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
     (Howard Switzer)
  7. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income
     (Gloria Mattera)
  8. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income
     (arkenrobin@hushmail.com)
  9. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income
     (Joe Firestone)

 12. Re: Proposal 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment - Livable Income
     (Howard Switzer)
 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
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     (John Rensenbrink)
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     (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

  1. Re: Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 923 - 2018
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Economic Justice and
     SustainabilityNational Debt (Howard Switzer)

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

     Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble
     (Howard Switzer)

  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: 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)
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     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)
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     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
     Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income (frank young)

----------------------------------------------------------------------

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
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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

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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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.
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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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject:** | Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 921 - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Livable Income |
| **From:** | [Joe Bongiovanni](https://www.startmail.com/email_compose?send_to=joebhed%40verizon.net) |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, July 4, 2018 at 2:19 PM |
| **To:** | [natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org](https://www.startmail.com/email_compose?send_to=natlcomvotes%40green.gpus.org) |
| **Cc:** | [howard@howardswitzer.com](https://www.startmail.com/email_compose?send_to=howard%40howardswitzer.com), [peters.s@startmail.com](https://www.startmail.com/email_compose?send_to=peters.s%40startmail.com) |

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.