

Interactive Sovereign Society

CHARTER

Any member who finds any representative(s) or official(s) of the ISS to be failing to act in accordance with this Charter is encouraged to ask a judicial panel chair to assemble a panel for a societal hearing with the representative(s) or official(s) named as respondent in accordance with ISS [Inter-sovereign Relations](#). The panel may overrule and disallow the respondent's acts.

The Charter of the Interactive Sovereign Society is granted, as per the third paragraph of the [Constitution](#), as the lawful limits on the powers of the society as a whole over its individual members. Though the prime representative has the power to grant or repeal charter within the society, it should be remembered by the members of our society that, if the prime representative repeals aspects of our society's charter, then She or He may be threatening the rights of the membership. In such a case, members are encouraged to use their electoral powers to choose a new prime representative that will once again enact the aspect of the Charter that was repealed, so that the rights of the membership are in a constant state of being empowered, rather than detracted from.

The existing prime representative must be willing to work with members of the society to amend the Charter and [Summation of Principles](#) when needed.

It is the responsibility of the prime representative to ensure that any member that would like to present communications to other members of this society will have those communications passed on to the extent practicable. This ensures that every voice will be heard.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The ISS recognises the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) (UDHR), as signed in 1948 at the General Assembly of the United Nations, as entirely consistent with the intentions of the Interactive Sovereign Society in its relationship with Humanity, with two exceptions. First, We reserve the right to deny our acquiescence with article 29, subsection 3, as We see fit. Second, article 16 of the UDHR is replaced for the purposes of the ISS to read as follows:

1. Children have the right to guardianship by adult members of their society. Guardianship of a Child is justified only when it is evident that the Child is not yet fully capable of taking full care of her or his Self or making decisions in her or his own best interest. A child's freedom may only be imposed upon by a Guardian for the purpose of guiding the Child toward capabilities of full self care and fully informed, mature, responsible decision-making.
2. Biological Parents initially have equal, mutual claim to guardianship of a Child. More Guardians may be designated if all present Guardians agree to it, and the status of guardianship may be forfeited with consent of other existing Guardians.
3. If a Guardian is dishonest or disrespectful to another Guardian, then status of guardianship may be revoked.
4. If a Guardian fails to respect the freedoms of a Child except as specified in section (1), then status of guardianship may be revoked.

5. A Child whose Guardians have their statuses revoked and is left without Guardians must have another Guardian assigned by her or his society if it is apparent that the Child is not yet fully capable of taking full care of her or his Self or making decisions in her or his own best interest.
6. No considerations of race, nationality, or religion may be considered in any of the above to be relevant to eligibility to provide guardianship.
7. A Child, or Children, and her, his, or their Guardian(s), form a Family, the natural and fundamental group unit of society, which is entitled to protection by society and/or state.

ISS members are lawfully required to do their utmost to see that all of the rights and freedoms depicted in the UDHR, with the possible exception of article 29(3) and with article 16 amended as above, are provided to their fellow human Beings.

Consultation Regarding New Members

One of the attributes that People may ask from their society in the interest of feeling acceptably aware of their place in that society, and the means by which the members of the society associate with each Other, is that there be a reasonable level of stability within the society's composition. One important element of stability in a society's composition is who the members are.

The members of the Interactive Sovereign Society have an intrinsic effect on the society's stability, because not only do They choose the representation by which the society is organised and how its principles of lawful conduct are constituted, but also They are involved in the judicial process of seeing that those principles are adhered to. When new members join the society, it may have an effect on the stability of the society.

The Constitution states that the prime representative may accept members into the society, based on the understanding that They agree to adhere to the society's principles. Members other than the prime representative may wish to also be aware of individuals interested in joining the society, in order to not only become satisfied that the prospective members intend to adhere to the society's principles, but also to be aware of how the new members may influence how those principles are enacted, as well as how they are interpreted by potential panel members in the judicial process.

In the interest of stability, the prime representative shall not accept a new member into the Interactive Sovereign Society without having first given the present members a means of contacting the individual requesting membership to their satisfaction, and hearing any responses put forward by those present members with regard to the acceptance of the individual applying.

Limitations On Termination of Membership

The Constitution states that the prime representative may terminate membership in the society, based upon reasonable grounds. It is implicit in the principle of the sovereignty of the individual that termination of membership must not be an executive decision made by a single individual. Not only must a termination of membership be based upon a [due level of process](#), which shall be described in the [Summation of Principles](#), but also, all considerations made in the termination of a membership must be recorded and made available to the extent possible as observed during the due level of process undertaken, with the exception of keeping sensitive private details from absolute transparency for the sake of the personal comfort of any individual whose wishes in this way may be respected without loss of judicial accountability.

Delay of enactment

The rights of the membership of the Interactive Sovereign Society to enjoy stability in their lawful association is influenced by the society's membership, but it is also influenced by the changes made to the enacted principles of lawful conduct that They are responsible to adhere to. This factor in the stability of the society may be assured by the following actions of the prime representative.

Upon a motion being carried for any changes to the Charter or [Summation of Principles](#), the prime representative will inform the entire membership of the society of the [intended changes](#), and allow a period of two months to pass before those changes are considered lawfully enacted.

Any member having difficulty comprehending or reacting to an announced change to ISS law who has not been shown patience and support by at least one other member during the delay of enactment period so as to remedy this difficulty may request an extension before being required to comply with the newly amended law. Any member who believes it is possible that another member may require such an extension is encouraged to make a motion requesting that the delay of enactment period be extended.

Representative Collaborators

This section adds a layer of accountability to the prime representative's decisions, as well as an explicit protection for minorities by the society's representatives.

In addition to the prime representative, the society shall also have main collaborators and secondary collaborators. Main collaborators are defined as candidates that have the same number of votes as the prime representative, and during a guaranteed term of office, also candidates with more votes, or in such case as there is no such candidate, the main collaborator(s) shall be the candidate(s) with the second highest number of votes no matter how big the gap in electoral support. Secondary collaborators are defined as candidates that have one less vote than the prime representative, or in such a case as there are less than 3 people combined meeting the definitions of main collaborators and secondary collaborators, secondary collaborators shall be the third and/or fourth highest candidates in number of votes received, so that there are a minimum of 4 elected legislative officials including the Prime Representative, Main Collaborators, and Secondary Collaborators. When the prime representative decides to carry a motion on behalf of the membership, all main collaborators must unanimously agree with the decision for it to be valid. If the prime representative and all main collaborators agree to carry a motion, and one or more secondary collaborators disagree with the decision, then the decision must be delayed for the duration of the delay of enactment period.

If any Main Collaborator, Secondary Collaborator, or any candidate with less votes, becomes aware that there is a minority that is opposed to a motion of the society, then that collaborator should use their veto power to delay the motion for a reasonable length of time to assure that any other suggested ways to amend the motion are considered. If the motion might possibly be amended so that it will be acceptable to that minority without unfairly compromising the interests of any other parties, then reasonable efforts should be made to accomplish that.

The principle of Representative Collaborators applies to every interactively elected position that exists in the ISS.

Acceptance of Votes

Public representation is not a required service of the members of the Interactive Sovereign Society. A vote for the position of prime representative is an expression of interest in a member acting in public representation, and thus members should not have votes standing for Them which They have not approved.

There shall be a member, known as the electoral clerk, chosen by the prime representative who is designated with presenting the electoral standings to the membership when changes of consequence are made. The electoral clerk shall receive notices of intent from members to cast their votes.

For a vote for the position of prime representative to be recognised as valid, first the electoral clerk must receive notice of acceptance from the recipient of the vote. Once this acceptance is received by the electoral clerk, the vote shall be presented to the membership as officially being counted. Members may, if They wish, present a standing status to the electoral clerk indicating whether They are willing to accept votes.

A further function of the electoral clerk, for the purposes of transparency as designated in the [Constitution](#), shall be to pass forward a message from the member casting a vote to indicate the member's reasoning for casting it.

Guaranteed term of office

A guaranteed term of office for an interactively elected official ensures that notice is provided to the members of the electorate to consider the potential consequences and implications of an upcoming change in representation. If an incumbent is exceeded in electoral support by another candidate, then the incumbent keeps the office for the duration of the guaranteed term, and if the incumbent does not regain the lead for that full duration, then the incoming, newly elected candidate would replace the incumbent in the office at the end of that time period.

The guaranteed term of office for the Prime Representative is three months, which may be changed for any of the following reasons:

1. The incumbent and incoming prime representative agree to a different time period
2. The incoming prime representative at any point in time has at least twice as many votes as the incumbent, ending the term immediately, or
3. A judicial panel in a societal hearing finds that the incumbent has failed to adhere to the Charter and orders the guaranteed term ended prematurely for that reason.

This guaranteed term of office applies only to the prime representative of the ISS and no inference or precedent may be drawn to provide any other elected position in the ISS with a guaranteed term of office unless specifically stated where the position is defined.

External Legislation Registry

According to the principle of Respect For Others' Laws in the ISS [Summation of Principles](#), members are not required to adhere to laws of governments to the extent that those laws are not consistent with ISS principles. However, if a member respectfully refuses to follow a law for this reason, and another member believes that the law is actually consistent with ISS principles, then the dissenting member can be brought before an ISS court for a definitive answer on whether the society regards the law as consistent with its principles. In order for members to be given a definitive answer on this prior to actually acting contrary to a known law, without having

to be brought before an ISS court, the [External Legislation Registry](#) (ELR) can provide a definitive answer in response to an inquiry by any member regarding any law of any relevant government. This registry shall be maintained by the External Legislation Committee (ELC).

Any member that disagrees with the ELC over a decision regarding the consistency of a law with ISS principles may ask the ELC to appear before an ISS judicial panel, as described in [Inter-sovereign Relations](#).

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.

For territorial limits on a government's jurisdiction, the ELC will have a sub-committee to make rulings on that government's laws. No member that resides outside of the relevant territory may be included in a decision on how well a law conforms to ISS principles. No ISS member, other than a member deemed qualified to act as a judicial panel chair by the Chief of Justice, may be called upon to act in a judicial panel regarding any law made by a government for which the member does not reside in the relevant territory of jurisdiction.

Appendix

Following is a glossary of terms to help clarify the principle of the sovereignty of the individual, cited in the ISS [Constitution](#) as the principle upon which the society is founded. This glossary is intended to illustrate the context in which this principle arises and its interpretation as may be relied on by the society's membership.

Lawful society - a society in which every member has a complete and concise method for their laws to be written and adjudicated

Lawful state - a lawful society in which the method of writing and adjudicating laws is identical for every member

Partially lawful society - a society in which some members have chosen complete and concise methods for their laws to be written and adjudicated and efforts are made to allow members who have not done so to resolve disagreements through the use of common judgment rather than by previously specified rules

Lawless society - a society in which any disagreement that cannot be resolved by common judgment of the parties in dispute may result in use of force to try to have their way

Rule of law - the theory that the overall contentment of members of a society is better served by the existence of prescribed rules by which to resolve disagreements rather than by use of force between parties in a disagreement

Constitution - a written, complete and concise method for writing and adjudicating laws

Sovereignty - the condition where there is no justifiable reason for any other party to claim authority to overwhelm a person's or a society's choice of method by which to write and adjudicate laws

Responsible sovereignty - the ability to ascertain that a method of writing and adjudicating laws is complete and concise

Irresponsible sovereignty - refusal upon request to entertain the possibility that one's method of writing and adjudicating laws is not entirely complete or concise

Democratic sovereignty - the belief that it is morally justifiable to impose a method of writing and adjudicating laws upon a person or society whose preferred method provides less equal influence to each member of society over the writing and adjudicating of laws

Sovereignty of civil peace - the belief that it is morally justifiable to impose a method of writing and adjudicating laws upon a person or society whose preferred method is less conducive to civil peace

Sovereignty of elder wisdom - the belief that it is morally justifiable to impose a method of writing and adjudicating laws upon a person or society whose preferred method does not provide stronger influence over the writing and adjudicating of laws to the elders who are believed to have developed greater wisdom

Labour sovereignty - the belief that it is morally justifiable to impose a method of writing and adjudicating laws upon a person or society whose preferred method does not provide stronger influence over the writing and adjudicating of laws to the members of society who work harder

Religious sovereignty - the belief that a hypothetical supreme conscious entity has already defined laws by which people should have their conduct constrained and therefore it is morally justifiable to impose a method of writing and adjudicating laws, that provides people who have a stronger psychic connection with that supreme entity greater influence over the writing and adjudicating of laws, upon a person or society whose preferred method accomplishes this less effectively

Evolutionary sovereignty - the belief that the imposition of a method of writing and adjudicating laws upon a person or society has been morally justified to an extent for democratic, civil peace related, elder wisdom related, labour related, or religious reasons, or a combination thereof, and is evolving, to change which of these five reasons hold more emphasis in the justification for the imposition of this method upon a person or society without consent, thus increasing the extent to which this imposition is morally justified

Individual sovereignty - the belief that ascertaining the moral justification or lack thereof for imposing any aspect of a method of writing and adjudicating laws upon a person who prefers a different method or even no method at all is predicated on assessing the person's infringement of the liberty and happiness of others, either directly or through impacts to their communities or environments

Conscientious consent - an expression of willingness to accept a method of writing and adjudicating laws by which to have one's conduct constrained

Tacit consent - implicit agreement to the rule of law without explicitly specifying consent to a method of writing and adjudicating laws and therefore being ascribed a method commonly used in a lawful society

Monarchy - a lawful society in which one individual is endowed as the authority on determining responsible sovereignty

Absolute monarchy - a lawful state in which the constitution is: "the monarch commands everyone"

Constitutional monarchy - a lawful state in which the monarch has abdicated a specified amount of authority to a constitution

Consensual constitutional monarchy - a monarchy in which a member who shows an alternative method of writing and adjudicating laws to the monarch may, if the monarch agrees that the dissenting member's method is complete and concise, result in the monarch commanding law enforcement officers to only enforce the laws written under the alternative method upon this member of society rather than the monarch's constitution

Republic - a lawful state, created by the enactment of a constitution, in which the extent to which individual sovereignty is respected by that state is specified by the sovereign People within a defined geographical region through the methods defined in the constitution

Absolute Republic - a republic whose members have decided to regard individual sovereignty as having no moral justification

Consensual republic - a republic whose members have decided to make every effort possible to respect individual sovereignty when adjudicating a disagreement between one of its consensual members and another person who prefers an alternative method of writing and adjudicating laws

Democratic state - a lawful state in which each member of society is provided some influence in determining how laws are written and adjudicated

Diplomacy - the ability of different lawful states to resolve disagreements through negotiation without implying that use of force is justifiable by either state in any expected circumstance

War - the use of force by states in circumstances where one state believes that the method used by the other state to write and adjudicate its laws allows its members to act in ways that are morally unacceptable and so uses forcible means to attempt to deprive the members of the other state of their individual sovereignty, which is then defended with force by the other state

Geographically separate peace - the ability of two lawful states to co-exist with members of each state in separate geographical regions with all disputes between members of each state resolved by diplomacy

Borderless peace - the ability of two or more lawful states to co-exist within the same geographical territory with all members of each state held only to the laws of that state and all disagreements between members of different states resolved with diplomacy