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: 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: 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: 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: 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

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: 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

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: 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: 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

1. 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
2. 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.

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

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.

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: 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: 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: 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

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: 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