Message: 2  
Date: Sun, 29 Jul 2018 23:57:40 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 922 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
Monetary and Banking Reform

So, I?ve stated what I believe are the shortcomings of items 15 ? 17 in the Monetary and Banking Reform section of the platform, relative to solving the problems specified in the introductory paragraphs. My reasons are the unaccountable character of the MA as specified in the NEED Act; its reliance on the objective of controlling the money supply as a way of controlling inflation/deflation; its failure to break up the big banks, encourage public banking, and provide for strong regulation of the asset side of banking.  
  
  
I believe that all these reasons collectively amount to a strong likelihood that the platform and the NEED Act on which it is based will not work to accomplish its objectives. The unaccountable character of the MA will expose its decisions to error, conservative ideological biases, and public mistrust. It will fail to control inflation/deflation because control of the money supply won?t work to do that by itself.  
  
  
The failure to break up the big private banks will result in continuing political problems for the MA requiring its supporters to constantly fend off attempts to destroy itthrough amendments to the NEED Act. The lack of encouragement for public banking will mean that there is no public option to hold bank fees in check. And finally, the lack of strong regulation of the asset side of banking will leave the way open to further private bank concentration with its attendant baleful effects on inequality.

1. Message: 3  
   Date: Sat, 28 Jul 2018 23:15:06 -0400  
   From: charles sherrouse <options@critpath.org>  
   To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Proposal 922 - 2018 Platform Amendment -  
   Monetary and Banking Reform  
     
   The changes in this proposal get into the complex monetary reform issues  
   being debated between supporters of AMI versus proponents of MMT.  The  
   proposed text that cuts to my point of disagreement is to be added in  
   point 17. "... The Monetary Authority will, however, support the network  
   of community, state, local, and commercial banks and credit unions in  
   creating money in the form of bank deposits backed by loans as needed to  
   support credit worthy customers in fulfilling their personal and  
   business needs."  
     
   This line asserts that we would support the continuation of a system of  
   money created by lending, though extended to a broader network of banks.  
    This is not a position that i think the Green Party should advocate.  
   Thus i oppose platform amendment proposal 922.  
     
   charles sherrouse  
   alternate, PA
2. 10. 400 economists support Greening the Dollar (Howard Switzer)
3. Message: 10  
   Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 09:38:09 -0500  
   From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: [usgp-nc] 400 economists support Greening the Dollar  
   Message-ID:  
   <CAOUEhLx+5Yn5QK7mYB9oUM3r3KJXHaNiEk9ckAgLXZN3rYtO=Q@mail.gmail.com>  
   Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
     
   Rodolfo,  
     
   The claim that there are no economists in the world who support the real  
   Monetary Reform proposed by AMI and GTD is based on ignorance of history.  
   If you had known the history you would know how ludicrous your statement is  
   becasue in 1939 over 400 economists publicly supported the Fisher-Douglas-  
   Graham paper for reform.  
   faculty.chicagobooth.edu/amir.sufi/research/monetaryreform\_1939.pdf  which  
   is essentially the same 3 elements of what we are proposing.  If you think  
   it is some obscure idea then you should study some history because there is  
   so much more to the story that everyone should know and doesn't.  
     
   Can you or anyone else find a parallel of economist support for any other  
   proposal?  
     
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt

Message: 3  
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2018 16:14:26 -0400  
From: GPUS Forum Managers <forummanagers@gp.org>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Cc: GPUS Forum Managers <forummanagers@gp.org>, Joe Bongiovanni  
<joebhed@verizon.net>, Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
Subject: [usgp-nc] The role of advisors on the National Committee  
votes list  
  
Several advisors to this National Committee votes list were added at the  
start of discussion on several platform proposals related to Federal  
spending and monetary policy.  
  
This is a reminder of the role for advisors, as providing background,  
answering questions, and making clarifications relevant to specific  
proposals and their area of expertise. Advisors should not advocate for,  
or against, proposals, nor should they engage in debate on this list.  
  
Delegates and alternates may seek information or clarification from  
advisors, but should address arguments for or against proposals to other  
National Committee members.  
  
Although there is no specific limit on the number of posts, please post  
in moderation.  All members of this list are asked to be respectful in  
their communications.  
  
Respectfully,  
GPUS Forum Managers  
  Holly Hart  
  Charles Sherrouse  
  Sid Smith
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Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2018 17:35:17 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Joe Firestone <eisai@comcast.net>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Why Greening of the Dollar is Important  
Message-ID: <1531823561.862542.1531863317308@connect.xfinity.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
Alternate Delegate Switzer,  
  
Will you kindly stop insulting people who disagree with you about The NEED Act by questioning their motives? Can't you just advance an argument and content yourself with the substance without attacking people and motives.  
  
Also, please stop painting all MMT writers with the same brush. We don't all make the same arguments and there are different degrees of confusion among us as there are among proponents of the NEED Act.  
  
And Btw, I agree with you that people ought to read the NEED Act for themselves. It's not that long and much of it is very good. I make clear the sticking points in it for me here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dR24cNnRDrA&t=15s> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dR24cNnRDrA&t=15s>  The debate accompanying the video in the comments is also illuminating from my point of view, and maybe will be for you too.  
  
Best Regards,  
  
Joseph M. Firestone, Ph.D.  
Adviser, GPUS  National Platform Committee

Message: 10  
Date: Tue, 17 Jul 2018 13:46:43 -0500  
From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Why Greening of the Dollar is Important  
  
Yes, well Michael Hudson, despite his recognition of the value of Stephen  
Zarlenga's book was often invited to come and debate the issue.  
And he admitted being wrong to Stephen in 2010, caught on tape in an  
emotional exchange. He further explained that he was afraid of monetary  
reform fearing the powers-that-be would get violent over the issue.  
  
AMI was built on independent research that no school will touch for fear of  
losing their funding.  You don't know about money becasue it is not taught  
at any university.  It used to be back when there was a study discipine  
called Political Economy but in the late 19th century, under pressure from  
their lending institutions, universities began separating Political Economy  
in to Economics, the study of wealth while ignoring power, and Political  
Science, the study of power while ignoring wealth.  Political Economy is  
the study of the relationships between wealth and power.  
  
Again, as you can see, knowing history is critical to understanding what is  
going on now. If you don't have a historical perspective you have a myopic  
view.  Myopic Monetary Thought is MMT.  
  
Rodolfo, if you want to be on the forefront of the revolution you should  
check the material out at AMI, Positive Money, Ons Geld and other monetary  
reform groups who know all this stuff.  
  
However there are a few economists and academics who support monetary  
reform.  Kate Raworth, Donut Economics, left economics school becasue the  
values being taught so anti-planet and people.  
She cites a study that was done of economics students from freshman to grad  
that indicated that the longer students stayed with the program the more  
they adopted the values of "Economic Man", the greedy assumptions they base  
their models on.  
  
Various economists have come to AMI conferences to learn about money,  
Michael Kumhof was one, Ben Dyson was one, Kaoru Yamaguchi, Sergio Turner,  
Nic Tideman...  there is a growing number of them out there but there is an  
element of risk to their careers as Paul Krugman famously stated.  Bernard  
Lietaer asked Paul, ?Why, with all your influence, don?t you tell people  
how the money system works?" Paul replied, ?Didn?t they warn you about not  
touching the monetary system? If you insist on talking about it, it will  
kill you academically.?  
Bernard ask that question of him just before he received the "Nobel" Prize  
in Economics. BTW the ?Nobel? in economics; is a prize given by the central  
bank of Sweden ?in honor of Alfred Nobel,? it is not a real Nobel Prize.  
  
The study of money is the third rail for an economists career because that  
is where the power is.  That is why some of them, like Ben Dyson, Edgar  
Wortman, Uli Kortsch and others leave economics and begin monetary reform  
groups.  
  
Howard Switzer  
GPTN alt.  
Message: 1  
Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2018 09:00:45 -0700  
From: Erik <erikrydberg34@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Why Greening of the Dollar is Important  
Message-ID:  
<CAP2o+zxpY=iHh08X3sPkCy8kYUoh49rNuL1T7wQNHVc6s\_mLnA@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
I am pretty sure we all want to see the FED Nationalized. To me it appears  
that the fear of whatever power the FED currently holds is being over  
dramatized. Yes there are corrupt bankers sitting on the board of the  
Federal Reserve and have been since day one passage of the Federal Reserve  
Act 1913. The Federal Reserve absolutely does not decide on the monies to  
be spent for war. Not in any way whatsoever. Only the Congress can decide  
to fund war. Period. Full stop.  
  
The reason we must change our platform to acknowledge Modern Monetary  
Theory is this... as it stands now with Greening the Dollar we would not be  
able to pass a Green New Deal. Cutting Military spending by 50% is not           <<<<<<<<<  
enough money to fund a Green New Deal. Quantitative Easings are sloppy and  <<<<<<<<<  
not enough to fund a Green New Deal.  
  
If we get Rodolfo Cortes, Kenneth Mejia and Laura Wells in Congress and any  
of them bring forward the Green New Deal Act there is only one way to pay  
for it in it?s entirety... we do not have time, the planet does not have  
time to go through a lengthy and limiting monetary reform process before we     <<<<<<<<<<  
pass a Green New Deal. We need it now.  
  
Our current system allows for Congress to propose trillions in  
infrastructure spending and that?s exactly what a Green New Deal Act from  
Rodolfo Cortes or Kenneth Mejia would do. Do we need to Nationalize the  
FED... of course we do. We need to Nationalize a great many things in this  
country. Do we need to wait to propose the Green New Deal Act until we?ve      <<<<<<<<<<<  
Nationalized the FED... absolutely not. The FED has absolutely no authority  
to stop a Green New Deal if the Congress ?decided? on it. To suggest that  
is putting the cart before the horse.  
  
The worst thing that can happen in this scenario is that a partisan  
Neo-Liberal Democrat that supports the Clintons like Alexandria  
Ocasio-Cortes makes it to Congress and proposes a watered down Green New  
Deal that is capitalist hand out and that doesn?t build towards a worker  
controlled economy.  
  
The Green New Deal train is leaving the station and if we don?t jump on  
board and get to the ?Pilot Car? first... we will be locked into another 50  
years of Capitalism like FDR did to us during the moment of conjecture in  
the 1930?s.  
  
We need a Green New Deal that Nationalizes Production. We need a Eugene    <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<NATIONALIZES PRODUCTION  
Debs approach not a FDR approach. We need a Rodolfo Cortes-Barragan  
approach not a Alexandria Ocasio-Cortes approach.  
  
If Capitalist Liberal Democrats like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortes pass the  
?Green New Deal? as it is worded in her platform... it will enrich  
billionaires like Elon Musk at best instead of enriching the working class.  
  
If the NC Delegates don?t have the situational awareness to adopt these  
amendments regarding our monetary platform... I only hope all the more that  
Kenneth Mejia and Rodolfo Cortes Barragan win their races for Congress so  
they can be the architects of the Green New Deal Act. Otherwise we will not  
get everything we want out of the Green New Deal and I am afraid we may  
only get one shot at this before the Democrats Co-opt it and turn it into    <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<bank created money  
another capitalist hand out.  
  
If you are paying attention the Democrats are already doing this. This is  
not the time to be naval gazing and speculating on long term monetary  
overhauls out of fear of the ominous Federal Reserve. We either do this now  
or watch the Democrats co-opt our hopes and dreams.  
  
Erik Rydberg     <<panic panic panic  
Delegate GPCA

Date: Mon, 16 Jul 2018 12:24:27 -0400  
From: Joe Bongiovanni <joebhed@verizon.net>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Why Greening of the Dollar is Important  
Message-ID: <164a3e84b46-c90-10d2d@webjas-vad191.srv.aolmail.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
Dear Delegates,  
I am very reluctant to get involved in the Rodlfo-Howard dialogue on these 'congressional versus executive "powers", but things have gotten a little 'squishy' lately? -? a term meant to convey a loss of clarity as the discussion progresses, rather than a progressively-enhancing of the clarity of the issue.????? So, my reading.....?? --?? Howard says "that Congress authorizes the money be spent and the Treasury writes the checks."??????? IMO what is at center stage in Howard's description is the obvious separation of our governmental powers. Besides making laws, Congress (Legislative Branch)? has Budgetary powers limited to authorizations and appropriations. Congress has never had any power to spend - if you know what that means? - on anything. Not even their lunches. Congress determines the size of the public purse, and where it can be spent. ? ?? ----?? It then becomes the Treasury's (Executive Branch)? job to BOTH 'fill-the-purse'?? -? with taxation and Bond-proceeds revenues .....  
. as they do, and then to spend 'write the check' from that public purse ONLY ON those things that Congress has 'authorized and appropriated.'.  
This is a true, unimpeachable statement of fact on public financial administration? -? as conveyed in the Treasury's Annual Fiscal Report - previously cited. And as Howard has described it.????????? For some reason Rodolfo's response abolishes this eparation of powers? -? he? replies to Howard's correct statement above by misunderstanding it in? a manner that appears almost willful. Why ?? Rodolfo writes : "It's great to see you acknowledging that Congress does have the authority to spend money,.."?????? How is it possibly great to see that, ? when that is the opposite of what Howard has said ?  
I would be glad to disagree with and correct Howard had he written that Congress does have the power "to spend" money.???? He did not.?? They (Congress) do not.????????? I have to admit that I'm not sure why this question has come to the fore, if not connected to Joe Firestone's WAN about the Congress 'instructing' the Fed to fill the Treasury's account..... Gawd.?? That never happens.???????? That has never happened.  
Joe F. says Congress could add enabling language to any appropriation Bill 'directing' the Fed to do so ..... Only among Joe's wildest dreams.  
It would never pass legal muster.?????? From where would Congress get such authority to exercise?? Make it up .... as per Joe ?  
"Would the gentleman (lady) please cite the authority to so instruct the Federal Reserve" ....... a private institution over which Congress exercises no operational control? --?? by virtue of its acceptance of central bank 'independence ?.  
So, not only would it violate separation of power doctrines IF the Fed were under Treasury, but given today's convoluted hybrid political construct of a privatized central banking and monetary system, the violation is impossible worse by leaps and bounds.  
  
Respectfully.  
  
joe bongiovanni, GPVA  
Advisor to GPUS natcom on Money and Banking Policy.

1. Message: 4  
   Date: Sun, 15 Jul 2018 17:46:55 -0500  
   From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Why Greening of the Dollar is Important  
   Message-ID:  
   <CAOUEhLw5R34nLkE9ECR0\_tMSznK9vWdhT04o3dwRz-SvsWorSA@mail.gmail.com>  
   Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
     
   Good question, Rodolfo,  
   I think your question, Rodolfo, is in fact sniffing at the root of the  
   problem.  
   If we look at who/what is in control of the money system we know that  
   Congress is restrained by what the money lenders will allow, and if a  
   Congress person disagrees they may be replaced by the money interests that  
   funded their rise to the office.  
   So profitable war is funded, military contractors are enriched but public  
   investment that competes with private business in what used to be all  
   public, healthcare and education, etc. is not allowed.  It is all about  
   making money, that is it.  
   Ever hear the saying "make a law make a business?"  Its an old saying, a  
   comment on government exclusively servile to business interests.  
   NO, its not complicated, complexity is used to hide the reality.  
   This is why Greening the Dollar puts the public in charge of the power over  
   public policy, and not the big private money-lenders.  
   Of course we have to replace the guys that are there to represent the  
   current system, that's where you and other Greens come in, right?  
   So in short to answer your question, Congress doesn't have the power to  
   decide, the ceded that power over 100 years ago.  
   Many Americans knew this when it was happening, and a growing number of  
   people today are learning about it now.  
     
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt.  
     
   Message: 1  
   Date: Sat, 14 Jul 2018 10:35:52 -0500  
   From: Howard Switzer <hmsarchitecture@gmail.com>  
   To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
   <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
   Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] A different perspective on economics and on  
   proposals 921, 922, 923, & 924  
   Message-ID:  
   <CAOUEhLweYZqZj0+XEATv3DtTKeVc0sTOErbzGTVW7VApAXd4ZA@mail.gmail.com>  
   Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
     
   Thank you, Charles,  for mentioning the Steady State Economy which is very  
   much what our Greening the Dollar plank is all about.  The current money  
   system crashes if its not growing.  
   Anyone who understands the exponential function (or has common sense) knows  
   that you cannot have continual growth at any percentage.  
     
   IN his article, 'Nationalize Money, Not Banks, ' Herman Daly, founder of  
   the Center for a Steady State Economy, made clear what needs to be done to  
   have a steady state economy and it is first and foremost Greening the  
   Dollar.  
   <https://steadystate.org/nationalize-money-not-banks/>  
     
   "To dismiss such sound policies as ?extreme? in the face of the repeatedly  
   demonstrated colossal fraudulence of our current financial system is quite  
   absurd. The idea is not to nationalize banks, but to nationalize money,  
   which is a natural public utility in the first place. The fact that this  
   idea is hardly discussed today, in spite of its distinguished intellectual  
   ancestry and common sense, is testimony to the power of vested interests  
   over good ideas. It is also testimony to the veto power that our growth  
   fetish exercises over the thinking of economists today. Money, like fire  
   and the wheel, is a basic invention without which the modern world is  
   unthinkable. But today out-of-control money is threatening to ?burn and run  
   over? more people than both out-of-control fires and wheels."  
     
   ?Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt.?  
     
     
   -  
     
     
   Why Greening of the Dollar is Important (Howard Switzer)  
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   Date: Fri, 13 Jul 2018 11:09:05 -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: [usgp-nc] Why Greening of the Dollar is Important  
   Message-ID:  
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   Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
     
   Former Supreme Court Justice, Louis Brandeis once wrote, "We can have  
   democracy in this country, or we can have great wealth concentrated in the  
   hands of a few, but we can't have both."  
     
   Democracy cannot exist within our current economic system called  
   capitalism. This is because the first-cause of capitalism is personal gain  
   while the first cause of democracy is the general welfare of society.  The  
   primary mechanism of power is money and because of this many believe money  
   is a capitalist trick but monetary reform is not about making capitalism  
   work.  Monetary reform is about ending the capitalist monetary paradigm by  
   making the money power public.  
     
   There are two monetary paradigms.  
     
   Capitalism is a privately controlled system where money is created and  
   issued as interest bearing debt for personal gain.  This system  
   concentrates wealth and power automatically which is why it has been the  
   dominant monetary paradigm for centuries.  This monetary system is the  
   primary source of capitalist power over governments, corporations, and the  
   people.  
     
   Democracy on the other hand is a publicly controlled system where money is  
   created and issued as money, an asset to be spent or gifted into the  
   economy for the general welfare. Social care is the first cause of the  
   democratic monetary paradigm.  
     
   The emergence of democracy was a revolt against rule by the wealthiest in  
   order to put social concerns before the profits of the oligarchy. To do  
   this they issued their own money disbursed to the households where the need  
   was which was then spent on all the goods and services in their economy.  
   Not being a debt this money continuously circulated fulfilling the needs of  
   society. If more was needed to make it run smoothly more was added, if less  
   a tax was levied. It created a prosperous economy emulated by others that  
   survived for 300 years before being crushed by the oligarchic powers.  
   Money privately issued as debt for personal gain is usury and has been the  
   dominant monetary paradigm ever since, save the challenge that was the  
   American Revolution, won militarily but lost monetarily.  
     
   To end capitalism then we need to end the debt-for-money system. An asset  
   money system would, instead of concentrating wealth, spread it broadly  
   throughout society. The Greening of the Dollar, in the NEED Act HR2990, is  
   legislation ready to go that would, through an elegant and seamless  
   transition, change the system to a democracy, public control of public  
   policy.  
     
   I hope this helps explain why we must preserve, protect and project  
   Greening of the Dollar.  
     
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt.
2. Message: 8  
   Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2018 14:23:11 -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 922  
   - 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Monetary and Banking Reform  
     
   Delegates,  
     
   As you can see there is little evidence to support MMT's broad claims.  For  
   those who want to explore MMT for themselves here is a link to the MMT  
   Primer by Randal Wray  
   <<http://neweconomicperspectives.org/modern-monetary-theory-primer.html>>.  
     
   In it you will discover that MMT has nothing to do with Monetary Reform,  
   (except to criticize monetary reformers) and little to do with monetary  
   theory either, for that matter.  
   In perusing the MMT Primer one might run across this little gem from Randal  
   Wray commenting (or not) on Milton Friedman and 100% reserve money:  (yes  
   even Milton was progressive when he was young :-)  
     
   "He thus proposed to combine monetary policy and fiscal policy, using the  
   budget to control monetary emission in a countercyclical manner. (He also  
   would have eliminated private money creation by banks through a 100%  
   reserve requirement?an idea he had picked up from Irving Fisher and Herbert  
   Simons in the early 1930s?hence, there would be no ?net? money creation by  
   private banks. They would expand the supply of bank money only as they  
   accumulated reserves of government-issued money. (He then adds -my caps)  
   WE WILL NOT ADDRESS THIS PART OF THE PROPOSAL.)"  
     
   ?Well proposal 922 is MMT addressing Monetary Reform? by trying to  
   eviscerate Greening of the Dollar.  In other words, while they say  
   government issues the money they actually oppose any proposal requiring  
   government to issue the money.  
   But an even larger issue for MMT is " no ?net? money creation by private  
   banks" that is, banning the private creation of our money for profit by the  
   banks. That is what they are trying to protect on behalf of their  
   sponsors.  
   They support deficit spending to increase the debt to the private banking  
   system that creates all the money. (except the coins)  
     
   Also Wray is wrong about "100% reserve banking."  The term is  
   self-canceling and a confusing term to describe banking under a sovereign  
   money system.  It is more accurately described as a "100% money banking  
   system" as there would be no "reserves" as there would be no need for  
   reserves. It means banks would only lend real money (created by government)  
   that has been entrusted to them in time (savings) deposits to invest and  
   earn enough to be able pay their customers interest on their money.  It is  
   the way most people believe the banking system works now, it is what I was  
   told when I was young, it is a myth that should be our reality.  Same way  
   with "the government issues the money."  It is a myth that should be our  
   reality.  
     
   100% banking would NOT "expand the supply of bank money" becasue banks  
   would no longer be creating money, they would be lending "government money"  
   and only government would be able to expand the supply of money.  
   MMT uses language to deceive in so many ways I can't help but think they  
   are themselves deceived by it, kept afloat by academic puffery.  
     
   thank you  
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt.
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   Delegates,  
     
   As you can see there is little evidence to support MMT's broad claims.  For  
   those who want to explore MMT for themselves here is a link to the MMT  
   Primer by Randal Wray  
   <<http://neweconomicperspectives.org/modern-monetary-theory-primer.html>>.  
     
   In it you will discover that MMT has nothing to do with Monetary Reform,  
   (except to criticize monetary reformers) and little to do with monetary  
   theory either, for that matter.  
   In perusing the MMT Primer one might run across this little gem from Randal  
   Wray commenting (or not) on Milton Friedman and 100% reserve money:  (yes  
   even Milton was progressive when he was young :-)  
     
   "He thus proposed to combine monetary policy and fiscal policy, using the  
   budget to control monetary emission in a countercyclical manner. (He also  
   would have eliminated private money creation by banks through a 100%  
   reserve requirement?an idea he had picked up from Irving Fisher and Herbert  
   Simons in the early 1930s?hence, there would be no ?net? money creation by  
   private banks. They would expand the supply of bank money only as they  
   accumulated reserves of government-issued money. (He then adds -my caps)  
   WE WILL NOT ADDRESS THIS PART OF THE PROPOSAL.)"  
     
   ?Well proposal 922 is MMT addressing Monetary Reform? by trying to  
   eviscerate Greening of the Dollar.  In other words, while they say  
   government issues the money they actually oppose any proposal requiring  
   government to issue the money.  
   But an even larger issue for MMT is " no ?net? money creation by private  
   banks" that is, banning the private creation of our money for profit by the  
   banks. That is what they are trying to protect on behalf of their  
   sponsors.  
   They support deficit spending to increase the debt to the private banking  
   system that creates all the money. (except the coins)  
     
   Also Wray is wrong about "100% reserve banking."  The term is  
   self-canceling and a confusing term to describe banking under a sovereign  
   money system.  It is more accurately described as a "100% money banking  
   system" as there would be no "reserves" as there would be no need for  
   reserves. It means banks would only lend real money (created by government)  
   that has been entrusted to them in time (savings) deposits to invest and  
   earn enough to be able pay their customers interest on their money.  It is  
   the way most people believe the banking system works now, it is what I was  
   told when I was young, it is a myth that should be our reality.  Same way  
   with "the government issues the money."  It is a myth that should be our  
   reality.  
     
   100% banking would NOT "expand the supply of bank money" becasue banks  
   would no longer be creating money, they would be lending "government money"  
   and only government would be able to expand the supply of money.  
   MMT uses language to deceive in so many ways I can't help but think they  
   are themselves deceived by it, kept afloat by academic puffery.  
     
   thank you  
   Howard Switzer  
   GPTN alt.

Message: 7  
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2018 18:39:03 -0400  
From: Joe Bongiovanni <joebhed@verizon.net>  
To: natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 922  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Monetary and Banking Reform  
  
Dear Green Party National Committee delegates,  
  
I am honored for the opportunity to be a 'seconder' to everything that GPTN Member Howard Switzer has just said - it being the solid truth of the historic evolution of our money system and our understandings of its malevolence on our society, and also of the evolution of the GPUS historic treasure of a public policy?? being the one that Dee Berry and Ben Kjelshus brought to the GPUS Policy pages years ago.? Thank you Howard.And Dee?? and? Ben.  
  
It will ultimately be the NatCom decision about whether Howard and I, and Sue Peters, and Dee and Ben earlier, are correct about the money system, or whether GPNE's postulations - based as they are completely on what has become known as Modern Monetary Theory(MMT) are correct.? Toward that end I encourage a continual call for clarity on the fundamental issues.  
  
There is no more fundamental an issue of disagreement between the present GPUS Policy and the revisions being proposed by GPNE than the question of whether, at the present time, the government of the United States .... the Treasury .... creates new money by spending , or not.  
It is in advancing a false view of the answer to that question that MMT advances their other flawed idea ? - ?? that taxes are not needed to pay for government spending, or its superfluous conclusion .... that taxes do not pay for government spending.? ( Let's ask the government.? )  
  
Situation being that - if taxes DO pay for government spending, then ipso facto, the government does NOT create new money when it spends. Or ever.  
The exception being "coins", which the government does issue.??? Ninety nine percent of all national money is issued by the private bankers, through which issuance the banks control the capital development of the economy. And of our government.? Look around.  
  
When you come to understand that truth, then THAT is the problem.  
We already have the answer to "How are you going to pay for fixing it ? ".? Please??? Don't give it up to a banker charade.  
  
  
joe bongiovanni? GPVA  
a NatCom advisor on this Platform proposal.