

## **Proposal 156: Don't Tally and Dally**

*Hose*

{{  
Amend Rule 2-2 by inserting the following paragraph under the heading  
of "Tallying the votes":

{{  
A Proposal's Stamina is equal to the sum of the Vote Power of the  
Registered Voters whose Final Vote on that Proposal is FOR, plus the  
sum of the Vote Power of the Registered Voters whose Final Vote on  
that Proposal is AGAINST.  
}}

Amend Rule 2-2 by inserting the following text as a list item to the  
top of the list under the heading of "Tallying the votes":

{{  
Each Open proposal with a Stamina less than the Quorum becomes Pending.  
}}

Amend Rule 3-5 by replacing the following paragraph:

{{  
At the beginning of each nweek, the players that voted in the previous  
nweek gain the "Active" property, the players that failed to vote in  
the previous nweek lose the "Active" property.  
}}

with:

{{  
At the beginning of each nweek, the Players that failed to vote in the  
previous nweek lose the "Active" property. A Player that posts to a  
Public Forum gains the "Active" property.  
}}  
}}

[[Let's make sure we always have enough people voting so that a  
proposal can't slip in and Pass with one vote. Also, Players should be  
active if they participate in any way. You shouldn't have to wait for  
an end of a voting session to change state.]]

## **Proposal 157: /etc/motnw**

*Hose*

{{

Create a new rule, titled "Message of the nweek", with the following text:

{{

There exists a unique Game Object called the Message Of The nweek, also known as the motnw. The motnw has one Attribute called the Message, with a Scope of the motnw Object, a Range of any string of between 1 and 256 characters inclusive, and a Default Value of "This space intentionally left blank".

The Registrar, as a Game Action with Support, may change the value of the motnw Message, but cannot change the value more than once in an nweek.

The value of the motnw Message Attribute should be prominently posted on a Public Display. [[the main page of the B Nomic wiki is ideal]]

}}

}}

## **Proposal 158: Big Scam**

*Wooble*

{{

Increase the mackerels of the player known as Wooble, and the players known as [Lend me m50 and I'll revise this proposal with your names here] to m500.

Change the status of Proposals 159 and 160 to Failed.

Create 3 new Holy Hand Grenades, one owned by Wooble and one each owned by [your names here! give me mackerels!].

}}

## **Proposal 161: Solidify Liquidity**

*Hose*

{{

Amend Rule 3-11 by removing the following text:

{{

The points -> mackerel exchange rate is 5.0 - that is, 1 point may be exchanged for m5.

}}

}}

## **Proposal 162: An Indecent Proposal**

*Hose*

{{  
Amend Rule 2-6 by removing the following text:

{{  
If the Proposal Failed and was never Won, then its Author loses 3 points.  
}}

Change the Trigger for the Victory Condition named "Win By Legislative Dominance" to:

{{  
Three proposals made by the same player, during the same nweek, pass,  
have no votes AGAINST, and no more than one of this player's proposals  
fail during that nweek, and no proposals made by players other than  
that player pass during that nweek.  
}}

Amend Rule 1-4 by adding the following text:

{{  
Player names shall not contain any of the following, regardless of  
character capitalization, whitespace, punctuation, or diacritic marks:  
"Minister", "Rulekeeper", "Chairman", "Oracle", "Registrar", "Gödel",  
"Mom", "Artisan", "Ambassador", "Post Holder", "Pot Holster", "PHD",  
"Redford", "Demi", "Harrelson", "Garth", "Brooks"  
}}  
}}

### **Proposal 163: Hold on a sec**

*Wonko*

{{  
\_\_Hold on a sec\_\_

Repeal rules 3-12 and 3-14.

[[Obviously these need to be thought out a bit more before we can use them.]]

}}

## **Proposal 164: Odd groups got left, Episode 2**

*Hose*

```
{{  
Any Player who has more than m101 shall have their mackerels set to m1.  
}}
```

## **Proposal 165: Even groups got right, Episode 2**

*Hose*

```
{{  
Any Player who has more than m101 shall have their mackerels set to m1.  
}}
```



**Proposal 166: Untitled dated Wed, 31 Oct 2007 23:44:46 -0400**

*Billy Pilgrim*

{{

Amend rule 2-2, under the heading "Conflict Culling", to read:

{{

When Conflict Culling occurs, every Open proposal is processed in descending order of Strength, and in ascending order of Proposal Number when Strength is equal. When a proposal is processed in this manner, if it is Won, then every proposal that Conflicts with it becomes Lost.

}}

[[The way Conflict Culling reads currently, conflicting proposals with equal strength are processed in descending order of Proposal Number, meaning proposals submitted later are processed first and can knock out earlier ones...]]

[[This fix allows a player whose proposal is targeted directly by a proposal submitted later (or even indirectly, i.e. they happen to contradict each other) to modify his own proposal and declare it in conflict with the later proposal. As long as the original proposal passes, the later one is not a threat unless it can muster more strength, in which case the original proposal should logically fail anyway...]]

Add a paragraph to Rule 2-2, under the heading "Submission and Revision", that reads:

{{

If, in the Chairman's judgment, a revision radically alters the nature or purpose of a Pending Proposal, he may reassign it a new Proposal Number greater than those of all other Pending Proposals. Any player may, with 1 more supporter than objections within 2 ndays, force the Chairman to take such action.

}}

[[This should prevent players from "reserving" low proposal numbers by submitting bogus proposals early in the week, just in case they might eventually need to conflict with something later, unspecified for the moment...]]

}}