  1. Re: Proposal 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment - GPUS Platform  
     Preamble (charles sherrouse)  
  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 02:04:59 -0400  
From: charles sherrouse <options@critpath.org>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment - GPUS  
Platform Preamble  
  
This proposal make relatively minor changes to the platform preamble.  
It removes a reference to taxes as the cause for low federal revenue,  
and inserts this clause, "... because Congress refuses to use its  
sovereign power to spend what is necessary to meet the challenges that  
face us."  
  
This change supports the mindset that congress could spend us out of any  
problem without regard to revenue on hand or taxes coming in.  Thus, for  
the reasons i articulated in response to proposal 923, i oppose proposal  
924, as well.  
  
charles sherrouse  
alternate, PA

  6. Voting Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
     Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (voting@gpus.org)  
   
Message: 6  
Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 00:05:00 -0400 (EDT)  
From: voting@gpus.org  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: [usgp-nc] Voting Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Voting has begun for the following proposal:  
  
Proposal ID: 924  
Proposal: 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Floor Manager: Andrea Merida, andreamerida@gmail.com  
Voting Dates: 07/30/2018 - 08/05/2018  
  
Voting ends at Midnight Pacific Time

1. Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble (Sue)

  3. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (elie yarden)  
  
  
----------------------------------------------------------------------  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Sat, 28 Jul 2018 02:44:10 -0400  
From: "Sue" <peters.s@startmail.com>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org, "Sue Peters" <peters.s@startmail.com>  
Subject: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 -  
2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
To national committee members,  
  
I am Sue Peters, a member of the NY County Greens, NYS State Committee,  
and advisor for money reform to the national committee.  
  
I wish to encourage you to vote NO to proposal 924 - amend GPUS  
Platform Preamble.  
  
Here are my reasons.  
  
#1 This amendment removes the sentence 'Levels of federal revenue are  
the lowest they have been since 1950 because of tax cuts and breaks for  
the very rich and for corporations.'? This sentence is fact. Why remove  
it, except to protect the billionaires and corporations.  
  
#2 This amendment adds the sentence 'because Congress refuses to use  
its sovereign power to spend what is necessary...' This is untrue.  
According to the 1913 Federal Reserve Law, Congress gave up its power  
to create money to the private commercial banks. Please look at my  
presentation, given at the recent national meeting in Salt Lake City,  
on the current banking system's creation of our money supply from bank  
debt.  
  
<http://infostation1.net/sue/2018-07-19%20%20to%2007-22%20GP%20SALT%20LAKE%20CITY%20-%20GPUS/2018-07-20%20MONEY%20CREATION%20TALK%20-%20GP%20national%20meeting%20-%20Sue%20Peters/>  
  
If you cannot listen to the recorded talk (minutes 14-57), then simply  
review the powerpoint. Congress does not have a sovereign power to  
create our money any more.? The Federal Reserve Law of 1913 was  
designed by very powerful bankers to put our government into debt and  
therefore cripple our government. Today, by this law, our government  
cannot create its own money, but must pay its expenses by raising taxes  
or borrowing from the public.  
  
Please review the website GreensForMonetaryReform.org.? Myself and  
several other greens, from around the country, created this website to  
explain the 'Greening the Dollar' plank in our national platform. It  
explains in simple terms that money does not have to be private  
bankmoney, created whenever a private commercial bank makes a loan. It  
explains that our government can change the law and take back the power  
to create money from the banks. When that new law is passed, our  
government will then be truly a sovereign of its money.?  
  
Thank you.  
  
Sue Peters  
Member, NY County GP  
Member, NYS State Committee  
Advisor for money reform, National Committee  
GreensForMonetaryReform.org  
212 864 0229  
  
  
  
Message: 3  
Date: Sat, 28 Jul 2018 14:33:11 -0400  
From: elie yarden <yen.yarden@verizon.net>  
To: "natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org" <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
For a political party committed to acting for the common good, with a large constituent membership, a large number of individuals committed to the values grounded in Ecological Wisdom ? some having actually studied its text and aware of the nature of human knowledge and belief ? there is little reason to be concerned about the discovery of paniceas or strategic keys.  The need by a group of advisors on monetary reform to the National Committe for a website to counter the activities of a group of advisors on economic to the Platform Committee is questionable.  I am somewhat persuaded that delegates to the NC have sufficient knowledge of the Platform of the GPUS to understand the limited (unecological) nature of the Nebraska amendments to vote them down.  
  
The use of consultants is an accepted tool of bureaucratic governance.  It is indeed one of the many conventional devices of domination and control of populations that the Green parties will need to overcome if we still recognize the full potential of grass-roots democracy ? both as a value and also as a political agenda for \_change\_!  I am emphasizing the word ?change? because of the need to change the familiar behaviors, the familiar ways of developing political strategies, to develop an efective responsse to the condition of the planet.  
  
Elie Yarden  
alternate, MA G-RP

  1. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018

     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Joe Bongiovanni)  
  2. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Howard Switzer)  
   
Message: 1  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 14:47:16 -0400  
From: Joe Bongiovanni <joebhed@verizon.net>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Dear Advisors Fadhel Kaboub and Joe Firestone, Delegate Mike Feinstein and natcom Delegates  
  
Welcome again, Advisor Kaboub   .    This is responsive to your comment which was included / responsive to Delegate Feinstein on the matter of "monetary sovereignty".   For my part, it is inadequate to 'define' a context or a issue near the core of our discussion without citing the source of that definition. I am not even sure who has previously written what about sovereignty, but we are left with the incorrect statement that monetary sovereignty is defined as anything more or less than a nations supreme authority over its money system.  That's all it is.                                                          
  
My citation here is the book titled 'Monetary Sovereignty ... 'by Dr John Goodman who is an economist who wrote his book to clarify whether, or not,,the nation's that were joining the European Monetary Union(EMU) not just the EU, were giving up their monetary sovereignty - as some were claiming at the time (1992) .                                      
  
So - this cite is for the following publication - "Monetary Sovereignty - The Politics of Central Banking in Western Europe" ,  A Volume in the Cornell Studies in Political Economy Series, Cornell University Press -    the author is Harvard University Graduate School of Business Professor Dr. John B. Goodman - published in 1992.                                        
  
While the citation is important and the statements about sovereignty and other national money powers are instructive to our GPUS discussion, it is the logic of the matters that will hopefully prevail and remain in the reader's thinking about things money going forward.                                 In reality, there is a hierarchy of national money powers. Our suggestion as reformers is to first understand and then to protect and preserve every one of them - for they are the foundation of what a national economy  is all about.                  Understanding 'monetary sovereignty' goes a long way in helping to understand its subordinate state powers.                                                                                          As according Prof. Goodman in his First Chapter titled "Politics, Economics and Central Banking" he explains the then current evolution of our modern money hierarchy thusly (pg. 5) .                         "While states have retained their monetary  
 sovereignty - that is, their legal and political supremacy in monetary matters -  they have progressively lost their monetary autonomy." (9)'                                                          
  
(9)"""Sovereignty" refers to the legal and political authority that makes the state supreme in its domain. 'Monetary Autonomy' means that a state is able to set and maintain a monetary policy which is not driven by markets or exchange rate regimes."" END                                                                                 So, for whomever advanced the following definition of monetary sovereignty as a declaration of valid fact .....  'The reference to "sovereignty" is really about monetary sovereignty which is defined as an entity that can 1/ issue its own currency, 2/ levy taxes in that same currency, 3/ issues bonds denominated exclusively in that currency, and 4/ follow a flexible exchange rate policy.   -----   is wrong.                      
  
Nos. 2, 3, and 4 have nothing to do with monetary sovereignty, except that, WITHOUT sovereignty you can't do any of those things.  Number 1 is also questionable because there is no need for a 'state' to give its issuing power to another 'state', rather the issuing power can be handed over to a private international cartel - and that is what we have dome with the Federal Reserve Banking System(FRBS) in this country.                                                              
  
All countries of the European Monetary Union retain their monetary sovereignty. It was an expression of that national monetary sovereignty to JOIN the EMU and it would be another expression to quit the EMU. They have all given up their monetary "autonomy". They are not able to advance their own monetary policies, having given up those policy decisions to the European Union.                                       Without surrender of its sovereignty, a nation cannot be without monetary sovereignty. It is a perennial state power.Without monetary autonomy, no nation can pursue its national economic purpose. Restoring monetary autonomy to the state  is the reason for the existing Greening the Dollar Policy..  
  
For clarification.  
Respectfully.  
  
joe bongiovanni - GPVA  
Advisor to the GPUS natcom on Money and Banking Policy.  
  
Message: 2  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 14:06:05 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Very well said, Mr Bongiovanni, thank you for making these, between  
sovereignty and autonomy, distinctions clear.  
  
HOward Switzer  
GPTN alt.

  4. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018

     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Howard Switzer)  
  5. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Joe Firestone)  
  6. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Joe Firestone)  
  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 10:35:20 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Delegates,  
  
I think it adds to the confusion to claim that we have a sovereign  
government that issues currency, this is not true.  Our government issues  
NO currency. It merely prints and mints the cash currency and sells it to  
the banks for cost of production who then issue it at face value, meaning  
the banks make a profit off of the issuing of our money.  Well, the profit  
on the few coins produced goes to government becasue they are sold to the  
banks at face value, but the bills are sold for around $50 per 1000 bills  
(nickel a bill) in 2017 regardless of what denomination.  See page 20;  
<https://www.treasury.gov/about/budget-performance/annual-performance-plan/Documents/FY17_AFR_508_FINAL.pdf>  
  
BUT, that is only 3% of the money supply most of which is created by  
commercial banks when they make a loans to individuals, businesses or  
governments.  So private entities create our money, not the government.  
In that regard "our" government is really "their" government which allows  
them the privilege of doing this.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 12:43:06 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Welcome Adviser Fadhel Kaboub,  
  
And thanks for such a clear statement.  
  
Best,  
  
Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
Adviser, GPUS  National Platform Committee  
  
  
Message: 6  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 12:51:26 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Delegate Feinstein,  
  
As an adviser helping the GP NE to formulate its proposed amendments to the platform, we tried keep the background text and the changes to the minimum consistent with what we believe are the economic and fiscal facts. We very consciously decided to leave background and explanation for the discussions, rather than making the platform itself too wordy.  
  
The proposed amendments to the Monetary and Banking Reforms provisions in the platform have much more background text, on why we're proposing the changes.  
  
Best Regards,  
  
Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
Adviser, GPUS  National Platform Committee

2. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Mike Feinstein)  
  
  7. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Fadhel Kaboub)  
  8. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Mike Feinstein)  
   
  
Message: 2  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 02:45:59 -0700  
From: Mike Feinstein <mfeinstein@feinstein.org>  
To: GPUS National Listserve <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID: <7490D7CE-BB9D-423A-AF91-9AA30105090C@feinstein.org>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
  
Again, not helpful at all that people are bifurcating this discussion on the same proposal be creating different subject headers.  It would be much easier for NC Delegates to follow the debates on a single proposal if this practice ended.  
  
That said, I have a question about the very short statement in the background of the proposal

Amend the following statements from the Preamble to reflect the sovereign economics as they are

What in the world does ?sovereign economics? mean?  I shouldn?t have to ask this here, it should be elaborated in the background, not assumed to be self-explanatory.

, and to acknowledge again that these problems mostly stem from people in our government

Is there something to back this up?  Couldn?t one argue that its not the people per se, but our inadequate electoral system leads to electing people who don?t act in our interest?

who are not willing to do what is needed to take care of the problems faced by the American People.

As for the content, I don?t support removing mention of the role of corporate welfare, and would likely vote against this amendment solely on that basis.

Levels of federal revenue are the lowest they have been since 1950 because of tax cuts and breaks for the very rich and for corporations

But I am interested in revising this text, but not necessarily in this manner

Amend, ?Every single level of government ? local, county, state, and federal ? is operating in the red, running up crushing amounts of debt.? to read,  
  
?Nearly every single level of government ? local, county, and state ? is operating in the red, running up crushing amounts of debt.?

The concern I have with the existing and proposed text, is that it talks about levels of governments, as if they were a single entity.  The reality is that there are thousands of municipalities, counties, etc. on each level of government, each with their own budget realities.  
  
Also using text like ?operating in the red? can blur an understanding of how local/county/state government works, where most are mandated to pass a balanced budget (<http://www.gfoa.org/achieving-structurally-balanced-budget> ? <http://www.ncsl.org/research/fiscal-policy/state-balanced-budget-requirements.aspx> ? <http://www.ncsl.org/research/fiscal-policy/state-constitutional-and-statutory-requirements-fo.aspx>,) unlike the Federal government, which is not.  
  
<https://financial-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Operating+in+the+red>

Operating in the Red  
  
Describing a business that continues operations while losing money.

It is true that governments can incur long-term debt (here in CA local governments face unfunded long-term pension obligations for example), but they are not ?losing? money per se. At the same time, I know that it is commonplace to say governments are ?running in the red?, including here in CA (<https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article66904557.html>.)  
  
I?d like to hear more discussion on that point.  
  
To make the text more coherent, perhaps it should read something like  
  
?Governments on every level - local, county, state and federal - face significant budget shortfalls, and many are running up crushing amounts of debt?  
  
Thoughts?  
  
Finally, can the Platcom ensure that past versions of our platform are easily found on gp.org?  There is no link on <http://www.gp.org/platform> to our past versions.  
  
The 2010 attempt to amend the preamble failed (<http://gp.org/cgi-bin/vote/propresult?pid=558>,) and to find the origin of the current text I to work to find our earlier platform versions, and a search did not find them on our site.  
  
<https://2008election.procon.org/pdf/green2004platform.pdf> (same platform for 2004 and 2008)  
  
2000 (ASGP)  <https://gpus.org/committees/platform/2000-platform/#preamble>  
  
Hence this language was part of the 2004 platform.  
  
Mike Feinstein  
NC Delegate, GPCA  
  
  
Message: 7  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 09:57:06 -0400  
From: Fadhel Kaboub <kaboubf@denison.edu>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID:  
<CALYjpRrpC-AQE6zgDcCC1Ss1dcSt3m0W7GDKSa5giYDD9T0PpA@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
Dear NC delegate Mike Feinstein,  
  
Your proposed statement ?Governments on every level - local, county, state  
and federal - face significant budget shortfalls, and many are running up  
crushing amounts of debt? is not factually correct. The reference to  
"sovereignty" is really about monetary sovereignty which is defined as an  
entity that can 1/ issue its own currency, 2/ levy taxes in that same  
currency, 3/ issues bonds denominated exclusively in that currency, and 4/  
follow a flexible exchange rate policy. As such only the US federal  
government qualifies as monetarily sovereign. States, cities,  
municipalities are not monetarily sovereign.  
  
As the issuer of the currency, the US federal government faces no financial  
burden (the national debt is a misnomer). Currency users  
(states/cities/municipalities, consumers, firms, etc) are financially  
constrained and do face the burden of debt.  
  
Making the distinction between issuer and users of the currency is  
extremely important to explain how one pays for the policies that GPUS care  
about (fighting for climate change, Green New Deal, generous social  
services, etc.). The financial burden of these programs cannot be put on  
the people when we have the privilege of full monetary sovereignty at the  
federal level (a privileged that not all countries enjoy).  
  
Sincerely,  
  
Fadhel Kaboub  
Economic advisor to the GPUS  
Associate Professor of Economics, Denison University, Ohio  
President, Global Institute for Sustainable Prosperity  
740-587-6315 @FadhelKaboub <<https://twitter.com/FadhelKaboub>> & @GISP\_Tweets  
<<https://twitter.com/GISP_Tweets>>  
  
  
  
  
Message: 8  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 07:05:40 -0700  
From: Mike Feinstein <mfeinstein@feinstein.org>  
To: GPUS National Listserve <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID: <0FBCF368-7C9D-401B-A23D-23D0E6183A5A@feinstein.org>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
  
Thank you Fadhel Kaboub for your comments.  
  
You make my point exactly about the insufficiency of the background to this proposal, as the kind of arguments you are making are absent in the background text, making it hard to know what the sponsors are referring to in their proposal.  
  
Mike Feinstein  
NC Delegate, GPCA  
  
   4. Re: GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal  
     - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble (Jared Laiti)  
  
  5. Re: GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal  
     - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble (Jody Grage)  
  
  6. Re: GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal  
     - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble (Howard Switzer)  
  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Sat, 7 Jul 2018 19:32:45 -0700  
From: Jared Laiti <jared.laiti@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
NC,  
  
I'm not sure our preamble is an appropriate place to get into this  
discussion about "because Congress refuses to use its sovereign power to  
spend what is necessary to meet the challenges that face us." That's not  
the only reason social programs are not funded, it's also where else we  
choose to put the money that is spent. We have another plank dealing  
specifically with monetary reforms, and personally I'd rather focus first  
on military/prison/police  and intelligence agency spending (things we are  
spending money on that we don't like as Greens..) as a source of funds for  
other programs. Not that I don't think we need monetary reforms but again  
we have another plank for that. I'd support using language such as "because  
of federal (why the focus on Congress when the president has to sign  
budgets too..?) spending priorities."  I think that encapsulates the  
monetary argument too as I think everyone accepts the government can spend  
what it chooses to, it's just a question of whether that spending is  
treated as government debt or not - which we discuss elsewhere, not in the  
preamble.  
  
Thanks,  
Jared Laiti  
GPCA  
  
On Fri, Jul 6, 2018 at 12:18 PM, Peggy Koteen via Natlcomvotes <  
natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org> wrote:

Thank you for updating our Preamble. The suggestion to OMIT that line is  
excellent.  I have a grammatical suggestion.  
  
  
  
  
  
Peggy Koteen  
GPCA

Message: 5  
Date: Sat, 7 Jul 2018 19:35:11 -0700  
From: Jody Grage <jodytgrage@gmail.com>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
I support Jared's suggestion (and I remembered to trim this post!).  
  
Jody Grage  
WA Delegate  
  
  
  
Message: 6  
Date: Sat, 7 Jul 2018 23:55:08 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
Jared,  
the point is government cannot spend what it chooses to, it spends what  
those who control the purse, the 'big bankers', choose and on what it will  
be spent.  They haven't bought Congress to let them spend whatever they  
want on whatever.  
The big money has an agenda and they have the power.  
This has been the problem for governments world-around, the debt-for-money  
monetary system rules and directs the spending through their paid for  
agents in Congress or Parliaments, the EU etc.. It is how the system works.  
Those who issue the money rule and have for centuries but for a few  
exceptions which are importnat to know about.  
Congress doesn't even write most of the laws, they just rubber stamp them  
and fundraise for re-election.  
So if we want to be in control of spending we need to elect OUR government  
that issues the money publicly as an asset for public purpose and prevent  
the bankers from controlling the money..  
Understanding the systemic problem is important and misdirects abound.  
This proposed change does not accurately describe the problem nor the  
solution.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.

7. Re: GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal  
     - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble (pkoteen@aol.com)  
  
    9. Re: GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal  
     - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble (Howard Switzer)  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 7  
Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2018 15:18:11 -0400  
From: pkoteen@aol.com  
To: Natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID: <1647107bae5-17a1-449a@webjas-vae166.srv.aolmail.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
  
  
Thank you for updating our Preamble. The suggestion to OMIT that line is excellent.  I have a grammatical suggestion.  
  
I suggest a grammatical change on the first amendment proposed-  Either leave out the comma before the word "because" OR insert the word "partially" before the word because and leave the comma in place.  
Thus my two offered suggestions would read:  
  
deleted comma:   ?Government agencies charged with safeguarding public health and safety are operating with slashed budgets that paralyze their efforts because Congress refuses to use its sovereign power to spend what is necessary to meet the challenges that face us.?  
  
insert partially and keep the comma:  ?Government agencies charged with safeguarding public health and safety are operating with slashed budgets that paralyze their efforts, partially because Congress refuses to use its sovereign power to spend what is necessary to meet the challenges that face us.?  
  
Peggy Koteen  
GPCA  
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~  
  
  
Proposal  
Amend Green Party Platform Preamble:  
  
Omit, ?Levels of federal revenue are the lowest they have been since 1950 because of tax cuts and breaks for the very rich and for corporations.?  
  
Amend, ?Government agencies charged with safeguarding public health and safety are operating with slashed budgets that paralyze their efforts.? To read, ?Government agencies charged with safeguarding public health and safety are operating with slashed budgets that paralyze their efforts, because Congress refuses to use its sovereign power to spend what is necessary to meet the challenges that face us.?  
  
Amend, ?Every single level of government ? local, county, state, and federal ? is operating in the red, running up crushing amounts of debt.? to read, ?Nearly every single level of government ? local, county, and state ? is operating in the red, running up crushing amounts of debt.?  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
Message: 9  
Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2018 14:46:38 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
I hear you Delegate Koteen, it does sound better to avoid absolute  
statements, though I have no trouble with the first statement they seek to  
remove which is a fact.  
  
However, I would ask that we take a closer look at the statement "...  
because Congress refuses to use its sovereign power to spend what is  
necessary to meet the challenges that face us.?  
  
The fact is that under current law, which we propose to change, Congress is  
barred from using its sovereign power to spend money into existence and  
requires them to spend only revenue collected in taxes and fees or to  
borrow it through bond sales.(FRB Act 1913)  
Of course, in a sense it is true becasue Congress does have the power to  
change that law and reclaim its sovereign Constitutional Authority to spend  
money into existence, which is what we propose in GOTD.  
  
I'm not opposed to improving on our preamble but I would not want to pass  
on such ambiguity regarding our understanding of monetary science.  
  
If GPNE would be open changing their proposal to more accurately reflect  
how the system works I would be happy to help.  Otherwise, I vote NO on 924.  
  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.

3. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
     (Howard Switzer)  
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From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: "The natlcomvotes (aka National Committee Votes) listserv is for  
decision-making and management of GP-US affairs."  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID:  
<CAOUEhLzB\_+2x=AYFsUtz4WSsMpaNF9w\_Dc6rpx9RRWSQQtfYmA@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
  
Delegates,  
  
I have to say these proposals seem to me malicious and combative.  
  
There is no reason to delete the 2nd sentence in the first paragraph - it  
is a statement of fact!  
  
Second paragraph: to lay the blame on Congress for refusing to spend hides  
the underlying cause that prevents Congress from spending: lack of funds  
and a fierce aversion to borrowing.  
  
Third paragraph - Again, the amended statement attempts to cover up the  
indebtedness of the Federal government to support the false claim that  
borrowing has no consequences.  
  
Monetary experts have been imploring lawmakers for over 50 years to revamp  
the failed Federal Reserve experiment for an honest and transparent  
alternative - an alternative that places the fact that only the government  
should create the people?s money front and center.  Instead, the amendments  
proposed here try to concoct a scheme built upon a rickety structure that  
was cobbled together over a hundred years ago specifically to serve the  
profit oriented interests of the banking industry.  
  
Green economic/monetary policy will leave the current debt-for-money  
policies in the dust bin of history where they belong.  
  
I am happy to answer any questions you all may have. I am doing my best to  
explain why Greens should oppose these proposals.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.