Thursday, November 1. 2007

Matthew: Covers the basic issues, but what about leadership?

With the deadline for candidate registration having passed, today I'll start by writing one of a series of articles reviewing each of the candidates' platforms. I've chosen Matthew first because he recently entered the race to replace Jaguar Hahn, who effectively had been running a campaign in absentia.

It is a good move that Matthew became the head of his own campaign, because his commitment to Jaguar Hahn's campaign shows that he definitely has the motivation to succeed at the AWTeen Governor position, and that motivation is sorely needed. However, his stances on several key issues leave one wondering whether he would be able to maintain strong leadership throughout his tenure as Governor.

One interesting stance that Matthew takes is that he would establish a committee system. While I have, in the past, proposed that committees are inefficient, they are not an absolutely ineffective method in which to manage a world. However, having committee leaders become members of a Core is a system that has been rehashed about six times over the past seven or so years. Each time, one of the Caretakers has tried to get it right, and each time the Caretaker has failed.

The reason the Caretaker has failed is simple - the Caretaker is ultimately responsible for what happens in the world. When the time comes for the Caretaker to overrule the committees' decisions, the committee leaders become angry and chaos ensues. One could argue that the Governor faces an even greater challenge in this area now - because while Flagg might have been willing to give the Caretakers a second chance before, the voting public will not be so forgiving. If the Governor fails to get accomplished what needs to get accomplished, AWTeen's citizens will have no objection to canning him in February, and this Core system that Matthew proposes is not going to help him out come reelection time.

It is easy to imagine a case here where Matthew wants to propose a new and innovative idea for the world but is opposed by his committee leaders. His platform does state that he is allowed to veto decisions, but it does not provide him the power to unilaterally enact decisions. Matthew will find himself in a bind - the public will be clamoring for whatever change he has proposed, but the committee leaders will stand firm, perhaps even because they themselves would lose their positions as a result of the change. There would be a "constitutional battle," although the only constitution in dispute here would be the one Matthew imposed upon himself.

Moving on to the other issues of Matthew's platform, his stance on harassment is strong. Matthew claims he will eject those committing personal attacks for one day on the first offense. However, some have questioned whether he would actually enforce such an edict, as in reality it is difficult to determine when to draw the line on questionable offenders who continually nag but don't quite cross the line. On this issue, I say that only time will show whether Matthew, if elected, would uphold this stance or whether he would cave in to pressure.

Finally, while Matthew states that he wants to bring AWTeen together to host a major event, he only lays out in his platform that "C P will return as major events manager, and will be expected to hire a team that will run at least one major event per every three months." C P is a good man for the job - but Matthew himself would be an even better one. For a candidate who has championed the cause of making a major event a priority of his administration, Matthew should not be outsourcing his most important goal. C P would be an excellent addition to any committee and should be offered a differentposition, but Matthew's reelection will largely depend on whether the event succeeds or fails, and as leader I would want to have full control of the planning process for my key campaign issue.

In summary, Matthew's platform has all the basics together, but falls short in a few key areas. Matthew's key shortcoming that shows in all three areas is that he is not taking, or may not take, ultimate control of his Governorship. It is great to work with the community and give everyone a say, but in the end, he will be the boss, and he will be the one running for reelection.

Posted by Brant in Campaigns at 14:59

With the deadline for candidate registration having passed, today I'll start by writing one of a series of articles reviewing each of the candidates' platforms. I've chosen Matthew first because he recently entered the race to replace Jaguar Hahn, who effectively had been running a campaign in absentia.

It is a good move that Matthew became the head of his own campaign, because his commitment to Jaguar Hahn's campaign shows that he definitely has the motivation to succeed at the AWTeen Governor position, and that motivation is sorely needed. However, his

stances on several key issues leave one wondering whether he would be able to maintain strong leadership throughout his tenure as Governor.

One interesting stance that Matthew takes is that he would establish a committee system. While I have, in the past, proposed that committees are inefficient, they are not an absolutely ineffective method in which to manage a world. However, having committee leaders become members of a Core is a system that has been rehashed about six times over the past seven or so years. Each time, one of the Caretakers has tried to get it right, and each time the Caretaker has failed.

I have noticed that you, Brant, proposed a system of "Projects" . While this system would most likely work, I fear that it would not meet the expectations that the committees can meet. This is because none of the Projects, under your plan, would be regularly meeting to discuss changes and make them, besides JAM. The need for a permanent building team is very evident. Without a permanent team, there will be no way to update the Ground Zero when it is needed. It will simply be updated only when a project is created for it, which will severely limit the amount of time that the team has to work on the project. The reason that committees are better than the project idea is even more evident with the events team. Without a permanent committee, like with the Building Team, there will be no way for minor events, like Paintball, to be officially held without having a committee that works throughout the year. That would eliminate the point of having a project for it. As for the Major Events, that team needs to work throughout the year so that they can keep the huge events coming every couple months. Again, this would eliminate the purpose of projects. Without permanent committees, I think that much less will get done in the world.

The reason the Caretaker has failed is simple - the Caretaker is ultimately responsible for what happens in the world. When the time comes for the Caretaker to overrule the committees' decisions, the committee leaders become angry and chaos ensues. One could argue that the Governor faces an even greater challenge in this area now - because while Flagg might have been willing to give the Caretakers a second chance before, the voting public will not be so forgiving. If the Governor fails to get accomplished what needs to get accomplished, AWTeen's citizens will have no objection to canning him in February, and this Core system that Matthew proposes is not going to help him out come reelection time.

This is true. People will never be happy with everything that any governor does. That is what comes as the result of having a user-ran government in the world. As Governor, I will try to do what is the best for the world, and what the users want, but I will be trusting upon myself to see what these users want, and I will be trusting that the others in the Council will try to represent the users of the world, not just themselves.

It is easy to imagine a case here where Matthew wants to propose a new and innovative idea for the world but is opposed by his committee leaders. His platform does state that he is allowed to veto decisions, but it does not provide him the power to unilaterally enact decisions. Matthew will find himself in a bind - the public will be clamoring for whatever change he has proposed, but the committee leaders will stand firm, perhaps even because they themselves would lose their positions as a result of the change. There would be a "constitutional battle," although the only constitution in dispute here would be the one Matthew imposed upon himself.

You did miss one thing that I had outlined in my platform. I posted that the Core will be able to pass any decision, as long as the vote is a majority of the Core, and all members of the Core are present at this meeting. You do bring up an interesting point, one that I did not really consider. Because of this, I am going to think up a plan for a way to have a system of "executive order", while still being fair concerning the ability of the Council and the Core to make decisions. Expect this to be posted on the AWTeen forums, with some other things, soon.

Moving on to the other issues of Matthew's platform, his stance on harassment is strong. Matthew claims he will eject those committing personal attacks for one day on the first offense. However, some have questioned whether he would actually enforce such an edict, as in reality it is difficult to determine when to draw the line on questionable offenders who continually nag but don't quite cross the line. On this issue, I say that only time will show whether Matthew, if elected, would uphold this stance or whether he would cave in to pressure.

Indeed, it will be hard to tell when someone has crossed the line in the area of harassment and insults. However, I have seen many times in AWTeen where this harassment has certainly gone much too far and resulted in something very, very bad. Harassment is a very hard thing to judge, however, it will be treated very, very harshly in my administration as Governor. In the details that I am going to release soon, I am going to try to work out a way to more objectively monitor harassment. There is a policy that my high school has, where if someone is harassing you, and you ask them to stop, and they don't, they will be dealt with harshly. While this appears extremely lame upon first glance, it is one of the ways that I have seen to make this monitoring more objective. I'm not saying that this system will be used, it is just an example of how it is certainly possible to objectify the process.

Finally, while Matthew states that he wants to bring AWTeen together to host a major event, he only lays out in his platform that "C P will return as major events manager, and will be expected to hire a team that will run at least one major event per every three months." C P is a good man for the job - but Matthew himself would be an even better one. For a candidate who has championed the cause of making a major event a priority of his administration, Matthew should not be outsourcing his most important goal. C P would be an excellent addition to any committee and should be offered a differentposition, but Matthew's reelection will largely depend on whether the event succeeds or fails, and as leader I would want to have full control of the planning process for my key campaign issue.

Of course, I can not do everything. This is the point of having a bureaucracy to assist with the day-to-day tasks of running the world. Having a major event is extremely important, especially because there has not been a single one for quite a long time. C P and I will hopefully work very closely to organize this event, if I am elected, and I already do have some ideas as to what sort of events could be done. C P has brought great ideas to my campaign, and he is very motivated to do the events. I know that he will be able to hold a great major event, but this does not mean that he will be doing it alone. Just like with all the other committees, I will be working closely with the leaders to make sure that things are done in a good fashion. Don't get confused just because I am not the one who will be directly in charge of the major event(s). In the end, everything will go to the core, and to me.

In summary, Matthew's platform has all the basics together, but falls short in a few key areas. Matthew's key shortcoming that shows in all three areas is that he is not taking, or may not take, ultimate control of his Governorship. It is great to work with the community and give everyone a say, but in the end, he will be the boss, and he will be the one running for reelection.

Anonymous on Nov 1 2007, 16:44