

In the Supreme Court of British Columbia

Between

Samuel Michael Frank, petitioner

and

BC Attorney General, respondent

Bryan Jacobs
26th Ave
Vancouver, BC
V5

I, Bryan Jacobs, affirm that:

I have personal knowledge of the facts and matters herein referred to by me except where indicated to be on information and belief, and where so stated I verily believe them to be true.

I have been a citizen of Canada since my birth.

I continue to exercise good faith, in practice, in my allegiance to Her Majesty Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada.

I have been provided a measure of fairness, security, and accountability for my actions through the rule of law as upheld by the Crown in Canada, for which I am grateful.

As a citizen of Canada, I have found that the level of democratic enfranchisement available to influence governance in Canada has been such that I have never believed that my part in it had any meaningful effect.

During the two years that I have now been a member of the Interactive Sovereign Society, I have found that the interactive electoral system has given me hope that democratic enfranchisement can actually give an individual a meaningful part in how the governance shared with other members of society is directed.

There is a section included in the ISS Charter called Representative Collaborators, originally entitled Main Collaborators, which was originally conceived by me.

When I made the motion for the concept of Main Collaborators to be adopted by the ISS, I saw evidence of how an interactive electoral system allows an individual to have an idea heard by a collective and to patiently allow each dissenting voice to be heard rather than simply deem a motion decided because there is a majority in favour.

Prior to the Main Collaborators motion, the rules were written to make it the prime representative's responsibility to make as much effort as reasonably possible to try to achieve consensus on a decision, rather than simply allowing a majority to prevail.

By defining Main Collaborators as candidates for the position of Prime Representative that had the same number of votes as the present elected Prime Representative, and stating that a motion could not be carried until all Main Collaborators unanimously agreed with the decision to

carry it, the discretion was no longer solely in the prime representative's hands and an improved means became available to effectively circumvent deliberate legislative obstructionism.

At the time that I made the motion to create the Main Collaborator position, the acting Prime Representative had been surpassed in electoral support and a newly elected Prime Representative was waiting to take office, after a three month guaranteed term elapsed for the acting Prime Representative.

The Main Collaborators motion achieved a tally of 13 votes in favour and 4 votes opposed, which led to the elected Prime Representative resigning from the Interactive Sovereign Society altogether under protest of this limitation of her discretionary powers.

All members opposed to the Main Collaborators motion resigned from the ISS at the same time as the elected Prime Representative, leaving the motion to carry unanimously.

I believe that the distinction between the ISS Constitution's statement that the Summation of Principles is "agreed upon by this society" as opposed to if it were to read "agreed upon by a majority of this society's members" is an important illustration of the reason that the Main Collaborators idea is consistent with the ISS Constitution. Main Collaborators give minorities a recourse by which to electorally assert their presence when they are not willing to agree with a decision supported by a majority. I believe that opposition to the Main Collaborators idea can therefore be seen as acting inconsistently with the ISS Constitution. I believe the utmost effort should be required for decisions to be agreeable to the largest number of members possible in order for the ISS Constitution to be upheld, rather than giving the prime representative discretionary powers to deem a simple majority sufficient to consider a decision "agreed upon by this society".

I believe that the members that resigned as described above had a mentality of majority rule, and resigned because their mentality was not consistent with the ISS Constitution.

I believe I have seen active participation in the Interactive Sovereign Society bring about positive changes to members' outlook on life, relationships with other people, feelings of self worth, and gratitude for the existence of freedom and democracy, and I believe these changes can be attributed to the society's principles and to the inherent respect for an individual created by uninterrupted democratic enfranchisement.

The right to vote in an election of members of a legislative assembly is never denied for any period of time for an Interactive Sovereign Society member, unless that member has laws imposed upon Her or Him by another institution that denies this right for periods of time.

The Interactive Sovereign Society has now existed as an institution of democratic law for over three years, and during that time, to my knowledge, no justification has been demonstrated as to how denying the right to vote in an election of members of a legislative assembly for any period of time might be considered a reasonable limit in a free and democratic society.

Having been appointed Chief of Justice of the ISS in June, 2014, I intend for the above facts and beliefs to guide my decisions for the benefit of the ISS and for freedom and democracy in general, as per my responsibilities defined in ISS Inter-sovereign Relations.