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
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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
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<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>>
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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