

What does PeopleTree aspire to be?	Can Wikipedia be this?	Can Q&A sites (Quora, Yahoo! Answers, Stack Exchange) be this?	Can the internet/ social media coupled with search technologies be this?
<p>A site where all can <b>express opinions freely and fully (subject to appropriateness guidelines of the community)</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>harness the power of the crowd;</li> <li>provide the crowd with a sense of empowerment, promoting engagement and responsibility.</li> </ul>	<p>✗ No, Wikipedia's <a href="#">core content policies</a> specify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">original thoughts and other contributions are excluded</a>;</li> <li><a href="#">only published material may be added to the site</a>;</li> </ul> <p>There is also an <a href="#">editing hierarchy</a> and <a href="#">protection policies</a>.</p>	<p>✓ Yes, however some of these sites prioritise voting on existing alternatives rather than enabling the contribution of individual perspectives.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>A site that enables all perspectives on a topic to be combined into a single text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>unity</b> may be achieved within and between communities;</li> <li>everything readers need may be found in one place creating great efficiency savings.</li> </ul>	<p>✓ Yes, Wikipedia has a single location for each topic but this is achieved through its content rules and editing policy, rather than synthesis of multiple viewpoints.</p>	<p>✗ No, both questions and answers may be duplicated.</p>	<p>✗ No, however the semantic web would (as understood here) tend towards this functionality.</p>
<p><b>Democratic (or otherwise representative<sup>1</sup>)</b>: given a single location for each topic the numbers of supporters for different viewpoints can be compared against each other according to agreed methods of representation<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>✗ In place of democratic selection Wikipedia relies upon its core content policies, editing hierarchy and protection policies.</p>	<p>(✗) There is ranking of answers but, since usually multiple instances of the same question and of ideas arise, democratic evaluation is problematic.</p>	<p>✗ Without a semantic web democratic assessment would not be possible.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The form of representativeness should be a plug-in feature thus allowing full flexibility. Possible systems include: democratic, votes by those above a certain level of knowledge in an area, votes by those representing at least a certain number of other users. Choice amongst the benefits and disbenefits of such systems would be for users not the designers of the website.

<sup>2</sup> Various forms of delegated participation would also allow active indirect participation by users through a portfolio of delegates. In the event of no active vote being cast a default delegate could potentially be automatically nominated.

<p><b>People-driven:</b> the data on the site should primarily be structured, classified and managed during creation and editing by the crowd/ <a href="#">swarm</a>, rather than by software, in order to connect keep the connection between the site and the people it would represent direct and tangible.</p>	<p>✓ Wikipedia is a people-based system (though not democratic).</p>	<p>✓ People-driven but with limitations described here, principally duplication.</p>	<p>✗ Searches/ automated classification used.</p>
<p><b>Explorable by viewpoint and/ or community:</b> all points of view should interact with each other in a democratically weighted way so that the site would be a constantly evolving representation of the views of all participating. The different perspectives would be easily accessible, along with their democratic weighting, through filtering by viewpoint and/or community.</p>	<p>✗</p>	<p>✗</p>	<p>✗ Without a semantic web democratic processing would not be possible.</p>