

Interactive Sovereign Society External Legislation Registry (ELR)

Following is a list of decisions made by the ISS to indicate consistency of laws of external governments with ISS principles. Laws made by external governments that are consistent with ISS principles have the assent and agreement of ISS members. Any member who refuses to follow a law that has been officially deemed inconsistent with ISS principles in the ELR has the right to the society's protection to the extent of its abilities if the member is prosecuted or otherwise imposed upon by an external government over that law.

Any member may ask the External Legislation Committee (ELC) to look at any law of any external government at any level and give a definitive answer as to whether the ISS deems the law to be consistent with ISS principles. If a member disagrees with a decision of the ELC, the member may ask to bring the ELC before the [ISS judiciary](#) and the ELC's decision may be overruled by a judicial panel.

Any member acting in contravention of a law of an external government without consulting the ELC for an answer as to the ISS's official position on consistency of that law may be deemed not to be acting in concordance with the principle of Respect For Others' Laws in the ISS [Summation of Principles](#).

The ISS's position on laws of external governments are separated into areas of jurisdiction in the following list.

Table of Contents

Jurisdiction: Canada

Superior Provincial Courts as Appellate Courts From ISS Courts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Conduct Toward Public Officer or Peace Officer, and Lawful Process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Threats To the Security of Canada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Federal Income Tax	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Executive Authority, the Queen, and Interactive Canada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8

Jurisdiction: British Columbia

Provincial Income Tax	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Jurisdiction: United States of America

Executive Authority	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Jurisdiction: Canada

Superior Provincial Courts as Appellate Courts From ISS Courts

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why a decision of an ISS [judicial panel](#) may in some circumstances be appealed to a superior provincial court in Canada:

- any ISS member who is a citizen of Canada and who wishes to avail herself or himself of the protection of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) (“the Canadian Charter”) in order to be relieved of governance of periodically elected legislative assemblies so as not to be denied her or his section 3 Charter rights (“the right to vote in an election of members of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein”) should be cognizant that she or he is thus acknowledging the entirety of the Constitution in which that charter is included as a cohesive and harmonious provision for the rule of law in the nation,
- section 24 of the Canadian Charter designates “courts of competent jurisdiction” to hear allegations of denials and infringements of rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Canadian Charter, and superior provincial courts are described to have inherent jurisdiction in such matters, which makes them appropriate courts to recognize as a first level of appeal from a decision of an ISS judicial panel where parties in the decision are citizens of Canada,
- the laws governing the processes of superior provincial courts are created by legislative assemblies that fail for periods of time to provide any means to exercise the rights described in section 3 of the Canadian Charter; however, if these courts find it unlawful under the Canadian Charter for section 3 Charter rights to be denied for periods of time, then the ISS concludes that none of these court processes have prejudiced these courts to the relevant primary motivation of the ISS: accountable democracy,
- courts in Canada recognize that a balance must be struck when the provision of one right to one party compromises the provision of another right to another party. One such case is [R. v. Crawford](#), heard in the Supreme Court of Canada in 1995, in which the court held that “(a)pplication of Charter values must take into account other interests and in particular other Charter values which may conflict with their unrestricted and literal enforcement”. A remedy for periodic denials of section 3 Charter rights can therefore be subject to the discretionary balance of a court of competent jurisdiction,
- the ISS does not intend to replace nor show contempt for existing democratic governments; the society’s intention is to demonstrate that it is more fair, respectful, and practicable for citizens to be provided access to their fundamental democratic rights in the same way that all other constitutional rights are intended to be provided: accessible at all times, and
- it is more effective for the principle of the sovereignty of the individual (the principle upon which the ISS is founded, according to its [Constitution](#)) to be upheld when there is more consistency between the constituted laws chosen by a collection of individuals, such as the collection of individuals who are citizens of Canada, some of whom are ISS members.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS would, under the following conditions, therefore affirm that it is consistent with ISS [principles](#) for superior provincial courts in Canada to be recognized as appellate

courts (courts that may be appealed to) from ISS courts where ISS members who are citizens of Canada have been parties in a decision of an ISS judicial panel:

- superior provincial courts in Canada acknowledge (e.g. by having decided in favour of section 3 Charter protection for an ISS member in a judicial matter) that legislative assemblies in Canada fail to provide any means for a citizen to exercise section 3 Charter rights for periods of time while the legislative assembly of the ISS always provides the means for its members to exercise these rights,
- superior provincial courts acknowledge that section 3 of the Canadian Charter is not upheld when laws of a periodically elected legislative assembly are imposed upon an ISS member without any demonstration having been given that freedom and/or democracy are better served when section 3 rights are denied for periods of time, which is the only way to justify such a denial as a ‘reasonable limit’ as per section 1 of the Canadian Charter,
- superior provincial courts acknowledge that ISS courts have concurrent original jurisdiction for any matter in which an ISS member who is a citizen of Canada is a defendant, and
- an appeal to a superior provincial court from a decision of an ISS judicial panel can only be made based on an allegation of inconsistency of a decision of an ISS judicial panel with the Constitution of Canada.

Conduct Toward Public Officer or Peace Officer, and Lawful Process

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why it is in some circumstances consistent with ISS principles for a member to be required to act in accordance with [section 129](#) of the [Criminal Code of Canada](#):

- ISS members have agreed to adhere to the laws of the ISS as a condition of membership,
- if an ISS member is believed by a non-member to have acted unlawfully, then other ISS members, and in particular the prime representative, relevant External Legislation Committee regional subcommittee Chair, and other designated officials of the society, will find it important to be informed of this, regardless of whether the non-member is a public officer, peace officer, or any other person,
- based on the principle of False Or Withheld Information in the ISS [Summation of Principles](#), an ISS member who is believed by a non-member to have acted unlawfully has agreed as a condition of membership to inform ISS members to whom this information is important, including at least one of those listed above,
- according to the ISS [Charter](#), a member has agreed as a condition of membership to participate in the defence of rights and freedoms of others when she or he is capable of doing so and it is needed,
- any ISS member who believes ISS judiciary will not provide fair and impartial adjudication of allegations of unlawful conduct is free to ask for ISS [judicial protocol](#) to be amended at any time,
- if section 3 of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) (“the Canadian Charter”) is upheld, then an ISS member who is a citizen of Canada may expect never to be held subject to any laws other than the ones she or he has agreed to as a condition of ISS membership adjudicated by judiciary using a system which she or he may express desire to see changed at any time,
- section 129 of the Criminal Code of Canada states that it is unlawful when a person
 - (a) resists or wilfully obstructs a public officer or peace officer in the execution of his duty or any person lawfully acting in aid of such an officer,
 - (b) omits, without reasonable excuse, to assist a public officer or peace officer in the execution of his

duty in arresting a person or in preserving the peace, after having reasonable notice that he is required to do so, or

(c) resists or wilfully obstructs any person in the lawful execution of a process against lands or goods or in making a lawful distress or seizure

- If an ISS member were thought to have acted inconsistently with section 129 of the Criminal Code of Canada, then the member may expect that, if section 3 of the Canadian Charter is upheld, then such an allegation may be heard fairly and impartially by an ISS judicial panel based on ISS principles including Respect For Others' Laws.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS therefore affirms that, for an ISS member who

- is a citizen of Canada, and
- has no reason to believe that a public officer or peace officer will fail to uphold section 3 of the Canadian Charter or be required to do so by courts,

it is consistent with ISS principles for the member to be required to comply with sections 129 (a), (b), and (c) of the Criminal Code of Canada as part of her or his agreement to adhere to the society's principles.

A member who is acting as directed by a public officer or peace officer in accordance with section 129 of the Criminal Code of Canada should inform the officer, verbally or in writing, that

- there are laws in Canada that are created in a manner where section 3 Charter rights are unavailable to be exercised for periods of time,
- the Interactive Sovereign Society is an organization with a complete and concise set of laws created in a manner in which section 3 Charter rights are available to be exercised at any time,
- it is unconstitutional in Canada to enforce laws created in a manner in which section 3 Charter rights are unavailable to be exercised for periods of time upon an ISS member without demonstrating that it can be justified as a reasonable limit in a free and democratic society to periodically deny these rights,
- the prime representative of the ISS, relevant External Legislation Committee jurisdictional subcommittee chair, or public safety representative appointed by a legislative body presided over by any of the above anywhere in Canada may be informed if any allegations of unlawful conduct are made by the officer and then the conduct will be adjudicated according to ISS laws using ISS judicial procedure,
- as long as all of the above takes place in a way so that section 3 Charter rights are not denied for periods of time, then the ISS member is willing in good faith to have her or his conduct adjudicated accordingly.

The ISS will, upon request, provide any member a [written account](#) of the above statements, signed by any representative of the society listed in this ELR entry, to be presented to an officer when the situation calls for it.

Threats To the Security of Canada

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why it may in some circumstances be consistent with ISS principles for an ISS member to be subject to investigation or measures defined in the [Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act](#) ("the Act"):

- the [Constitution of Canada](#) asserts that the fundamental purpose of the rule of law in Canada is to provide a free and democratic society, a value supported by the ISS,
- if a government in Canada recognizes, or is ordered by courts to recognize, that members of the ISS are constitutionally entitled to be relieved of governance of periodically elected legislative assemblies

via choosing the ISS as a suitable alternate system of governance of, by, and for the People that meets the constitutional requirements of peace, order, and good government in Canada, so as not to periodically be denied their section 3 Charter rights (“the right to vote in an election of members of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein”), then a threat to the security of Canada could compromise the ability of that government to protect the democratic rights of members of the ISS,

- “threats to the security of Canada” is defined in the Act to mean
 - (a) espionage or sabotage that is against Canada or is detrimental to the interests of Canada or activities directed toward or in support of such espionage or sabotage,
 - (b) foreign influenced activities within or relating to Canada that are detrimental to the interests of Canada and are clandestine or deceptive or involve a threat to any person,
 - (c) activities within or relating to Canada directed toward or in support of the threat or use of acts of serious violence against persons or property for the purpose of achieving a political, religious or ideological objective within Canada or a foreign state, and
 - (d) activities directed toward undermining by covert unlawful acts, or directed toward or intended ultimately to lead to the destruction or overthrow by violence of, the constitutionally established system of government in Canada,but does not include lawful advocacy, protest or dissent, unless carried on in conjunction with any of the activities referred to in paragraphs (a) to (d).
- the expression, “threats to the security of Canada”, even as defined in section 2 of the Act, is still open to a broad degree of interpretation, and [ISS courts](#) may be recognized by their appellate courts as having concurrent original jurisdiction over this interpretation in a matter where an ISS member is directly affected by any intended investigation or measure, if those appellate courts find no reason to believe ISS courts not to be presided over with enough judicial expertise to warrant it,
- if an ISS member were posing a threat to the security of Canada, then the ISS may support reasonable and proportional measures taken to reduce the threat,
- according to sections 21 and 21.1 of the Act, any investigation or measure that requires a warrant and is intended to be taken against a perceived threat to the security of Canada by an agent of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) must be approved by the Minister of Public Safety (“the Minister”) prior to being acted upon; the Minister is chosen as a democratic representative of the People of Canada in a fashion in which section 3 Charter rights are not available to be exercised for periods of time, without satisfying section 1 of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) (“the Canadian Charter”) by demonstrating that the periodic denial of this right is a reasonable limit that can be justified in a free and democratic society,
- if the ISS chooses a representative whose approval must be acquired before any investigation or measures that directly affect an ISS member and that are specified as requiring approval in the Act may be taken, then the section 3 Charter rights of ISS members would no longer be denied for these purposes.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS therefore affirms that it is consistent with ISS principles for an investigation or measure as defined in the Act to be taken despite directly affecting an ISS member if the following conditions are satisfied:

- the prime representative of the ISS, or else an ISS public safety representative designated by the prime representative or by a jurisdictional subcommittee of the External Legislation Committee for this purpose, gives approval of the investigation or measures prior to their being acted upon,

- any ISS member may make a motion to create rules specifying conditions under which the prime representative or public safety representative may approve an investigation or measure; any such rule will be added to a document called “ISS [Public Safety Rules](#)” when the motion is carried.
- a level and branch of government in Canada that is relevant to the investigation or measures being proposed acknowledges, or is ordered by a court to acknowledge, that legislative assemblies in Canada fail to provide any means for a citizen to exercise section 3 Charter rights for periods of time while the legislative assembly of the ISS always provides the means for its members to exercise these rights,
- the level and branch of government specified above also acknowledges, or is ordered by a court to acknowledge, that section 3 of the Canadian Charter is not upheld when laws of a periodically elected legislative assembly are imposed upon an ISS member without any demonstration having been given that freedom and/or democracy are better served when section 3 rights are denied for periods of time, which is the only way to justify such a denial as a ‘reasonable limit’ as per section 1 of the Canadian Charter.

Federal Income Tax

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why it may in some circumstances be consistent with ISS principles for an ISS member who is a citizen of Canada to be required to contribute a portion of their income as defined in the Canada [Income Tax Act](#) (“the Act”):

- ISS [Contributions](#) states that “in keeping with principles of sharing properties, members should regard it as their responsibility to regard a portion of the currencies at their disposal as being a contribution to the needs of their community. In keeping with the principle of respect for other’s laws, as contained in this [Summation of Principles](#), the amount of this portion should be decided in a way that is commensurate with the amounts allocated by those in our proximity who are under the lawful authority of a government”,
- The Act indicates the taxes required to be paid to the federal government by citizens of Canada under Parliamentary governance,
- The allocation for expenditures of taxes received by the federal government is chosen in a manner in which the rights specified in section 3 of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) (“the Charter”) are unavailable to be exercised for periods of time,
- If the legislative assembly of the ISS receives the same amount of taxes from members as they would be responsible to pay under the Act, then section 3 Charter rights are not denied for any period of time with regard to decisions about the expenditures of those funds.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS therefore affirms that it is consistent with ISS principles for a member to be required to make contributions as are specified in the Act to be made by taxpayers if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- those taxes are allocated for usage by a legislative assembly that does not deny section 3 Charter rights for periods of time,
- the member consensually prefers to have expenditures of those taxes allocated by Parliament and voluntarily waives their section 3 Charter rights for periods of time, or
- a demonstration is provided that the denial of section 3 Charter rights for periods of time is a reasonable limit that can be justified in a free and democratic society, thus satisfying section 1 of the Charter.

Executive Authority, the Queen, and Interactive Canada

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why the creation of an organization such as Interactive Canada, whose constitution has [previously been sent](#) to the Governor General, would be regarded as replacing ISS membership as a method by which a citizen of Canada may rely on section 3 of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) (“the Canadian Charter”) to be provided an exemption from the governance of periodically elected legislative assemblies:

- the executive authority over the ISS derives from the agreement of an individual to become a member and consent to accept the ISS Constitution as their supreme law, while the executive authority over Interactive Canada derives from Her Majesty the Queen; however, the methods of defining and adjudicating laws are consistent between both organizations,
- it is more effective for the principle of the sovereignty of the individual (the principle upon which the ISS is founded, according to its [Constitution](#)) to be upheld when there is more consistency between the constituted laws chosen by a collection of individuals, such as the collection of individuals who are citizens of Canada, some of whom are ISS members,
- the Constitution of Canada provides a method in section 41 of the [Constitution Act, 1982](#) for the office of the Queen to be amended, for example, to read “the People of Canada”, thus changing the nature of the source of the executive authority that exists in the nation of Canada; this option may be exercised if the People of Canada choose at any time to exercise their collective sovereignty in this fashion.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS therefore affirms that it would be consistent with ISS principles, if Interactive Canada or a similar organization were created, for ISS membership to be regarded as insufficient to rely on section 3 of the Canadian Charter for an exemption from the governance of periodically elected legislative assemblies, under the following conditions:

- if the Constitution of Interactive Canada is amended by the Governor General prior to its ratification, then ISS members must agree that the amendments are still consistent with ISS principles,
- any level and branch of government in Canada, in whose territorial jurisdiction an ISS member resides, acknowledges, or is ordered by a court to acknowledge, that the legislative assembly of Interactive Canada does not fail to provide any means for a citizen to exercise section 3 Charter rights for any period of time,
- any level and branch of government specified above also acknowledges, or is ordered by a court to acknowledge, that section 3 of the Canadian Charter is not upheld when laws of a periodically elected legislative assembly are imposed upon a member of Interactive Canada without any demonstration having been given that freedom and/or democracy are better served when section 3 rights are denied for periods of time, which is the only way to justify such a denial as a ‘reasonable limit’ as per section 1 of the Canadian Charter.

Jurisdiction: British Columbia

Provincial income tax

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why it may in some circumstances be consistent with ISS principles for an ISS member who is a citizen of Canada to be required to contribute a portion of their income as defined in the British Columbia [Income Tax Act](#) (“the Act”):

- ISS [Contributions](#) states that “in keeping with principles of sharing properties, members should regard it as their responsibility to regard a portion of the currencies at their disposal as being a contribution to the needs of their community. In keeping with the principle of respect for other’s laws, as contained in this [Summation of Principles](#), the amount of this portion should be decided in a way that is commensurate with the amounts allocated by those in our proximity who are under the lawful authority of a government”,
- The Act indicates the taxes required to be paid to the provincial government by citizens of Canada under Parliamentary governance,
- The allocation for expenditures of taxes received by the provincial government is chosen in a manner in which the rights specified in section 3 of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) (“the Charter”) are unavailable to be exercised for periods of time,
- If the legislative assembly of the ISS receives the same amount of taxes from members as they would be responsible to pay under the Act, then section 3 Charter rights are not denied for any period of time with regard to decisions about the expenditures of those funds.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS therefore affirms that it is consistent with ISS principles for a member to be required to make contributions as are specified in the Act to be made by individuals resident in or earning income in British Columbia if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- those taxes are allocated for usage by a legislative assembly that does not deny section 3 Charter rights for periods of time,
- the member consensually prefers to have expenditures of those taxes allocated by Provincial Legislature and voluntarily waives their section 3 Charter rights for periods of time, or
- a demonstration is provided that the denial of section 3 Charter rights for periods of time is a reasonable limit that can be justified in a free and democratic society, thus satisfying section 1 of the Charter.

Jurisdiction: United States of America

Executive Authority

Following are several reasons which together illustrate why it is in some circumstances consistent with [ISS principles](#) for the ISS and its members who are citizens of the United States of America to respect the executive authority of the President of the USA:

- the executive authority over the ISS derives from the agreement of an individual to become a member and consent to accept the [ISS Constitution](#) as their supreme law while the executive authority of the US President derives from the presumption by the founders of the [US Constitution](#) in 1789 that They had the moral and lawful right to enact one supreme law for the entire land of the USA that would be applicable to every resident without prior affirmation of consent; however, if the [US Declaration of Independence](#) is respected in regard to ISS members choosing an alternative form of governance with foundation laid on principles and powers organised in a form to which They consent and whose governance shall be abided, then the authority of the executive branch of the US government may be expected to only use the force of law for according purposes,
- it is more effective for the principle of the sovereignty of the individual (the principle upon which the ISS is founded, according to its Constitution) to be upheld when there is more consistency between the constituted laws chosen by a collection of individuals, such as the collection of individuals who are citizens of the United States of America, some of whom are ISS members,
- the fundamental democratic right a voter may exercise to show preference for, and have a mitigable impact upon, a candidate to influence legislative process is a right whose constant provision is not specifically enumerated in the US Constitution but the ISS asserts it to be a fundamental human right in accordance with the [ninth amendment](#) in anything resembling a democratic society, a right that is now retained without interruption by some of the people and is asserted by the ISS to be a valid right of all of the people, unless any untenable impediments can be reasonably demonstrated to its uninterrupted provision,
- votes that are cast transparently as in the ISS, meaning that each member knows how each other member's vote stands, have the potential effect of allowing a voter to be coerced, while votes that are cast confidentially, such as secret ballots in a periodic election, make it possible for inaccurate results to be reported and also for voters to have no recourse to be heard in their opinions about the law by others who are known to have voted based on opposing views; a hybrid system of elections, where each voter can choose a ballot that is either periodic and secret, interactive and confidential, or interactive and transparent, allows each voter the right to choose which of the above interests to give priority, a right which, in accordance with the ninth amendment, is retained by some of the people and which the ISS asserts to be a valid right of all of the people, unless any untenable impediments can be reasonably demonstrated to its provision,
- if the Constitution of the USA or any subsidiary legislation were amended to change the way public servants are elected so that the above listed right were available to be exercised at times of the voter's discretion instead of only on periodic occasions, then the methods of creating laws would be virtually identical between the ISS and any State in the Union, removing any known valid motive for an ISS member to deny consent to be governed under the same Constitution enacted in 1789 with the respectable intent of maintaining a unified nation.

With the above reasons in mind, the ISS therefore affirms that it is consistent with ISS principles for the executive authority of the President to be respected by the ISS and its members who are citizens of the USA if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- the President acknowledges that ISS members who are citizens of the USA may make a valid denial of consent, in accordance with the US Declaration of Independence, to the authority of legislative assemblies at federal, state, and civic levels periodically elected under the US Constitution in a way that the fundamental rights described herein are denied for any period of time, or
- US courts acknowledge the same as above (e.g. by having decided in favour of laws created by periodically elected legislative assemblies being of no force or effect in relation to an ISS member who has made a public withdrawal of consent to the US government) and direct members of the executive branch to act accordingly.

To request a decision upon a law of an external government that is not yet in this registry please contact the Chair of the External Legislation Committee (ELC), Daniel Phillips.