

First Past The Post Politics: It's not cricket!

In the cricket game between Little Bamford and Nether Ashton, Little Bamford score 155 runs against Nether Ashton's 145.

	Little Bamford		Nether Ashton	
#1	Potts	59	Whitton	61
#2	Evans	47	Simpson	53
#3	Jackson	49	Bannister	31
Total	155		145	

Little Bamford are declared the winners. All fair and square, right?

If politics was like cricket, then **the party with most votes would win** and that would be fair, wouldn't it?

Well politics in the UK is not like cricket. We have a system called "First Past The Post" which sounds like a horse race, where there's only one runner from each party. But politics is not a horse race and it's not cricket.

In politics we have lots of "Head To Head" battles in 650 constituencies.

If we scored the above cricket match as a series of head to head battles, like voting in political constituencies, then **Nether Ashton** become the winners. They won 2 "Head to Head" contests whereas Little Bamford won only one.

	Little Bamford		Nether Ashton		LB	NA
#1	Potts	59	Whitton	61		1
#2	Evans	47	Simpson	53		1
#3	Jackson	49	Bannister	31	1	
Total	155		145		1	2

Is that a fairer way to decide the game?

Should cricket be more like politics, or should politics be more like cricket?

Let's stick to **most runs wins** in cricket and let's switch to **most votes wins** in politics.

Let's stop pretending politics is a horse race and let's be fair about who the winner should be – just like cricket.