LIVABLE INCOME

1. Re: Discussion about UBI (michael zubas)  
     
     
   ----------------------------------------------------------------------  
     
   Message: 1  
   Date: Thu, 26 Jul 2018 14:11:41 -0400  
   From: michael zubas <mrzubasjr@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion about UBI  
     
   Thank you. I hope addimg this as my signature helps fiz that issue. Im  
   going to wait a while and observe others before i create another thread.  
     
   Micheal Zubas Jr  
   Green Party Of Michigan Delegate  
   Achivist of the Mi Green Party

  1. Subject: Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable  
     Income (Ann Link)  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 09:55:28 +0000  
From: Ann Link <eastst@hotmail.com>  
To: "natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org" <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: [usgp-nc] Subject: Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment  
- Livable Income  
  
I agree with the need for deficit spending where we borrow to finance an investment that will pay off in the future. The issue with the deficits we have now is they are financing the wrong things - Ann Link, delegate from the Women?s Caucus

  2. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
     (Howard Switzer)  
   
  5. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
     (elie yarden)  
  
Message: 2  
Date: Thu, 2 Aug 2018 01:22:46 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Livable Income  
  
Jared & Tamar,  
  
Yes, I think the platform can and should be winnowed down becasue some  
policies remove the need for others in some cases, but don't we want to be  
careful about watering it down?  
  
I guess I would like to know; how do people feel about issuing  
"near-universally supported statements" in a social system where the  
narrative is controlled by Capital?  
  
The fact that MMT managed to somehow push a proposal onto this committee  
lets me know that somebody cares enough about our clear and simple economic  
policy to send language assassins  
<[https://www.filmsforaction.org/watch/corporate-jargon-lying-by-obscurity/>after](https://www.filmsforaction.org/watch/corporate-jargon-lying-by-obscurity/%3Eafter)  
it.  
  
We should not allow efforts using manipulation of language, misdirects and  
complexity, (while ignoring history, law and precedent) to confuse us about  
money, something simple and very basic to our Green economic policy.  
  
I think we need better vetting of proposals because I have a feeling that  
there will be, in fact I know there are, other efforts to blunt Green Party  
policy.  I would say be careful about going for the glitter, but what do I  
know?  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Thu, 2 Aug 2018 15:19:11 -0400  
From: elie yarden <yen.yarden@verizon.net>  
To: "natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org" <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Livable Income  
  
Howard Switzer,  
I here violate my normal rule of avoiding personal acknowledgement on a voting listserv  to thank you for the gift of llanguage assassins <<https://www.filmsforaction.org/watch/corporate-jargon-lying-by-obscurity/>>, and the film list that resulted.  It is about time that people understood the GPUS radical basis in theory and practice.  
  
Only for purposes of Illustration of what Green Party members might be talking about ? economies, not ?economics? ? I quote the introductory paragraph from the ?Political Agenda?of the Green-Rainbow Party in Massachusetts,  
"II .Sustainable Economies                                                                                                     Economies are systems developed by ordinary people working together to meet their needs. Ecologically sound economies conserve and recycle natural resources and fully involve human capabilities and imagination and are responsible to the future of humanity. The prevailing global "economic" system, controlled by the powerful, is wasteful, predatory, and destabilizing. Accepting this model, Massachusetts has failed many sectors of its population and permitted widespread degradation of its land, water, air, and ecosystems. We will strengthen local and regional economies, encouraging sustainable <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainability>> enterprises that are rooted in and responsible to their communities, while promoting regional and trans-regional collaboration."  
  
I very much doubt that the 'Advisor(s) to the GPUS Platform Committee? know much about the Green parties.  But why Nebraska?  That is the question.  
  
Elie Yarden  
alternate, MA

1. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Joe Firestone)  
     
     7. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Joe Firestone)  
     8. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Joe Firestone)  
      
   Message: 1  
   Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 11:27:05 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Adviser Joe B.  
     
   Glad to see you say directly say that the NEED Act facilitates deficit spending. As for the rest:  
     
   1. MMT does not favor debt issuance. To see this all you have to do to see that is to read Bill Mitchell's work or my own. And you know very well, Joe B. that Bill Mitchell always says that he would stop issuing debt instruments. Here's a quote from him: "Specifically, I would stop issuing Treasury debt instruments ? that is, stop public borrowing." A declarative statement from a blog post critiquing Iceland's Sovereign Money proposal: <http://bilbo.economicoutlook.net/blog/?p=30833> Then there's my own book the very title of which suggests that I am opposed to debt issuance: <http://amzn.to/Z7kG5q>  
     
   2. MMT can claim that "the Government IS the monopoly issuer of the nation's currency," not the nation's money, because MMT economists believe a) that the Central Bank is a part of Government; and b) that currency includes paper money, coins, and reserves issued by the Fed or the Treasury (which issues the coins).  
     
   3. And also MMT does not: ". . . at the same time say that this 'issuing' government needs to borrow the money from the bankers to fund their deficits." In fact, MMT writers universally always say the opposite again see my book, Bill Mitchell's blogs and books, many of the blog posts on neweconomicperspectives.org and many other MMT sites.  
     
   "Sorry, Joe.  
   MMT is a systemic loser as a logical construct.  
   Public debt is the tool of the Banker-capitalists.  
   We should pay it off with Public Money. "  
     
   4. MMT is beating the pants off AMI everywhere in the public space except in the GPUS, so it's doing well for a systemic loser  
   5. I'm against having public debt, as you know, and  
   6. I'm all about paying off the debt with public money, as, again you very well know.  
     
   Best,  
     
     
     
   Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
   Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee  
     
     
     
   Message: 7  
   Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 20:30:34 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Delegates,  
     
   As you read this, please keep in mind that the body of this reply isn't very well connected to the opening line. Yes, simply breaking up the banks is not enough, but that's not all the GP NE proposals do. They also greatly change the internal composition of the network of banks weighting it heavily towards public options in banking. That will mean a very large proportion of the money that is created will be created by public banks, and, in addition, the high-powered money would clearly be created by an entity within Treasury ending the debate about whether private banks are creating Government money.  
     
   More importantly, Howard, you keep refusing to answer the issue I raised about the desirability of having a Monetary Authority in which a small elite will make the decisions about how new money will be created and allocated, and the vulnerability of such a centralized institution to Wall Street penetration and control. In contrast, the GP NE allows money creation in the context of borrowing to be governed by decentralized decision making.  
     
   Decentralized money creation through a network of banking entities with a very large component of public and cooperative banks seems much more in tune with the thinking of people today who mistrust centralized authority greatly. I think, It will be hard for millenials to accept the idea that "Greening the Dollar" requires developing a centralized MA.  
     
   Best Regards,  
     
   Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
   Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee  
     
     
   Message: 8  
   Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 20:35:30 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Sorry, but some people won't be able to wait for the GPUS to change the system before they survive it. So, a debt jubilee is a powerful first step to help people while we work towards more fundamental change in it.  
     
   Best Regards,  
     
   Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
   Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee  
     
      2. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Joe Bongiovanni)  
     3. Re: Subject: Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
        Livable Income (Joe Firestone)  
     
     
     
     
   Message: 2  
   Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 08:49:27 -0400  
   From: Joe Bongiovanni <joebhed@verizon.net>  
   To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   To clarify for Advisor Joe F and the natcom Delegates on Joe's question.... .... if I may  
   Joe,  
   It's past time to stop pretending that the issue is whether to 'deficit spend' - or not, ... the "policy" issue is HOW TO FUND that deficit .... either with with more public debt (MMT-style) , or with using government-issued Public Money for real, using the Greening-The-Dollar monetary-financing of deficits. Public Money replaces debt.  
   The bigger question for most of us is HOW can MMT claim that the Government IS the monopoly issuer of the nation's money and at the same time say that this 'issuing' government needs to borrow the money from the bankers to fund their deficits. It's only logical that the issuer of the money never has a need to borrow that money. Need a bigger shoe-horn for that one.  
     
   Sorry, Joe.  
   MMT is a systemic loser as a logical construct.  
   Public debt is the tool of the Banker-capitalists.  
   We should pay it off with Public Money.  
     
   joe bongiovanni - GPVA  
   Advisor to GPUS natcom on Money and Banking Policy  
     
   Message: 3  
   Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 10:57:55 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Cc: Ann Link <eastst@hotmail.com>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Subject: Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform  
   Amendment - Livable Income  
     
   Delegates, Alternate Delegates and Advisers,  
     
   All spending, whether deficit or otherwise can be for the right or the wrong things. If some spending is for the wrong things, it doesn't make it more acceptable to point out that it is not deficit spending.  
     
   The problem with opposition to deficit spending is that it is based on the idea that deficits are in themselves bad. That notion, in turn is based on our own personal experience as currency users who cannot create US currency and who are subject to insolvency. However, the Federal Government doesn't have that problem since, it can always create the money it needs to repay it debts through Congressional action.  
     
   The AMI group here may deny that the Government can do this because they believe that the private banks, including the Federal Reserve Banks create all the money, but there is no reason to go into that contested issue again, since I framed my statement just above to include the Congress and certainly whatever one believes about the current power of the Government to issue Government money, it would certainly have that if the NEED Act were passed.  
     
   In any event, assuming the Government can pay any debt it may have and assuming that under a Green Government it would stop issuing debt and simply issue money when it wanted to deficit spend, then Government deficits would become nothing more than the accounting record of the surplus contribution made by the Government to the non-Government sector of the economy as a consequence of Government spending.  
     
   Put simply a dollar in Government deficit spending is a dollar in the pocket of some non-government entity! A Dollar in Government surplus is dollar out of the pocket of some non-government entity!  
     
   Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
   Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee

  1. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income (Erik)  
  2. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
     (Howard Switzer)  
  3. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
     (Howard Switzer)  
  
  6. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
     (Joe Firestone)  
  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 22:39:51 -0700  
From: Erik <erikrydberg34@gmail.com>  
To: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>,  National Committee Votes and  
GP-US Work <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Livable Income  
  
I am very concerned with opposition to this proposal... by opposing this  
amendment the Green Party is saying we want to cut military, cut subsidies  
and raise taxes to pay for the things we want. The problem that is you  
can't have 33 trillion dollars in new spending in the next 20 years by  
cutting the military, cutting subsidies and raising taxes. It simply isn't  
enough money to accomplish the Green New Deal. The only possible way to  
achieve all of our goals is through deficit spending. We are a monetarily  
sovereign nation and we have the ability to pay for all of these things  
right now.  
  
Cut military yes, cut subsidies yes, raise taxes yes... but stop acting  
like that will give us a Green New Deal in time to combat climate change...  
it won't. If you want UBI, Housing as a right, Healthcare as a right,  
Education as a right, Green Energy, Organic Permaculture and brand new  
roads schools and bridges... you're going to have to acknowledge that we  
are a monetarily sovereign country and that we have to deficit spend to do  
it.  
  
Opposing this amendment is the Green Party saying we want a Green New Deal  
but we want to take 100 years to do it because we are unwilling to deficit  
spend because we believe that we have to solve every problem before we are  
willing to improve the lives of our citizens. Do we need to end the fed...  
yes. Do we need to end war... yes. Do we need to end subsidies... yes. Do  
we have to wait until we've done all that before we can spend 33 trillion  
on a Green New Deal... NO. The first thing a Green President or Greens in  
Congress should do is propose the Green New Deal Act and pay for it by  
predominantly by deficit spending. We are more likely to pass a Green New  
Deal quickly than we are to get a swift end to Wars, Subsidies and a 90%  
Corporate Tax Rate.  
  
Pass the Green New Deal immediately and it will make it much easier to  
accomplish the other goals because the people will be less dependent on  
capitalism to meet their needs as they will have millions of socialist jobs  
and they will be much more inclined to support us.  
  
Who ever passes a Green New Deal will receive overwhelming support of  
American citizens. They had to enact term limits because people kept voting  
for FDR. FDR's New Deal wasn't Socialism... ours is. If we hesitate and let  
Democrats pass a Capitalist Green New Deal... we'll be locked into  
capitalism for another 50 years. Not proposing the full extent of our Green  
New Deal because we don't like the fed or we haven't cut military spending  
or subsidies is political suicide. The Democrats are going to beat us to  
the punch and their Green New Deal will be garbage.  
  
I hope everyone has had a look at Alexandria Ocasio-Cortes' platform...  
notice something familiar? A GREEN NEW DEAL. Democrats are co-opting our  
platform and Ocasio's Green New Deal if passed will not be socialism and it  
will be so laced with corporate hand outs that we Greens will spend the  
next 2 decades cringing every time American's praise Democrats for the  
Green New Deal. Notice how Ocasio plans to pay for it? Deficit Spending.  
  
Remember FDR killed Socialism. Progressivism is designed to subvert  
Socialism and keep us locked into capitalism. It worked in the 1930's and  
it will work again unless we beat them to the punch. Don't let your hatred  
for the FED(which I share) keep us from missing the most important  
opportunity in this critical moment of conjuncture. If Democrats pass a  
Green New Deal it will enrich Capitalists. If we pass a Green New Deal it  
will implement Socialism(Worker Owned Means of Production/Economic  
Democracy) and enrich the working class. This is the most important  
opportunity ever... I am shocked that doesn't seem to be a priority to some  
delegates.  
  
Erik Rydberg  
Delegate GPCA  
  
  
  
Message: 2  
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 12:40:59 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Livable Income  
  
Erik,  
  
Opposition to these proposals is important.  
  
Here is a good talk with a professor at York U in Toronto on the subject  
what must be done to finance all the social programs needed.  Canada has  
the same problem we do.  
  
As he described more democratization and socialist public programs Leo  
Panitch said, (at about 22 min.) "for these to be viable you will have to  
turn finance into a public utility...its not a matter of breaking up the  
banks."  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Awbmj6uc0jI>  
  
This goes along with what we Greens and many others around the world, like  
Herman Daly, have said, "nationalize the money not the banks."  MMT says it  
already is and that we need to break up the banks, not a good idea as the  
professor explains.  
  
Erik, if the Democrats pass the Green New Deal it will not be viable unless  
they also implement Greening of the Dollar which turns government finance  
and our money system into a public utility.  
Democrats could do that, they have the bill that Kucinich introduced, but  
being toadys for capital I'm quite sure they won't.  
This is why I keep saying Greening of the Dollar should be front and center  
in our campaigns.  
Take a breath Erik, remember Democrats may campaign on all kinds of good  
promises but they will keep none of them. Remember Bill Clinton and Health  
Care?  People voted for him becasue they thought they would get it and  
didn't.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
Message: 3  
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 12:51:41 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Livable Income  
Message-ID:  
<CAOUEhLw\_xVuSPhvhSHDdDPiVPzMvbjeEcJqbOuyX\_x0QdzB8EQ@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
Debt jubilees?  
  
Debt jubilees are what the Mesopotamian priest/kings did in order to keep  
their system of issuing money as debt going. They had to do it every 50  
years or so to keep their profiteering off of the people going.  
  
That is not changing the system, that is a strategy for surviving the  
system.  We propose a much needed change in the system. Debt for many today  
is unapayable, with GTD we can make it all payable.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
  
Message: 6  
Date: Wed, 1 Aug 2018 00:37:06 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>, Erik <erikrydberg34@gmail.com>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Livable Income  
  
Erik,  
  
The opposition to deficit spending in the GP is a mystery to me too. From my point of view it seems like the NEED Act enables deficit spending. So why embrace GTD and reject deficit      spending? Doesn't make sense to me.  
  
Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee

1. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Joe Firestone)  
     3. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Joe Firestone)  
     
     
   Message: 2  
   Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 00:47:08 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Howard,  
     
   I don't know perfectly well that the Federal Government creates no money today, because I know perfectly well that the truth or falsity of that assertion depends on whether one thinks that the Federal Reserve System of banks supervised by a Board of Governors is public or private. That question is still a matter of hot debate, and won't be settled by us here.  
     
   Regardless of how that issue is settled however it is unambiguously true that the Government has created many trillions of net financial assets for the non-Government sector in the form of Treasury securities issued in the context of deficit spending.  
     
   As for the MMT edifice, I'm one who looks at it from the inside, and I personally certainly blame the banks for their behavior. Why do you think, I'm for nationalizing the Fed banks, breaking up the big banks and limiting the growth of commercial banks in the future while advocating for postal banks, and an expanding network of state and local banks, and credit unions? Why do you think I would prefer, if politically possible, to allow only public banking in the United States?  
     
   Best Regards,  
   Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
   Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee  
     
     
   Message: 3  
   Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 00:59:15 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Alternate Delegate Jacobs,  
     
   I agree with Michael and yourself that we ought to have a private debt jubilee. I'd like to see that in the national platform. However, Michael Hudson doesn't agree with you about the NEED Act. He agrees with me, and other MMT economists and writers that the problems of the banks need to be solved in a different way, in line with MMT-based proposals for banking reform.  
     
   Best Regards,  
   Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
   Adviser, GPUS National Platform Committee  
     
      4. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (arkenrobin@hushmail.com)  
     
     6. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
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        (Gloria Mattera)  
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        (arkenrobin@hushmail.com)  
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    13. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Rita Jacobs)  
     
     
     
     
   Message: 4  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 11:11:32 -0500  
   From: arkenrobin@hushmail.com  
   To: "National Committee Votes and GP-US Work"  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   I would agree that a job guarantee is a necessary component.  
   Definitions of work need to change so that raising children at home is  
   considered work.  UBI is an idea that Republicans and establishment  
   Democrats can get behind .  It simply buys off the majority of  
   citizens to settle on the cheap and then in return getting out of the  
   way of the corporate capitalism machine.  I don't like the amendments  
   or the original text.  UBI is a liberal "reform" that attempts to hush  
   up the citizenry and soothe the wounds that the capitalist system has  
   caused.  We should be advocating for the real equality of income for  
   all, not some patch for capitalism.  I will vote no on 921 and hope  
   for a better plank for the future.  
     
   Robin Rumph  
   Arkansas Delegate  
     
     
     
   Message: 6  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 11:31:46 -0500  
   From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Robin,  
     
   I think if you contemplate the implications of Greening the Dollar, making  
   money a real public utility, issuing all money as its first use for the  
   common good, we could solve that problem.  
   It would be giving the government the power of the purse to fund public  
   policy instead of the banks who don't want to fund good public policy, they  
   only want increased profits.  
   A public money system would put a lot of money into the economy at the  
   grassroots level of wages for healthcare, education, building new  
   infrastructure, elder care,  etc. etc. all the things people need.  
   Plus we could fund reparations to communities devastated by the current  
   system and a sensible national response to climate change, instead of  
   billions going to corporations for big corporate bank profits almost  
   exclusively.  
   The current system concentrates wealth systematically though the mechanism  
   of interest, compounded, creating poverty at the other end.  
     
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt  
     
     
     
   Message: 7  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 13:05:26 -0400  
   From: Gloria Mattera <gmattera@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Thank you Charles for kicking off this discussion.  I don't see the purpose  
   for this change  
   and do not support it for the reasons stated by my fellow delegates.  
     
   Gloria Mattera  
   New York  
     
   On Mon, Jul 30, 2018 at 12:31 PM, Howard Switzer via Natlcomvotes <  
   natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org> wrote:  
     
     
     
   Message: 8  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 12:16:43 -0500  
   From: arkenrobin@hushmail.com  
   To: "National Committee Votes and GP-US Work"  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Hi Howard:  
     
   I have read your posts and others regarding the monetary system with  
   great interest.  I have been reading Michael Hudson's book Killing the  
   Host but have not finished it.  At least at the moment I would agree  
   that the Fed is obsolete and should be in sovereign hands.  Your views  
   are consistent with Hudson's analysis of the effects of rents in all  
   forms, interest, finance, insurance etc. on the real economy.  None of  
   the former produce anything real in the economy. These parts of the  
   economy are unearned income that goes to the super rich and parasitic  
   to the real economy. I agree that money to pay for what's needed is  
   not the real problem.    
     
   Robin Rumph  
   Arkansas Delegate  
     
   Message: 9  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 13:50:46 -0400 (EDT)  
   From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Just for the record. Michael Hudson is an MMT economist, who would agree with GP NE platform proposals and disagree with the current platform.  
     
   Message: 12  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 13:41:11 -0500  
   From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Michael was a Marxist economist now he is an MMT economist and he does a  
   good job of describing the problems caused by the system.  
   But both Michael and Joe Firestone know perfectly well that government  
   creates no money today and that the privilege of doing so was given to the  
   banks by law in 1913.  
   The entire MMT edifice is designed to deflect the growing blame from banks  
   onto government. Government certainly deserves some blame but Congress has  
   been bought by the big banks and the wealth extracting corporations they  
   fund.  
   Indeed, some bankers are worried becasue they see the thing approaching  
   collapse.  In fact now there is a Nationalist Faction on Wall St.  
   challenging the War Faction Which Owns the CIA and Media.  
   <<https://www.opednews.com/articles/5/A-Nationalist-Faction-on-W-by-Jay-Janson-Capitalism-Over-Humanity_Media-Collusion_Media-Corruption_Media-Distortion-180728-539.html>>  
   The issue is coming to a head.  
     
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt  
     
     
   Message: 13  
   Date: Mon, 30 Jul 2018 18:56:02 +0000  
   From: Rita Jacobs <rjacobs@arq.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   I have been an avid follower of Michael Hudson for long time. He does an excellent job of teaching the problems within the current monetary system. His approach has been to have a debt jubilee - where debts are forgiven. Otherwise there is never enough money in the system to pay back all the debts and interest. Money is created only through debt issuance, and there is no "extra money" created to pay the interest on the debt. Therefore at some point it becomes impossible for debts to be paid off. We seem to be reaching a crisis in this regard.  
     
   The system in our present platform would remove from the banks the power to create money and put it back in the hands of the government where it belongs.  Banks are a parasite in our economy.  
     
   Rita Jacobs  
   Alternate delegate  
   GPMI  
     
     
      2. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (John Rensenbrink)  
     3. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Linda Cree)  
     
     7. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Ben & Sue Emery)  
     8. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Andrea Merida)  
      
   Message: 2  
   Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 09:20:01 -0400  
   From: John Rensenbrink <john@rensenbrink.com>  
   To: Elie Yarden via Natlcomvotes <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Amen to that Charles. The amendment, proposal 921, has deep problems and is headed in the wrong direction.  
     
   John Rensenbrink  
   Maine Delegate
2. Message: 3  
   Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 14:08:18 +0000  
   From: Linda Cree <creelinda@hotmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Thank you, Charles. You've clearly stated concerns with 921 that I share but couldn't have expressed so well, when you say:  
     
   "My stronger concern is that it inserts the line, "1. We favor deficit  
   spending for a federal jobs program to put the unemployed to work;...".  
   The specification of deficit spending, instead of increased corporate  
   taxes or cutting military spending, implies fiscal irresponsibility and  
   a commitment to a cycle of increasing growth of capital and consumption."  
     
   I also share your concern about removing our support for a universal basic income (UBI).  As Greens, we need to think long-range and think sustainability. That means, in my book, we need to do a lot more bio-regional thinking. As we move toward a more bio-regionally based economy, we'll need a UBI more than ever to help people transform from a growth-oriented jobs economy to a simpler, more land-based, bio-regional economy where possible.  Erosion of jobs due to constantly growing mechanization in our current economy is another reason to continue our support for UBI.  
     
   For these reasons, I also urge delegates to vote NO on 921.  
     
   Linda Cree  
   GPMI Alt. Del.  
     
     
     
   Message: 7  
   Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 16:16:45 -0700  
   From: Ben & Sue Emery <su\_ba\_ru2@nccn.net>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   As the capitalist system is pushing for more and more automated work force average people are going to have a harder and harder time to earn a living. Deficit spending is using the vocabulary of the status quo. Most people associate deficit spending with social programs or austerity. It can be addressed with cuts to corporate subsides/ welfare and military empire.  
     
   Universal Basic Income is a way to assure all people have a way to meet their basic necessities.  
     
   I agree a NO vote on Proposal 921  
     
   Sue Roberts Emery  
   GPCA/ Delegate  
     
     
     
   Message: 8  
   Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 17:20:45 -0600  
   From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   I personally am troubled by the ableist/ageist prospect of a "jobs" focus.  
   What if one has a disability or advanced age that precludes their ability  
   to keep a job? This is ethics 101: we provide for those who cannot provide  
   for themselves.  
     
   Plus, I reject the notion that capitalism's responsibility is to care for  
   human needs.  It clearly hasn't worked so far!  
     
   Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
   Colorado
3. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Jenefer Ellingston)  
      
     3. Voting Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018 Platform  
        Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (voting@gpus.org)  
     
   Message: 1  
   Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 19:30:45 -0400  
   From: Jenefer Ellingston <jellygreen3@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   Reply to Charles Sherrouse\_  
   Thank you for your wise explanations and rejection of Amdt to 921.  
   I hope your explanation is read by all  ... and adopted.  
   Jenefer Ellingston, DCSGP  
     
     
   Message: 3  
   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 921 - 2018  
   Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
     
   Voting has begun for the following proposal:  
     
   Proposal ID: 921  
   Proposal: 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal -  Livable Income  
   Floor Manager: Gloria Mattera, gmattera@gmail.com  
   Voting Dates: 07/30/2018 - 08/05/2018  
     
      2. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (charles sherrouse)  
     
     4. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income  
        (Sid Smith)  
     
     
     
   Message: 2  
   Date: Sat, 28 Jul 2018 23:13:19 -0400  
   From: charles sherrouse <options@critpath.org>  
   To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   This amendment makes several changes, but particularly, it changes a  
   clear statement about universal basic income to one that is much more  
   verbose, confusing, and largely redundant with the following point 2.  
     
   My stronger concern is that it inserts the line, "1. We favor deficit  
   spending for a federal jobs program to put the unemployed to work;...".  
   The specification of deficit spending, instead of increased corporate  
   taxes or cutting military spending, implies fiscal irresponsibility and  
   a commitment to a cycle of increasing growth of capital and consumption.  
     
   The transfer of emphasis from livable income to a job guarantee, ignores  
   the decades long loss of jobs to technology and the need to transform  
   how we think of "full time" work and pay.  
     
   For these reasons i oppose platform amendment proposal 921.  
     
   charles sherrouse  
   alternate, PA
4. Message: 4  
   Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 00:11:17 -0400  
   From: Sid Smith <bsidneysmith@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Livable Income  
     
   I too am troubled by the replacement of a simple UBI with a "jobs  
   guarantee+basic income to eliminate poverty." These are philosophically  
   very different propositions. A UBI is founded on the recognition that every  
   citizen is a stakeholder in the larger economy, and deserves a dividend  
   without having to "earn" it other than by being a member of society. A jobs  
   guarantee ties being able to live to a requirement to sell one's labor on  
   terms set by the government, with a "safety net."  
     
   I don't see any justification being offered for this fundamental shift in  
   philosophy, nor am I able to imagine one that I find convincing.  
     
   Perhaps a proponent can address the rationale behind this?  
     
   Sid  
     
   \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  
   B. Sidney Smith

Today's Topics:  
  
  1. Re: Discussion about UBI (michael zubas)  
  
  
----------------------------------------------------------------------  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Thu, 26 Jul 2018 14:11:41 -0400  
From: michael zubas <mrzubasjr@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion about UBI  
Message-ID:  
<CA+QKaRwTZ1avaj7T-Z5SqRMmusMrhL24Gaj4PRpA0jPpDXeZPQ@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
Thank you. I hope addimg this as my signature helps fiz that issue. Im  
going to wait a while and observe others before i create another thread.  
  
Micheal Zubas Jr  
Green Party Of Michigan Delegate  
Achivist of the Mi Green Party

1. Discussion about UBI (michael zubas)  
     
     
   Message: 2  
   Date: Tue, 24 Jul 2018 22:19:46 -0400  
   From: michael zubas <mrzubasjr@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: [usgp-nc] Discussion about UBI  
   Message-ID:  
   <CA+QKaRyc+ODuEi7\_i8oO8m2MoaEbbamtougfve6J\_EwT6yRGEA@mail.gmail.com>  
   Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
     
   Adding a Jobs garuntee is the missing peice of the puzzle.  
     
   I am for this.

Message: 11  
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2018 11:36:56 -0500  
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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
Message-ID:  
<CAOUEhLwe6S573kS+NV9=VJhwWrRCmAHLTrG\_W9fCSUrqF1GUsw@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
  
Delegates,  
  
This proposal seeks to incorporate a fallacy that is explicitly exposed in  
the Green Party Platform, Greening of the Dollar, and contradicts the  
conclusions of that platform plank.  
  
Specifically, while the Federal government has the Constitutional authority  
to be the issuer of the currency, it has given up that power to the  
commercial banking industry. (the capitalists)  
The Federal government today does not issue the money, period. The  
commercial banking industry does, providing its owners with enormous profit  
and power.  
  
The proposed changes rely upon the perpetuation of the fallacy and take  
away the Green Party efforts to attack societal and economic problems at  
the root cause.  
  
The current unamended platform explicitly addresses this root cause by  
calling for the end of money creation by private banks and the restoration  
of the sovereign power of the government to generate money for public  
purpose including for a ?livable income?.  
  
Further, the proposed amendment continues to rely upon a failed,  
destructive and unnecessary process of extreme deficit spending which will  
increase the interest payments  paid for by taxes.  
  
This proposal ignores the common-sense conclusion that a government that  
issues the money (its own currency) has no need to borrow that money in the  
first place.  
The amendment is self-contradictory.  
  
Please vote no on 921 to maintain our revolutionary position.  
  
thank you,  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.

9. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Wesson Gaige)  
  
   
  
Message: 9  
Date: Mon, 02 Jul 2018 13:02:41 -0500  
From: Wesson Gaige <wesgaige@mac.com>  
To: iconofcharles Ostdiek via Natlcomvotes  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
Message-ID: <136A277A-5FD7-4CD8-A66C-A3BBEE6E86D6@mac.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
  
Will someone explain to me why we would want to abandon support for UBI?  Continued support for UBI is critical if we want to stay true to our values.  UBI is one of the basic human rights laid out by the UN 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights?.  We should not abandon it?  
  
Wesson Gaige  
GPTX Co-chair  
GPTX delegate  
GPAX  
He/Him/His  
  
Healthcare not Warfare  
  
"Whatever the problem, community is the answer.  There is no power greater than a community discovering what it cares about."  Margaret Wheatley

  8. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (iconofcharles Ostdiek)  
  
 14. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Wesson Gaige)  
  
 15. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Jared Laiti)  
  
 17. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Howard Switzer)  
  
  
  
  
Message: 8  
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2018 18:39:40 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
this was the most highly controversial position among the members of our  
state council during our discussions.  
 no consensus could be reached and we had to have a vote on it. the  
disagreements expressed at our state level endure and are trenchant.  
 it is true that the language is changed to differ from simple support of  
"Universal Basic Income", but it should be clear (it is stated at least  
twice) that a "basic income" (or "Basic Income") is still recommended for  
those who can't or even simply don't want to work.  
  
 1st mention: "We also support an expansion of the social safety net to  
eliminate poverty in the US through a basic income."  
 2nd mention: "We also support the expansion of social security to provide  
a Basic Income to those who either choose not to work or are otherwise  
unable to participate in their local economies."  
  
 the difference is simply that the basic income is no longer universal as  
it would be complementary to a federal job guarantee. those with jobs would  
receive their job income, those unemployed would receive a basic income.  
--charles ostdiek  
delegate, nebraska

Message: 14  
Date: Mon, 02 Jul 2018 23:41:27 -0500  
From: Wesson Gaige <wesgaige@mac.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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
I cannot support this.  We need to continue to support UBI. This will not have my support unless the wording is changed to support UBI.  
  
Wesson Gaige  
GPTX Co-chair  
GPTX delegate  
GPAX  
He/Him/His  
  
  
  
Message: 15  
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2018 21:51:58 -0700  
From: Jared Laiti <jared.laiti@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
NC,  
  
Charles said:  
 1st mention: "We also support an expansion of the social safety net to  
eliminate poverty in the US through a basic income."  
 2nd mention: "We also support the expansion of social security to provide  
a Basic Income to those who either choose not to work or are otherwise  
unable to participate in their local economies."  
  
The inconsistent, and unnecessary capitalization is enough for me to not  
support this proposed change to our public-facing platform. Why are things  
like "Right to a Job" and "Public Purpose" capitalized?  
  
More substantively, I also don't like the move away from "universal" basic  
income. A "jobs guarantee" ignores the reality (promise of  
science/technology..?) that less traditional "work" is needed. Maybe if it  
were stated that basic income recipients would get the same income as some  
with a guaranteed job - otherwise we're advocating for a two-tier system..  
There is pretty much nothing in the proposal about what kinds of jobs these  
should be (carbon reduction jobs?), just the assumption that some form of  
"work" is better than none. What about allowing people to explore their own  
talents/aspirations..?  
  
What I like about universal social programs is that they end up being more  
difficult to take away - look at Social Security vs. food stamps, for  
instance. In our system, those with means have more ability to fight for  
the benefits they have come to expect than do recipients of programs only  
for the poor.  
  
Thanks,  
Jared Laiti  
GPCA  
  
  
Message: 17  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 00:31:22 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Delegates, regarding how to get the money and power into people's pockets:  
  
I think the people should be issued the money to decide what work they want  
to do that is most beneficial to them and their community, not the Federal  
government.  It should be seen as investing in building local economies.  
(decentralizing the economy)  
The thing is that it is working people who create the value of our money  
from our resources, so it is they who should benefit first and directly  
from the creation of money.  
I appreciate the sentiment for UBI but I think we should consider calling  
it a "National Dividend" from our Green Dollar public money system. It is  
not a handout, it is the people's share in the equity of the nation.  
I think the framing of this issue is important and should be done in  
alignment with our monetary policy.  It actually simplifies things  
considerably.  
  
I think it is about acting locally and thinking globally. Acting locally is  
about creating sustainable and sane local economies and thinking globally  
is about changing the money system becasue it is a global system and needs  
a global political party to bring it home for every nation.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.

1. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018

     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Howard Switzer)

  2. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Rita Jacobs)

  3. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)

  4. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (stephen verchinski)

  5. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Jody Grage)

  6. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Holly Hart)

  7. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Howard Switzer)

  9. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Howard Switzer)

  16. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Janet Martell)  
   
 18. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Jody Grage)

 19. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (iconofcharles Ostdiek)  
  
  
----------------------------------------------------------------------  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 11:13:47 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Thank you delegate Young, that is a good question in that it exposes the  
extreme absurdity of the MMT postulates shared by delegate Rodolfo.  
  
Can anyone imagine that the greedy gang running things would allow any  
money anywhere paid to the government to just sit?  
By law government spends the taxes and borrows what can't be covered by the  
revenue from taxes and fees.  
  
MMT also fiercely claims the Federal Government currently does issue the  
money.  We dispute that, as does  AMI <<http://www.monetary.org/>>, Positive  
Money <<http://positivemoney.org/>>, COMER <<http://www.comer.org/index.htm>>,  
IMMR <<https://internationalmoneyreform.org/>>  etc.  
  
Why then would they so fiercely oppose Greening of the Dollar that would  
make what they claim to be ...true?  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 2  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 16:36:56 +0000  
From: Rita Jacobs <rjacobs@arq.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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
I have to agree with Howard Switzer on this. I used to work for IRS, and if we took in large payments (i.e. over $1 million) they had to be sent to the nearest office with a depository by express or overnight mail so they could be quickly deposited to earn interest. I can't imagine that the IRS would go to this trouble if the money was not used for some purpose.  
  
Rita Jacobs  
  
Alt. Del GPMI  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 3  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 10:54:00 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
We have taken the habit of referring to each other by last names when we  
disagree.  It would be Delegate Cortes in this case.  
  
Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
Colorado  
  
  
  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 17:01:03 +0000 (UTC)  
From: stephen verchinski <sverchinski@yahoo.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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
What definition of UBO are you using is critical.?  
The question is how do we integrate something like this into an ecologically based economics and politics??  
If we're unable to go ahead and answer that type of question then we have no business placing it within our platform.  
We need to stop making the ecological systems separate from our economic platform.?  
How has a countrywide UBI fared in the world so far??  
  
Stephen Verchinski  
GP-NM National Representative  
GP-US International Committee  
GP-US Eco Action Committee  
2700 Espanola St NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87110  
sverchinski@yahoo.com  
505 238 2398  
  
Support We the People.  
<http://www.MovetoAmend.org>  
  
  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 10:13:25 -0700  
From: Jody Grage <jodytgrage@gmail.com>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Andrea, Howard, Rodolfo, and everyone:? I look forward to building  
toward consensus with you all  
rather than emphasizing disagreements by how I address you.  
  
Jody Grage, GPUS Secretary, WA Delegate  
  
  
  
Message: 6  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 12:26:00 -0500  
From: Holly Hart <hhart11@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Michael, you're on that committee, right?  Check the archives!  I was just  
on the losing side of that issue, and finally gave up.  
  
Frankly, it's not that difficult to get "state" approval for something, as  
we've seen. But thay's not good enough.  Some time ago, there was more  
encouragement for disseminating potential amendments to a much wider  
membership, and that really did provide a better sense of what was ready  
for prime time, where problems might surface, whether to jsut drop  
something.  I see no reason not to make this not-so officult effort.  
  
Holly Hart  
Delegate, Iowa  
  
  
  
Message: 7  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 12:38:43 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Delegate Cortes,  
  
Have you studied any of the work regarding monetary systems that did not  
come from MMT?  I highly recommnd you read The Lost Science of Money by the  
late Stephen Zarlenga, a book Michael Hudson called  
  
You are clearly an MMT proponent and is using all their same 'confusury'  
talking points language.  (Confusury: economic double-speak in defense of  
usury.  Usury: the issuance of money for personal gain)  
  
"The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 ? Following up  
on the previous ~700 billion dollar Defense Authorization from Fiscal Year  
2018, the U.S. House voted for another ~700 billion dollar Defense  
Authorization. What does this mean? Once signed by the President, it is an  
authorization for the Federal Reserve (a creature of Congress) to credit  
the funds (?print the money?) into the Department of Defense?s digital  
accounts. The Department of Defense then draws down the funds as they pay  
personnel, enter contracts with Lockheed Martin, etc. The commercial banks  
have 0% to do with this process. "  
  
  
The Federal Reserve was created by Congress in 1913, Congress has no say  
over their activities and does not even get the minutes of their meetings.  
Show me the actual accounts in question and that these are completely  
divorced from taxing and borrowing accounts.  
BTW did you all know that  Lockheed Martin  was given the contract for  
handling the DOD's bookkeeping?  
  
Delegate Switzer further argues against deficit spending because it  
increases interest payments paid for by taxes. There are two things wrong  
with this statement.  
  
1) Interest payments do not necessarily go up as a result of deficit  
spending, but they \* can \* go up if the government borrows, which is not  
what deficit spending does. Deficit spending creates money (Constitutional  
power). If people are worried about the mere existence of the deficit, one  
proper response is to finance the deficit by authorizing funds for expenses  
(like the military) while also authorizing funds to ?pay off? that  
component of the deficit. In practice, this is unnecessary. So long as the  
U.S. Congress does not give up its power of the purse, it will always be  
able to create more dollars without worrying about the large deficit.  
  
  
  
Deficit spending is spending over what Treasury has in revenue from taxes  
and fees for Congress to spend so they then borrow it from the commercial  
banks through a convoluted process of selling bonds.  Thus deficit spending  
increases the debt and an increase in debt, as we all know, means an  
increase in interest payments.  
  
  
  
2) Federal income taxes are not used by the government to pay for anything.  
The government has no use for your tax money. Congress can create as many  
dollars as it goes. It can pay for whatever it wants and which can be  
realistically purchased. Fact: That?s how Congress managed to authorize  
(create) ~1.4 trillion dollars in the last two years for the Department of  
Defense, all the while REDUCING federal taxes. The Ways and Means Committee  
(taxes) is not related to the Appropriations Committee (spending) in any  
meaningful way.  
  
  
  
The American people will be happy to hear that they don't need to pay  
Federal Income Tax anymore as "the government has no use for your tax  
money."   If the Green Party were to claim that nonsense to be true we  
would be laughed off the stage.  
  
  
  
Think about it another way, which few Greens would dispute: It is often  
said that in this country we have ?socialism for the rich and rugged  
individualism for the poor.? What does this actually mean? It means that  
the rich get money FOR FREE ? it is created for them. As a concrete  
example, the CEOs of all the major defense contractors (Lockheed, Raytheon,  
Northrop, etc.) receive their salaries from dollars created by Congress.  
But that money did NOT come from taxes. That came from Congress? ?magic?  
money tree (?the power of the purse.?) So while the rich get access to the  
fruit of that money tree, the poor are repeatedly denied access (?rugged  
individualism.?)  
  
  
  
Notice how many times the word ?can? appears.  It is the hallmark of MMT to  
deliberately confuse what is possible if the law was changed, i.e. Greening  
of the Dollar, versus what is legally allowed under current law.  The power  
of the purse is held by the bankers, as Senator Durbin from Illinois so  
clearly put it, "The banks run this place."  Why would he say that and why  
would there be any debt if Congress could create money.  Trump can break  
the law but Congress cannot.  
  
  
It is very important for all Greens to understand these facts. This is not  
rocket science. The idea that federal income taxes ?pay for? anything is  
nothing but neoliberal, capitalist propaganda. It?s important to defeat  
that propaganda, which can be difficult. I was under its spell for most of  
my political life, and most people still think it is true. It is not true.  
It is capitalist propaganda and Greens should defeat that propaganda.  
  
  
  
More of the propaganda language used by MMT proponents to confuse. It is  
interesting that people could be so certain about such nonsense, kind of  
like a religion but with less science and evidence to back it up. LOL  
  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
  
Message: 9  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 13:05:25 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
"The question is how do we integrate something like this into an  
ecologically based economics and politics?"  
  
Stephen,  
  
you will be glad to know that the Greening of the Dollar relies on the work  
of Frederick Soddy, founder of ecological economics.  
  
Obviously ecological concerns are public concerns which will require a  
public money system in order to fund the necessary changes in how our  
economy treats the environment.  
  
Without a public money system government has no control over public policy,  
the banks do, and they have shown little interest in protecting the  
environment.  
  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt  
  
  
  
Message: 16  
Date: Wed, 04 Jul 2018 19:50:05 -0400  
From: Janet Martell <ninth.st@frontier.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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Four weeks discussion, not ten. Four is the maximum allowed by our rules.  
  
Jan Martell  
Alt, NC  
  
  
Message: 18  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 16:51:40 -0700  
From: Jody Grage <jodytgrage@gmail.com>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
I think Charles is including the time that a platform amendment is  
available before it goes to the  
voting queue.  
  
Jody Grage, GPUS Secretary, WA Delegate  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 19  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 19:15:22 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
jan,  
 gpus r&p's require 6 wks posting by platcom before the 4 wks required in  
formal nc discussion.  
--charles ostdiek  
delegate, ne

  2. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Holly Hart)

  3. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)

  4. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Jared Laiti)

  5. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Michael Trudeau)

  6. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (iconofcharles Ostdiek)

  7. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)

  8. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Holly Hart)  
  
  
  
  
Message: 2  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 19:49:41 -0500  
From: Holly Hart <hhart11@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Not per the platform.   Perhaps the committee needs to make more of an  
effort next time  
  
  
Message: 3  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 18:59:15 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
They are submitting a proposal to CHANGE the platform.  They have a right  
to do do, whether we agree with the proposal or not.  
  
What am I missing?  
  
Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
Colorado  
  
  
  
  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 19:53:22 -0700  
From: Jared Laiti <jared.laiti@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
NC,  
  
I think my issue with the "MMT" phrasing is that it seems to reduce the  
concept that the government has the power to change how money is currently  
created into statements like taxes don't fund government and government has  
no spending constraints, which don't seem to be true statements about how  
the system currently operates. I found Rita's distillation of our current  
monetary system helpful and consistent with my knowledge from  
macroeconomics in college. I think we can say how we think the monetary  
system should work without making questionably accurate statements about  
how it currently works.  
  
Thanks,  
Jared Laiti  
GPCA  
  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 23:14:48 -0400  
From: Michael Trudeau <mdtrudeau@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Holly, why aren't you telling PlatCom that it needs to seek grassroots  
approval for all of the platform proposals that it wrote, yet you are  
saying this to an actual state party? If PlatCom grassroots but Nebraska  
isn't?  
  
Michael Trudeau  
Delagate  
North Carolina  
  
  
  
Message: 6  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 23:12:49 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
holly,  
 a review of gpus r&p's re. platform submissions criteria and the platcom  
page's description of same indicates that this ngp approved proposal meets  
all requirements.  
 ngp, presumably like any other state party, caucus, or gpus committee,  
works to decide motions & plans by consensus. when that fails, we vote. by  
no stretch of interpretation of democracy can a single dissenting vote  
opposed by even more than a supermajority of other voters indicate the  
failure of such a vote.  
 that vote, necessitated by a disagreement over a single clause in the  
proposal, took place during our platform amendment committee special  
meeting and passed handily. at ngp's next regularly scheduled meeting, the  
decision of the committee was accepted by our council with full consensus.  
 thank you for your concern about our state's approval process. this  
proposal certainly does have the approval of the nebraska green party.  
 please confine future comments to the merits of the content of the  
proposal.  
 with respect,  
--charles ostdiek  
cochair, ngp  
gpus nc delegate, ngp  
  
  
  
Message: 7  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 22:23:26 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Seems like all is in order.  Thanks, Charles, for explaining your process.  
It's like Colorado's.  
  
Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
Colorado  
  
  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 8  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 23:55:24 -0500  
From: Holly Hart <hhart11@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Charles & All,  
  
For the record, whiel I don't meaen to suggest that NE didn't follow your  
decision-making rules, platform submissions are supposed to have been  
strongly vetted at the local and state level, as widely as possible, before  
being sent to the platform committee.  
  
That should have been spelled out more assertively before hand, perhaps,  
and hopefully will be better considered next time.  
  
Holly Hart  
Delegate, Iowa  
Member, GPUS Platform Committee
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     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)  
  
----------------------------------------------------------------------  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 00:53:31 -0500  
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 923  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Economic Justice and  
SustainabilityNational Debt  
  
Delegates,  
  
Someone who would have loved our Greening the Dollar plank was the great  
economist Henry Simons who said, "The mistake lies in fearing money and  
trusting debt."  This proposal, unfortunately,  exemplifies that fear.  
  
The first paragraph misrepresents the Greening of the Dollar position by  
claiming it advocates for a reduction in spending.  The assertion that  
spending must be tied to national debt is false as is explained in the GOTD  
platform statement.  When a government is the sole issuer of the money the  
concept of debt no longer applies.  
  
The second paragraph is an example of circular reasoning. ?...all dollars  
in existence came from them in the form of spending."    Sovereign money is  
not created by spending. You have to create it before you can spend it. It  
works like this:  
Congress sends an appropriations bill to the U.S. Treasury who then would  
create the money and cut the checks.  The creation of money in a sovereign  
money system funds spending.  
  
This proposal redefines the meaning of the word ?debt? in an arcane and  
bizarre manner in an attempt to dismiss the impacts of continued government  
borrowing.  The authors of the amendment will offer no proof, detailed or  
otherwise, on how the process of spending money into existence occurs under  
the current system. Money is spent from existing treasury accounts.  
  
The third paragraph refers to ?servicing? the debt - a euphemism for  
interest.  Because all money continues to be created by private banks under  
the proposed amendment, the interest accrued in the lending process is  
direct profit to those corporations that is paid by the public when  
borrowing to fund spending.   This innocuous ?servicing? is a real expense  
born by the public, running about a half trillion dollars per year now,  
most a part of bank profits.  
  
The forth paragraph reflects a fallacious reinterpretation of the accepted  
concept of the word ?debt?.  It reflects a poorly thought out scheme to  
piggy back on the current failed system through a convoluted and opaque  
process whereas the existing GOTD platform position is straightforward,  
intuitive and uncomplicated.  The claim is that these schemes will be more  
palatable to the mainstream, when, in fact, attempting to sell the idea of  
unlimited and infinite debt as a solution is a non-starter politically.  
  
The ?GREEN SOLUTIONS? paragraph reflects the essence of the proposed scheme  
to continue the practice of funding through borrowing.  It then posits the  
contradictory approach of having the secretary of the Treasury to ?fill the  
Treasury spending account?, an account that was claimed to be unnecessary  
since, according to the authors, Congress creates money when it spends.  It  
also erroneously associates ?reserves? with currency.  All of this  
complexity and deviousness is not what the American people want and I trust  
Greens don't either.  
  
We are not afraid of money and a real transition to an Economics of Care  
that GOTD can create.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
  
  
  
Message: 3  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 01:08:33 -0500  
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  
  
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.  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 09:00:45 -0500  
From: rubies200 <rubies1111@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Charles, is there method that you and/or your delegation might suggest as  
to how the GPUS could collect enough taxes to create a trust fund for a  
Basic Income--seeing as how even the Social Security trust fund has been  
raided to pay for other things (like constant warfare)?  
  
Nekita Gandy  
Delegate GPMS  
  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 10:13:01 -0400  
From: Rodolfo Cortes Barragan <rodolfo.cortes.barragan@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Delegates,  
  
In regards to GPTN Alt. Del. Howard Switzer?s first email on this thread:  
  
Switzer is correct in that Congress (the U.S. House) has the authority to  
be the issuer of the currency. However, Switzer is incorrect to state that  
Congress has ?given up? that power. Here is how things actually work, with  
an example:  
  
The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 ? Following up  
on the previous ~700 billion dollar Defense Authorization from Fiscal Year  
2018, the U.S. House voted for another ~700 billion dollar Defense  
Authorization. What does this mean? Once signed by the President, it is an  
authorization for the Federal Reserve (a creature of Congress) to credit  
the funds (?print the money?) into the Department of Defense?s digital  
accounts. The Department of Defense then draws down the funds as they pay  
personnel, enter contracts with Lockheed Martin, etc. The commercial banks  
have 0% to do with this process.  
  
Delegate Switzer further argues against deficit spending because it  
increases interest payments paid for by taxes. There are two things wrong  
with this statement.  
  
1) Interest payments do not necessarily go up as a result of deficit  
spending, but they \* can \* go up if the government borrows, which is not  
what deficit spending does. Deficit spending creates money (Constitutional  
power). If people are worried about the mere existence of the deficit, one  
proper response is to finance the deficit by authorizing funds for expenses  
(like the military) while also authorizing funds to ?pay off? that  
component of the deficit. In practice, this is unnecessary. So long as the  
U.S. Congress does not give up its power of the purse, it will always be  
able to create more dollars without worrying about the large deficit.  
  
2) Federal income taxes are not used by the government to pay for anything.  
The government has no use for your tax money. Congress can create as many  
dollars as it goes. It can pay for whatever it wants and which can be  
realistically purchased. Fact: That?s how Congress managed to authorize  
(create) ~1.4 trillion dollars in the last two years for the Department of  
Defense, all the while REDUCING federal taxes. The Ways and Means Committee  
(taxes) is not related to the Appropriations Committee (spending) in any  
meaningful way.  
  
Think about it another way, which few Greens would dispute: It is often  
said that in this country we have ?socialism for the rich and rugged  
individualism for the poor.? What does this actually mean? It means that  
the rich get money FOR FREE ? it is created for them. As a concrete  
example, the CEOs of all the major defense contractors (Lockheed, Raytheon,  
Northrop, etc.) receive their salaries from dollars created by Congress.  
But that money did NOT come from taxes. That came from Congress? ?magic?  
money tree (?the power of the purse.?) So while the rich get access to the  
fruit of that money tree, the poor are repeatedly denied access (?rugged  
individualism.?)  
  
It is very important for all Greens to understand these facts. This is not  
rocket science. The idea that federal income taxes ?pay for? anything is  
nothing but neoliberal, capitalist propaganda. It?s important to defeat  
that propaganda, which can be difficult. I was under its spell for most of  
my political life, and most people still think it is true. It is not true.  
It is capitalist propaganda and Greens should defeat that propaganda.  
  
Rodolfo  
  
GPCA Green Alt.  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 13  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 11:08:59 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
A jobs guarantee also ignores the fact that millions of people with  
disabilities right now are purposely kept in low wage jobs or not even  
employed.  They face tremendous economic INjustice that this proposed plank  
change does not address.  
  
This doesn't get to the root of the extreme exploitation that happens at  
places like Goodwill Industries, where people with intellectual  
disabilities are paid considerably less than minimum wage.  
  
Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
Colorado

1. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018

     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)  
  
  2. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Holly Hart)  
  
  3. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)  
  
  4. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (iconofcharles Ostdiek)  
  
  5. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (iconofcharles Ostdiek)  
  
  6. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Janet Martell)  
  
  7. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (iconofcharles Ostdiek)  
  
 10. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (elie yarden)  
  
 11. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Howard Switzer)  
  
 12. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (elie yarden)  
  
 14. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
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----------------------------------------------------------------------  
  
Message: 1  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 00:12:16 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
There's no problem here at all.  You don't like the proposal; fine.  I'm  
not keen either.  But it actually went through a two-step vetting process.  
It follows their bylaws.  That's all we need to be concerned with.  
  
And I reiterate Michael Trudeau's point, that we can't have two sets of  
standards for PlatCom and for state parties.  If we insist on vetting at  
the local and state level, then PlatCom should be no different.  They  
should have found a state or caucus to co-sponsor so that their proposal(s)  
COULD ALSO be vetted.  
  
Andrea Merida Cuellar, SC  
Colorado  
  
  
-----------------------------  
  
Message: 2  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 01:23:01 -0500  
From: Holly Hart <hhart11@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income

There I good reason a higher standard is set for platform amendments.  
  
Consider other material that hasn?t achieved wide enough supports.  Much as I strongly support BDS, there are still complaints from members every time it surfaces in a statement or press release.  I?m ok th better Avenue is to persuade others of your position.  
  
Ann I agree that the Platform Committee should adhere to the same process.    
  
Holly Hart  
Delegate, Iowa  
Member, GPUS Platform Committee  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 3  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 00:26:34 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@gmail.com>  
To: Holly Hart <hhart11@gmail.com>  
Cc: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
Message-ID:  
  
The "higher standards" are not spelled out in GPUS bylaws...because that  
would be centralization.  
  
So essentially, you're asking for more than the rules require.  
  
Andrea Merida Cuellar, SC  
Colorado  
  
  
  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 01:50:55 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
please take up the discussion about platform process elsewhere.  
 this thread is about this proposal.  
 please respect the subject line of this thread.  
thank you,  
--charles ostdiek  
delegate, nebraska  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 03:01:04 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
<https://gpus.org/rules-procedures/#09>  
\*"C. General Netiquette. \*In general, when quoting other messages, the  
person quoted should be properly cited, and extraneous text (including  
headers, footers, irrelevant messages to the section being responded to  
when replying to a digest, and the like) should be deleted. Non-substantive  
one-word replies generally should be sent off-list. Violations of General  
Netiquette guidelines can result in written informal reminders from the  
Forum Managers. Repeated off topic posting, over posting and other  
disregard for the purpose of the lists can be grounds for an official  
warning."  
  
\*\*"Repeated off topic posting [...] can be grounds for an official  
warning."\*\*  
  
please don't make me complain to a party cochair or a forum manager about  
disregard for the purpose of this list.   lol   <wink>  
  
with love,  
--charles ostdiek  
delegate, nebraska  
cochair, gpus bylaws, rules, policies & procedures committee  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 6  
Date: Wed, 04 Jul 2018 06:45:44 -0400  
From: Janet Martell <ninth.st@frontier.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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
I disagree. Although peripheral in a sense, this discussion is about this proposal, as well as platform amendment process.  
  
As I said earlier, the problem here is not whether or not these Nebraska proposals are rule-compliant. It has to do with the depth and breadth of the changes being proposed -- basically that the party completely change their monetary policy and base it on a new economic model, one which most Greens haven't heard of or don't understand. **I'm not saying that it is out of order for a state party to call for this, but to show some respect for the membership, the presenters should first spend some time making their case, by engaging other state parties to consider and sign on to this idea, before calling for a platform change.**  
  
Other deep changes like this such as the anti-capitalist, workplace democracy plank, and recently 912, spent a year building their case in an inclusive and persuasive way. One passed, one didn't. But we had time to really look at these issues.  
  
Jan Martell  
Alt, NC  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 7  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 07:02:01 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
Message-ID:  
  
jan,  
 ngp respects that this body has other business in addition to these  
proposals, and that this body has determined that 10 weeks' discussion time  
is appropriate and is sufficient time for deliberation. ngp also believes  
that some matters may not require that much time, and if the nc wishes, it  
may determine a shorter deliberation time, as long as it explicitly permits  
waiving the particular rules determinative of the duration of this process.  
at the conclusion of this cycle's process, i believe that more time than  
that per proposal will actually have been tallied up for some of them.  
 like kierkegaard observes in \_a concluding unscientific postscript\_  (i  
believe, but perhaps it was another of his works), evaluation of a  
situation can be endless, like being on a moving train looking out the  
window. things just continue to roll on by. the challenge, situationally  
and existentially, is to come to a rest. we respect that the nc can do so.  
 if the delegates can not do so, or are uncomfortable with the scope of  
the changes, then, by all means, they should not assent to these proposals.  
 ngp discussed having cosponsors. one of the problems with having many  
cosponsors is that proposed friendly amendments are more difficult to  
accept in a timely manner. nevertheless, ngp's other delegate, shane fry,  
was looking into having some other state parties cosponsor these. he  
reached out to a few. i no longer recall which ones. that scenario never  
developed enough for ngp to adequately consider it. i would suppose we're  
still open to it.  
 yet, having such a long engagement and consideration time is no guarantor  
of passage, nor should one think that it would necessarily be beneficial.  
while it may be the case that it may have helped the passage of the  
anti-capitalist plank, perhaps that amendment passed, rather, on its merits  
alone. and while 912 had a fair number of cosponsors, it did not pass, and  
perhaps so because friendly amendments that may have allowed passage were  
unacceptable to all cosponsors, or there was not enough time for some or  
all of them to come to agreement with the friendly amendments, or perhaps  
it simply failed due to a basic lack of merit.  
 in the thread regarding ngp's fair taxation amendment, you describe that  
you "cruised" through all of ngp's proposals. this is hardly the long  
deliberation time you claim should be necessary or beneficial. you  
recommended rejection of them all without much debate. this is hardly a  
recommendation for a fair hearing.  
 ngp has confidence that the nc can and will decide these matters in a  
fair, reasoned, and decisive manner. we are open to friendly amendments.  
 whether any or all of ngp's proposals pass or fail, we hope that they  
will serve as a starting place for an ongoing dialog about these matters.  
 thank you,  
--charles ostdiek  
delegate, nebraska  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 8  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 07:34:43 -0500  
From: iconofcharles Ostdiek <iconofcharles@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 918  
- 2018 Platform Amendment - Fair Taxation  
  
rita,  
 in re-reading your comments posted to the nc yet again, i see no  
question, only statements.  
 for the nc, may i post your private message, addressed to myself and  
ngp's former cochair (david long resigned from our state party earlier this  
year), which does append both a question and an additional  
suggestion/comment?  
 thank you,  
--charles ostdiek  
delegate, nebraska  
  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 9  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 14:15:19 +0000  
From: Rita Jacobs <rjacobs@arq.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 918  
- 2018 Platform Amendment - Fair Taxation

Yes, I intended for you to do that.  
  
Rita Jacobs  
  
Alt Del. GPMI  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 10  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 10:15:15 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
It may be a good thing that the moderators of the the listserv are hesitant to prevent  
people who are responsible for the fate of the GPUS( i.e., AOU) from being heard.    
How else would we be able know who others actually are except in their words.  
  
It might be that solipsisticly passionate people require require the restraint of rule.  
Sarcasm about hierarchical centralization might as easily come from matriarchal  
sources as from patriarchy.  
  
But when tit-fr-tat is my shtick, why not divert a comment on the invalidity of a  
pseudo-argument; "Universal Basic Income. (viz, right to life) is too hard for  
most people (many) to understand,  
  
So we all now know that Andrea Merida is a person who believes that we should  
do only what the rules require, that the behavior of the flesh requires restraint, and  
that aspirations, ?asking more that the rules require,? should be squelched!  
  
Interesting, how easily this forum helps us understand the nature of our political  
tasks and difficulties. The American ideological confusion of personal autonomy  
with (rugged?) ?iIndividualism could have been designed for the market society  
that it currenlly adorns. If people insist on confusing capitalism (the current state  
of an evolving economic system) with capitalist society and culture, as we know it  
in our everyday conversation.  
  
Another matter concerns the reality of poverty and climate change as an aspect  
of planetary ecology, addressed in the recent papal encyclical. Getting rid of the  
current Platform commitment to UBI as currently stated is clearly not an  
improvement in the platform of a party committed to ecological politics ? a full  
recognition of limitation of 'issue politics? in the solutions of problems as seemingly  
disparate as sexual freedom, air-pollution, plastic waste, conspicuous consumption,  
migration of humans, rising sea levels, eduction of needs, the competition of  
armed nation-states, mining of geological resources, incarceration, and schooling  
of the young.  
  
It would be also a bit more modest if, as delegates to the National Committee, we  
avoided acting as though we were privy to knowledge concerning what people, in  
the parties we represent, know.  It was in New Paltz, that a Green mayor celebrated  
the first gay marriage. (Ignoring its presence among the mountain men of the  
heroic West). In Massachusetts, legislation on incarceration and its aftermath,  
legislation on housing eviction, comes from Green-Rainbow Party pressure. And  
in the official political agenda of the MA affiliate, UBI is specified and implied.  
(That does not mean that every one elected to the MA delegation can understand  
it or explain it).  So yes, unless we return to a society in which people care for one  
another, we can deal with othe problems far more successfully by enabling the  
fullest participation in democratic political decision-making by ensuring that people  
do not have to have a paying job, acceptable as such from a capitalist viewpoint.  
And on the other do something about the enslavement of spouses ?mainly women.  
Members of communities, local and larger, will find plenty of work useful and other,  
if they do not have to concern themself with how to pay for a roof over their head,  
or the air-conditioning bill where needed.  
  
Elie Yarden  
alternate, MA  
  
  
Message: 11  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 09:43:54 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Delegate Rodolfo, Congress gave up its power over the purse by law in 1913  
with the establishment of a private central bank called the Fed.?  This put  
the wealthiest bankers in charge.  The progressive activists of the day  
knew this and some even wrote books about it.  
The 12 regional Fed banks are all owned privately.  There are no government  
employees of the Fed, not even the Board of Governors and their staff, not  
the Open Market Committee, none are government employees, they are all bank  
system employees.  
So how can it be a Federal Agency?  It is not!   Greenspan told Congress  
"the Fed is not a Federal Agency and also said that government has no say  
over what the Fed does.  
  
Congress of course has the power to change the law and create money,  
according to the Constitution, and that is what Greening of the Dollar  
does.  But to protect such a system from monetary war the banks must be  
banned from creating money. That is how the nation lost the Greenback, they  
didn't stop the banks from creating money. There are books about how that  
was accomplished as well.  
  
NO on 921  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
  
  
Message: 12  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 10:55:53 -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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Stop niggling!  
Try addressing substance, and demonstrating  
the knowledge of the subject that equips you to be a delegate.  
  
Elie Yarden  
alternate MA  
  
  
  
  
  
------------------------------  
  
Message: 14  
Date: Wed, 4 Jul 2018 11:08:28 -0400  
From: "frank young" <fyoung@mountain.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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Alternate CA Delegate Barragan says: "1. When happens when we send in our federal taxes? Someone at the IRS, perhaps a few people (I'm not sure), are able to see all the transactions coming in during tax season. So there are computers that show some the total number of intake for that year (and maybe all years), and there is a registry of the people who have paid, those who the computers identify may be sending wrong amounts, etc. That's what is done with the money. It "sits there." Congress has no use for it."  
  
So where is the money that IRS  has been collecting since 1862?  
  
Frank Young  
WV Delegate

  4. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (rubies200)  
  
  5. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Rodolfo Cortes Barragan)  
  
 13. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018  
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (Andrea Merida)  
  
  
  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 09:00:45 -0500  
From: rubies200 <rubies1111@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Charles, is there method that you and/or your delegation might suggest as  
to how the GPUS could collect enough taxes to create a trust fund for a  
Basic Income--seeing as how even the Social Security trust fund has been  
raided to pay for other things (like constant warfare)?  
  
Nekita Gandy  
Delegate GPMS  
  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 10:13:01 -0400  
From: Rodolfo Cortes Barragan <rodolfo.cortes.barragan@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Delegates,  
  
In regards to GPTN Alt. Del. Howard Switzer?s first email on this thread:  
  
Switzer is correct in that Congress (the U.S. House) has the authority to  
be the issuer of the currency. However, Switzer is incorrect to state that  
Congress has ?given up? that power. Here is how things actually work, with  
an example:  
  
The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 ? Following up  
on the previous ~700 billion dollar Defense Authorization from Fiscal Year  
2018, the U.S. House voted for another ~700 billion dollar Defense  
Authorization. What does this mean? Once signed by the President, it is an  
authorization for the Federal Reserve (a creature of Congress) to credit  
the funds (?print the money?) into the Department of Defense?s digital  
accounts. The Department of Defense then draws down the funds as they pay  
personnel, enter contracts with Lockheed Martin, etc. The commercial banks  
have 0% to do with this process.  
  
Delegate Switzer further argues against deficit spending because it  
increases interest payments paid for by taxes. There are two things wrong  
with this statement.  
  
1) Interest payments do not necessarily go up as a result of deficit  
spending, but they \* can \* go up if the government borrows, which is not  
what deficit spending does. Deficit spending creates money (Constitutional  
power). If people are worried about the mere existence of the deficit, one  
proper response is to finance the deficit by authorizing funds for expenses  
(like the military) while also authorizing funds to ?pay off? that  
component of the deficit. In practice, this is unnecessary. So long as the  
U.S. Congress does not give up its power of the purse, it will always be  
able to create more dollars without worrying about the large deficit.  
  
2) Federal income taxes are not used by the government to pay for anything.  
The government has no use for your tax money. Congress can create as many  
dollars as it goes. It can pay for whatever it wants and which can be  
realistically purchased. Fact: That?s how Congress managed to authorize  
(create) ~1.4 trillion dollars in the last two years for the Department of  
Defense, all the while REDUCING federal taxes. The Ways and Means Committee  
(taxes) is not related to the Appropriations Committee (spending) in any  
meaningful way.  
  
Think about it another way, which few Greens would dispute: It is often  
said that in this country we have ?socialism for the rich and rugged  
individualism for the poor.? What does this actually mean? It means that  
the rich get money FOR FREE ? it is created for them. As a concrete  
example, the CEOs of all the major defense contractors (Lockheed, Raytheon,  
Northrop, etc.) receive their salaries from dollars created by Congress.  
But that money did NOT come from taxes. That came from Congress? ?magic?  
money tree (?the power of the purse.?) So while the rich get access to the  
fruit of that money tree, the poor are repeatedly denied access (?rugged  
individualism.?)  
  
It is very important for all Greens to understand these facts. This is not  
rocket science. The idea that federal income taxes ?pay for? anything is  
nothing but neoliberal, capitalist propaganda. It?s important to defeat  
that propaganda, which can be difficult. I was under its spell for most of  
my political life, and most people still think it is true. It is not true.  
It is capitalist propaganda and Greens should defeat that propaganda.  
  
Rodolfo  
  
GPCA Green Alt.  
  
  
Message: 13  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 11:08:59 -0600  
From: Andrea Merida <andreamerida@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
A jobs guarantee also ignores the fact that millions of people with  
disabilities right now are purposely kept in low wage jobs or not even  
employed.  They face tremendous economic INjustice that this proposed plank  
change does not address.  
  
This doesn't get to the root of the extreme exploitation that happens at  
places like Goodwill Industries, where people with intellectual  
disabilities are paid considerably less than minimum wage.  
  
Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
Colorado  
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Message: 4  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 09:00:45 -0500  
From: rubies200 <rubies1111@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
  
Charles, is there method that you and/or your delegation might suggest as  
to how the GPUS could collect enough taxes to create a trust fund for a  
Basic Income--seeing as how even the Social Security trust fund has been  
raided to pay for other things (like constant warfare)?  
  
Nekita Gandy  
Delegate GPMS  
  
  
Message: 5  
Date: Tue, 3 Jul 2018 10:13:01 -0400  
From: Rodolfo Cortes Barragan <rodolfo.cortes.barragan@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 921  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income  
Message-ID:  
<CACPso\_gb++5njjeR6NiVwFQG9neEE4N4ypYOjPYNoqNw3YxKYg@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
  
Delegates,  
  
In regards to GPTN Alt. Del. Howard Switzer?s first email on this thread:  
  
Switzer is correct in that Congress (the U.S. House) has the authority to  
be the issuer of the currency. However, Switzer is incorrect to state that  
Congress has ?given up? that power. Here is how things actually work, with  
an example:  
  
The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 ? Following up  
on the previous ~700 billion dollar Defense Authorization from Fiscal Year  
2018, the U.S. House voted for another ~700 billion dollar Defense  
Authorization. What does this mean? Once signed by the President, it is an  
authorization for the Federal Reserve (a creature of Congress) to credit  
the funds (?print the money?) into the Department of Defense?s digital  
accounts. The Department of Defense then draws down the funds as they pay  
personnel, enter contracts with Lockheed Martin, etc. The commercial banks  
have 0% to do with this process.  
  
Delegate Switzer further argues against deficit spending because it  
increases interest payments paid for by taxes. There are two things wrong  
with this statement.  
  
1) Interest payments do not necessarily go up as a result of deficit  
spending, but they \* can \* go up if the government borrows, which is not  
what deficit spending does. Deficit spending creates money (Constitutional  
power). If people are worried about the mere existence of the deficit, one  
proper response is to finance the deficit by authorizing funds for expenses  
(like the military) while also authorizing funds to ?pay off? that  
component of the deficit. In practice, this is unnecessary. So long as the  
U.S. Congress does not give up its power of the purse, it will always be  
able to create more dollars without worrying about the large deficit.  
  
2) Federal income taxes are not used by the government to pay for anything.  
The government has no use for your tax money. Congress can create as many  
dollars as it goes. It can pay for whatever it wants and which can be  
realistically purchased. Fact: That?s how Congress managed to authorize  
(create) ~1.4 trillion dollars in the last two years for the Department of  
Defense, all the while REDUCING federal taxes. The Ways and Means Committee  
(taxes) is not related to the Appropriations Committee (spending) in any  
meaningful way.  
  
Think about it another way, which few Greens would dispute: It is often  
said that in this country we have ?socialism for the rich and rugged  
individualism for the poor.? What does this actually mean? It means that  
the rich get money FOR FREE ? it is created for them. As a concrete  
example, the CEOs of all the major defense contractors (Lockheed, Raytheon,  
Northrop, etc.) receive their salaries from dollars created by Congress.  
But that money did NOT come from taxes. That came from Congress? ?magic?  
money tree (?the power of the purse.?) So while the rich get access to the  
fruit of that money tree, the poor are repeatedly denied access (?rugged  
individualism.?)  
  
It is very important for all Greens to understand these facts. This is not  
rocket science. The idea that federal income taxes ?pay for? anything is  
nothing but neoliberal, capitalist propaganda. It?s important to defeat  
that propaganda, which can be difficult. I was under its spell for most of  
my political life, and most people still think it is true. It is not true.  
It is capitalist propaganda and Greens should defeat that propaganda.  
  
Rodolfo  
  
GPCA Green Alt.  
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To: "The natlcomvotes (aka National Committee Votes) listserv is for  
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<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921  
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A jobs guarantee also ignores the fact that millions of people with  
disabilities right now are purposely kept in low wage jobs or not even  
employed.  They face tremendous economic INjustice that this proposed plank  
change does not address.  
  
This doesn't get to the root of the extreme exploitation that happens at  
places like Goodwill Industries, where people with intellectual  
disabilities are paid considerably less than minimum wage.  
  
Andrea M?rida Cu?llar, SC  
Colorado

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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National Committee Delegates  
  
How MMT ignores the law, and calls it just a self-imposed 'constraint'.  
On whether government tax receipts are used for balancing government spending.  
  
They are, in the Budget Process          
  
  
Title 31, Sub II, Ch. 11, SS 1103 - Budget Ceiling

Congress reaffirms its commitment that budget outlays of the United [States](https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=31-USC-80204913-206022345&term_occur=204&term_src=title:31:subtitle:II:chapter:11:section:1103) Government for a fiscal year may be not more than the receipts of the Government for that year.           
  
So tax "receipts" are part of what, indeed, can pay for spending "outlays".      .  
Every year.     
Why would they not be used for that purpose ?    h  
Thanks.  
  
joe bongiovanni - GPVA  
Advisor to GP natcom on money and banking related amendment proposals.