

*BrexitGlory's Manifesto for
Speaker of the Commons.*

*“Ultimately those
involved in any system
requiring human input
must always be aware of
that system's flaws.”*

- Simon Case, Cabinet Secretary.

The meta, the game and the community is essentially a system with human input, and thus needs constant oversight on it's flaws.

1.0 #ItsBGforME

Yeah so I am BrexitGlory, most call me BG.

Discord if you have questions: BrexitGlory#0830

I am running because I believe I have the fresh perspective, the zeal, the drive, the passion, the motivation, the ambition, the energy and the grit to get stuff done.

I believe the whole meta landscape (quad, speakership, events team, discord mods, etc) and how MHoC does reform needs an overhaul. An overhaul to make the meta institutions more transparent, dynamic, self-reflecting, open, inclusive and innovative. Such an overhaul will be detailed throughout this manifesto.

Brit left MHoC in a good enough shape that the next speaker won't be an immediate firefighter, but that doesn't mean we don't have problems. Labour is a rump of what it once was and the left basically routed, the centre right have dominated since simulated polling began, active new members are rare, meta reform has stagnated, discord main is full of bnocs while active members retreat to party chats, trust between parties and speakership is low, elections are boring, interesting and well-thought out bills and motions are passing the commons with no debate, I could go on.

I do not know how to fix every issue we face, and I won't know how to fix every future issue. Any candidate that says they do know is naive, we are all just human not divine. I do however believe that together with the right minds and the right processes in place we can solve and overcome any problem.

2.0 Speakership

“We need to move to a system where those who propose the innovative, the different, the challenging, are given room to progress.” - Michael Gove, Minister for Cabinet Office.

My end vision for the Speakership is a highly adaptable, inclusive and innovative problem-solving team. We need to smash any groupthink and we need to break any barriers (including perceived barriers) into the speakership, and get the best people for the job on the inside.

While our current Deputy Speakers work hard, we cannot rely on their good will forever, and we need to ensure others are ready to take up the mantle of being a Deputy Speaker and drive meta innovation to solve our problems.

2.1 Creating a Deputy Speaker Guide

I will create a short (1 page) guide designed to inform the community of what Deputy Speakers do. This is important not just for new members but also for members of the community who might be interested in taking up a meta role later on.

2.2 Stepping in as a Deputy Speaker

One flaw I have is that I have not been a DS before. I could not lead a team without knowing what it is like to do the work they do. Therefore I would step in and do the work of one DS as Speaker of the Commons. This may mean a DS gets rotated out (more on this in a bit) but it is a worthwhile change.

2.3 Reducing Bloat

Between the commons speakership, the lord's speakership, the devo speakership, the events team, the discord mods, advisors and the quad; we have more meta people than we do active players of the game.

I do not know how to fix this, section 2.2 will mean one less DS I suppose. My general approach is that the speakership team should look to do as much as possible. I would not create further teams to do x or y on a permanent basis.

2.4 Rotating Speakership

To my memory, the last two slots open for Deputy Speaker became open because one was sacked for continuous misconduct and the other was perma banned for doxxing. To me, this doesn't seem like a good model to promote innovation, and is likely to cement in any group think. The manager of Barcelona FC doesn't wait for one of his starting eleven to kick the bucket before putting a young star on the pitch. Likewise, I will not wait.

Therefore I shall make some DS positions "rotationary". This means that a DS will serve for say two or three months, before somebody else replaces them. I say "rotationary" instead of "temporary" because I would also want to rotate people *back* into the speakership if they are good.

It seems reasonably sensible to have a certain number of DSs who are in "permanent" slots, especially the Chair of Ways and Means. I am thinking a 50/50 split in DS's being permanent or rotational would be appropriate.

The benefit of this is allowing members of the community to have a go in a meta position, seeing what's happening on the inside, giving contributions (which benefits everyone), opening up the meta world to more people, breaking down cliquiness, building relationships with parties etc.

Furthermore, DSs are volunteers. Giving some of them a break now and then before rotating them back in won't be the worst thing in the world.

2.5 Addressing the Cabal

[This comment from a former DS](#) is a must read for all voters. You really should read the comment yourselves but the commenter notes certain types of "cliquey" behaviour from speakership.

I want to address this problem, and as someone who hasn't been in speakership before and doesn't really care about the apparent "social allure", I am best placed to do it. Indeed every one of my proposed reforms so far are in part targeted at solving this problem.

In addition to what has already been proposed, I will immediately ban gossip and alleged ganging up on other community members.

3.0 Processes, Procedures and Practices

“A bad system will beat a good person every time” - Dr Deming

3.1 Leading From The Front

I intend to lead this community, and sometimes that means taking control of reform and its processes. If there is a small common sense reform with no good reason not to do other than metawankery, then I will do it without a community vote.

While I think all big reforms should go to a community approval vote, **I will not sacrifice the obvious good to democratic puritanism.**

3.2 Engagement

Every thread in /r/MHoCmeta should get a formal and official response from the relevant Quad, instead of leaving threads like [this](#) and [this](#) untouched.

As Speaker I will never decline to engage with the community, no matter how painful it may be sometimes (no offence), I pledge to do everything I can to engage, and will resign the day I begin to withdraw.

3.3 Data-led Reform

When was the last time MHoC did anything based on actual data? Where reform is proposed I shall seek to collect and consider actual data. This may mean provisioning anonymous surveys on why community members do X, what they think of Y, do they want to see more or less of Z etc. This could also mean tracking activity, different types of activity, it's frequency etc.

Actual data should inform decision making, when it doesn't it leaves a sort of “reasoning vacuum”, where actual reasoning based on data and fact will be replaced by metawankery.

*“To design experiences that meet members’ needs requires knowing what these needs are. If you don’t know what members want, then it is hard to satisfy them. **Sometimes the members’ motivations are not obvious, even to insiders.**” (Ren et al. 2010)*

3.4 Reforming and Codifying Processes

“Decisions without actions are pointless. Actions without decisions are reckless.” - Colonel John Boyd

Sometimes our processes for reform are wrong or non-existent. This is a tricky topic with no easy solution. What we need is a lot more community engagement while reforms are being made, but ultimately speakers can't force people to engage in /r/mhocmeta; they can just be sure that they will get complaints once a bad reform has been pushed through.

I will go out of my way and actively try to get people to engage. This could mean breaking down reforms and starting discord discussions to see what people think. This could mean starting discussions with particular parties to see what their members think, especially those not on the main discord. This could mean taking an active part in the discussion thread, asking for people to expand on their points and playing devil's advocate to them.

In the past, processes for reform have looked too much like:

Reform proposed -> Low community engagement -> Low feedback -> Problems not addressed -> Reform pushed through by docile vote -> Community point out problem after implementation -> Speakership inertia -> Low community engagement -> Problems persist.

Sometimes it looks like this:

Problem observed -> Quad proposes small common-sense fix-> Some people don't like it -> Vote is then created -> Reform is killed -> Problem persists.

Ultimately I desire systematic *reform to how we reform* and I am confident the right processes and decision making can be worked out.

3.5 Monthly Meta Updates

To help facilitate transparency, feedback and engagement, I will work towards monthly meta reports made by the Quad for the community. These will essentially be updates

from the Quad to the community on what Speakership have been working on, if anything, and give a constant platform to members to engage with the Quad.

Quad will also be able to use these to get quick feedback on certain things. For example if they are half way through making a reform, they can use the monthly meta report to ask for feedback at that particular stage.

It can also be a good opportunity for the community to suggest ideas if there isn't much for the Quad to do.

[Threads like this](#) won't be necessary if I am Speaker.

3.6 Ethical Meta Hacking

When a serious reform is proposed, we kind of put it to the community and the odd person will raise a query on how it will work. I do not believe this to be extensive enough and inevitably means problems slip through the cracks.

I will create a list of microactions, mechanics and features (for example: commenting, voting, defecting, op-eds, press briefing etc) of the game. When a reform is being developed, myself and the speakership team will go through how the new reforms would interact with every feature of the game - we will catch the errors before they are pushed through. Essentially, we try to break the proposal like "ethical hackers", before fixing it. This of course happens to some extent already but should be formalised.

The results of this simple exercise can be presented in a simple spreadsheet and linked in a meta thread about the proposal.

3.7 Value of Transparency, Feedback and Inclusiveness.

These values should be at the heart of reform because all three allow more people to get involved, when more people are involved there is more capacity for innovation, more oversight, more engagement, better problem solving and so on.

Feedback is essentially the engine to improve, I shall work feedback into everything I do as Speaker and diligently work to improve.

4.0 The Game, It's Features and It's Mechanics.

There is a *lot* to talk about here, and not enough pages. Therefore I will just go over my general outlook on these different features, especially the ones I would like to see reformed.

4.1 Caution with Activity Reviews

I admit this is not as applicable to the commons as it is devo right now, but the electoral system (i.e. 650 seats) could very well change meaning we must watch how activity reviews work. I don't like how activity reviews have mutated into this kind of formulaic "gotcha" to shoehorn a by-election into the term.

Under my speakership, activity reviews will be "are you still an active member? If not, please let a more active party member take over." There is no need to force by-elections that is a pain in the arse for mods and not very fun for most of the players. By-elections should be the absolute last resort. **Remember that parties are already incentivised to fill seats with active members so they can actually use the votes!**

4.2 The Polling System

I think we didn't handle the polling system debacle very well at all, and that isn't due to a lack of trying from Brit. But to me, it felt like we were at a crossroads, we had so much opportunity to innovate something new, fun and engaging; and we ended up voting for rarer polls and closing the issue there. Rarer polls will bring some benefits but won't really fix our issue. I know I am not alone in thinking this way.

*If you think that it will take the pressure off of players, then we leave ourselves in a position where nobody has an incentive to grow the community's membership. While Quad should be responsible for growing the membership, that isn't the same as an active incentive; and how often do we see Quad actively taking a role in growing the community? Where the polling system took active membership numbers as an input, this gave party leaders a strong incentive to grow their membership; and thus growing the community. **If you believe the new polling reporting procedure will take stress off of leadership, it therefore follows that this key incentive of getting more members will be made void.***

On the other hand, if you believe that the reform won't take pressure off players (indeed the actual underlying polling system remains unchanged), then we are left with the same issues as before.

This doesn't even touch upon other benefits that polling gives: informing parties on key decisions (such as snap elections, when to cash in on political capital), giving reward for a political win and giving parties constant feedback. **Can you imagine the shit show in a few weeks time where a party gets wrecked in the polls and they don't recognise why?** Changes in polling must reflect what has happened in the game.

My personal preference would be having a go at creating polling that is more based on public image (*not* the same as press) while keeping membership as a factor and essentially eliminating polls for "raw activity." Something as described in [this comment](#) as well as events could be worked into a new polling system.

4.3.0 The Electoral System (100 seats, 650 seats, how parties are voted in, seat ownership etc)

As Brit observed, the electoral system is intricately tied to the polling system because parties need members to fill seats. The 650 seat system is the proposed solution, allowing sim members to take up more than one seat, and therefore enabling parties to poll above their membership levels. I oppose the 650 seat system for various reasons, and I will only implement something like it if it is to facilitate polling changes.

4.3.1 The Value of First Past the Post (FPTP)

I don't believe in pure FPTP for MHoC, but it is a necessary feature to some extent. [This comment](#) goes into more detail, but essentially some element of FPTP reduces the "winner's threshold" and therefore makes it easier for parties like Labour and LPUK to rise to the very top.

Most opposition to FPTP is based on personal ideology, I will oppose this kind of reasoning.

4.3.2 The 650 seat system and FPTP

When people advocate for the 650 seat system, they rather curiously also want to use it to abolish the FPTP element. This is not necessary. In fact, [in the proposal](#) it is noted that one route would be to keep the election system the same

other than adding eight new constituencies and multiplying seats won at the election by six.

I propose that if we decide to go down this kind of route, we further simplify this by keeping everything the same, and multiplying seats won by six, thereby creating a 600 seat system. This keeps the fun FPTP aspect, will be easier to implement and doesn't need a boundary review (nothing special about the 650 number anyway).

I will not go down this kind of route unless it is for the purpose of facilitating a new polling system that isn't as tied to membership numbers.

4.3.3 An Alternative Solution

I am still of the opinion that multiple seats per player can, and should be, avoided and here is my proposal: "Proxy Allowance".

1) Keep the entire election system the same - 50 FPTP constituencies, 100 seats in total.

2) A new polling system based not on membership could mean a party gets more seats than they have members.

i) Keeping active membership as a *factor* in polling will help ensure this doesn't get wildly out of control.

ii) Elections are also skewed to membership numbers as well, again helping keep this effect to a minimum.

3) These extra seats will be allocated to the party's leadership as a "proxy allowance", essentially allowing leadership to own that number of seats.

4) New members can be given a seat if leadership wishes to get them involved.

This is very easy to implement and realistically the amount of votes leadership will be owning is not going to be very big, I can't see it being more than 5 at the most. But it will mean we can have a pollings system less based on membership and activity grind.

4.4 Elections

Elections are in big need of reform, they are super boring after you have done your first one and people always feel burnt out after them. I'm of the opinion that elections should broadly have little effect on polling compared to term time. Maybe a 90/10 or a 85/15 split for term-time/election.

I would like to see elections be reformed so they focus more on issues. One option would be to have "issues debates". So debates for the economy, debates for foreign affairs, debates for home affairs. How extensive this is and how it is implemented is still up in the air, but I will work to reform elections before the next one.

4.5 Referendums

Like by-elections, they should be kept as rarities. They also, like elections, need some kind of reform. When the justice devo thing came out, basically everyone knew it would go through and the referendum will certainly be a yes vote. Tories are the only party against and simply cannot outgun LPUK-Labour-Lib-Solidarity alliance. This isn't an argument against further devolution (see section 8.3 for that), but is an argument about how we do referendums.

The referendum starting polls should not be based on devolved elections, this is very stupid. It basically means someone has to be active in all four sims just to oppose a policy like devolution. Whatever happened to reducing workload?

Referendum campaigns, more so than general elections, should be based on the quality of posts and the message that the two sides are giving out to the voting public. They don't allocate seats to sim members so are not tied up by the electoral system like normal polling/elections are.

4.6 Minister's Questions

PMQs take way too long to answer and nobody really reads through them. Foreign MQs are basically "what is the SoS doing about this issue in this obscure country", to which the real answer is always "nothing". Most other MQs people shoe horn in questions because they feel obliged, rather than they actually want to.

My vision for MQs would be something that everyone actually pays attention to and uses the answers to their advantage. Questions should be fun and engaging for debate,

rather than something to make a minister do some research on a thing they have never heard about before.

I do not know exactly how to get to that vision, it could mean further limiting questions. It could mean not giving polling for asking a question, but instead giving polling for asking *good* questions. It could mean totally reforming questions (including PNQs, written Q's, urgent Q's, lord's oral Q's) from the ground up.

4.7 Budgets

At the moment budgets are inaccessible, too complex and riddled with a lot more issues than most players know. I want more transparency with budgets and more coordination between WM and devolved sims (as their budgets are intertwined).

One issue I have with budgets is that once they are passed, no more money can be spent. This means if you join just after a budget, none of your policies are going to be funded for another six months. It also leaves the government very inflexible to emerging challenges, including with events and international relations.

Issues and errors with budgets don't get pointed out and are kept secret because it would be a canon scandal, as Speaker I would make it so if the government saw they made a mistake, they wouldn't get hit by scandal polling. This may depend on the nature of the mistake though.

Budget debates shouldn't be about particular's of the spreadsheet and how the Chancellor accidentally costed only DEL instead of TME of a department. **The budget debates should be about the policies and the economic and financial outlook proposed by the government, not spreadsheet wankery to catch people out.**

I have a strong appetite to reform how budgets and spending works in MHoC, and I want to work with some of the budget experts in MHoC to make changes, though I recognise that this same enthusiasm is not shared amongst a lot of the community.

4.8 Phased Canon Reset

This isn't a personal pet policy of mine, but it is an idea. As MHoC history bloats, new players step into a more and more alien world, making it harder for them to get started. In the past people have proposed canon resets, I do not think this is wise.

However, we could do a phased canon reset, i.e. decanonising 2014 stuff, then 2015 stuff next year and so on. Early MHoC in particular is a mess if anyone fancies digging around the legislation. Again, this is just an option rather than something I will actively pursue.

5.0 Events

I think having an events lead is a good idea, though finding the right person is a difficult job. Quad should be involved in all events business.

5.1 Building a Framework

Events need a framework. We need to work out the type of thing we want, codify its structure and then recreate with different flavours. A framework should involve the extent of the event, the type of event (negotiations with Iran on JCPOA will have a different framework to Daisy overdosing) and how players can interact with the “event”. Without a framework people metawank when things go wrong.

5.2 Managing Expectations

There is this weird expectation with events that it will add unrivalled amounts of excitement and fireworks to the game, this is not the case. Really an event from the events team is not going to be anything more exciting than an irl development on foreign affairs or a steel works.

A fundamental problem with events is that they are *inorganic*. Players do stuff in game that they are interested in. Press about X or legislation on X because they are interested in X. Events about Y will not interest those players. Any event design should take this fact into account.

5.3 Keeping Realism and Minimising irl Diversion

Diversion from irl should be kept to a minimum, this simplifies things, keeps it realistic and also means new players aren't stepping into an alien world.

5.4 Archive

[I raised the question of events archiving here](#), but I don't think anything has been implemented. I will work with the rest of Quad and events people to archive events. Probably best done utilising reddit and the spreadsheet after the event has closed.

5.5 Brexit and Simplifying Complexities

Brexit is going to be a challenge. The negotiations are horrifically complex irl and obviously need to be dumbed down. I would suggest the deal be presented not as a piece of legislation that changes the law but rather a long statement explaining how different things will work, perhaps with tables attached, and just assume that all the law bits are in place to facilitate such a thing. This will be a challenge but nothing insurmountable.

5.6 Declaring Canonicity

When it comes to canonising deals that have been struck irl, I think we should be very lenient and allow them.

However canonising things in the next year may be more complicated than before given that many things are happening because of Covid which is not canon. I think we should still be lenient because canonising things like steel-struggles adds fun to the game.

5.7 Having Purpose

Events also need to have purpose. The way I see it, events should be unleashed when MHoC slows down and gets dull. A sort of MHoC Keynesianism when the normal MHoC economy isn't providing enough interest. This means that events should be timed right, planning events right in the middle of an already active period is unwise.

5.8 Bias is Good

Events are never going to be 100% unbiased. There will always be a party that struggles more with it than others. While events that are obviously targeted to screw over a party should maybe be avoided (I am not totally against it), we should allow bias to happen - bias is a bad word for it, it's more "canon misfortune".

Canon misfortune is fine and should be encouraged, spices the game up a bit.

6.0 Moderation

Moderation isn't really fully the jurisdiction of the commons speaker, but all Quad have influence. I can't see myself focusing that much on moderation because without direction and drive from the head mod, nothing will happen. Therefore these are more my proposed reforms, I cannot force them through.

6.1 Sack a couple of the Mods

Too many cooks spoil the broth. There are too many Discord mods and they seem to do little when needed because no other Discord mod has acted - kind of like how people walk past the homeless. They only seem to act when an outraged mob demands it and then once one of them acts too many Discord mods get involved.

6.2 Review aims of Moderation - and stick to them

When the Discord mods were created the Head Mod drew up a bunch of rules and guidelines for them before they were discarded because they were deemed too inconvenient. Any moderation review needs to be done with the ambition of sticking to the guidelines.

In that spirit, moderation should be less about recruiting dedicated muters and more about recruiting people from the community to encourage community cohesion, welcome new members in and refine a healthy culture. Sounds all a bit hippy but it is important! - Studies show that the strongest thing to keep people in communities is having human relationships.

6.3 Punish personal abuse

Personal abuse and other nasties often goes unpunished. Moderation seems to be more about punishing controversies than actually tackling objectively bad things. As commons speaker, I will advise that this practice stop.

7.0 Growing the Community

Moderation is important for growing the community, but there are also other things we can do that aren't being done at the moment. In my view, the best way to grow the community is to get players enjoying the game. This means MHoC needs to be accessible and enjoyable for new members.

7.1 A Better New Member's Guide

I think our guide we have at the moment is not suitable. I made a new member's guide for the Conservatives because we thought the community one was bad. It's simply a two page google doc that aims to give just enough information to the member that they can get stuck in.

It's imperfect but I shall aim to make something similar but better for the whole community.

7.2 Simplifying MHoC

At times MHoC gets too complicated, this makes it harder for people to get stuck into the game. Think about games like *Flappy Bird*, they are super successful because it's super easy to get into. Of course people stop playing *Flappy Bird* because of a lack of features - MHoC doesn't have this problem and the interests are different. The point is that MHoC needs to be very very simple to get into at the start, bombarding new members with spreadsheets, websites, essays and the like is bad.

As Speaker I would ensure that future reforms do not overcomplicate MHoC and do not inadvertently make it inaccessible for newer players.

7.3 Investigating Why People Leave

When community member's make posts [like this](#), it should be the duty for the Quad to look into the issues raised and decide if action must be taken. Action won't always be appropriate, but if people feel they can no longer stay in the community for legitimate reasons, those reasons should be looked into. As Speaker, I will take it upon myself to do this.

7.4 Tracking new members

I will create a hidden spreadsheet that Quad can use to keep track of new players and their interactions with the game. If these players do not get further involved in MHoC, we should find out why. It may just be they weren't interested in the game, but it could be because of an unwelcoming culture or the game was too complex. We may also find something out that none of us would even consider given that none of us are recently new and have left MHoC.

8.0 Devolved Sims

Some of this is out of Speaker jurisdiction, some of it is not.

8.1 Standardisation

For some reason votes and debates in devolved sims last a shorter amount of time than MHoC - despite having significantly less business. I do not like this inconsistency and it doesn't really exist for a reason (or a reason that I am aware of).

I shall work with the devolved speaker to correct these types of indiscrepancies, which will in turn allow people to move across sims easier. I think a big barrier to devolved sims is the

8.2 Consultation on Interaction Between Sims

Devolved sims and MHoC obviously interact a fair amount, I don't have a strong opinion on this but from a government perspective the devolved sims are increasingly just designated problem causers for government, where the problem causers should be in the Shadow Cabinet.

At some point I shall lead a review of how devolved sims and the main sim interact

8.3 Sceptical of further Devolution

Ideology aside (I am not ideologically opposed to devolution despite common belief), we need to be more sceptical of devolution. Devolution is absolutely a meta issue, it changes the rules of the game and how we play it. It also absolutely affects WM. It affects budgets for a start, not to mention that if you want to oppose devolution you

have to be active in all four sims. There is a lot more room to fuck up the implementation - and sustained implementation - of further devolution.

The same scepticism is applied to a potential reduction of devolution. **There would (rightly) be a meta discussion if WM started undevolving things from Wales, so why has there not been a proper discussion regarding further devolution, especially given the later has a larger room for error and is harder to implement?**

9.0 About BrexitGlory

That brings me to the end of that. Now a bit more about me. I decided to ask a bunch of tories to describe both my positives and negatives in a few words. They came out with:

Ambitious, astute, pushy, decisive, gregarious, persistent, driven, focused, cerebral, stubborn, honourable, righteous, dedicated, radical, a “doer” and a bunch of other words that basically said the same thing.

“Gryffindor: very vocal, brave, and this works both ways. It's good to stick up for your thoughts but can come off as brazen/ill-planned” - Anon tory.

Always thought of myself as Slytherin but I will let it slide.

I'm sure plenty of others will have a lot more to say on that front, indeed most of you probably have a list of words you would like to add.

The point is that I have my positives and I have my negatives, the important thing is, as I said at the very start, being aware of flaws both in myself and in the meta will ultimately lead to success.

10.0 Questions, Questions, QUESTIONS!

“It is not the answer that enlightens, but the question.” - Eugène Ionesco

Ask me questions. Ask me to justify my stances. Debate me. Tell me I'm wrong.

I look forward to the frank discussions ahead.

