FIRST PAST THE POST – FOR AND AGAINST

FOR	ISSUE	AGAINST
FPTP structures electoral choice by offering voters a clear and simple choice between potential parties of governments	Electoral choice	FPTP offers voters an artificially narrow choice of parties/candidates, in that votes for them appear to be 'wasted' – small parties are not 'electable'
Extremism is kept at bay because it is more difficult for small, radical parties to gain representation and thus respectability	Party representation	The over-representation of large parties and parties with geographically concentrated support, at the expense of small parties and parties with evenly spread support, is systematically unfair and unjustifiable
MPs have a strong constituency role because they have a clear responsibility to take up constituents interests and grievances – one MP serves one constituency	Constituency representation	In 'safe' seats there is no guarantee that MPs will be good constituency representatives, and they may be unsympathetic to particular causes or concerns
The winning party can claim a popular mandate to carry out its policies because the largest body of voters have endorsed its manifesto commitments	Mandates	The winning party cannot claim a popular mandate as it (usually) wins less than 50% of the vote - more voters vote against it than for it
Single-party majority governments are strong and effective because they can (usually) ensure that their legislative programmes are enacted – governments can govern	Strong government	Government (the executive) is over-strong in that it is able to dominate the House of Commons and so render Parliament ineffective ('elective dictatorship')
Single-party governments are stable and cohesive, rarely collapsing as a result of disunity and friction (coalition governments are inherently fractured and unstable)	Stable government	The transfer of power from one single-party government to another may result in destabilising shifts in government policy, damaging, in particular, economic prospects