Dear Guardian,

Murphy's Law of Politics: the worst ones win.

With two candidates, maybe our Orwellian electoral system *was* OK: this one 'good', that one 'bad'.  With four or more candidates - A, B, C and D - the voter cannot express an opinion with any accuracy: if C is 'good', are the other three, A, B and D, all equally 'bad'?

If individual voters cannot  be precise, any collation of all their data cannot give an accurate assessment of the *collective* will.  So, yes, what can go wrong will go wrong, the worst may win, and the outcome will probably not be an accurate reflection of the will of the people.

In Papua New Guinea - former British colony, of course - they used to have our first-past-the-post.  As a result, elections were very negative.  They now use preferential voting and, to be valid, a vote must include at least three preferences.  So parties and candidates seek allies, voters cross the party divides, the whole campaign becomes much more civilised, and the outcome is much more accurate.

Yours

3rd May 2015.