council

12:00-17:00, Saturday 18 April 2015

Quaker meeting house, Birmingham

Where the term 'agreed' is used, this reflects that either a vote was taken and passed overwhelmingly (and not counted) or that no opposition was voiced to a proposal by the chair and the proposal was declared approved.

Apologies: Pete McL, Anna B, Kerry A, Ali T, Soraya L, Rachel GW, Felicity D, Simon H, Ed P, Ann B, Pip T

Attendance: Terry C, Andrew B, Salman S, Pete G, Micheline M, Kate H, Oliver N, Tom W, Sharon McC, Guy H, Luke C, Matthew C, Liz D, Kathy L, Bianca T, Yassamine M, Jack C, Marc R (Yorks and Humber), Dave T (West Mids), James T (NW), Sarah McD (London), Len A (Wales), Siobhan D (Scotland), Liam C (London), Dave I (SE), David L (SE), Liz S (East Mids), Joseph H (London), Doug T (London), Fred LeP (London), Brigitte L (NW and Women's Caucus), Barbara S (SW), Stephen M (East Mids), Matthew J (Scotland), Andy R (SE), Richard F (LGBTQ Caucus)

Observers: Bob W, Sheelagh G, Darren McC, Anna F

Chairs: Doug T, Sharon McC; **Minutes:** Guy H

1. Minutes and matters arising from February NC

a. Accuracy

The minutes were agreed as accurate.

b. Matters arising

[4] Manifesto

Thanks were given to Tom W and others involved in the production of the manifesto and to the organisers of the manifesto launch.

[6] UK Constitution

The Secretary of the Welsh National Committee reported that Wales LU had taken a position to support referendums on new powers for the Welsh National Assembly and on independence, and to argue for independence for Wales. In addition it was reported that bilingual Welsh/English version of the LU Manifesto is in production.

There was some discussion of the continued lack of a commission on the UK Constitution. It was **agreed** that Pete G would be delegated to find a convenor.

2. Matters arising from March EC

During this agenda item there was some discussion of the prescriptive nature of motions coming to Left Unity's decision-making bodies. In many cases this has affected the decision to agree motions since it was not felt possible to guarantee an outcome, with the decision to agree in principle being preferred in such cases. There was agreement that this was not ideal and that branches ought to be encouraged to consider this when sending motions to EC/NC.

[6a] West London LU *on giving culture a prominent position alongside political activities, and to establish a cultural wing of the party*

There was some discussion, including suggestions for a call-out for volunteers in the members newsletter and on the website. The decision of the EC to agree in principle was endorsed, with Joseph H, Micheline M to be part of an organising team (to include volunteer from West London branch).

[7iii] Lambeth LU *calling on branches to be more active in local campaigns, and to report their activities to the NC*

The decision of the EC to agree in principle was endorsed, with described action to be taken in supporting branches where possible and where resources permit.

[2h] Spring Political Event

There was some discussion of the developments in planning this event, for which progress had stalled due in part to two EC meetings proposing different conceptions of how the event might look due to a lack of consensus in a variable EC membership. There was discussion of the nature of a potential event, with an agreement that a decision on its direction would be deferred to after the General Election. It was overwhelmingly **agreed** that the May EC and June NC meetings prioritise discussion on the impact of the election result and strategy going forward.

[7i,7ii,7iv,6c] EC decisions on motions from Stockport, Birmingham, Waltham Forest, Yorkshire & Humberside

The decisions of the EC were endorsed (see minutes).

3. EC Composition (passed at December NC but referred to new NC for implementation)

Resolution: One of the constitutional amendments which wasn't taken, proposed establishing a fixed membership of the EC, to ensure continuity of action and decision-making. The LU Constitution currently lists the component parts of the EC but doesn't specify how they are arrived at. Instead of the current rota system agreed at the June NC, we would like to propose that the NC elects the EC from the categories listed in the Constitution.

Supplemented by: In order to ensure the effective functioning of the party between EC meetings, any NC members involved with the running of the party office and day to day activities may meet regularly as necessary. Any NC member will be welcome to participate. Any policy decisions will be immediately referred to the EC.

There was discussion of the implementation of the resolution, including in particular a system of alternates/standins. It was **agreed** that the NC should elect the EC in total, given the proportions outlined in the constitution. It was **agreed** that deputies would be elected to stand in when Regional representatives were unable to attend. It was proposed and **agreed** that Liz D would write standing orders for the NC and EC. Volunteers were taken for membership of the EC and since the composition reflected the constitutional requirement, the list was proposed and **agreed** as the elected section of the EC.

4. General Election campaign

Tom W presented a verbal report on the progress of the General Election campaign, in which Left Unity is standing 10 candidates alongside 25 Local Election candidates, a number of which are standing as Left Unity – Trade Unionist and Socialist candidates. Andrew B presented a financial statement, in which it was reported that whilst some local crowdfunding initiatives had assisted in funding campaigns, the bulk of the funding had come from the election drive (raising around £15,000) with the remainder coming from what has remained of membership fees after usual running costs.

There was discussion around various aspects of the campaigns, including the mobilisation of less active members and supporters, and the building of a presence in locations where a LU campaign was being run. It was reported that running in elections has been beneficial in terms of building experience and it was proposed that the process be systematised with future GE campaigning to be informed by the experience of this campaign, and educational sessions to be implemented where campaigns are to be run.

There was discussion of Left Unity's national presence and methods of reaching out to our wider base of supporters through newsletter updates on our campaigning.

There was discussion of gender representation amongst LU candidates, with only 1 General Election candidate and 9 Local candidates being women. There was recognition that no steps had been taken to support women as candidates, especially in terms of the practical consideration of the amount of work required and planning supportive measures in advance. It was proposed that a focus of the GE assessment should be gender representation.

It was suggested that a number of the shortfalls that had been aired were symptomatic of the ad hoc approach that had been followed in part due to time and resource constraints. However it was recognised that elections ought to be viewed as a means to an end, and that the success of the campaign ought to be measured in engagement rather than purely on results.

5. Proportional Representation Elections

Liz D presented a paper on the upcoming GLA, Welsh National Assembly, Scottish Parliament and European elections [see Appendix A].

Len A presented a verbal report on discussions that have been taking place in Wales: that it had been agreed not to stand in the General Election due to the lack of a local political base and that it had come during a period of heavy activity around the launch of an anti-austerity referendum petition, but that the intention was to stand for the upcoming National Assembly elections.

Matthew J presented a verbal report on Scotland, including that Glasgow South had been approached by the RMT branch with regard to the election.

There was discussion of the paper, with points being made around the lack of London-specific policies and the importance of targeting specific elections and combining this with crowdfunding so as not to spread resources too thinly. It was also suggested that we look outwards to other left organisations, both national and international, to draw in a wide base of support. It was proposed that the London Region organise an Aggregate meeting to address the lack of London-specific policy and maximise member involvement in the preparations.

The proposals detailed in the paper, including standing in the upcoming GLA elections, were overwhelmingly **agreed** in principle, subject to the London Regional Committee's agreement that this is viable. It was **agreed** that if the London Regional Committee considers the proposals unviable, the paper would go back to the National Council for discussion of a way forward.

6. Internal Elections

Terry C presented a report on the recent Internal Elections. The report noted the following themes:

- Whilst there was an increased number of candidates compared to the previous internal election, a significant number of empty seats remained, in particular on the standing committees (Disputes Committee, Appeals Committee and Standing Orders Committee).
- The question of women's representation in terms of the small number of female candidates coming forward, and what action should be taken to remedy this.
- The low visibility of the Appeals and Disputes Committees in the organisation, resulting in a relative lack of recognition of the work they carry out.

There was some discussion of the proposed recommendations, including around the timetable for internal elections, which clashed with national elections, and which only allowed for 10 days of voting. The proposed timetable was withdrawn for future consideration. The issue was raised of the potential of the organisation to appear dysfunctional with regular re-runs due to a lack of candidates. A vote was taken on whether to reduce the proposed maximum regularity of elections from quarterly to twice a year, which was **defeated** with 15 for, 16 against and 3 abstentions.

Accordingly the recommendations as amended were endorsed overwhelmingly:

- a) *The actions of nominating officer Chris H in disqualifying ineligible candidates from the last election*
- b) *The actions of nominating officer Terry C in consultation with the officers' team in starting by elections for the vacant positions*
- c) *The team for an annual election should consist of at least four people so that both administrative and technical work can be double checked so as to minimize the chance of mistakes*
- d) *The process of elections will include checking candidate's membership status prior to ballot papers being issued.*
- e) *Candidates will be asked to submit their details, those of their nominators and their election statement on an on line form. The form will make it clear that if people are standing for more than one position they need to state in which order they would accept them if they were successful in more than one. (This will limit the amount of work the team needs to undertake and perhaps even more important will reduce mistakes).*
- f) *Branches and the women's caucus are asked to discuss the question of women's representation within our structures and what can be done nationally to ensure that we make our commitment to being a feminist party as well as our constitutional commitment to our structures being at least 50% women a living one. Feedback should be taken to the next Executive Committee.*
- g) *The national council agrees that by elections will normally take place on not more than a quarterly basis except where there is a vacancy for a national officer or where any of the committees of the party are unable to function.*

7. Conference timetable

There was a discussion around the necessity for modifications to be made to the LU Constitution, whilst recognising the need to turn our focus outwards. It was overwhelmingly **agreed** that the next Annual Conference would be a 2-day conference on 24-25 October, one day of which would be dedicated to the constitution.

There was a proposal for a conference to discuss the implications of the General Election result. It was suggested that this would not be adequately geographically representative and that these discussions would be already be taking place in branches. It was **agreed** that the June NC meeting would be expanded with the addition of a day dedicated to this discussion, open to members and others specifically invited.

8. Membership issues

Individual member issues were reported on that had been raised to the NC in the absence of a Disputes Committee. These were referred to the incoming DC (membership of which to be decided in a re-run internal election).

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

Appendix

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS

There are four elections in Britain involving some element of proportional representation. PR is not only a fairer system than first-past-the post (FPTP) but also one in which smaller parties can show their real support. Those elections are:

- 1 Mayor of London/ Greater London Assembly 5 May 2016;
- 2 National Assembly for Wales 5 May 2016;
- 3 Scottish Parliament elections 5 May 2016
- 4 European elections 2019.

The European elections are too far away to plan for now. This paper concentrates on London because that is where my particular experience and expertise is, but we should ask comrades in Wales and Scotland to begin discussing these elections as soon as possible after the general election (if they have not already done so).

Elections for the GLA, Wales and Scotland are all on the same additional member principle: constituency representatives elected under FPTP and then a top-up list. The key opportunity for small parties is to obtain 5% or more on the list vote. 5% guarantees one seat.

London

Recommendations:

- 1 that Left Unity resolves to campaign actively in the London elections, with a view to achieving at least one seat;
- 2 that the London committee with the national nominating officer commences a discussion on the issues raised in this paper (and any others) in May, reporting to the National Council for decisions to be made in July 2015;
- 3 that the London Committee consults with branches urgently on whether to stand candidates in the Mayoral Election or only in the GLA election and makes a recommendation to National Council in July 2015;
- 4 that the London Committee devises a process for selection of candidates and a timetable, with the aim to select candidates by end of September 2015;
- 5 the London Committee considers the possibilities of discussions with TUSC, NHAP and any other potential left campaigns and reports to the July NC.

Electoral contest in London

Obviously the contest that the press pays attention to is that for Mayor. There have been four elections for Mayor won, respectively, by Ken Livingstone (Independent, then Labour) and Boris Johnson (Tory). Neither will be standing in 2016. Labour Party is selecting its candidate: names in the ring are Tessa Jowell, David Lammy, Diane Abbott and Christian Wolmer. The Labour Party selection process will run from 18 May to 31 July 2015, with the candidate declared on 31 July. The Greens will undoubtedly run a candidate. Galloway has not ruled out standing for Mayor. Russell Brand apparently has ruled out standing.

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

The interesting contest for small parties is for the Greater London Assembly (GLA), and specifically the list seats on the GLA. There are 25 seats on the GLA in total. 14 are constituency seats elected under FPTT. This means the constituencies are extremely large entities, which don't have any common political identity. A list of the constituencies is at Appendix Two.

11 GLA members are elected on a regional list system across the whole of London, using the additional member method. The list can contain up to 25 candidates, so high-profile names who would not want to be elected can appear. Electors have 2 votes: one for a candidate for the constituency and one for a party for the list. Appendix One has the results for the list seats in 2012. The bottom line is that the threshold is 5% to obtain a seat under the list. However, in four elections since 2000, only six parties have ever won seats on the List (Lab, Con, LD, Green, UKIP in 2004 only, BNP in 2008 only) and no party has ever won a list seat without standing a Mayoral candidate at the same time.

Note that in 2012, if UKIP & BNP had not stood separately, a UKIP candidate would probably have obtained 5% (or slightly more). Note also that the only left party was TUSC with a dismal 0.8%.

The Mayor is elected by a modified FPTP system – the supplementary vote (SV), where there is a run-off between the top two candidates, adding the electors' second choice to the first choice votes. This makes it possible both to run a candidate (for the profile and publicity it gives the party) and to indicate a second choice for the run-off (most likely to be between Tory and Labour). In other words, voting for a left candidate as first preference doesn't prevent tactical voting against the Tory in the second ballot. Appendix 2 shows the result in 2012. Currently, with no-one of the stature of Livingstone in the frame, the only conceivable real victor is the Labour or Tory candidate. Labour will be working very hard in 2016 to win back the Mayoralty, given that Johnson is standing down. But, given uncertainty of the general election outcome, it is more difficult to know what the national picture will look like in 2016.

The Additional Member method for GLA list members

First of all, the FPTP constituency votes are counted, so that the number of constituency seats per party is known.

Then the list votes are counted. A formula is applied to each party's votes:

$$quot = \frac{V}{s + 1}$$

. V is the total number of votes the party received on the list vote. S is the number of seats already allocated to that party. The numerical calculation is unbelievably complicated, in that a party that has done well on the constituency seats then does not get many seats on the list; the skew is towards small parties. However the bottom line is that 5% on the list vote guarantees a GLA seat.

History of left votes in London

2000: After being refused the Labour nomination, Ken Livingstone ran as independent for Mayor and received 39.6% of votes. There were several left parties or candidates running on the list vote. The figures are actual votes, and share of vote. Sadly, their combined vote of 5.2% exceeded the 5% threshold, although of course there is a danger in extrapolating that all of those votes would have gone to one united left list.

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

London Socialist Alliance 27,073	1.6%
Independent Peter Tatchell 22,862	1.4%
Campaign Against Tube Privatisation 17,401	1.0%
Socialist Labour Party 13,690	0.8%
Communist (CPB) 7,489	0.4%

The left did not stand in the Mayoral election against Livingstone. The LSA did stand in a number of constituency seats and achieved 2.9% of the vote. Interesting that the share of the constituency vote was higher than the share of the list vote, probably reflecting local dynamic campaigns where there was an active LSA branch (which did not entirely translate into a list vote). The Greens got 3 seats on the list system, with 11.1% share of the vote.

2004: Lindsey German stood for Mayor as Respect and came fifth with 3.3% of the vote. UKIP achieved 6.2%. Respect got 4.6% in the constituency vote (15% in City & East). Respect was the only left party standing and got 4.7% in the list vote. This was the high-point of the left vote. Greens got 8.4% and got 2 list seats while UKIP got 8.2% and also got two seats (both UKIP elected members subsequently defected).

2008: Mayoral election: Greens came fourth with 3.2% of the vote. Lindsey German for Left List came eighth with 0.7%. In the constituency vote, Greens got 8.1% and Respect 1.1%. Socialist Party(GB) and Socialist Alternative (the other Socialist Party, ex-Militant) each got 0.1%. Greens had 8.3% in the list vote and got 2 seats. Respect had 2.4%. Left List got 0.9%. The BNP won 5.3% in the list section and won 1 seat (BNP stood in the Mayoral but in only one seat out of 14 in the Constituencies, indicating that you don't necessarily need to stand in many seats in the Constituency section, it's the Mayoral candidacy that seems to matter).

2012: Mayoral election Green (Jenny Jones) 4.5%. No left candidate. In the list vote, Greens came third with 8.5% (probably because Liberal vote collapsed). TUSC stood in list vote, but not for constituencies, and got 0.8%. Alex Gordon from the RMT headed its list, other candidates were Nick Wrack, John Hendy,

The electorate

To be able to vote in the London elections you must:

- live in the Greater London area (ie the 32 London Boroughs+City of London);
- be a British, Republic of Ireland, Commonwealth or EU citizen;
- be 18 years old or over on 5 May 2016. If you are 16 or 17 you can still register to vote, but you will not be able to vote until you are 18.

The electorate consists of registered electors in the 32 London Boroughs plus the City of London. Citizens of all 28 European Union states have the right to vote in the election, so do citizens of Commonwealth countries (in London, those people are likely to be mostly citizens of India, Pakistan or Sri Lanka).

EU citizen numbers are very high in London – according to the BBC, London is the sixth largest city in the world for French citizens with up to 400,000, many concentrated in the East End. EU migrants

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

are younger than the UK resident population. Many of them are unlikely to be aware that they have the right to vote and so may not be registered (registration has changed to individual rather than household registration). They are often concentrated in certain geographic areas which can be identified through the Datashine website: <http://datashine.org.uk>. Datashine's information comes from the 2011 census and drills down to census/street level. So wards and smaller areas which contain high numbers of EU citizens can be identified. Ditto Commonwealth citizens. Social class, students, average income, disability etc can also be identified.

This offers us the opportunity to reach out, possibly through our links with the European Left Party and individual left parties, to EU and Commonwealth citizens living or working in London. Obvious partners are Syriza, Die Linke, AKEL Cyprus, Parti de Gauche, Podemos, etc who could work with us to promote voter registration and campaign for votes amongst EU citizens. We could even stand representatives of some of those parties on our 25-strong list for the GLA.

Voter registration should be a key priority for us. We should target students from September/October 2015 and sign them up to vote (they can be registered both at their (parental) home and their college and can even vote in both local elections, at 'home' and in the London elections). We should also run voter registration campaigns – knocking on doors with forms – in wards with high concentrations of: young people, EU migrants, black and ethnic minorities, who traditionally have lower rates of registration and are more likely to vote for us. Voter registration leaflets can contain key political messages: tuition fees, housing, anti-austerity, internationalism, green issues, making the point that if you care about any of these issues, you should be registered to vote for the London elections.

Formal requirements

330 London voters – 10 per constituency plus ten in the City of London – must nominate the Mayoral candidate (the City of London obligation could be problematic as there are only a few thousand electors). There is a whopping deposit of £10,000, returnable if 5% is achieved. The deposit for constituency elections is £1,000 per constituency, also returnable if 5% is achieved (with 14 constituencies in all this is the most expensive election to stand across the board in, apparently for the smallest return – see BNP result in 2008). The deposit for the list is £5,000, returnable if the party achieves 2.5% of the vote. 25 names can be put on each list.

There are spending limits: Mayoral candidates: £420,000; Constituency London Assembly candidates: £35,000; London-wide Assembly candidates: £330,000 (for an individual independent candidate or political party list).

There is an information booklet sent to each London voter, containing two pages per Mayoral candidate (with colours, lay-out etc decided by the candidate) and then lists of constituency candidates and the names on party lists.

Standing for Mayor is expensive, and time-consuming for the candidate. However, it provides exposure for the lead candidate on the list if s/he is the same person as the Mayoral candidate. Obviously big names can have more impact, particularly for small parties.

Useful information is at: <http://www.londonelects.org.uk/>.

Candidates

Candidates must be:

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

- 1 aged 18 or more on the day of the nomination; and
- 2 a British citizen, an eligible Commonwealth citizen (indefinite leave to remain or leave to remain without conditions) or an EU citizen; and
- 3 either:
 - a. registered to vote in the Greater London area; or
 - b. occupies land in the Greater London area as owner or tenant on the day of the nomination and date of the election, and for the previous 12 months; or
 - c. have his or her only or main place of work in Greater London on the day of the nomination and date of the election, and for the previous 12 months; or
 - d. lived in Greater London on the day of the nomination and date of the election, and for the previous 12 months; and
- 4 not be disqualified (member of staff of GLA, politically restricted central or local government position, bankrupt, sentenced to up to three months' imprisonment in previous 5 years, disqualified for corrupt election practices).

Up to 40 candidates could stand: 1 for Mayor, 14 for constituency seats, 25 on list. This allows for well-known names to be run, along perhaps with representatives of other European left parties (Syriza? Podemos?). Other factors to put into the mix are: diversity (gender, race, disability, sexuality, age etc), trade union activists, students, radical campaigners (eg housing, immigration campaigns).

There is also obviously potential for approaches to other left parties. The Greens will presumably stand a full house, entirely on their own (although the Green Party has recently changed its constitution to allow for joint slates).

The top name on the list should be someone who is prepared to do the job of GLA member as s/he is only likely to be elected. Anything else (such as the top member being elected and then standing down) would be seen as a cynical manoeuvre. Note, however, that if a GLA list member does stand down, the next candidate is simply appointed. There is no by-election.

Selection

Our constitution provides the following:

Clause 16:

“ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONDUCT OF MEMBERS ELECTED TO PUBLIC OFFICE

- a) *All Left Unity members elected or serving in any form of public body (e.g, local councillor, Member of Parliament, Member of the European Parliament) will adhere to the nationally agreed policies, priorities and principles of LU. Failure to abide by these principles and rules, or to engage in any behaviour which brings the Party into disrepute, may incur suspension pending the deliberations of the Party disciplinary procedure.*
- b) *No member may stand as an official 'LU Candidate' without undergoing a democratic selection process at local, regional or national levels, as determined from time to time by the National Conference and supervised by the national Nominating Officer*
- c) *Candidates for LU will agree to abide by the following Code of Conduct:*
 - i. *In cases where an elected position require the post is carried out on a full time basis, Left Unity members will only draw a maximum of the median national wage (plus legitimate expenses, including London Weighting) – donating 20% of the surplus to Left Unity and 80% returned to public funds.*
 - ii. *Where an elected position is a full time job Left Unity members will take on no other paid employment.*

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

iii. No Left Unity member will be allowed to continue in any single externally elected position for limited terms as follows:

- *MPs and MEPs – 2 terms/maximum of 10 years*
- *Local councillor, MWA, MSP – 3 terms/maximum 12 years*

iv. After a gap of 1 term of office members may again seek nomination to stand as a candidate.

.v All Left Unity members serving in elected positions must provide regular report backs at the agreed appropriate, local, regional, or national level, to Left Unity.

vi. No elected Left Unity member may take any payment from NGOs, lobbyists or the private sector either in cash or in the form of gifts.”

It can be seen that there is no provision for a selection process. I presume that, until now, branches have simply selected their candidates for local or general elections.

The London Committee will have to devise a selection process for London members. I propose that it embraces the following principles:

- 1 voting in person by post and by internet so as to maximise turn-out;
- 2 a hustings meeting so that members can see potential candidates and ask them questions;
- 3 a nomination process by London branches;
- 4 some consideration of how to ensure that there is a diversity of candidates.

Targetting

Some careful analysis needs to be done of the breakdown of votes in 2012 (and indeed after the general election in May). The aim for LU should be to maximise voter turn-out in areas that traditionally vote Labour/anti-Tory ie inner London, black and ethnic minority areas, areas with a high proportion of young voters. A noticeable public profile in those areas is worth much more than campaigning in Tory areas. Since the list vote is counted across the whole of London, then high turn-out in certain areas affects the result. In 2008 and 2012, Johnson concentrated on the outer London boroughs and Livingstone on the inner London boroughs. Data from the 2012 elections are available at ward level in an Excel spreadsheet. <http://www.londonelects.org.uk/download/file/fid/517>. The ward profiles from this data can also be combined with General Election data and census data from Datashine to enable strong targeting.

Conclusion

The history of London elections has been pretty dismal for the left. Leaving aside Livingstone, the most high-profile left candidate was Lindsey German in 2004, when she was relatively well-known as Convenor of Stop the War, and had an organisation behind her (Respect) which had not yet split or become tainted. Respect will have been disappointed that she failed to be elected to the GLA.

Left Unity has to stand in London if it is serious about elections. It also represents the best chance (5% of the list vote) to obtain an elected representative with a profile higher than local council level. Standing in the list vote involves challenging the Greens, but in a friendly way under PR, and a challenge to the Greens at some point is inevitable. Better under PR than under FPTP.

Winning the Mayoral vote is not possible for a small party (excluding a Syriza moment). The same applies to the FPTP vote in constituencies. However, having a Mayoral candidate provides publicity for the list vote.

Politically, Labour will be trying to regain the Mayoral position since Johnson is standing down. We will be one year into a new government (of who knows what political complexion).

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

Clearly the political objective is to obtain 5% on the list vote. The question is whether standing more broadly – Mayor, constituency – assists that possibility, or becomes a waste of resources. That is a difficult balancing act between the prohibitive cost; and the opportunity for publicity provided by the booklet, hustings etc. In addition, standing only for the list makes us look as though our ambitions are limited.

Left Unity should get its act together on London quickly, soon after the general election in May. We need to be campaigning and have a very public presence on London streets, tube and rail stations etc, so that we start to establish name-recognition and familiarity. There are rules about not campaigning before the official start of the campaign. However, the point is to make Left Unity a familiar phrase to Londoners. The London Committee should be asked to put this on their agenda in May.

Appeal: our job as a new small party is not so much to persuade voters about our policies, as to reach out to those dissatisfied with the existing parties (and perhaps with electoral policies) and want a progressive anti-austerity alternative to vote for, but may never have heard of Left Unity. Such people might describe themselves as socialists, feminists, environmentalists, internationalists, global justice campaigners or some combination of those labels. An election campaign needs to be as high-profile and as public as possible: street stalls, cavalcades, lots and lots of leafleting. Persuading voters on the doorstep is time-consuming and the success rate is very low indeed. However leaflets – in the street or through the door - will be picked up by people who are likely respond to our policies. The key is high-profile public presence.











Liz Davies with assistance from Terry Conway and Mike Picken

April 2015

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

Appendix One

List votes London 2012

Party	Votes ^[8]	Share ^[8]	Change ^{[8][9]}	Seats	Loss/Gain
 Labour	911,204	41.1%	+13.5%	4	+2
 Conservative	708,528	32.0%	-2.6%	3	—
 Green	189,215	8.5%	+0.1%	2	—
 Liberal Democrat	150,447	6.8%	-4.6%	2	-1
 UKIP	100,040	4.5%	+2.6%	0	—
 BNP	47,024	2.1%	-3.3%	0	-1
 Christian Peoples	38,758	1.8%	-1.1%	0	—
 English Democrats	22,025	1.0%	-0.1%	0	—
 TUSC	17,686	0.8%	N/A	0	N/A
Ijaz Hayat	9,114	0.4%	N/A	0	N/A
The House Party	8,126	0.4%	N/A	0	N/A
 National Front	8,006	0.4%	N/A	0	N/A
Rathy Alagaratnam	4,835	0.2%	—	0	—

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections






APPENDIX TWO

GLA constituencies elected under FTPT and current GLA representatives, elected in 2012

- [Barnet and Camden - Brian Coleman](#) (Conservative)
- [Bexley and Bromley - James Cleverly](#) (Conservative)
- [Brent and Harrow - Navin Shah](#) (Labour)
- [City and East London - John Biggs](#) (Labour)
(Barking and Dagenham, City of London, Newham, Tower Hamlets)
- [Croydon and Sutton - Steve O'Connell](#) (Conservative)
- [Ealing and Hillingdon - Richard Barnes](#) (Conservative)
- [Enfield and Haringey - Joanne McCartney](#) (Labour)
- [Greenwich and Lewisham - Len Duvall](#) (Labour)
- [Havering and Redbridge - Roger Evans](#) (Conservative)
- [Lambeth and Southwark - Valerie Shawcross](#) (Labour)
- [Merton and Wandsworth - Richard Tracey](#) (Conservative)
- [North East - Jennette Arnold](#) (Labour)
(Hackney, Islington, Waltham Forest)
- [South West - Tony Arbour](#) (Conservative)
(Hounslow, Kingston-upon-Thames, Richmond-upon-Thames)
- [West Central - Kit Malthouse](#) (Conservative)
(Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, Westminster)

Appendix A - Proportional Representation Elections

APPENDIX THREE

Mayor of London election 3 May 2012 ^[68]						
Party	Candidate	1st Round	%	2nd Round	Total	First Round Votes Transfer
Conservative	Boris Johnson	971,931	44.0%	82,880	1,054,811	
Labour	Ken Livingstone	889,918	40.3%	102,355	992,273	
Green	Jenny Jones	98,913	4.5%			
Liberal Democrat	Brian Paddick	91,774	4.2%			
Independent	Siobhan Benita	83,914	3.8%			
UKIP	Lawrence Webb	43,274	2.0%			
BNP	Carlos Cortiglia	28,751	1.3%			