



A CRITICAL STUDY OF FIRST PAST THE POST (FPTP) SYSTEM

By Kartikya Chaudhary

From Law College Dehradun, Uttarakhand University

By Vatsal Chaudhary

Assistant Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttarakhand University

ABSTRACT:

The First Past the Post (FPTP) electoral system, also known as the simple majority system, is a widely used method of electing representatives in many democracies, including India. This study offers a thorough examination of the FPTP system, looking at its historical roots, fundamental tenets, and real-world application in India. The system is praised for its simplicity, speed, and propensity to create stable governments, but it is also criticized for its lack of proportionality, marginalization of minority voices, and large number of "wasted" votes. The study examines the systemic tradeoffs involved by comparing it to other electoral systems, like proportional representation and mixed-member proportional models. In addition, it looks at potential reforms to make the electoral system more inclusive and representative from a judicial and constitutional standpoint. The research ends by emphasizing how crucial it is to constantly analyze elections in a diverse nation like India in order to maintain a genuinely democratic and fair system.

KEY WORDS: First Past The Post (FPTP), Electoral Reforms, Indian Democracy, Plurality Voting, Representation, Proportional Representation, Parliament.

1. INTRODUCTION:

The way that representatives are elected has a significant influence on the character and caliber of governance since elections are the foundation of every democratic system. One of the most widely used electoral systems in democratic nations worldwide is the First Past the Post (FPTP) method, sometimes referred to as the simple plurality system. With this approach, a nation is split into numerous electoral districts, and voters in each district vote for a single candidate. The winner is the candidate who receives the most votes, regardless of whether or not they get a majority (over 50%). Particularly in large and diverse countries, this "winnertakesall" strategy is simple, easy to understand, and administratively practical.

Many nations, including the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and India, have adopted the FPTP system, mostly due to its simplicity and historical legacy. The Constituent Assembly's decision to implement this system in India was motivated by the necessity to create a functioning democratic framework that could handle the enormous geographic, linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic variety. India had widespread illiteracy, a poor administrative infrastructure, and a pressing need to conduct elections quickly in order to establish a stable and legitimate government at the time of independence. Given the circumstances, the FPTP method was thought to be the most realistic option¹.

Although the system has made a significant contribution to political stability and the establishment of decisive governments in India, it has also brought up concerns about fairness, inclusion, and representation. One of the most significant criticisms of FPTP is that its seat allocation does not accurately represent the total popular vote. A party can win a large majority of seats with just a minority of the overall vote share, which distorts democratic representation. Furthermore, because their support may be dispersed rather than focused enough to win

¹ Granville Austin, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (Oxford University Press, 1999) p. 260.



constituencies, the system frequently marginalizes smaller political parties, regional voices, and minority communities².

2. MEANING AND FEATURES OF THE FPTP:

2.1 MEANING:

In the plurality voting system known as the First Past the Post (FPTP) electoral system, the candidate with the most votes in a constituency is declared the victor, regardless of whether they obtain a majority of the votes. Because just one candidate is chosen for each constituency, this system is also known as the "winnertakesall" model, as all other votes, including those for the second highest candidate, are essentially ignored for the purpose of seat allocation.

With the FPTP system, a nation is split into single-member districts, and each voter may only vote for one candidate. The candidate who wins the most votes in that district represents the people³. A simple plurality is enough for the system to award the winning candidate; a majority of the votes is not necessary. In comparison to systems that demand a proportional representation or an absolute majority, which are determined by the total vote share across regions or party lists. Because of its operational simplicity, administrative efficiency, and quick result declaration, the FPTP system is well-suited to big democracies such as India. The United States, the United Kingdom, India, and Canada are just a few of the nations that adhere to the Westminster model of parliamentary democracy, where its use is most prevalent.

2.2: KEY FEATURES:

i. Single Member Constituencies:

The legislature is composed of one representative from each constituency, which fosters a direct line of communication between citizens and their elected official.

ii. The Majority Vote, Not the Plurality:

Only a majority of the votes is required for a candidate to win; they only need to have more votes than the other candidates. If the remaining votes are split among many candidates, this means a person might win with only 25–30% of the total votes.

iii. A straightforward balloting process

The candidate who receives the most votes from voters on the ballot paper wins. Particularly in nations with significant illiterate populations, this simplicity is helpful.

iv. Focus on Local Representation:

Since each elected official represents a distinct geographical region, the system increases their accountability to their constituents.

v. The possibility of disproportionate results:

The number of seats a party wins could not reflect its proportion of the electorate. If opposition votes are split, a party with 40% of the vote might win a significantly greater proportion of seats⁴.

3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

The First Past the Post (FPTP) method originated in medieval England, when a primitive form of plurality voting was used to elect members to the British Parliament. This method of electing members to the House of Commons was institutionalized as the norm over the centuries, especially following the Reform Acts of the 19th century, when it took its current shape. The British Empire extended this system to its

² Election Commission of India, Statistical Report on General Elections 2019 to the 17th Lok Sabha, Vol. I (2020).

³ Electoral Reform Society www.electoral-reform.org.uk

⁴ Granville Austin, The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation (Oxford University Press, 1999) p. 278.



colonies, such as India, Canada, Australia, and sections of Africa and the Caribbean.

The choice to implement the FPTP system in India was made during the discussions of the Constituent Assembly (1946–1950). This system was chosen by the Assembly after careful consideration to guarantee simplicity, efficiency, and timely election results in a newly independent country facing issues like illiteracy, poverty, regional diversity, and administrative underdevelopment. The founders thought that it would be challenging to introduce a more sophisticated electoral system, such as proportional representation, throughout a subcontinent that had more than 300 million people at the time.

In his speech to the Assembly, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar stressed that the aim was to guarantee representation from every region of the nation without fostering extreme fragmentation or political instability. The focus was on simplicity and straightforward depiction. The FPTP system was officially established as the foundation for elections to the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, which put the Constitution's electoral provisions into effect⁵. The candidate who received the most valid votes in each district would be deemed the winner, with each district electing one representative. Even though the FPTP system has remained mostly unchanged since its start, it has been periodically reviewed by various Law Commission reports, Election Commission consultations, and academic scholars who have questioned its capacity to produce representative outcomes in a pluralistic society like India. For instance, the 170th Report of the Law Commission of India (1999)⁶ recognized the advantages of FPTP but also suggested considering mixed electoral models to better represent voter diversity.

In conclusion, the practical implementation of FPTP in India throughout history was driven by pragmatism, administrative viability, and a wish for political stability. The historical rationale needs to be reconsidered in light of evolving political dynamics, increased voter understanding, and demands for more equitable representation, even if it helped establish the basis of electoral democracy in India.

4. FPTP in India:

The plurality theory of electoral representation, which asserts that a government's legitimacy is derived from its capacity to win the most votes in each constituency, regardless of whether this represents an outright majority, underpins the First Past the Post (FPTP) system. Many theoretical tenets support this system, which has influenced how it has been accepted and defended in contemporary representative democracies.

- **Plurality Rule versus Majoritarian Principle**

The plurality principle, where a relative majority (just having more votes than others) is sufficient for electoral triumph, is the foundation of the FPTP system, not the majoritarian ideal (i. e. , winning more than 50% of the vote). This model, theoretically speaking, encourages effectiveness and decisiveness in governance, enabling a clear winner to emerge even in a divided multiparty system⁷.

According to political philosopher Giovanni Sartori, plurality systems tend to foster centripetal competition, in which parties move toward the center in order to win the most votes in a zero-sum contest. In contrast, in highly pluralistic nations like India, fragmentation along identity lines like caste, religion, or language may result, with regional parties gaining support in certain regions.

⁵ Representation of the People Act, 1951, Section 53.

⁶ Law Commission of India, 170th Report on Electoral Reforms (1999), Chapter II.

⁷ Giovanni Sartori, Comparative Constitutional Engineering (Macmillan, 1994), pp. 30–35.



• Representation and Responsibility

The "trustee model" of representation, as outlined by Edmund Burke, where elected officials are accountable to a particular geographic electorate, is closely related to FPTP. Local governance and development are encouraged by the single-member district system, which also improves direct accountability.

The liberal democratic theory, which highlights individual political equality (one person, one vote) and a direct electoral connection between the voter and their representative, also resonates with this system. It emphasizes geographical representation over ideological or proportional representation, which supports the notion of local government and constituency service.

• Duverger's Law

The French political scientist Maurice Duverger created Duverger's Law, one of the most significant theoretical frameworks pertaining to FPTP. It asserts that proportional systems favor a multiparty system, whereas plurality-based electoral systems tend to result in a two-party system. Given India's regional, ethnic, and linguistic diversity, however, this legislation is not fully applicable since the FPTP system has encouraged multiparty competition there⁸. In addition, Duverger makes a distinction between the psychological and mechanical impacts of FPTP. In terms of mechanics, it disproportionately favors larger parties while underrepresenting smaller ones. The "wasted vote syndrome" is a psychological tendency for voters to vote strategically, frequently avoiding smaller parties that are seen to have a low chance of winning.

• Representativeness vs. Stability

From a systems theory perspective, FPTP is believed to encourage political stability and make it easier for majority governments to be formed without relying on

coalitions. Nevertheless, this is at the expense of representational fairness, particularly in heterogeneous communities where minority voices may be excluded from decision-making. The FPTP system is criticized primarily for this compromise between inclusivity and governability.

Academics such as Arend Lijphart have made theoretical arguments that consensual democracies, which use proportional systems, tend to be more inclusive, socially harmonious, and representative, especially in fractured societies. Lijphart claims that systems that incorporate powersharing, proportionality, and minority inclusion may be more beneficial for nations like India⁹.

5. ADVANTAGE OF FPTP:

The First Past the Post (FPTP) electoral system offers a number of theoretical and practical benefits, notably in big and varied democracies like India¹⁰. It is favored in many parliamentary democracies because of its simplicity, speed, and decisiveness.

i. Simple to implement and easy to use

One of the easiest electoral systems in the world is FPTP. The candidate who receives the most votes wins when voters select one candidate on the ballot. In nations like India, where electoral literacy differs by area, this simplicity is very advantageous. Additionally, it simplifies the administrative procedures for election officials.

ii. Rapid and unambiguous outcomes

Since FPTP's vote-counting mechanism is straightforward, the results may be announced more quickly. By lowering the possibility of disputes and facilitating the rapid establishment of governments, this promotes political stability.

iii. Solid and Stable Governments

⁸ Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State* (Methuen, 1954).

⁹ Arend Lijphart, *Patterns of Democracy* (Yale University Press, 1999), Chapter 2.

¹⁰ ACE Electoral Knowledge Network <https://aceproject.org>



By often producing single-party majority administrations, FPTP avoids the unpredictability and indecision frequently associated with coalition governments. For example, India's Lok Sabha elections, which are conducted under FPTP, have often resulted in obvious majorities, as seen in 1984, 2014, and 2019.

iv. A Direct Connection Between a Citizen and their Representative

Each constituency has a single representative who is immediately accountable to the public. This fosters constituency service, promotes responsiveness, and enhances democratic accountability at the grassroots level¹¹.

v. Excludes Radical and Fringe Elements

Radical or extremist parties that lack widespread support are frequently excluded by FPTP because they have a hard time winning the most votes in any single constituency. This safeguards the democratic structure against being taken over by divisive ideologies.

vi. Efficient and Cost-Effective

FPTP is less expensive than systems like two-round elections or proportional representation. Its simplicity, which makes it perfect for a vast electorate like India's, eliminates the need for complicated vote counting or runoff rounds.

vii. Encourages TwoParty or Competitive Systems

According to Duverger's Law, FPTP typically promotes the rise of two powerful national parties, which results in clearer political choices and more conclusive elections for voters. In recent decades, the FPTP system, despite India's multiparty system, has resulted in the emergence of major national parties.

viii. Continuous Historical and Legal Tradition

Since India's first general elections in 1951–1952, the FPTP system has been in use and has become firmly

established in the nation's electoral system. The legal framework, judicial interpretation, and institutional mechanisms are all well-suited to it.

6. CRITICISM AND CHALLENGES:

Although it has been used for a long time in many democracies, including India, the First Past the Post (FPTP) system has come under increasing fire for its inherent structural flaws and democratic shortcomings. Despite its simplicity and decisiveness, it also poses serious questions about fairness, representation, and inclusion, especially in diverse nations like India¹².

i. An imbalance between votes and seats

FPTP's distortion of election results is one of its most often mentioned flaws. The system frequently generates outcomes in which a party's seat count is disproportionate to the percentage of votes it receives. For example, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) won 55. 8% of the seats in the Lok Sabha in the 2019 General Elections, despite receiving 37. 4% of the national vote. On the other hand, the Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) and other parties garnered more than 3. 6% of the national vote yet did not win any seats.

This disparity weakens the democratic concept of equal representation, which states that every vote should have equal weight.

ii. Promotion of tactical voting and wasted ballots

Voters may select a candidate in FPTP not because they back them, but to prevent another from winning, which encourages strategic or tactical voting. As voters worry about "wasting" their vote, this frequently deters smaller or newer political parties. Millions of votes cast for candidates who lost have no bearing on the legislature's ultimate makeup. These are known as "wasted votes," which weaken the representative legitimacy of the democratic system¹³.

¹¹ Arend Lijphart, *Patterns of Democracy* (Yale University Press, 1999), p. 150.

¹² Vajiram & Ravi <https://vajiramandravi.com>

¹³ Yogendra Yadav and Suhas Palshikar, "From Hegemony to Convergence: Party System and Electoral Politics in the Indian States, 1952–2002,"



iii. Exclusion of Marginalized and Minority Groups

Even if minority groups or communities have a sizable presence across the country, the FPTP system might systematically exclude them if they are not the majority in any one constituency. Religious minorities, Scheduled Tribes, and other marginalized groups are frequently underrepresented in legislative bodies¹⁴. Especially in a nation like India, which is multilingual, multireligious, and multiethnic, this is a major issue.

iv. National Politics Regionalization

Parties with strong regional support tend to be rewarded by FPTP over those with a wide but weak national presence. Consequently, national politics could become regionally split, resulting in populism, policy stagnation, or the prioritization of local interests over national unity. This may give a voice to regional identities, but it also poses a threat to the unity of national policy frameworks.

v. Susceptibility to identity politics

Since a candidate only needs a plurality of votes to win, FPTP encourages the establishment of vote banks along caste, religious, or ethnic lines. As a result, there is identity-based mobilization and polarization, which can exacerbate social divides and undermine the secular and inclusive basis of democratic government.

vi. Undermines Multiparty Democracy

FPTP favors larger and more established parties, making it challenging for new or issue-based political movements to succeed electorally, despite India's multi-party system. In certain areas, this results in a well-established political duopoly that restricts voter options.

vii. Failure to accurately reflect the will of the people

The winning candidate in many constituencies may only receive between 30 and 35 percent of the total

votes, indicating that the majority of voters did not support the winner. The legitimacy of elected officials is called into doubt by this, as is their mandate to rule.

7. COMPARISON WITH OTHER ELECTORAL SYSTEM:

Among the numerous electoral models used around the world is the First Past the Post (FPTP) method. Although FPTP is commonly used in nations with British colonial legacies, such as India, the UK, and Canada, several democracies have switched to Proportional Representation (PR), Mixed-Member Proportional (MMP), or Two-Round Systems (TRS) in order to achieve more fair representation. Understanding how FPTP compares to these systems is essential for assessing its strengths and weaknesses, particularly in the context of India's plural democracy.

i. Proportional Representation (PR) vs. FPTP

The goal of proportional representation is to translate the proportion of votes cast into the proportion of seats in the legislature. PR systems are used in nations like South Africa, Israel, and Germany to promote greater inclusivity.

Criteria	FPTP	Proportional Representation (PR)
Vote-to-Seat Ratio	Often disproportionate	Highly proportional
Minority Representation	Low	High
Government Stability	High (majority governments likely)	Low to Moderate (coalitions common)
Voter Choice	Limited (one vote for one candidate)	Broad (party lists, preferences)

Journal of Indian School of Political Economy, Vol. XV, No. 1-2, 2003.

¹⁴ Christophe Jaffrelot, India's Silent Revolution: The Rise of the Lower Castes in North India (Permanent Black, 2003).



For instance, in the 2019 Indian elections, the BJP won 55.8% of the seats but only 37.4% of the vote. On the other hand, they would have won about 37.4% of the seats in a PR system, which would have resulted in a more coalition-based government¹⁵.

ii. FPTP vs. Mixed-Member Proportional (MMP)

MMP combines FPTP and PR — used in countries like Germany and New Zealand. Voters cast two votes: one for a constituency candidate (FPTP) and one for a party list (PR).

Criteria	FPTP	MMP
Representation	Single-member constituency	Dual: constituency + proportional
fairness	Low (vote wastage high)	High (vote wastage reduced)
Complexity	Simple	Moderate

Advantage of MMP: Balances local accountability with national proportionality. Reduces the “wasted vote” problem.

iii. The TwoRound System (TRS) versus the First Past the Post (FPTP) model

If no candidate receives a majority in the first round of the TwoRound System, a second round is conducted between the two highest vote-getters. This is used in France and many African nations¹⁶.

Criteria	FPTP	TRS
Winning requirement	Plurality (most votes)	Absolute Majority
Voter Turnout	One round	Two rounds (may reduce turnout)

Legitimacy of Winner	Often less than 50% votes	Ensure majority mandate
----------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------

iv. Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) / Instant Runoff vs. FPTP

Voters can rate candidates in order of preference thanks to the RCV. The candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated and their votes are redistributed if none of the candidates receive a majority.

Used in parts of US, Ireland, and Australia.

Criteria	FPTP	RCV
Vote Expression	Single choice	Ranked preferences
Winner	Plurality	Majority (after redistributions)
Strategic Voting	High	Lower

8. REFORMS AND ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION TO FPTP:

India has maintained its use of the First Past the Post (FPTP) method at the institutional level since independence. The adequacy of FPTP in guaranteeing fair, inclusive, and democratic representation has, nevertheless, come into question from academics, commissions, and civil society organizations as the political environment has become more divided, identity-driven, and multipolar¹⁷. To counter the systemic distortions and democratic deficits that the current electoral system generates, a number of reforms and alternative models have been put out.

i. Recommendations from India's Law Commission

The 170th Report of the Law Commission of India (1999) provided a critical assessment of the FPTP system and proposed a partial move toward Proportional Representation (PR). It suggested:

¹⁵ Election Commission of India, General Elections 2019 – Statistical Report, Vol. I.

¹⁶ IDEA (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance), Handbook on Electoral System Design, 2005.

¹⁷ Electoral Reform Society www.electoral-reform.org.uk



- A mixed voting method that combines FPTP with PR.
- 25% of Lok Sabha seats to be determined by party lists based on national vote share, with the remaining 75% using FPTP.
- Intended to lessen the disproportionate advantage enjoyed by large parties and increase the representation of minority and issue-based parties.

ii. The National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution (NCRWC) recommended electoral reforms.

The idea of shifting towards a more inclusive electoral system was also supported by the NCRWC in 2002. It acknowledged that FPTP promotes stability, but frequently does so at the expense of fair representation¹⁸.

The Commission made the following recommendations:

- Investigating the viability of Mixed Electoral Systems, which are similar to those used in Germany and New Zealand.
- In jurisdictions where the winning candidate receives less than 50% of the votes, RunOff Elections are introduced.

iii. A plan to employ ranked choice voting (RCV)

As a potential change, Ranked Choice Voting, also known as Instant RunOff Voting (IRV), has been proposed by a number of proponents of electoral reform. Voters may use this approach to rank candidates in order of preference, which guarantees that the winning candidate receives a majority mandate through vote redistribution¹⁹.

Benefits:

- Minimizes vote splitting.
- Discourages negative advertising.
- Enhances voter participation.

iv. In high-stakes elections, the Two-Round System (TRS) is used.

The TwoRound System, which is utilized in France, has been suggested by some political theorists for Presidential or Chief Ministerial elections, where a second round is conducted between the top two candidates if no candidate wins a majority in the first round²⁰.

- May strengthen the legitimacy of the executive, particularly in states where elections are tight.
- Nevertheless, it is a time-consuming and expensive process.

v. Improving Candidate Selection and Intraparty Democracy

Vote bank politics and unclear party candidate selection are two of the main problems with FPTP. Reform proposals include the following:

- Mandatory internal democracy within political parties (as mandated by the Election Commission).
- Open standards for choosing candidates.
- Reducing the impact of caste, religion, and wealth on nominations.

vi. Changes to Campaign Finance Laws

In many cases, unequal access to campaign funds exacerbates unfair results under FPTP. The suggested reforms include:

- State support for elections for recognized political parties.
- Restrictions on campaign spending and open financial review.
- Limiting the use of anonymous electoral bonds, which disproportionately favor powerful political parties.

9. JUDICIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL VIEWPOINT:

¹⁸ Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR), Analysis of Electoral Bonds and Political Funding, 2023.

¹⁹ Drishti IAS <https://www.drishtiias.com>

²⁰ Yogendra Yadav, "Towards a Proportional Electoral System for India," Seminar, Issue No. 615, November 2010.



Although the First Past the Post (FPTP) system is not expressly stated in the Indian Constitution, it has been implicitly acknowledged and judicially supported as a component of the nation's electoral system. The Supreme Court and High Courts have, throughout the years, addressed various elements of the FPTP system, notably in relation to the right to vote, representative democracy, and electoral fairness. The judiciary has issued important statements regarding the advantages, disadvantages, and democratic validity of FPTP, even though it has not directly challenged its legitimacy²¹.

i. The Constitutional Underpinnings of FPTP

The foundation of the existing electoral system is laid by the Representation of the People Act, 1950 and 1951, which are read in conjunction with Article 81(1)(d) of the Indian Constitution. The FPTP system, however, is mandated by law rather than established by the Constitution as the method of voting.

- The authority to make laws governing elections to the Lok Sabha and State Assemblies is granted to Parliament by Article 327.
- In Section 53, the Representation of the People Act of 1951 formalizes the FPTP system by stating that the candidate with the most legitimate votes in general elections is declared elected.

Therefore, FPTP has evolved into the legal standard, even though it is not required by the Constitution.

ii. The FPTP system is judicially supported.

The Supreme Court has affirmed the validity and administrative practicality of the FPTP system in a number of cases, but it has never directly addressed its merits or demerits.

- a. *Kuldip Nayar v. Union of India* case²²,
While handling the election to the Rajya Sabha, the Court reaffirmed Parliament's authority to set the

method of election under Articles 80 and 327 of the Constitution in this instance.

- It ruled that courts will not intervene in electoral systems unless they violate fundamental rights or the fundamental structure because they are a question of policy.

b. *PUCL v. Union of India* case²³,

The Court reiterated in this historic decision regarding the right to know the background of electoral candidates that free and fair elections are an essential component of the fundamental structure of the Constitution.

- Although the ruling did not specifically mention the FPTP system, it stated that electoral procedures should promote informed choice, which is something that critics claim FPTP restricts due to binary or strategic voting.

c. *Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR) v. Union of India* case²⁴

The Court stressed the need of transparency and educated voting, reiterating that the legitimacy of any electoral system is contingent upon voter awareness and participation.

iii. Issues of fairness and representation in the judiciary

In decisions involving topics such as: courts have recognized larger representational issues, even if they have not ruled FPTP to be unconstitutional.

- Delimitation, which involves redrawing constituency boundaries to reflect population shifts, is crucial to preventing inequities in FPTP-based constituencies.
- Electoral equality, such as in the case of *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain*²⁵, where the Court emphasized that democracy is meaningless unless there is fair representation.

²¹ Representation of the People Act, 1951, Section 53.

²² *Kuldip Nayar v. Union of India*, (2006) 7 SCC 1.

²³ *PULC v. Union of India* (2003) 4SCC 399.

²⁴ *Association for Democratic Reforms v. Union of India*, (2002) 5 SCC 294.

²⁵ *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain* (1975 AIR 2299),



Although not opposed to FPTP, these decisions demonstrate that every electoral system must be assessed in light of the values of fair representation, equity, and inclusion, all of which are areas where FPTP is coming under more and more scrutiny.

iv. Judicial Reform Isn't Being Pushed Hard Enough

Up until now, the Indian judiciary has been hesitant to meddle with the selection of electoral systems, viewing it as a policy issue best left to the legislature. Unless there is a clear breach of the Constitution, this is consistent with judicial restraint when it comes to political matters.

The Election Commission of India and Parliament have, however, been periodically urged by the courts to take reforms into account, particularly in light of:

- Funding for elections.
- The politicization of crime.
- Inner democracy in political organizations.

But the electoral system itself, namely FPTP, has not been legally questioned, in part because of its administrative familiarity and political acceptability.

10. CONCLUSION:

The First Past the Post (FPTP) system, one of the simplest and most prevalent electoral systems in the world, has a complicated combination of advantages and disadvantages, especially in a diverse and populous democracy like India. Its simple mechanism has made a big contribution to the continuity and operation of parliamentary democracy in India, particularly at the Union level, and has made it possible for rapid results and stable governments.

Nevertheless, the system has inherent democratic flaws, such as the underrepresentation of smaller parties, the marginalization of minority voices, and the inability to accurately reflect the will of the electorate. These challenges have fueled rising demands for reforms and consideration of alternative electoral models that may better represent the diverse character of Indian society.

The validity of FPTP has been largely upheld by judicial interpretations and constitutional viewpoints, which acknowledge the Legislature's authority in selecting electoral methods. Nevertheless, academic and political discourse is still fueled by the necessity for increased inclusivity, transparency, and representational fairness.

In conclusion, despite the fact that FPTP has provided India with a practical and effective electoral system, the changing political environment necessitates a thorough re-examination of the system. Future reforms must attempt to strike a balance between administrative efficiency and democratic principles, making sure that each voter's voice is fairly and effectively represented in the decision-making process.
