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

Message: 7  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 09:57:06 -0400  
From: Fadhel Kaboub <kaboubf@denison.edu>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID:  
<CALYjpRrpC-AQE6zgDcCC1Ss1dcSt3m0W7GDKSa5giYDD9T0PpA@mail.gmail.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
  
Dear NC delegate Mike Feinstein,  
  
Your proposed statement ?Governments on every level - local, county, state  
and federal - face significant budget shortfalls, and many are running up  
crushing amounts of debt? is not factually correct.

The reference to  
"sovereignty" is really about monetary sovereignty which is defined as an  
entity that can 1/ issue its own currency, 2/ levy taxes in that same  
currency, 3/ issues bonds denominated exclusively in that currency, and 4/  
follow a flexible exchange rate policy. As such only the US federal  
government qualifies as monetarily sovereign. States, cities,  
municipalities are not monetarily sovereign.  
  
As the issuer of the currency, the US federal government faces no financial  
burden (the national debt is a misnomer). Currency users  
(states/cities/municipalities, consumers, firms, etc) are financially  
constrained and do face the burden of debt.  
  
Making the distinction between issuer and users of the currency is  
extremely important to explain how one pays for the policies that GPUS care  
about (fighting for climate change, Green New Deal, generous social  
services, etc.). The financial burden of these programs cannot be put on  
the people when we have the privilege of full monetary sovereignty at the  
federal level (a privileged that not all countries enjoy).  
  
Sincerely,  
  
Fadhel Kaboub  
Economic advisor to the GPUS  
Associate Professor of Economics, Denison University, Ohio  
President, Global Institute for Sustainable Prosperity  
740-587-6315 @FadhelKaboub <<https://twitter.com/FadhelKaboub>> & @GISP\_Tweets  
<<https://twitter.com/GISP_Tweets>>  
  
  
  
Message: 8  
Date: Thu, 19 Jul 2018 07:05:40 -0700  
From: Mike Feinstein <mfeinstein@feinstein.org>  
To: GPUS National Listserve <natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] Discussion Has Begun on GP-US Proposal: ID 924  
- 2018 Platform Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
Message-ID: <0FBCF368-7C9D-401B-A23D-23D0E6183A5A@feinstein.org>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
  
Thank you Fadhel Kaboub for your comments.  
  
You make my point exactly about the insufficiency of the background to this proposal, as the kind of arguments you are making are absent in the background text, making it hard to know what the sponsors are referring to in their proposal.  
  
Mike Feinstein  
NC Delegate, GPCA  
  
Message: 4  
Date: Sat, 7 Jul 2018 19:32:45 -0700  
From: Jared Laiti <jared.laiti@gmail.com>  
To: National Committee Votes and GP-US Work  
<natlcomvotes@green.gpus.org>  
Subject: Re: [usgp-nc] GP-US Proposal: ID 924 - 2018 Platform  
Amendment Proposal - Amend the GPUS Platform Preamble  
  
NC,  
  
I'm not sure our preamble is an appropriate place to get into this  
discussion about "because Congress refuses to use its sovereign power to  
spend what is necessary to meet the challenges that face us."

That's not  
the only reason social programs are not funded, it's also where else we  
choose to put the money that is spent. We have another plank dealing  
specifically with monetary reforms, and personally I'd rather focus first  
on military/prison/police  and intelligence agency spending (things we are  
spending money on that we don't like as Greens..) as a source of funds for  
other programs.

Not that I don't think we need monetary reforms but again  
we have another plank for that. I'd support using language such as "because  
of federal (why the focus on Congress when the president has to sign  
budgets too..?) spending priorities."  I think that encapsulates the  
monetary argument too as I think everyone accepts the government can spend  
what it chooses to, it's just a question of whether that spending is  
treated as government debt or not - which we discuss elsewhere, not in the  
preamble.  
  
Thanks,  
Jared Laiti  
GPCA