



12/07/10
Issue 9

Bokontonian News Service

This issue focuses on the OAM and

Warning. *These views are the columnist's own and are intended to offend no-one. Contains minor profanity and major satire, sarcasm and use of brackets, hyphens and confusing methods of address.*

Bokonton's exit from the OAM

The reasons and the terms

In a move that shocked the Micro-Wiki sphere, last week a bloc of 5 nations left the OAM in a mass movement, citing corruption, injustice and immaturity as their reasons. Bokonton was among these nations.

We felt that the OAM's lenient policy spoilt the wonderful organisation, as it contributed to 'bad egg' members being allowed to wreak havoc. Below, is our official statement:

Ladies and gentlemen of the OAM,

It is with great regret that I announce my intention to leave the OAM, as the representative of Bokonton for this Organisation.

After first hearing of the OAM, I was understandably sceptic. After seeing countless organisations springing up through places such as MicroWiki and other forums, I confess I did not give thought to the OAM until later. I am very glad that I was proven wrong as to the calibre of the organisation and the vision of its founding. The OAM had become a well-run organisation, and one of the best of its kind- spearheaded and upheld by such prominent micronational leaders as Mr. Bralesford and Mr. Fish, with no signs of stagnating and inactivity that are often the trademark of YAMOs that the micronational sphere of operations is littered with.

And how was this activity achieved? No matter how dedicated the core few, such an organisations

needs a body of many members, all contributing their own ideas and support for the OAM. A body that, with such a large number, unfortunately has now led to the OAM's undoing.

It seems that recently one sad event after another has increased my mistrust of the OAM in general, from betrayals of some, and the showing of some members' "true colours", to the downright unacceptable and outrageous events concerning specific members and the Organisation itself.

The OAM has seen personal attacks on members that are only seeking to run the Organisation as they were charged to do; it has also seen members blatantly flouting the most basic rules set out in the OAM and being defended time and time again by the same members when to do so is both wrong and completely illogical.

The behaviour of those that stood by and let certain individuals wreak havoc and drag down such a fine organisation from the ideological vision to this recent reality is no less responsible for my decision to leave the OAM than those that have committed these atrocities. However, I must make it clear that just as not only a minority have caused such a terrible situation, it is also not only a few that have brought sanity, coherency and innovation to the OAM.

Mr. Fish's vision of a viable alternative to the GUM for micronationalists was a great one, and his obvious dedication along with the work of others toward this end has delayed my decision concerning the growing corruption and reduction in sense of the OAM membership body. However, I feel that the good work of some has not been enough to overcome the idiocy and betrayal from others, and along with other (former) members of the OAM, I am henceforth withdrawing from the Organisation until this cancer can be gotten rid of and the OAM of old restored.

I wish you all good luck in this endeavour.

Sincerely,

Holly Davies I,

Bokonton

The promise to return

However, Bokonton joined the OAM for the same reason we'd like to return one day- the OAM had a wonderful ideology and a brilliant set-up. Hopefully, the less-than-serious micronationalists' time will pass, as usually happens, and Bokonton will then be proud to rejoin the OAM and assist however possible in helping the OAM carry on as a strong intermicronational organisation.

The Other Nations

So, you've heard the reason why Bokonton left the OAM- but what about other nations? We interviewed representatives of Erusia, Nemkhavia, and Sandus. Interview on the next page.

Erusia

Why did you join the OAM in the first place?

The Central People's Government opted that it would be in the interests of the intermicronational community for the Democratic People's Republic to pursue OAM membership. At the time, tension between the GUM and the OAM was still running rather high. We were of the opinion at the time that our membership application would accomplish one of two things: if it was to be successful, then we would have made the first move in facilitating reconciliation between the two sides of the community, a sentiment I must note that the right-wing of the OAM continues to see as foolish to this date. The other outcome was that, if our application was rejected, the Organisation would have proven itself illegitimate and demonstrated it was, indeed, anti-Erusian as its critics asserted. I am rather pleased to say that we achieved the former with our application.

What 'sealed' the deal, so to speak, and made your mind up to leave?

It rather seems that the overwhelming majority of OAM members are either blind or illiterate - they continue to insist that the decision to withdraw from the Organisation was a sudden and unexpected one. In reality, the Central People's Government was legally bound to leave the Organisation before October 2010, in accordance with the result of a national referendum held on the matter of our continued membership in the institution. There was no incident that broke the camel's back; we had all ready minded to take this action some time ago, and we had given the OAM plenty of warning on the matter. The reasons for our withdrawing from the Organisation at this critical juncture are those that I noted in my statement to the Council through the Secretary-General, though it seems that few bothered to take the time to read it - despite having found plenty of time to respond to it. I made the decision to terminate Erusian membership because a certain bloc of "nations", which has been quick to fantastically defend itself despite not being named in my statement, had come to dominate it. This bloc is one comprised entirely of - if I may be so bold to repeat myself - children playing at politics; they are not true nation-states, and the Central People's Government was no longer prepared to be forced to acknowledge them as such. Erusia takes great pride in her professional integrity, and we were not prepared to allow that to be compromised by idiotic schoolchildren who see this entire venture as nothing more than a hobby.

Why did you choose to leave in the bloc of members?

I feel compelled to note that this "bloc" of which everyone is speaking does not exist. There is no formal alliance of nations in this scenario, and anyone who believes that there is is most certainly suffering from some kind of paranoid delusion. The five nations that withdrew each did so for their own reasons, and of their own accord, without any kind of formal agreement between them. When it became apparent that each of us intended to pursue this action, I simply saw fit to ensure that we organised ourselves to maximise the impact of our respective withdrawals, and to send a clear and firm message to the institution as to why we were withdrawing. There is no organised political entity behind the June 29th incident.

Why did you choose to leave in said bloc?

To reiterate part of my answer to the previous question, it seemed entirely appropriate to me that we should coordinate our actions and move in concert when the time came to withdraw. It seemed utterly senseless for us to simply terminate our memberships randomly and incoherently when we had the opportunity to form a united front, one which would draw more attention to the flaws of the Organisation and the reasons for our withdrawal.

Do you regret your decision?

Unlike certain individuals, I am gifted with both a spinal cord and the ability to form settled political and personal convictions. I do not regret my action nor that of my government in the slightest, nor do I care for what others may think of it - thus far the most extreme condemnation has come solely from those nations who have moral responsibility for our withdrawal. I fail to see what I could possibly have to regret.

Do you ever plan to rejoin the OAM?

I am afraid that I cannot offer, at this time, a concrete answer on the matter. Such an eventuality would require a fresh referendum to be held on renewing our membership, something that is entirely beyond the remit of my office.

What do you hope for the OAM in the future?

I hope that it will find itself with Sir Philip Fish as its Secretary-General, and that he will bring order where chaos now reigns. If he can impose order of professionalism upon the anarchy of childish ignorance, then there shall indeed - or so I hope - be a time when the OAM can once again be proud of itself. At the moment, it is nothing more than a club of childish friends indulging in a hobby that they will have entirely outgrown in just a few short years. Indeed, it is barely worthy of being described as an intermicronational organisation - it is instead little more than a forum community. If Fish is wise - which I believe he is - he will see the need to reform and restructure the OAM in such a fashion that these flaws can be dealt with, and those members who are destroying the institution dealt with.

Nemkhavia

Why did you join the OAM in the first place?

we joined the OAM to increase our foreign relations, at the time when Nemkhavia was united with Pristinia. Pristinia, as an Autonomous Republic was already a member, so it made sense of the rest of the SFR to join. We wanted to broaden our relations in a way that is only possible in something like the OAM.

What 'sealed' the deal, so to speak, and made your mind up to leave?

the reaction of the OAM members to the threats of war made by Rajputistan against Nemkhavia and Sandus left much to be desired. Many didn't care and many more didn't seem to even notice, still coming to the defence of the Rajputistan. We found that we couldn't trust the OAM to look after our better interests, as we felt that not enough could be done to defend us. The National Assemblies and Federal Assembly decided that it was not good for us anymore.

Why did you choose to leave in the bloc of members?

We had been debating leaving for some time. Each of the four Parliaments debated separately, with the National Assemblies (that's the governments of the republics) putting more and more pressure on our Prime Minister. We found that joining with the others who left would raise awareness for our cause, as one member leaving would not have the same impact as an en-masse move, we felt that leaving with them would better serve our wish for the OAM to be improved, even without us.

Would you have left if a bloc had not formed?

Yes, I do feel that we would have withdrawn anyway, given the level of discontent among our people about the issue.

Do you regret your decision?

I don't regret the decision, but I wish it had not been necessary. We believe there is a lot of good in the OAM, but it needs to be realised. My people spoke en-masse through their representatives, so I was bound by my oath to serve the people to act accordingly.

Do you ever plan to rejoin the OAM?

If the issues regarding war threats are resolved in a full manner by the members of the OAM, then the reason for our departure would disappear. We wish for the OAM to discuss and create a change that would mean that member nations are protected from acts of aggression. If this happens, I would be happy to address my people about it, and once again put the decision to them.

What do you hope for the OAM in the future?

We hope that the OAM grows and becomes an even stronger force for peace than it already is. It has a long way to go towards this dream (our concerns regarding war being a large part of this, we believe) but it can achieve an even higher status than it already has. We would be honoured to be a part of this.

Sandus

Why did you join the OAM in the first place?

The Barony of Sandus joined to become an active participant in the intermicronational community. That seat was retained during the March Revolution when the Democratic People's Republic of Sandus.

What 'sealed' the deal, so to speak, and made your mind up to leave?

What sealed the deal to leave was the constant arguing and the blatant insults which were directed at the Central People's Government and that people began to be so ignorant to the theories of civil rights and diplomatic protocol was not being upheld. All together, there was a surgency of disrespect and lack of responsibility

Why did you choose to leave in the bloc of members?

I chose to leave in the bloc because those that left are respectful nations who have continuously upheld respect for all nations, diplomatic protocol, have respected Sandus and have taken responsibility all together for their actions. Too, they also have some understanding of the basic principles of diplomacy.

Would you have left if a bloc had not formed?

The Democratic People's Republic of Sandus most likely would have, because the constant insults and attacks were adding up. The bloc, of course, persuaded me to leave then, but it is not the reason why we left. We left because we need a respectful, legitimate organization to be apart of if we are to accomplish anything.

Do you regret your decision?

I do not regret my decision, not one bit. I hold no remorse for those nations who made us leave and I do not believe we will be able to overcome these blatant attacks and offenses to our nation as they have been the most despicable and gruesome attacks on our nation in its entire history and in my entire history as a micronationalist.

Do you ever plan to rejoin the OAM?

The Democratic People's Republic of Sandus may rejoin, but that is only if a few objectives are completed. We want to establish that an international organization has no authority to maintain civil rights between its delegates - as it is not a state or a civil institution, that diplomatic protocol is upheld, that respect is there for ever delegate and their nation, that the legislative process of the member-states is respected and that the sovereignty of member-states is not infringed upon - as some delegates asked the former General-Secretary to intervene in the Democratic People's Republic of Erusia's judicial sovereignty.

What do you hope for the OAM in the future?

For the future, I hope that the OAM understands that we have a great potential, as micronations, to do what is best for us all and for our nations. Some have criticized me by saying that I am too "strict" and too "professional" and, indeed, I am - I do not believe that humour has a place in the internal or external affairs of a nation. I believe that we should represent our nations in the manner of which we wish to be recognized and I do wish that my nation is recognized and that it upholds the democratic sovereignty and legitimacy of the state. Everything which I have done - with the exception of some, minor actions - I have done in the complete hope for my nation to fulfill statehood in this grander international community. I hope that the member-states of the OAM accept this too, because many of

them are bright, intelligent people - but they act like children, even when talking to foreign diplomats. It's uncalled for and I believe they can do better - all of them can, especially the Kingdom of Wyvern. I believe that kingdom has great potential to become a respectful micronation, if only they would begin to use their senate in an official way, to begin to pass laws, to ensure the legislative sovereignty and independence of their nation from the Netherlands and if they would establish a responsible and respectful way to conduct relations.
