

 **Topics** ● **Review** **Invite** **More**▼ **URTH** **Urth** **Urth @ TepWiki** **Urth Maps**▼ **VALSORA** **RMB Cafeteria** **Valsora Dispatch** **ValsoraWiki**▼ **THE EAST PACIFIC** **TEP Main** **On NationStates**▼ **CATEGORIES****Newcomers St...** ●**Worlds to Build****The Plaza** ●**University of the ...****The Magisteriu...** ● **All categories**▼ **TAGS**

graceful ▼



[AMENDMENT] Citizenship Act

A_mean_old_man**Vizier****21d**

By apparent necessity, I've taken on the role of approving citizenship applications / enforcing lapses in status / maintaining citizenship records. Aside from having to extensively repair and combine records, I've found this to be a needlessly onerous and poorly-followed procedure, both by citizenship officials and by numerous citizens making changes to resident / WA nation status.

Right now, the onus is heavily on the Office to monitor and accommodate individuals playing fast and loose with their residency and WA status. People are changing their nations and not announcing it, changing their nations and not sending telegrams as required by the statute, CTE'ing and refounding, raiding with foreign organizations & not announcing these changes in WA status, and the Office seems expected to offer leniency, chaperone people and chase them down when they're in violation, and is obligated to grant a 48-hour grace period while people fool around at our expense. While I could choose austerity and have the legal authority right now to purge multiple citizens who have not followed the law in regards to updating the Office in the Thread and telegramming an Official, I'd prefer to amend the law, change things and put a stop to all this in the future. This is ridiculous and I don't have time for it, and it puts strain on people and resources that could be better focused elsewhere.

[Skip to main content](#)

For those who don't know exactly what I'm talking about, please observe all updates to the records thread beginning [here](#).

Also eliminating the dispatch option for recordkeeping. This is what the forum is for. Things go poorly when dispatches are used for government business like this. Same for proscription.

SECTION I: CITATION

...1.1. This Act shall be known and cited as the "Citizenship Act."

SECTION II: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITIZENSHIP OFFICE AND THE APPLICATION THREAD

...2.1. The Citizenship Office ("Office") is hereby established to oversee the process of naturalization. It shall be composed of the Viziers, the Eastern Pacific Police Service Commissioner, and other Citizenship Officials as confirmed by the Magisterium. The Delegate cannot serve concurrently as a Commissioner.

...2.2. The Grand Vizier shall lead and set out the procedures of the Office.

...2.3. The Magisterium shall confirm Citizenship Officials nominated by the Grand Vizier via a 2/3 majority vote for an indefinite term. The Magisterium may remove Citizenship Officials by the same majority.

...2.4. The Office shall establish an official forum thread ("Thread") that can be utilized for official records, inquiries, the posting of applications, acceptance or denial of applications, acceptance of

[Skip to main content](#)

requests, and other purposes as seen proper by the Office or this law.

SECTION III: NATURALIZATION

...3.1. Residents seeking to become Citizens must (as listed alphabetically):

...3.1.1. State within their application one of their valid Resident nations and their World Assembly ("WA") nation, and post said application in the medium designated by the Office,

...3.1.2. Respond in confirmation to a telegram sent to both their nations from a Citizenship Official, and

...3.1.3. Have their application accepted by the Office.

...3.2. All applications must list a valid WA nation and all nations listed in an application must be operated by their respective applicants. Applications not meeting these criteria shall be denied.

...3.3. A Citizenship Official shall notify a Resident, via an in-game telegram, on whether their application for Citizenship was accepted or denied.

...3.4. The Office may deny any Citizenship application for reasons of regional security concerns, incomplete application, provision of falsified information and/or ejection from the WA. Said denial may be appealed to the Conclave within two weeks of denial.

...3.4.1. The Praesidium may vote to overrule the Office's decision to grant Citizenship for reasons of regional security.

...3.4.2. If a telegram from the Citizenship Office is not replied to within fourteen days, the associated citizenship application shall

[Skip to main content](#)

automatically expire, in which case a new citizenship application must be submitted in order to be accepted.

...3.5. Upon becoming a Citizen, a Resident is required to maintain continuous residency with the Resident nation they stated their application ("recorded Resident nation"). They shall also, maintain continuous WA membership with the nation they stated as their WA nation in their application ("recorded WA nation").

...3.6. In the event a Citizen wishes to change what nation the Office has noted as their recorded Resident nation or recorded WA nation, they shall request the Office , within the designated Thread, to change one of their recorded nations to a new nation they own. A telegram from the new nation shall be sent to a Citizenship Official.

...3.6.1. A Citizen does not need to send such a telegram if their new nation is their current recorded Resident nation or recorded WA nation.

...3.6.2. A Citizenship Official shall notify a Citizen, via an in-game telegram, once their request for a change is granted by the Office in the Thread.

...3.7. Continuous World Assembly membership requirements shall not apply to any active soldier of the Eastern Pacific Sovereign Army ("EPSA") as verified by the Overseeing Officer. The active EPSA soldier must notify the Citizenship office within one week of joining EPSA.

...3.7.1. If an EPSA soldier ceases active duty, they have one week within which to declare a World Assembly nation

[Skip to main content](#)

they own to the Office in the designated medium to serve as their recorded WA nation following said declaration. Failure to do so in said time-frame shall invalidate their Citizenship.

...3.8 The Overseeing Officer is mandated to upkeep an updated list of EPSA soldiers for the Citizenship Office to review. If the Overseeing Officer does not keep an updated list, they shall be in dereliction of duty.

SECTION IV: CITIZENSHIP AUDIT

...4.1. A Citizenship shall be **immediately** invalid ~~48 hours after they are publicly notified in the Thread by the Office to either (as listed alphabetically)~~ **upon discovery by the Office of:**

...4.1.1. ~~No longer~~ **Failure to** maintain residency with their recorded Resident nation ~~at the time of notification,~~

...4.1.2. ~~No longer~~ **Failure to** maintain WA membership in their recorded WA nation ~~at the time of notification.~~

...4.1.3. **Failure to comply with the process detailed in Section 3.6.**

~~...4.2. If the Citizen returns their recorded Resident nation to the region or their WA membership to their recorded WA nation and issues a notification of such return within the Thread before the 48-hour period established in Section 4.1 expires, their Citizenship shall remain valid.~~

~~...4.2.1 The Citizen may also keep their Citizenship valid if they successfully change their recorded Resident nation or recorded WA nation to another nation with valid citizenship or WA~~

[Skip to main content](#)

~~membership within the same 48-hour period, following Section 3 procedures.~~

...4.32. Exceptions to Section 4.1 and its subsections may be established by additional law. Any Citizen may reapply for Citizenship upon removal.

...4.43. Any Resident may renounce their Citizenship by notifying the Office in the Thread.

SECTION V: CITIZENSHIP RECORDS

...5.1. The Office shall maintain an official list of all Citizens. Said list shall remain publicly viewable on The East Pacific forums ~~or in an in-game dispatch~~. The list may be posted in another forum thread besides the Thread if the forums are utilized for this purpose.

...5.2. Approval or denial of a Citizenship application or change of a Citizen's nations shall be the moment when the Office states within the Thread that an application has been denied or accepted or that a change of nation was accepted.

...5.3. Removal of Citizenship shall be the moment when the Office marks, within the Thread, that a Citizen's Citizenship is invalid or a Citizen has renounced their registration.

SECTION VI: PROSCRIPTION

...6.1. Proscription shall be a status which confers banishment from the region for reasons of regional security based on actions committed abroad or against The East Pacific. No proscription

[Skip to main content](#)

may be issued against any resident for reason of summary or indictable offense; all such instances must be tried by Conclave.

...6.2. Individuals with no known resident nation may be proscribed by the Praesidium through any process dictated by the Standing Orders of the Praesidium.

...6.3. Non-citizen residents may be proscribed by the Praesidium through a 3/4 majority vote, the administration of which shall be defined by the Standing Orders of the Praesidium.

...6.4. No Citizen may be proscribed by the Praesidium.

...6.5. The Grand Vizier shall maintain a public record of proscribed groups and nations on the forums ~~or in a dispatch~~, as well as the reasons behind proscription...

...6.6. The Delegate must be informed upon the beginning of a proscription process, as well as once a decision is made. The Grand Vizier must announce each proscription, or consign such a task to the Delegate. This announcement must adequately justify the proscription.

...6.7. The maintenance of a resident nation by an individual proscribed by the Praesidium shall be considered a summary offense with a sentence of banishment for as long as the proscription lasts.

...6.8. The Praesidium may alter or lift any proscription by the process in which it was established, or establish a

[Skip to main content](#)

time limit or terms within the initial proscription decision.

...6.9. Any proscribed nation may appeal to the Conclave, in which the length or terms of proscription may be altered, including an exception to group proscriptions, or the proscription may be fully lifted, if it is determined to be unreasonable or unjustified.

SECTION VII: VOTE FRAUD

...8.1. Nothing in this Act permits an individual to maintain multiple Citizenships, which shall constitute an indictable offense with a maximum sentence of permanent banishment.

...8.2. Any individual who attempts to vote during Delegate Elections and regional referenda without valid Citizenship shall be committing an indictable offense with a maximum sentence of one year banishment.

[🔗 \[A-2025-16\] Amendment to the Citizen...](#)

AC5230  **Provost**

21d

While I could choose austerity and have the legal authority right now to purge multiple citizens who have not followed the law in regards to updating the Office in the Thread and telegramming an Official...

Who's to say you shouldn't?

Full support. I'm sick of the bullshit.

[Skip to main content](#)

The Commonwealth of ArenaC - since January 27th, 2019

Resident (1/27/2019 - position abolished 8/20/2021) (position re-established 9/5/2023 - present)
Citizen (2/19/2019 - present)
Magister (2/5/2020 - present)
Deputy Provost (2/6/2020 - 5/18/2021) (10/17/2021 - present)
Special Constable of the EPPS (2/20/2021 - present)
Assistant Commissioner of the EPPS (1/10/2025 - present)

Less formal titles:
Deputy Provost Emeritus (5/18/2021 - 10/17/2021)
Z-Day Killsquid, always.
1st Hm'st've'nt'ed'ist of TEP (2/16/2020 - present)

theclockworkvixen  **Office o...**  **21d**

Despite me being in LOA, I'm still gonna comment

I don't like this. What it's doing is removing a period of grace for people who may have forgotten, like "hey, just so you know" and replacing it with "boom, you're off the list".

I would like some reasoning behind the removal of IV.2 (admittedly, I did skim through the initial explanation, so just quoting will be fine).

Folly Red Vixen

Nation in TEP: The Clockwork Multiverse | — | **WA Nation:** The Clockwork Multiverse

Magister: [September 3, 2024 - Present]

[Skip to main content](#)

Delegate of the Gateway Hall: [January 17, 2025 - January 26, 2025]

Deputy Provost: [April 2, 2025 - Present]

A_mean_old_man  **Vizier** **21d**

They can just reapply. Putting all of this work on the Cit Office is unreasonable. 4.2 just doubles the checks that Cit Office has to do within 48 hours, and I don't always have time to work within 48 hours like this. And it seems like no one else is willing to do this right now if I don't handle it.

The vast majority of citizens aren't delinquent when it comes to reporting, but the few who consistently are are making a lot of work and a lot of possible problems - potentially even frivolous legal challenges - for people who are actually willing to put the time and effort into making this place function on a basic, fundamental level. Please let me just nix citizenship when our process is not respected; people can reapply later with updated credentials, although I may eventually recommend repeat offenders to the Praesidium for denial.

Lucklife  **Office of the Provost** **21d**

I would say the problem here is that citizen office needs to be expanded, for example assigning more Viziers to the task. We have double digit viziers, and if they aren't doing work, you all need to sit down and have a good talk to split work. Handling everything by yourself is not healthy.

The first time cit official checks - say 20 citizens, and then finds 3 in noncompliance, the second time after the notification

[Skip to main content](#)

should just be zero-ing on those 3 which another official can do.

Pardun? Tarunatala no love.

Captain of the EPSA

Service History and Awards (Dispatch)

Mangegneithe Vizier 

21d

Full support. Grace periods have been argued for a lot in the past, but I don't see the need for it. I can't think of a single reason why someone would need the time. So far, the only people who I have (in my long tenure being the sole active citizenship officer until I burnt out) notified that needed to correct are:

1. People who corrected but then continued to not use voting rights anyway (the only thing citizenship confers, since residents are protected by the Concordat)
2. People who just don't notice/correct anyway
3. One singular person who did notice and then refused to correct out of spite and then also tried to sue me

Our grace period is currently not bringing any positive community benefit. It's extra red tape, extra burden on an understaffed, overworked, underappreciated, over-relied-upon office. Which brings me to this:

Lucklife:

I would say the problem here is that citizen office needs to be expanded, for example assigning more Viziers to the task. We have double digit viziers, and if

[Skip to main content](#)

they aren't doing work, you all need to sit down and have a good talk to split work. Handling everything by yourself is not healthy.

Yeah, I definitely agree. One of the main things I tried to do as GV was get Viziers more active and another one of my main things was expanding the Office. I managed to get 2-3 more Viziers roped in and 3-5 new Officers working on it. I even appointed someone to take over duties to encourage action. Most recently, we've gotten some bot development in that supports the office.

However, I think at some point we have to accept that there is little interest in a time-consuming, dispassionate, thankless job like citizenship applications. We also need to keep in mind that, while there's no official distinction (something I wish I had pursued more before I burnt out) but there is an unofficial distinction between Viziers who are more proactive vs reactive. Many retire into the office to be more like security reserves – waiting to be called into service in crisis, when they leap to action like no one you've seen before – while some elect to serve as more active duty guardians – keeping a close eye on different stats and tasks.

Due to our status as a feeder, particularly in a post-F/S stage where we have so many enemies, we need shields as much as we need swords. It's not like these Viziers are doing nothing – they still endotart, they still talk when we need to, and they've acted on high alert situations from Fedele's coup to the false flag del bump to the ConCrisis to Jo. And they have lives outside of NS, where they cannot contribute a lot of time to things that just aren't fun.

[Skip to main content](#)

So the reality is, we've tried a lot to reach this ideal of every Vizier lending a hand in citizenship applications, but the problem is it's unattainable as long as we both have and need reactive Viziers alongside our proactive ones, and as long as who we add to the office is limited by who is actually interested (a necessary assumption and an incredibly limited pool).

So if there's a situation where we can loosen the burden of this boring, thankless job that we need for our government to survive, I say go for it. In my experience, it'll bring no harm. Besides, reclaiming citizenship afterwards anyway isn't very difficult due to a lot of reforms we've made in the past, reforms that are younger than the clauses AMOM wants to edit. I see this as necessary but unfortunately delayed adjustment to the new reality.

[he/him](#)

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

[A_mean_old_man](#)  [Vizier](#) 20d

Something else that's unwritten and thus far unspoken is that forum admins should be doing IP checks on new citizens to make sure they're not alts of banned accounts and / or hiding their IP and geo behind VPNs. There doesn't seem to be any way that this has been legally reconciled besides loose references to fraud, but it should also be mentioned that there are only a small handful of Viziers who are able to do this (that will probably not be

[Skip to main content](#)

expanded). Provisions exist for admin to do it retroactively and for the Praesidium to “overrule the Office’s decision to grant Citizenship for reasons of regional security”, but it’s likely to be missed retrospectively like this.

I’m not saying we try to codify this right now, but it’s something else to consider.

Bachtendekuppen Arbiter 17d

As I understand, Citizenship can nearly immediately be regranted. So I don’t really see a lot of downside to good-faith Citizens.

A_mean_old_man Vizier 16d

I move to vote.

theclockworkvixen Office o... 🌸 16d

I second.

Folly Red Vixen

Nation in TEP: The Clockwork Multiverse | — | **WA Nation:**
The Clockwork Multiverse

Magister: [September 3, 2024 - Present]

Delegate of the Gateway Hall: [January 17, 2025 - January
26, 2025]

Deputy Provost: [April 2, 2025 - Present]

Automatically bumped on May 13

[Skip to main content](#)

Closed on May 13

Opened 15 hours ago

AC5230  Provost

15h

Do you believe in life after ~~love~~ veto?

The Commonwealth of ArenaC - since January 27th, 2019

Resident (1/27/2019 - position abolished 8/20/2021) (position re-established 9/5/2023 - present)

Citizen (2/19/2019 - present)

Magister (2/5/2020 - present)

Deputy Provost (2/6/2020 - 5/18/2021) (10/17/2021 - present)

Special Constable of the EPPS (2/20/2021 - present)

Assistant Commissioner of the EPPS (1/10/2025 - present)

Less formal titles:

Deputy Provost Emeritus (5/18/2021 - 10/17/2021)

Z-Day Killsquid, always.

1st Hm'st've'nt'ed'ist of TEP (2/16/2020 - present)

Mangegneithe Vizier 

14h

Today, the Delegate of The East Pacific has made the decision to exercise the first veto we've seen in five years, to shoot down an amendment that would close a dangerous loophole and save time and effort for our dedicated public officials. The Delegate made this decision supposedly with "the advice and feedback of members of the region." However, it is clear that the Delegate did not listen to both sides of the

[Skip to main content](#)

debate, did not seek or heed the advice of anyone who disagreed with him, and pushed ahead with the support of his Cabinet echo chamber to undo Magisterium legislation with little to no logic.

So far only one Vizier has stepped forward and said he was contacted. This Vizier, notably, has no experience in the Citizenship Office, despite over six months as a Vizier. With no hands on experience and no qualifications other than agreeing with the Delegate, that Vizier served as the only known consultant on this issue, despite not being affected by it. Meanwhile, I myself, a former Grand Vizier, currently one of three Viziers who has actively worked on citizenship applications in the past few years, and one of only two that is still active, was never consulted, nor was the bill's sponsor, who is the second. Because the Delegate already made up his mind.

The first argument – and the first lie – that our Delegate sets forth is that the amendment was not passed with a majority. He claims it was only passed with 47% of the vote. This is incorrect. The amendment passed with 53% in favor. The Delegate derives this erroneous claim from the Magisterium poll, which counts abstentions. Our Standing Orders, as well as the parliamentary procedures of many real life corporations and governments (including the U.S. Congress) do not count abstentions in the passage percentage. To do so is contrary to all logic and law.

Particularly, I'd like to note the recent failure of a Praesidium proposal to lower the endorsement cap to 200. This amendment failed with 52% of Magisters

[Skip to main content](#)

voting against – a difference of one vote just like this vetoed proposal and a similar percentage. Two Magisters, however, abstained. If we took this the way our Delegate did, that those abstentions mean whatever we'd like, then this proposal should have passed because only 47% opposed the proposal. However, we do not live in this fantasy world. We live in one where our rules mean something even when our Delegate wishes they did not.

The Delegate then goes on to describe instantaneous removal of citizenship as a “great inconvenience,” stating that residents will be “unjustly and immediately punished for actions they may not have yet even realised they had taken.” This is untrue as well. There is no justified reason why anyone would not realize that they have Ceased to Exist, Moved Regions, or Resigned from the WA. Either they are neglecting TEP for months on end or they are making an active choice. We should not be bending over backwards for people who can't bother to spend five minutes every two months on logging in and we should not be bothering ourselves with people choosing to forfeit citizenship.

As I noted in the amendment thread, which is public and ought to be influential in any decision made on this topic, there are two main types of people who I've notified of impending loss of citizenship in my years in the Praesidium: (1) Those who corrected course but don't vote in elections, which is the only right conferred by Citizenship and (2) Those who don't correct anyway. Exceptions tend to include people who were heavily criticized by the public for their actions or inactions and already had to jump through extraordinary hurdles to get back to their initial position, since their

[Skip to main content](#)

number only includes Delegates and Viziers. No one's rights are being preserved by vetoing this amendment. All it does is make life more difficult for the Citizenship Office and keep open a useless loophole.

The Delegate goes on to describe the amendment as "incredibly hostile to cosmo members of TEP." As a cosmo myself, speaking about a Delegate who holds citizenship only here and in a nine nation start-up, I can confidently say that this is incorrect as well. Nothing about this bill makes it any harder for cosmos to acquire citizenship. What he describes, with these cosmopolitans either needing to WA lock or contact the office each time they change their WA, is already how our system works. Vetoing this amendment does not change that, nor does this amendment passing. All it does is prevent people that don't follow our laws from having any immediate consequences.

As a side note, I have served as a member of the Free Nations Federation's government for nearly five years and the Alstroemerian Commonwealth's government for over three. I served in Thaecia's government for almost two years, and I have held citizenship in nine separate prominent gameplay regions across my 5+ years of East Pacifican citizenship. As a cosmopolitan and a prolific one at that, I am offended by a Delegate who says he speaks for people like me while suggesting that I am hostile to myself for supporting this legislation. It makes no sense and is disrespectful.

The Delegate further claims this amendment will not "prevent foreign enemies from infiltrating our region" – this, notably, is not the goal. The goal is to fix a

[Skip to main content](#)

loophole that allows someone who still holds citizenship to not meet the requirements of citizenship. The goal is to ease the burden on one of the most thankless and tedious jobs our region has to offer – and one of the most necessary. It does not “unjustly punish” anyone. It simply enforces the law. The Delegate claims to appreciate the hard work of the Magisterium, but he vetoes our proposals, twists our Standing Orders, and rails against our existing legal systems under the facade of concern for populations who are not truly vulnerable.

This is a quality of life improvement. It is an amendment which simply and sensibly updates our legal code to account for the fact that we Citizenship Officers are human beings – human beings who have lives, classes, jobs, friends, other positions in TEP, and little free time to devote to the mindless task of approving and auditing citizenships. And yet we do so, without glory or thanks from the Delegate or anyone else. We sink our energy into this task because we know it’s important, and we came to the Magisterium with an inefficiency we wanted to correct. The Magisterium agreed with us, but the Delegate did not.

It is the responsibility of every citizen of The East Pacific to reject the Delegate’s arguments, which are based more in the vibes of the proposal than the actual concrete provisions of it. It is our responsibility to see the plain facts for what they are – this amendment is and does none of the things that the Delegate claims. We must come together in logic and solidarity to reinforce the value of truth and democracy in our region. We must not bow down to exaggerated fearmongering. I call

[Skip to main content](#)

on my fellow Magisters to pass this proposal as is, without any changes. This amendment is necessary. Let's show the Executive government that the Magisterium does not make decisions based on vibes and vague misinterpretations but rather on truth, logic, and a commitment to bettering our region.

[he/him](#)

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

Zukchiva   

11h

As a note, I was also contacted by Dead about this amendment and shared to him my thoughts. While I have not worked in the CitOffice for many years I HAVE worked in the Citoffice in the past - notably when it was under the Viceroy, and did audits as such - and a little bit more recently at the start when it swapped to WA/tg requirements (though I never did audits in then, and by that point we had swapped to the suspension system this amendment is trying to do away with).

Based on that I will say that, while the Delegate's veto is too generalizing and is mistruthful (probably from misunderstanding of the legislative process) in terms of Magi majorities, there are some truths to this core.

1. This bill WILL inconvenience some TEPers. That's just a fact. In the past five years we saw 2 Delegates loose their WA which - if Im understanding this amendment right - would force

[Skip to main content](#)

them to loose citizenship and thus the Delegacy. I myself have moved out of TEP accidentally once or twice, and if this amendment had been in effect then, then I would've lost my citizenship and then theoretically been forced to undergo the renomination process for an Arbiter or Vizier (i say theoretically cuz I cant remember what positions I had when that happened). While this is anecdotal, I do recall Libertanny - literally one of our greatest recent delegates - got disenfranchised because of a system like this amendment that did an audit right before elections began (back when nom period stopped new cits from voting).

It is true that the regular TEPer it inconveniences will be rare because people are generally good at staying put. But mistakes happen and history shows that they do, and in those I'd say uncommon moments, this amendment definitely will inconvenience some TEPers - whether you think that inconvenience is great or small is personal opinion.

2. While this bill doesnt really alienate cosmos as the Delegate claims, it DOES prevent from gaining citizenship those non-EPSA R/Ders. Yes, in our current system they weren't supposed to hold citizenship anyways, so the suspension system is a loophole such people use OR is a happy little accident heh. Either way, closing this loophole formally shuts out a small minority of current and future TEPers from having a full voice (via votes in elections or referenda). Again, whether one thinks this is a big deal is

[Skip to main content](#)

personal preference, but this does alienate such individuals. Prime example is Aster.

3. I don't really see how this system is a major inconvenience since all it is is literally just one extra post then waiting 2 days. That's it. It works perfectly well if audits are batched up like once a month or every two weeks or so, which to my knowledge is how it used to be done from 2020 all the way to 2023. If the Prae insists on constant day-by-day audits then sure I can see how this is a bit tiring, but again: just do an audit sweep every two weeks and suddenly this system just isn't so bad.
4. I do not agree nor condone the phrasing of Delegate's act as anti-Magisterial.
5. Although it may appear to be executive overreach to some, it does not to me. The Delegate clearly has some deep concerns with this bill - which may or may not be true, but they are deep - and is not using this power frivolously. Nor does the Delegate have any reason to vote against this amendment beyond the arguments he's stated, nor does his history in the past year show any anti-Magisterial resentment that could explain this veto. It's very clear the Delegate believes in the arguments he sets out and thus believes this bill should be vetoed due to how it could inconvenience some TEpers and alienate the cosmos (which as I said isn't true for the most part, but I digress).

[Skip to main content](#)

Ad astra per aspera.**EvanRikuta****7h**

@Mangegneithe 🚫 If I may, may I suggest the ammendment of 4.1 to the following;

...4.1. A Citizenship shall be immediately invalid upon discovery by the Office of:

...4.1.1. Failure to maintain residency with their recorded Resident nation,

...4.1.2. Failure to maintain WA membership in their recorded WA nation, and;

...4.1.3. Failure to comply with the process detailed in Section 3.6 within one hour of the happenings detailed in articles 4.1.1 or 4.1.2 occuring

Or a variation of it, as it ensures 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 don't mess with 4.1.3, this is the result of my convo with Bach

Mangegneithe **Vizier** 🚫**4h**

Zukchiva:

As a note, I was also contacted by Dead about this amendment and shared to him my thoughts.

I appreciate coming forward. The lack of transparency from the Delegate on who actually advised can only breed speculation, and the more information we hear, the more complete a picture we get. So far, though, I'm still not convinced that he didn't just hear from those who agree with him already.

Zukchiva:

In the past five years we saw 2 Delegates loose their WA which - if Im

[Skip to main content](#)

understanding this amendment right -
would force them to loose citizenship
and thus the Delegacy

I would argue that they as much "lost" the Delegacy under the current system as the old, since they lost the Delegacy seat without appointing a successor. I would also add Marrabuk to the list of those who lost WA status – Marrabuk was rigorously interrogated by the Magisterium during his reconfirmation vote as Vizier, which was already required under the old system.

Zukchiva:

But mistakes happen and history shows that they do, and in those Id say uncommon momments, this amendment definitely will inconvenience some TEPers - whether you think that inconvenience is great or small is personal opinion.

I would argue that any inconvenience can be measured and, more than that, compared to what the inconvenience would be under the current system. Is someone who already has to regain hundreds of endorsements that much more inconvenienced by an additional telegram? Is someone who already has to jump through the hurdle of renomination and reconfirmation that much more inconvenienced by the smaller hurdle of, again, a single telegram? It can be measured in the amount of time it takes – minimal – and the comparative impact – negligible.

Zukchiva:

[Skip to main content](#)

Either way, closing this loophole formally shuts out a small minority of current and future TEPers from having a full voice (via votes in elections or referenda).

I am honestly befuddled by this part of your argument. You admit it's illegal for foreign R/Ders to hold citizenship and that this is a loophole that allows people to bypass the law, then seem to suggest that it's a bad thing to close this loophole because those illegally holding citizenship would be held accountable?

Like you said, these people are already barred. Vetoing this amendment doesn't change that. What would change it is another amendment, which neither you nor Dead have proposed. In fact, it is me, the supposed anti-cosmo despite being the most prolific cosmo delegate we've seen in the modern era, who is broaching the topic of making that expansion. Unfortunately, this truth makes the false framework of the veto and any opposition to this chiefly clerical alteration crumble, so it is inconvenient.

Zukchiva:

I don't really see how this system is a major inconvenience since all it is is literally just one extra post then waiting 2 days.

The problem with having a heavy schedule IRL, as I'm sure you know, is that schedule being unpredictable. At any given day, I might be able to devote some time to an audit or getting through a batch of telegrams, but I cannot often say with any certainty that I will be available two days

[Skip to main content](#)

later for a follow-up. This discourages audits and makes those who perform them make room in their schedule to do so, which could be damaging depending on the context – maybe I’m free right now to write textwalls but I know for a fact that I have a meeting on Monday with a friend/coworker and we’ll probably hang out afterwards, leaving little to no room for me currently to schedule anything two days from now.

Zukchiva:

I do not agree nor condone the phrasing of Delegate’s act as anti-Magisterial.

The Delegate reversed a decision of the Magisterium. That means he is against the Magisterium in this issue. That is not something you can disagree with, it’s a simple fact – the Executive is taking a side against the Legislature on this issue. As many have pointed out, this is quite obvious to say, since any veto is inherently that. But I think it’s necessary to point out because a veto is a big deal, particularly in TEP, and here it is being used for reasons that make no sense.

Zukchiva:

The Delegate clearly has some deep concerns with this bill - which may or may not be true, but they are deep - and is not using this power frivolously.

If his concerns are not founded in truth, I would argue that this use is indeed frivolous. Of course, you are free to disagree, which I can obviously tell you do, but I wanted to remind everyone why I’m

[Skip to main content](#)

taking issue here – the dishonesty, intentional or mistaken, implicit or explicit.

Zukchiva:

Its very clear the Delegate believes in the arguments he sets out and thus believes this bill should be vetoed due to how it couod inconvenience some TEpers and alienatte cosmos (whixh as I said isnt true for tje modt part, but I digress).

Exactly my point. It isn't true for the most part, and so we should not just let it stand. Just as the veto is a constitutionally valid action so too is the veto override, which I'm suggesting here. That we take a stand against this veto, not because it's a veto, but because it's being employed for all the wrong reasons.

[he/him](#)

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

[American-Cascadia](#) 

4h

I will say that I was wrong in saying that the vote was not a majority, as it was legally a majority, I counted the absentions, which I should not have done. The majority point was brought to me by one of the people I contacted for feedback, who was not on my side in this whole thing. I will also say that I was too generalized as well, and for that I apologize. But I will be standing by the other points I made.

[Skip to main content](#)

Mangegneithe:

Particularly, I'd like to note the recent failure of a Praesidium proposal to lower the endorsement cap to 200. This amendment failed with 52% of Magisters voting against – a difference of one vote just like this vetoed proposal and a similar percentage. Two Magisters, however, abstained. If we took this the way our Delegate did, that those abstentions mean whatever we'd like, then this proposal should have passed because only 47% opposed the proposal. However, we do not live in this fantasy world. We live in one where our rules mean something even when our Delegate wishes they did not.

[@CyberiumShadow](#) made an excellent point here that I'd like to address, lest the core principles behind my statement get befuddled by my poor execution. Cyberium stated the following:

if the Magi operated even under the rules of *Plurality*, the Aye vote would still be lower than the Nay in the context of the Endo Cap amendment to 200

This is true, but I will note that the Magisterium does not operate under the rules of plurality – this misinterpretation of our very clear Standing Orders belongs to the Delegate alone. And yes, it does mean that, still, a majority of all Magisters has not voted in favor, since that is not required for anything to pass and is very rare to find. So I will substitute this argument for another:

[Skip to main content](#)

In **this vote** to admit Aster to the Magisterium, only 9/19 Magisters voted in favor. It passed, because our rules are not like the Delegate says, but if we took the Delegate's word as law, Aster would not be a Magister, or at least *shouldn't*. This logic is faulty and dangerous.

In **Zuk's reformatting of the Concordat** , once again, only 9/19 Magisters voted in favor. Another victory because abstentions do not count, but one that the Delegate has claimed is indefensible. Despite this, it went on to be approved by Referendum, and now forms the law of the land as a part of our Concordat.

In **my Proscription reforms**, only half of the Magisters (8) voted in favor, equal to the sum of those voting against, abstaining, or not voting. Despite this, it reached a majority because, again, our procedures are clear that abstentions aren't counted. This amendment was signed into law by then-Delegate Merlovich. In fact, one would be hard-pressed to find any instance where a Delegate vetoes a proposal in part or in whole because of this flawed understanding of procedure. As far as I'm aware, it has never happened before – Marrabuk's veto, the last one to be employed, targeted a bill that passed with a 90% majority.

Now on to my final point on this misinterpretation of procedure. If we take the Delegate's premise as a given – that a decision is only valid if voted upon by a majority of the eligible voters – then he himself is not a valid Delegate. In February, he received 23 votes out of 80 citizens. By the Delegate's math, that's only 29% of the vote. He is therefore, by his own logic, not our democratically elected Delegate. Of

[Skip to main content](#)

course, the idea is absurd, because the logic behind it is absurd. We do not go by absolute majorities of a voting body in any part of TEP, and the Delegate is wrong to apply that logic here.

EDIT: I was writing this when the Delegate submitted his post admitting wrongdoing on this point. I apologize for wasting the time of anyone who read this after the Delegate realized his fault.

he/him

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

Mangegneithe Vizier 

4h

American-Cascadia:

The majority point was brought to me by one of the people I contacted for feedback, who was not on my side in this whole thing.

Would you care to share who?

he/him

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

American-Cascadia 

4h

I will not until I get permission.

[Skip to main content](#)

Mangegneithe Vizier 

4h

It disturbs me that someone can influence one of the most extreme checks and balances that is available to the Delegate through backrooms conversations without being accountable to the public. However, I am less concerned with the lack of transparency and inclusivity in the Executive's internal conversations than I am with the faulty logic of the veto.

he/him

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

Mangegneithe Vizier 

4h

I don't see an issue with this but I also don't like the idea of trying to appease an Executive government that fundamentally misunderstands what we're doing here. I still think we should go through once more with the same proposal and show the Delegate that the Magisterium stands by our decisions and centers our legislation in logic and truth. I'm also not the bill's sponsor so I'm not qualified to accept an amendment.

he/him

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

[Skip to main content](#)

A_mean_old_man  **Vizier****3h**

I just had a nice conversation with [@American-Cascadia](#) , who suggested 12 hours as an alternative to 48 hours. While I'd obviously prefer instantaneous removal, I can understand some of the points made regarding delegates / citizens who have accidentally resigned from the WA / accidentally moved regions, and can reluctantly accept 12 hours as an alternative to 48.

Logic aside, it is the Delegate's prerogative to veto any amendment. There is no constitutional expectation that reasoning even be provided. While I obviously don't agree with the decision to veto, being the author / sponsor, and by nature see a veto as "unpopular", it remains a mechanism that exists between the legislature and executive and must be respected and worked through / around. The amendment will not pass as written if an override is attempted.

Opening the floor to discussion of a 12 hour window (this will essentially entail the reversion of section 4), with keeping all of the other proposed edits re: allowing the use of dispatches.

Ladona  **Magister****3h**

With reducing the 48 hour period to 12 hours, does this mean the original 4.2 would no longer be removed?

Democratic Monarchy of Ladonatalacton

My noon is 2:00 AM+00:00

[Skip to main content](#)

► History

Mangegneithe Vizier 

2h

A_mean_old_man:

I just had a nice conversation with [@American-Cascadia](#) , who suggested 12 hours as an alternative to 48 hours. While I'd obviously prefer instantaneous removal, I can understand some of the points made regarding delegates / citizens who have accidentally resigned from the WA / accidentally moved regions, and can reluctantly accept 12 hours as an alternative to 48.

Would this follow the original procedure or Aster's procedure? In other words, is a warning necessary to kick off the 12 hour grace period (thereby extending the grace period to often ridiculous levels) or is it a flat grace period whether or not the Praesidium notices?

I'd like to again assert that the Delegate's veto is completely unjustified considering every single point it makes is wrong. I would still simply like to see this veto overturned and the existing proposal go through.

he/him**Regional Positions** | **WA Ambassadors****Guide to Aivintis** | **RP Nations****Things I've Written** | **Things I've Done****A_mean_old_man**  Vizier

2h

[Skip to main content](#)

RE: Ladona: at this point it behooves me to rewrite the amendment to section 4 (proposed amendments to sections 5 and 6 remain the same).

We can consider this something in-between the vetoed proposal and the original leniency of the Act, which will still remove some of the onus from Cit Office to chase / hassle / constantly notify people then track their timeline, but doesn't allow for instant removal of citizenship for a mistake that someone can correct by rejoining the WA or moving back to TEP within a reasonable timeframe.

Also, to remove some confusion, I'm getting rid of "discovery by the Office of"; I'd like for it to be 12 hours after the occurrence, not 12 hours after "discovery". I don't think that was worded properly.

Please discuss:

SECTION IV: CITIZENSHIP AUDIT

...4.1. A Citizenship ~~shall~~ **may** be invalidated **by the Office** ~~48~~ **12** hours after ~~they are publicly notified in the Thread by the Office to either (as listed alphabetically):~~

...4.1.1. ~~No longer~~ **Failure to** maintain residency with their recorded Resident nation ~~at the time of notification.~~

...4.1.2. ~~No longer~~ **Failure to** maintain WA membership in their recorded WA nation ~~at the time of notification.~~

...4.1.3. **Failure to comply with the process detailed in Section 3.6. within the aforementioned 12-hour timeframe.**

...4.2. If the Citizen returns their recorded Resident nation to the region

[Skip to main content](#)

or their WA membership to their recorded WA nation and issues a notification of such return within the Thread before the ~~48~~ 12 hour period established in Section 4.1 expires, their Citizenship shall remain valid.

...4.2.1 The Citizen may also keep their Citizenship valid if they successfully change their recorded Resident nation or recorded WA nation to another nation with valid citizenship or WA membership within the same ~~48~~ 12 hour period, following Section 3 procedures.

...4.3. Exceptions to Section 4.1 and its subsections may be established by additional law. Any Citizen may reapply for Citizenship upon removal.

...4.4. Any Resident may renounce their Citizenship by notifying the Office in the Thread.

Mangegneithe Vizier 

2h

My question was immediately, tangentially answered by the proposed wording. I apologize for my impatience.

he/him

[Regional Positions](#) | [WA Ambassadors](#)

[Guide to Aivintis](#) | [RP Nations](#)

[Things I've Written](#) | [Things I've Done](#)

A_mean_old_man  Vizier

2h

Although I guess the question still stands as to whether Dead prefers it be “after

[Skip to main content](#)

announcement" / Office can do it after discovery of this lapse. Again, the whole point of the amendment, in my opinion, is to remove some of this silly goose chase activity from the Cit App thread. If someone has an "oh shit" moment that they can't correct within 12 hours, it was probably intentional, or they're just done playing Nationstates and have CTE'd and will stay CTE'd.

A_mean_old_man 

Vizier

2h

Also, to remove some confusion, I'm getting rid of "discovery by the Office of"; I'd like for it to be 12 hours after the occurrence, not 12 hours after "discovery". I don't think that was worded properly.

Sort of a self-correction here: it wasn't "worded properly" because it wasn't worded at all; the original diction of the amendment was just instantaneous removal. So now I had to rethink how to achieve a wording as well as an intended result that was in-between the original law and the intention of the amendment.

Libertanny 

Vizier

1h

I will come out as one of the people that Dead contacted. They asked my opinion (which I did not disclose anywhere before as I did not participate in the debate on the matter). I shared my support for a veto (and I take blame for misreading majority - not Dead).

I still stand. It's a big change and the majority was almost non-existent. And the

[Skip to main content](#)

amount of threats we face with this amendment outweighs the value it brings. I just want to remind you that Atlae would stop being Delegate legally or Marrabuk would stop being Grand Vizier *and* Vizier. That's just two examples, but there were more. I see the point in this amendment - we want more security. But history proves that this exact way of achieving it would only cause more danger and instability.

A_mean_old_man  **Vizier** 1h

What're your thoughts on the revision

Bachtendekuppen **Arbiter** 1h

A lot to comment on here, and a lot of my comments have been posted to Discord. I'll try to recompile them here for the record.

As to the veto and it's justification:



Bachtendekuppen  11:27 AM Jum

And the entire point of the majority argument is that it's completely misguided to state that there is no majority for a law after it passed with a legal majority.

[\(see here\)](#)



Bachtendekuppen  11:39 AM Jum

What is this statement than: "The amendment (A-2025-16) or 'Amendment to the Citizenship Act' did not reach a majority, the AYE's only winning with 47%."

[\(see here\)](#)

[Skip to main content](#)

**Bachtendekuppen**  11:46 AM

Ju

My second problem is that the Delegate did not participate in the debate and is blindsiding everybody, only pointing to consultation with non-identified people, ignoring the Citizenship Commission itself, and presenting this as if a substantial number of people oppose this.

**Bachtendekuppen**  11:44 AM

Ju

My problem is that the reasoning of the Delegate is dogshit. You might as well veto "because it rains this morning".

[\(see here\)](#)

As to the legal nature of a veto and its remedies:

**Bachtendekuppen**  2:17 PM

Jump

Look, in my view, a decision and action like this by the Delegate has at least two distinct aspects to it, and there are 3 layers of responses to it. The decision is both (1) a political decision; (2) a legal action; where *how* this action is taken is a different consideration than the political reasons for it; as for the responses to it, you have indeed (a) a legislative one (overriding the veto); (b) a legal one - review of the Delegate's action under Article C, § 4, 1 of the Concordat; (c) an oversight instrument such as suspension for abuse of power under Article B, § 5, 1 of the Concordat.

[\(see here\)](#)

Now, going over that veto, I'll clarify a few of my positions, because I'd prefer this to be on the record.

[Skip to main content](#)

This is a decision I've made as Delegate, with the advice and feedback of members of the region. To help you understand why I've made this decision, I've laid out my rationale below.

Good. We have a decision by the Delegate, which is an action reviewable under Article C, Section 4, 1 of the Concordat ("The Conclave may rule on the actions of the Delegate ... "). The Concordat doesn't require an explanation, but here we have a rationale that is explicitly added to the decision ([see here](#)).

Just to get that out of the way.

1. The amendment (A-2025-16) or 'Amendment to the Citizenship Act' met a legal majority by one vote. I was wrong to state that it didn't, and this was due to my lack of understanding of the voting process. I do believe that because of this slim majority

This read differently before, and has been changed. I can't find the previous version. I greatly object to changing this without including the previous version, as it hides from further debate and destroys part of our record.

I refer though to the Discord-post I added above.

What the Delegate does here is not only vetoing, and vetoing on any consideration whatsoever, what the Delegate does is vetoing *because* a certain majority, *as determined by the Delegate, was not achieved*. That is not in any way, shape or form the prerogative of the Delegate to

[Skip to main content](#)

determine, and runs counter to the Concordat.

The instantaneous removal of citizenship is a great inconvenience laid on the residents of The East Pacific. The justification is that it takes work off the shoulders of the citizenship office; however, this only places a great burden on the residents of TEP, many of whom will be unjustly and immediately punished for actions they may not have yet even realised they had taken.

This actually fails to state *why* this would be an inconvenience.

Importantly, this amendment is, by definition, incredibly hostile to foreign military cosmos of TEP, that being members who participate in more than one region and in a military different from TEPs. It essentially forces these soldiers with a mobile WA membership to either permanently move their WA to TEP, which many will undoubtedly be uncomfortable with, or enlist in the EPSA, lest they lose the various benefits their citizenship provides them. Although they can inform the office of their moving WA nation to keep their citizenship, this is a tedious process, especially for people who may be moving their WA often and only for a few hours at a time.

This claims a hostility exists because it would be either permanent WA in TEP or joining EPSA (the horror?). But next states a third alternative anyway, being informing the Citizenship Office. Why sending a

[Skip to main content](#)

telegram would be “tedious” is not explained.

While the amendment has good intentions, being the strengthening of our regional security, this amendment simply does not accomplish enough to warrant the alienating of a large portion of our region’s active community. This amendment will not prevent foreign enemies from infiltrating our region, if they are so determined, and unjustly punish those in our region who simply want to experience what TEP has to offer.

The first part is not explained, unless not preventing foreign enemies from infiltrating is why it’s not enough. But that’s not the goal of this legislation. Never was. Someone who would have read the debate on it, would know that. So this is a strawmans argument if I ever saw one. What part of this is “punishing” isn’t explained either.

And that’s it. That’s all we got.

Not only is the Delegate unilaterally employing and enforcing majority requirements against the Concordat, the rest of the decision is either unexplained, a fundamental misunderstanding of the amendment, self-contradictory or just plainly a strawmans argument.

Bravo.


Now, in a side note to this, I had a very productive discussion with [@EvanRikuta](#) on how Section 4 of the amended law would apply, and how it fits with Section 3.6.


Basically, anyone complying with the notification requirement under 3.6, can not

[Skip to main content](#)

be removed in an audit under Section 4.

@EvanRikuta and I came to the following amendment to clarify this:



Bachtendekuppen

3:25 PM

Jump

One more addition, to make it really clear:

...4.1. A Citizenship shall be immediately invalid upon discovery by the Office of:

...4.1.1. Failure to maintain residency with their recorded Resident nation,


...4.1.2. Failure to maintain WA membership in their recorded WA nation, **and;**

...4.1.3. Failure to comply with the process detailed in Section 3.6 within one hour of the happenings detailed in articles 4.1.1 or 4.1.2 occurring

[\(see here\)](#)

I see AMOM has found a compromise with our Delegate, and is amending the law in another direction. That's of course his prerogative, and shows a lot more grace than I could give this ... decision.

New & Unread Topics

Topic	Replies	Views	Activity
 Magister Application Thread ² application	89	2.0k	6h
2025 LAW REVIEW Index	21	119	1d

[Skip to main content](#)

Topic	Replies	Views	Activity
& Discussion			
Reframing the Citizenship Office	5	23	23h
Delegate Elections Act Amendment - Electioneering amendment	14	31	5h
Amendment to §1 of the Standing Orders of the Magisterium amendment, proposal	19	15	25m
There are 11 unread and 27 new topics remaining, or browse other topics in			

Powered by Discourse

Tep Network

We're an online gaming community founded in 2003. We play NationStates gameplay as The East Pacific, Urth forum roleplay, Valsora TEP RMB r...
[Skip to main content](#)

Community

Community Standards
Tep Drive
Status

Valsora

VALSORA Dispatch
ValsoraWiki

The East Pacific

NationStates

Worlds to Build

On NationStates
Character Builder v1 (Preview)
Conlang Dictionary Blueprint v4 (soon)

Urth

Rules
UrthWiki

[About](#) [FAQ](#) [Terms of Service](#) [Privacy](#)