Dissent To Union
Pandastical

Preamble

, The end of Classic's four and a half year reign has led to many new developments in the Civ world. Nations deciding if and how they should cross over, to where, with who. Many new questions and conundrums have arised from this massive new change in the Civ genre. Acadia is no exception to this; with the same debate ongoing now in the nation.

The idea proposed is, to my mind, deeply displeasing. A merger and creation of a new nation with what was on Classics Columbia. Not simply a close relationship, or one being above the other. But a merging of the two into a familiar but morphed identity and state, with a combination of the two into something fresh and new.

Now, I have nothing against Columbia. In reality, I know very little about them. Beyond speaking occasionally to Asu (controller of East Columbia) and Shadeboom (emperor) on Classics, I haven't really interacted with them. Never have I been in their lands, never have I seen their cities, never have I spoken to the broader populace.

For all I know, Columbia is the best nation to have ever existed in all of Civ. I am sure they have accomplished many amazing things. Obviously they've become quite a major power in Classics. They're players seem to be held in decent regard. While there's been some controversy with permapearling and shitters and things like that, they seem to be a broadly positively viewed nation.

This essay is not an attack on Columbia. If anyone sees it that way then they are mistaken. Rather, it is an attack on this idea as an entity. On the idea that Acadia should abandon many of the things it is known for, and instead replace them with something Acadian values, government philosophy and ideals are fundamentally against. That is what this essay opposes.

Acadian Essence

Before I explain why I believe this hypothesized merger is against Acadian values, I think I need to define what Acadian values are in my mind. Many people may not agree with me, and hopefully many will. Regardless of what others may think, these are what I believe the 'essence of Acadia' is.

The democratic nature of Acadia cannot be underplayed. The very soul and success of the state is dependent on its democracy. The right of any citizen to be able to hypothetically rise up and lead the nation is a key point of the nation. The social mobility of the nation is key to its existence.

This has been a part of Acadia ever since its start. Sure, attempted dictatorships and monarchies have occasionally popped up. But even then they're never able to rule, only achieve government positions. They always try to achieve this through *democracy*, not a coup or civil war.

More than just electing individuals in a representative democracy system, direct democracy has been just as important. Although the prime ministership, Senate, and the amount of centralization has remained, the National Assembly cannot be changed. This is a fundamental component of the nation.

We have seen how much Acadians love the mixture of direct and representative democracy. When some attempted to change the government too much, highly modifying the executive and Assembly, a new political movement almost immediately rose. Under the charismatic leadership of OwainX, DAM was able to almost immediately have electoral success and win the prime ministership. A man who was somewhat a newcomer to such high-stakes national politics was able to win the public heart and mind, and become the nation's leader. There's a key reason 'Jai Acadia, Jai Republic' has become so common amongst the leadership class.

Acadia revolves around democracy. It is the fueling philosophy behind the player base and the state. It is not ideologically fueled by geopolitical power, or personal wealth, or building prowess, or PVP. Every state has a 'focus' that it has to revolve around, something that is revered in the society, and players ideally want to be or accomplish. In Acadia this is not PVP skills, building monuments, becoming the richest or becoming the strongest power on the server. It is participating in democracy, in discussion, in the politics of the nation. It's the heart of Acadian society.

Not only is democracy and social mobility key, personal liberty is as well. People need to have the ability to be able to start businesses, start new towns, engage in personal enterprise. Some of the coolest things to come out of Acadia come because of personal liberty. ANN News, Vanhoover; these came about because people have the right to speak freely and settle freely. I doubt anyone would like to take away these liberties. However, I also hope no one would ever try to take away democracy and social mobility either, so I want to include it nevertheless.

Another part of the 'Acadian Essence' to me is the architecture and environment. Call me a traditionalist, but the heart of the nation is the tundra. It is snow, it is spruce forests. Now, Acadia doesn't have to *restrict* itself to this. Some of the coolest cities like Kanava and Vanhoover are creative builds in different biomes. But New Turing, the capital, the heart of the nation. It belongs in the tundra. 'Acadia' literally comes from a region in northeastern North America. To me this is just what the nation should be about.

Defense of democracy, personal liberty and social mobility. These are the very *heart* of Acadia. It is the essence that must be included in every single iteration of the nation, or the nation doesn't truly exist as Acadia. I hope that no one would argue with this, even me, who roleplays as a monarchist. Acadian Essence simply revolves around a snowy, spruce capital. A discord full of discord PVP and elections. A nation where people can go for it, to achieve greatness in various regards from business to politics to city-founding. To me, this is the Acadian Essence.

A New Constitution

I am not against adopting a new constitution. In fact, I am even in support of a new one. Truthfully, every new server iteration should probably see a new constitution. Not just for Acadia but for every nation more generally. Acadia should try something new each time, change things up a bit. After all the best part of democracy is fun RP, and meshing up the status quo is good for that.

However, there are some things I believe the Acadian constitution should always avoid. This, uncoincidentally, coincides carefully with the three major pillars of the Acadian essence. All constitutions should uphold democracy, personal liberty, and social mobility.

The first part is very simple. All positions should either be democratically elected themselves, or source themselves from democratically elected officials. It is fine if some government positions are not themselves elected. However, those positions must be given out by someone who *is* democratically elected, so that they answer to the people. Diplomats can be chosen by an elected minister, as a bad diplomat can result in the elected representative being held responsible, and so being voted out along with likely their chosen disliked diplomat.

Personal liberty must also remain in place. People should be able to open businesses, even if there is varying levels of government control. They must allow for people to set up their own farms, factories, or other such operations to gain economic prosperity. Clearly to me, this is hopefully the least controversial inclusion within a constitution.

Finally, social mobility. There has to be an opportunity for new players, even newfriends, to obtain higher positions. OwainX grew from a really smart guy and founder of Lovelace, to the Prime Minister. This should be allowed in any constitution. A newfriend should be able to come along, and theoretically be voted in.

Some might say that although this is ideal, it doesn't work in practice, because it could allow for a charismatic, well liked person to come to power, even if they have no real experience

or capability or talent for leadership. However, this is quite literally just an argument against democracy as a concept. Yes, anyone can theoretically come to power even if unqualified. That's just democracy. In that case, someone can then try and impeach the official once their incompetence becomes clear, or wait until the next election. Democracy isn't perfect; no one wants democracy in Acadia because it is the ideal or meta government for Civ. We want it because it is part of Acadian culture and is fun, and good RP.

Now, we have not seen the actual constitution yet. Therefore, it is difficult to make assumptions about it. Detailed information is severely lacking. However, based on some words from Cortwade, and what he clarified for me, I think we have somewhat of an idea of what could occur.

Theoretically, what Cortwade has proposed is sort of a much stronger Senate. This Senate would have more powers, but the National Assembly also has more powers to rein them in. For example, vetoes require the entire Senate to accomplish, and it would take less National Assembly votes to accomplish. However, one of these theoretical powers is also 'imminent domain'. This is where the government could boot someone off their land with compensation and cause, while the claimant could file a lawsuit to regain their land. I will speak more about this soon, though based on my 'Acadian Essence' chapter, you can probably see my thoughts on the matter clearly.

The membership of the council will be changed too. It will be raised proportionally based on the population. The selected members would all serve for life unless impeached, and would be chosen by the Senate with the National Assembly having to approve them. The prime minister will have one month terms, with snap elections if they step down or are impeached.

Frankly, a lot of these changes kind of repulse me. To be fair, some of them are fine to me. Vetoes requiring the entire Senate is good. But the rest is…well, just very bad. But before I can explain that, I need to finally type down why I dislike Senate power.

I am not opposed to having an upper class-body like this. Let's be honest, the vast majority of people would not be trusted in making major decisions. Stuff like conducting foreign diplomacy requires a leadership that is competent. It requires union in opinion, which is why the Minister of Foreign Affairs still has to answer to the Prime Minister. I'd honestly recommend reading Federalist No. 70 if you disagree. An executive branch requires energy, vigor, and expedition.

What I do have a problem with, however, is this branch having legislative prowess outside of foreign affairs and emergencies. That is where the National Assembly should have all power. In the day to day operations of the state, the National Assembly should have authority. The Senate might be able to veto legislation, as they are the competent-leadership that is supposed to oversee the nation, with the veto of course being able to be overturned.

However, the Senate should only be able to pass their own legislation (outside of strict foreign affairs) in emergencies. If there is an emergency requiring Senate legislation, the National Assembly should have to pass some sort of 'emergency period' action. Only during this period would the Senate have emergency legislation, and even then it would have to be

extended once it is over, or can be ended swiftly. Or, the Senate may start the emergency period, but the National Assembly can end it whenever they want and repeal whatever they want. Even so, I do not like it very much.

This is my opinion and it will not change. Due to this, my beliefs come in near direct conflict with this massive extent of Senate authority being gained. Frankly, I see this extension of Senate power against the essence of Acadia, and in the greater worsening of the Acadian nation, even if superior for the Acadian state. I will explain my opposition to each part individually, and hopefully this will clear up the matter, and portray why I believe what I do. Hopefully, it may even change some minds, and this whole mess may be avoided.

Let us look at the imminent domain section now, as I previously alluded to. This is the most clear breach of public rights and sovereignty I have ever seen, and I cannot believe our trusted political officials would even consider it. It is against a major pillar of the Acadian Essence, personal liberty, but more than that is simply immoral and dangerous.

I do not trust any public office to be able to simply take anyone's land whenever they want, even with compensation. Due to bureaucratic inertia and bias, I also do not trust courts to be the one solution to this. To take someone's land, it should depend most ideally on the National Assembly. However, with bias, I can see it depending more so on the Senate.

The Senate, should however, be only able to do such a thing under strict guidelines. They should not simply be able to provide a reason and some diamonds, and take someone's land, with a possibility to get it back via court. No. To do this the Senate should need to ask for permission from a court using one of a few reasons capable, then conduct a trial to take this land. Not take the land first and then possibly answer to court after. The difference is that one has the optional usage of a court to oppose the government, while the other has the mandatory usage of the court to allow the government to take action, which is better when it is something as big as seizing property. This imminent domain concept is simply repulsive, that is that.

Next on the chopping block is the new composition of this Senate. Members not appointed via elections but more so like American supreme court justices, proposed by the executive and then confirmed by the legislature. They will serve for life unless impeached. It is a bastardization of the Acadian political system, and if conducted, will likely greatly sap my interest from Acadia.

First off I must mention the fun aspect. Elections are fun. They are the most beloved part of Acadia to me and the reason I always wish to return. Democracy is the best part of Acadia and this is a keystone of it. So the fact that only the prime minister will now be elected is simply greatly sad, and a vacuum of fun.

Secondly, I must mention how poor this system is, as it will likely create an oligarchy. Impeachments and forced elections are very different things, and they will not work the same. An impeachment is an inherently negative action. To impeach someone, they must have done something wrong. Something poor in conduct or poor in effect.

In comparison a mandatory election is not an inherently bad thing. It is an opportunity for new blood to come in. For example, I may like an Acadian politician. However, I may like someone else more. I do not mind either, but prefer the new blood, allowing them to be elected.

However, now consider this an impeachment. A second, more liked party is not in consideration. It requires me to file a negative action against someone, and then have enough people agree with me to take them from office. Even then, the person I like may not be inherently put in.

This will just cause stagnation. The theorizors behind this system seem to have the optimistic idea that people will impeach a politician after a bad action. In reality, this will not happen. It will require a consistent streak of negative action and an equally consistent lack of positive action. This will lead to a stagnation of the Senate until new seats are opened. Yes, these will happen anyways. But that is not the point. The point is that elections should frequently occur, to necessitate consistent goodwill of the people, an opening of new blood, and social mobility.

This is also where the lack of social mobility comes into play. This system seems to be essentially electing an oligarchy that responds to the people. I have talked about how a system like this is likely beneficial and ‘meta’ for Civ. But Acadia is not meta. Democracy is not meta. I do not care if it is more efficient or effective. It is against the Acadian policy of allowing new people to move up. This Senate will just lead to a stagnation of the upper ruling class.

The National Assembly will not be as effective a check as it may be thought. A citizen that does not care enough towards the impeachment or negative action will vote to keep the official rather than remove them. They will vote for the person to remain over leaving, as if they do not care enough, a positive result will be chosen by instinct rather than a negative.

This Constitution should hopefully require the approval of the people. It should require ratification. And I hope it does not gain it.

These changes oppose social mobility. They oppose personal liberties. They oppose democracy. They oppose everything Acadia stands for. It is a disgrace to the good that has been built up here, and I pray there will never be a success or repetition of such disastrous thoughts.

Motivations of the Merger

Now, it is time to talk about why this is happening. Why is this merger being considered? What are the motivations behind it? I have collected a list of reasons mentioned by others, and will now try to discredit them to the best of my ability.

A major reason I have heard of is that it will help get through the difficult environment that a 'start of the world' brings to Acadians. It is true that SotW often is harsh. There are raiders. There is a lack of snitch curtains or bunkers. There is a lack of resources. A lack of alliances. A lack of Weepee. It is much harder than the stagnant peace of Classics, and closer resembling the chaotic raiding of the launches of Universe and Rev. Your buildings and farms and homes will be destroyed.

However, frankly, this does not warrant a merger with another nation. This is an astoundingly extreme solution to such a problem. There are other solutions. Acadia could find a new 'sugar daddy' nation like Javaya was, with autonomy but protection. Or, Acadia can just go like many nations will and ride through it. Ride through the damage, suffer through it, just go with it. Just like every other nation, live through the raiding. Merging with another nation is an extreme solution that will not even avoid being raided, perhaps just help combat it, which to me is not enough to warrant this action.

Someone, I think Bloof, mentioned that the government is 'burnt out'. So bringing in experienced fresh blood will alleviate this issue. Frankly, I do not think it is an issue at all. In general, this is just a part of democracies. Pass on the torch to newer Acadians if you are burnt out. Don't import experienced foreigners, just leave the future of Acadia to actual Acadians. If you do not trust any Acadians to take over the position, then you have massive problems on your

hands, and you should focus on that rather than importing people as a short term solution. After all, they aren't immune to burn outs either.

Bloof also mentioned that having a constantly changing government is a struggle in foreign affairs, and that in the UDF she was constantly contacted even after leaving office. This is not a good excuse for anything. Yes, diplomats that are consistently preserved are better in foreign affairs, which often come down to personal connections and trust. This is not an excuse to abandon terms and democracy. It is a reason to try and let skilled diplomats continue working from administration to administration. If an ex-official is contacted, they should stand their ground and refer to the new official. If efficiency is the sole reason to abandon constant elections and Acadian democracy, it is not a good reason.

Finally, we have player activity. It's very much a weak reason, I will not spend much time on it. Yes, Acadia will lose population in the swap of servers, perhaps more dangerous than usual with SotW chaos. But, again, not a good enough reason for such drastic action as merging with another nation. Acadia (especially due to the three pillars of it's essence, which are appealing to new players) is great at gaining new players. It bounced back after switching servers, and after going through a dry spell, bounced back around Vanhoover's rise. It has, and will, bounce back.

New Charter of Liberties

This isn't specifically linked to opposing the merger. But as it is also a current topic to discuss this new charter of liberties, I thought I'd try to throw my hat in. I have a few ideas for rights I believe should be on this charter.

The first three are quite obvious. No one should oppose these. Voting rights for citizens, free speech, and the right to travel outside the nation to any nation (if they're allowing visitors). No more elaboration needed, it's that simple.

Free trade is another inherent right that Acadians should receive. It is, after all, a key part of the personal liberties that are intrinsically tied to the nation. Anyone should be able to set up a farm or business, choose their own prices, etc. normal stuff. It's key for the nation's economy to actually progress, and is a basic right. Anyone should be able to sell wheat if they want to. Competing prices are good, shocker coming from a capitalist.

A right to a fair and somewhat speedy trial is next. Additionally, I want to add the fact that all people that are held in pearls have to get a trial to remain pearled. Not that crazy I think, right?

Directly opposed to imminent domain but complimentary to the essence of Acadia; the right to own property. Including not having your property just taken away for any reason and money. There must be courts involved to do that, cmon now.

Finally, you should have a right to defend yourself and your property, another basic lowball. This should also involve being able to own prot and combat gear. Bunkers and vaults are their own discussion; although I am theoretically supporting them I will not cover that here.