- Anthony Migchels:tsk tsk Mike..........people were doing mutual credit before you were born. Interest free credit at state level was done already in the thirties in several western nations.

  It's really weird how people can claim the battle against Usury as their own, ...See More

November 15 at 9:36pm · Like

-

Mike Montagne ~
BRICS ARTICLE HARDLY EVEN TOUCHES ON THE ISSUES
...See More
November 15 at 9:46pm · Like · 1

-

Jordan P Soreff Thank you for your succinct explanation Mike Montagne. Please don't be alarmed if I point out others who would offer a diversity of viewpoints. Communication is human and complex. Had the OpEd article never been written, we would not be having this con...See More
November 15 at 10:15pm via mobile · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne ~

Anthony Migchels wrote:

tsk tsk Mike..........people were doing mutual credit before you were born. Interest free credit at state level was done already in the thirties in several western nations.

It's really weird how people can claim the battle against Usury as their own, or a well established solution. In the thirties, they also understood one had to manage volume to prevent asset bubbles..........

Well managed interest-free mutual credit, with solid control of volume, is the solution that all the nations can implement today. The rest is basically details.

———————

Evasion Migchels, is your only claim to fame. That will do you in some day.

If people *ever* mutually issued "credit," this would be to pretend the party which gives up property issues what amounts to an obligation to redeem the instrument in the possession or production of the obligor: Only the obligor can issue their commitment.

"Mutual Credit" therefore is only your own tisk tisk... preposterous title for what you haven't resolved.

Yes, mutual *trade* existed before; and yes, I've seen your backhanded sleights that I plagiarize the work of others who never resolved the obfuscation of our currency to its singular solution.

It's isn't "weird" that *you* claim the battle against usury as your own — even alleging I am ruining its arguments.

This is what pretenders do, for whatever (generally obvious) reasons.

Not in the thirties, not before, nor after, did "they" (whoever that might be) understand how to manage volume to prevent asset bubbles. If "THEY" did, a proposition would have existed which would have prevented false asset appreciation. If YOU truly understood, that, you'd understand that asset bubbles are sustained *entirely* from re-finance (or more properly, re-monetization) only as if property which depreciates, instead appreciates. You claim circulatory inflation is the cause of price inflation... and we have dozens of people confirming that you provide neither data nor definitively-linked and corroborated theory to assert circulatory inflation even exists. After all, we suffer deflation — a circulation far less than the property it might represent — *because* the obfuscation imposes deflation which not only cannot exceed the property it represents in any purportedly inflationary respect (which cannot exist then)... but which exceeds that in a deflationary respect, which imposes deflation in regard to all things to the very extent of principal and interest, paid from a circulation comprised of only however little remaining principal (deflation).

These things are not difficult to understand, Migchels. So you've painted yourself into a corner.

Like we ought to give a damn, except for all the noise you make to demote a fact of singular solution.

Yes, you parrot the traditional claim that circulatory inflation precipitates in price inflation. You claim some understanding of means to sustain volume which aren't even possible under the obfuscation. You have to solve the obfuscation to do so.

So on the contrary, they never resolved how to manage volume in the thirties. Not only do you fail to cite any person or means who established how; neither have you, now.

One thing and one thing only sustains a volume of circulation which is immutably equal to the representation of entitlement it is called upon to represent; and that is retirement of the principal of promissory obligations, *necessarily* at the rate of consumption of related property... for this and this alone sustains perpetual equivalence between a remaining circulation of redeemable representation of entitlement, remaining value of represented property (which determines the relative value of all other property), and remaining obligation *to pay* *the* remaining representations of entitlement *for* the remaining value of represented property.

You only dispute that. Only in your perpetual dreams however, do you invalidate it.

You, in fact, haven't even yet determined *what* the proper volume of a circulation *ought* to be!

You merely muse it should be this or that. You haven't even determined then, how mathematically perfected economy™ can possibly fail that object.

Worse, you only pretend to do so, by falsely alleging a person could simply issue promissory obligations without limitation — while a cursory examination of the theses of MPE™ readily determines that MPE™ alone restricts issuance to its only rightful limitations — for never, never, never under MPE™ are asset bubbles possible, because they are fueled and sustained only by re-monetization at revised value ˚— which is impossible under MPE™.

You Migchels, are therefore as phony as phony gets. Which also explains why you hang where you do.

November 15 at 10:16pm · Like · 1

Anthony Migchels "If people *ever* mutually issued "credit," ...."
I don't agree. The problem now is that the bank claims it's their credit. Or worse, that they actually lend something.
Mutual Credit comes from the understanding that it's the community's credit (part of the commons) and that the credit facility's only functions are to keep the books and makes sure payments are made.
MPE's promissory note takes it a step further and state it's only the payer's business. I can go a long way with that, it addresses the key issue of bank usurpation. But it is a little black and white in my view: the promissory note depends on acceptance and this is where the community comes in. That's why it's 'mutual'.

"Not in the thirties, not before, nor after,............ "
Yes, they did. In New Zealand massive public housing and other projects were financed with interest-free state credit. They made sure they did not invest too much, management of volume was a key issue.
WIR in Switzerland started in 1934, and provided business with a private mutual credit based currency. It's still operable today, although they nowadays charge (very low) interest.

"You claim circulatory inflation is the cause of price inflation............"
I claim it's ONE of the causes. Price inflation is also caused by usury, of course, and by speculation too.
I have, in the article, named the Continental as a classical example. But the Chinese Emperor's money comes to mind also. In the 16th century there was a prolonged inflation throughout Europe as the Spanish brought in specie from the West. The Roman Empire suffered a number of inflations, as did several smaller sovereign currencies in the middle ages. The list goes on and on. I can't believe you really deny this.

" After all, we suffer deflation"
Deflation is a dwindling money supply. It's not 'less money than assets'.
Of course we are in deflation, or better: stagflation, ever since 2008. I've never said anything else.

"perpetual equivalence between a remaining circulation of redeemable representation of entitlement"
This is the key issue: first you deny 'circulatory inflation' leads to higher prices, next you claim this.
Of course principal must be retired at repayment, that's the nature of credit. But equally clear is that retiring principal does not guarantee the prevention of inflation of volume and associated higher prices.

So the denial of circulatory inflation's tendency to raise prices (if the economy is at full strength, money can be added as long as it isn't) lies at the heart of MPE's mistaken take on this. This is the heart of my critique in the article.

"You, in fact, haven't even yet determined *what* the proper volume of a circulation *ought* to be!"
I have: my take is that money must be added until prices start to rise.

MPE monetizes at market value. This market value may be inflating. I don't see how MPE addresses this and since it denies circulatory inflation's implications, it's unlikely to address it at all.

So you see Mike, I'll stick to my guns for the time being.
November 16 at 12:15pm · Edited · Like

-

[Mike Montagne] Anthony Migchels wrote:

"If people *ever* mutually issued "credit," ...." [*PARTIALLY* quoting mm]
I don't agree.

It's not a matter of opinion. No purported creditor issues the promissory obligation of the obligor. Period. Can you issue my agreement to a contractual obligation? Absolutely not. So get your facts straight before you come pretending you can obfuscate the relationship between the obligor and acceptor into "credit" at all — much less categorize mathematically perfected economy™ as an instance of "mutual credit" — which MPE™ not only precedes, but which "mutual credit," in fact cannot even exist!

NO ONE issues the contractual obligation of the other party!

Neither then can there be anything "mutual" about your pretended invention, but that it so impertinently imitates the means and objects of mathematically perfected economy™.

Anthony Migchels wrote:

The problem now is that the bank claims it's their credit. Or worse, that they actually lend something.

That's your simpleton's reiteration of my proof of obfuscation. You come along 40 years later and pretend to inform me by not even stating the fact?

What would make it "credit"? Not a damned thing.

NO ONE issues "credit." Whether they're so impertinent as to "think" so or not. You don't issue the contractual obligation of another party!

Anthony Migchels wrote:

Mutual Credit comes from the understanding that it's the community's credit (part of the commons) and that the credit facility's only functions are to keep the books and makes sure payments are made.

There's no such "understanding" at all. You're merely imitating MPE™, wrongly calling issuance "credit" — and wrongly pretending furthermore then that there's "mutual" issuance — all at quarter passed the twelfth hour. You've only "invented" these things *after* you poked your nose into the public arena for nought — and the truth is, you only borrow so much from MPE™, pretending you can dispense with its rightful management of volumetric solution — *pretending further that without even any means to do so* *you* accomplish the same purpose — which you don't even define — and which, *when you eventually *do* define it*, ***correctly***, you will *likewise* only borrow from MPE™!

You haven't come here with solution, Migchels. You've come here to steal solution, pretending you're inventing what you only assimilate after you're proven wrong on it by the prior theses.

November 16 at 9:13pm · Like · 1

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

MPE's promissory note takes it a step further and state it's only the payer's business.

You're such a pathetic simpleton, Migchels. MPE™ simply resolves issuance to its only actual and natural state. You can only resolve "economy," monetization, and rightful de-monetization (the inherent life cycle of money) from the actual facts. If you ever realized what you only pretend to realize, you'd be going the other direction with all this: The facts predicate the only justice — you inevitably resolve facts which *establish* a fact of promissory obligation, which *necessarily* sustain immutable representation of entitlement to the *acceptor* of money (as a representation of entitlement)... and so forth. The facts themselves define a singular mathematically perfected economy™ — not as a mere opinion or proposition (much less your ever-morphing propositionS) — but instead as the common solution of a set of facts, defining an inevitable obligation as arises in all commercial-industrial affairs.

Anthony Migchels wrote:

I can go a long way with that, it addresses the key issue of bank usurpation.

No, you can't "go along with that," because you don't even know what it means. You haven't even yet identified the factors we must account for in "money" (monetization and de-monetization). You pretend to be right there — sure, and you call MPE™ "an Epic Fail"?!!!

You don't even show how! You *merely claim* (so preposterously!) that MPE™ can precipitate in asset bubbles — when the only thing which sustains asset bubbles is *re*-monetization at purported appreciation — a thing which *is impossible* under MPE™!

Now you say you're "going along with that"?

You don't even understand the principle *yet*, or you'd retract your pathetic assertions with the greatest embarrassment!

You're still proud of being SO wrong! And now you're pretending to go along?

Anthony Migchels wrote:

But it is a little black and white in my view: the promissory note depends on acceptance and this is where the community comes in. That's why it's 'mutual'.

Exactly the preposterous obfuscation I'm pointing out to you! (How many times now, including what others have explained to you?)

Who the hell are you to complain MPE™ reduces issues to "black and white"?

What pretended invalidation is that?

OF COURSE our promissory obligations have to be *accepted*: But that *acceptance* is *most certainly* ***not*** to "mutually issue" "credit"!!!!!!!

(lmfao)

What the hell kind or crap is that?

What YOU have proudly called "an Epic Fail" in fact not only *ensures* fulfillment to the *acceptor* (not only in the case of default [in the remaining value of property *always* equaling or exceeding remaining obligation], but by the very fact the obligor is compelled to redeem the principal in what [the only actual] free enterprise determines to be an equal measure of the obligor's production); it compels the very production you have even written requires stimulus — *because* you haven't even recognized how MPE™ resolves every issue.

November 16 at 9:14pm · Like · 1

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

"Not in the thirties, not before, nor after,............ "

Yes, they did. In New Zealand massive public housing and other projects were financed with interest-free state credit.

You only *claim* that it's "credit" (still, incessantly). But you do so only to claim *you* are solving problems you don't even see the proper terms of.

Until you (and "they" — whoever [else as well] "they" may be) eventually realize that *NO ONE* issues the obligations of another, you'll *never* realize any such thing is *not to issue "credit" at all*!

Round and round, Migchels... just to pretend you ought to usurp MPE™ — when you don't even understand what the proper volume of *money* ought to be!

That's right: in all your BS, you don't even put your finger on *that* one fundamental issue yet! And yet you claim MPE™ doesn't accomplish that purpose — without even establishing (as a person would prevail in any court of law for example) either the inherent, singular disposition of "money" (which is absolutely *not* "credit" — much less your preposterous notion of "mutual credit"! [lmfao]); the singular inherent life cycle of money; its singular set of inherent *obligations*; and/or its singular just, inherent means of fulfillment — altogether fulfilling the means and objects which comprise a singular just "economy."

YOU in fact are claiming the one answer is wrong!

(lmfao)

Way to go, champ — BUT YOU ARE *NOT* [EVEN] ISSUING CREDIT!

(But thanks for edifying [yet again] how you offer such drivel, only to pretend your obfuscations of MPE™ accomplish its singular justified objects, by the only means to do so — which you are pretending to invalidate as "an Epic Fail!"

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

They made sure they did not invest too much, management of volume was a key issue.

———

You can't even legitimately [merely] *claim so*, if neither *you* nor "they" even established *what* the proper volume *was* — nor the means by which you would sustain *the* proper volume of circulation!

Who do you think you're kidding?

And yet you *likewise* *just claim* mathematically perfected economy™ does *not* accomplish that purpose?

Yeah! Who would be so preposterous as to claim that if [circulatory] inflation and deflation are defined respectively as increases or decreases in circulation *per* goods and services, the *only* solution to volumetric impropriety *is not* to sustain a circulation which is always equal to *represented* "goods and services"?

Or that MPE™ doesn't accomplish that purpose by *the singular* *just* means of retiring payments of principal at the rate of consumption of the related property?

That's an "epic failure" is it?

(lmfao)

———

November 16 at 9:14pm · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

WIR in Switzerland started in 1934, and provided business with a private mutual credit based currency. It's still operable today, although they nowadays charge (very low) interest.

———

You still haven't established they "issue credit"!

Which as my work proved from its inception, is the very lie that invalidates interest!

Your very incessant [mere] *insistence* this is "credit" shouts, "Pretender! Pretender! Pretender!"

You expect a reasonable world to expect you unravelled the obfuscation your self, when none your cited instances do either; and when the only way we can invalidate interest (or realize "usury") is to recognize that in the creation of money *no one* issues "credit"?

We ought to rest our case! Ah, but Anthony Migchels continues to claim credit for understandings his every word invalidates...

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

"You claim circulatory inflation is the cause of price inflation............."
I claim it's ONE of the causes.

———

And we invalidated your *mere* claim YESTERDAY.

Not only is circulatory inflation *impossible* where debts are collateralized by the subject property [yes, we understand and account for the negligible volume of exceptions]... but *furthermore* the very thing *you* *and* "the banks" are falsely claiming is "credit" (as *would* justify "interest") comprises the very thing you claim *also* to have understood — that *falsification* of credit, *only ostensibly* justifying interest (IF IT IS "credit"), imposes a *deflationary* aspect of *your* obfuscation — which is constantly (so long as "credit" justifies interest) *deflating* a circulation comprised only of *****some***** remaining principal (an *always* deflated state) by so much as all the principal and interest of eternity.

And YOU are claiming *inflation* (the VERY OPPOSITE) is a cause of price inflation — when we suffer instead from deflation; and when the *only remaining* ***possible*** cause of price inflation then is the maldisposition you pretend to understand? When increasing prices therefore are *only* *caused* by irreversible multiplication of falsified debt in proportion to a circulation and remaining capacity to service *falsified debt* (*pretended "credit"*)?

Did it ever occur to you that it is because you are SO WRONG, that you can never cite any corroborating data or process?

———

November 16 at 9:15pm · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

Price inflation is also caused by usury, of course, and by speculation too.

———

Ay, again, you don't even cite how. You hope to claim recognition and to prevail over mathematically perfected economy™ by merely pretending to understand the same resolution of facts, and simply imitating *parts* of solution, without the remainder — which you not only cannot articulate, but dare not try, because the arguments instead corroborate a singular solution to volumetric and dispositional impropriety!

Moreover, "speculation" doesn't *cause* price inflation — it merely agrees mindlessly to its consequences, as if

When a speculator kid walks in the door, does the owner of the candy shop raise the price of bubble-gum?

Does the carpenter charge three wages to the "speculator" who doesn't lift a finger, but means to charge three wages for the carpenter's work?

What you're calling "speculation" is instead exploitation. Exploitation yet *cannot* ***cause*** price inflation, except by denying us our universal right to issue unexploited promissory obligations!

Why?

If the carpenter were not denied his/her right to monetize their production, there would be no opportunity for your "speculator" to exploit the market.

Furthermore, if the carpenter in turn sought three wages, only the fool who could know no better would pay so much for the carpenter's work, *because the disparity can never rightly be reconciled against the relative value of *our* work*.

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

I have, in the article, named the Continental as a classical example.

———

Then you obviously haven't done your diligence. You're only pretending to cite data — without the freaking data! Come on, man! (lmfao)

You gotta be kidding! Who the hell do you think you're kidding?

Did you actually do the math, to figure circulatory inflation without even any data?

Furthermore, you pretend to blame the currency, when *funding a war* would be *inflationary* in your freaking "mutual credit" as well! (lmfao)

Give us a break, will ya?

Oh, you're so hysterical this morning!

Let's see, and did you further account for all the counterfeiting or the Continental in your figuring, did ya?

Sure! By some accounts, counterfeit Continentals far outnumbered the actual issuance.

And you just took all this into proper consideration did you?

Pffffffffffffff. Who do you think you're kidding.

No, that's not a question.

November 16 at 9:15pm · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

But the Chinese Emperor's money comes to mind also.

"THE Chinese Emperor's money"?

COME ON, MAN.

It's plain and simple: If the promissory obligations are collateralized by the represented property, circulatory inflation is impossible.

If not, so what? That's a case of monetary rectitude gone awry?

If it's impossible to increase the circulation (or manipulate the value of property from its original monetized value), both circulatory inflation and asset bubbles are impossible.

Don't pretend to understand this from an era which likely didn't even understand the terms were requisites — not to your preposterous "credit" — but to acceptance of promissory obligations, monetizing value collateralized by the represented property, and sustaining a circulation which is always equal to the remaining value of all represented property (and entitlement) by retiring principal at the rate of consumption.

In any case, Mr. Epic Fail, "THE Chinese Emperor's money" doesn't even *imply* the relevant data — much less the diligence to claim circulatory inflation.

Anthony Migchels wrote:

In the 16th century there was a prolonged inflation throughout Europe as the Spanish brought in specie from the West.

How could that possibly comprise inflation, when the specie itself was the value it represented?

Never mind. That's not a question.

Anthony Migchels wrote:

The Roman Empire suffered a number of inflations, as did several smaller sovereign currencies in the middle ages. The list goes on and on. I can't believe you really deny this.

What you don't understand is I don't deny "inflation" never happened in the whole of history. That circulatory inflation *ever* transpired in *any other system* (necessarily) is entirely irrelevant to your claim that under the present obfuscation, price inflation *is* cause by a circulatory inflation *we have in fact never suffered* (which is why you provide no corroborating data!): On the contrary, I understand that it is impossible under the conditions you cite, that circulatory inflation "causes" price inflation — on the contrary we have *never* suffered a circulation exceeding the remaining value of monetized property under central banking.

NEVER. THEREFORE CIRCULATORY INFLATION *CANNOT* BE A CAUSE OF THE PRICE INFLATION YOU CLAIM IT CAUSES.

What I understand instead then, is you only hope to twist what I understand into something else, so you might prevail in your preposterous claim that the circulatory inflation we have never suffered is the cause of price inflation.

November 16 at 9:15pm · Like · 1

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

" After all, we suffer deflation"
Deflation is a dwindling money supply. It's not 'less money than assets'.

Oh, it isn't, isn't it?

If you *have* deflation, you *have* less money than remaining value of monetized assets!

If you cannot increase the circulation, *or have not* increased the circulation beyond the remaining value of monetized assets, you *cannot* be suffering *inflation*!

Ay, the money supply (as I've pointed out from the beginning) imposes an implicit obligation to sustain a vital circulation by perpetually paying principal and interest out of our general possession, which, to whatever extent that forces us to sustain prior sums of falsified debt by re-borrowing principal, and thus increases the sum of falsified debt to whatever extent we are forced to re-borrow interest as perpetually escalates the sum of falsified debt... well what do you contend that comprises, if you pretend to understand the obfuscation you must deny precipitates in *our EVER-dwindling ***possession*** of "money"* then?

You can't have your cake and eat it too, Migchels. Either the obfuscation precipitates in perpetual deflation of our possession, or it does not.

If you claim it does not, let history measure your pretended understanding by your preposterous claim.

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

Of course we are in deflation, or better: stagflation, ever since 2008. I've never said anything else.

———

Are you on drugs? Weren't you just arguing that circulatory inflation causes price inflation?

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

"perpetual equivalence between a remaining circulation of redeemable representation of entitlement"
This is the key issue: first you deny 'circulatory inflation' leads to higher prices, next you claim this.

———

You bet I do!

This is a cornerstone of mathematically perfected economy™. It's a reason why mathematically perfected economy is a singularity: Unless principal is paid and retired at the rate of consumption of the related property, the circulation *does not* equal the remaining value of represented property and entitlement at all times!

Oh, now you're going to steal our obligatory schedule of payment (likewise denied by Simon doing his pillow) — claiming WE didn't understand how to regulate volume?

(lmfao)

November 16 at 9:16pm · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

Of course principal must be retired at repayment, that's the nature of credit.

———

No, if I *actually* issue you credit (lend you something from my legitimate possession), my legitimate possession (credit) does not cease with payment, which on the contrary is necessitated by my prior legitimate possession.

On the contrary then, as *I have always said* (and you are now borrowing as a contradiction to your assertion of "credit"), the *only reason* principal is essentially retired by payment of the principal, *is because* ***a promissory obligation*** *only represents value* until it is fulfilled!

That's the monumental reason for distinguishing between the two!

But I see you are *claiming* it's the natural disposition instead, of "credit."

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

But equally clear is that retiring principal does not guarantee the prevention of inflation of volume and associated higher prices.

———

Says, who (moreover, how)?

If anything that is *ever* monetized is only monetized at its remaining value over its "proprietary determinate lifespan," THEN NO ONE EVER PAYS A HIGHER PRICE FOR IT; THEY MERELY ASSUME A REMAINING PROMISSORY OBLIGATION, SUSTAINING THE ORIGINAL PRICE.

Here again, you merely make an assertion — which is nothing but double-talk. Never in the lifespan of *anything* does MPE™ monetize it for more than whatever an obligor and acceptor agree to be its remaining value. MPE™ only sustains the industrial-commercial relationship which they engage in. It *never* increases the money supply more than whatever you agree to be the value of represented property (and thus entitlement).

NEVER. What you say is an "Epic Fail" is impossible!

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

So the denial of circulatory inflation's tendency to raise prices (if the economy is at full strength, money can be added as long as it isn't) lies at the heart of MPE's mistaken take on this. This is the heart of my critique in the article.

AGAIN, you've only "critiqued" (on the contrary, counter-asserted) your own mis-characterization of MPE™ — pretending you understand volume can properly be regulated otherwise!

(lmfao)

Circulatory inflation (which term is devised by the theses of MPE™ *to distinguish it from the ever-unproven cause of *price* inflation [for which the traditional lie of economics used the same term, "inflation")... *circulatory* inflation (traditional "inflation") was defined as an increase in circulation per "goods and services" (I prefer to say "represented property" — which of course, further reflects represented entitlement). YOU CANNOT SUFFER OR IMPOSE CIRCULATORY INFLATION THEN, UNLESS YOU INCREASE THE CIRCULATION MORE THAN THE DECIDED VALUE OF REPRESENTED PROPERTY.

Your "critique" (mere preposterous claim) merely alleges something happens which is prevented from happening by the very fact MPE™ only monetizes the remaining value of represented property — for the whole life of the property — AND NO MORE.

You haven't shown how MPE™ can precipitate in increasing the circulation above remaining value or represented property — when MPE™ is explicitly denied the means to do so, in fact in order to solve *both* volumetric and dispositional impropriety. (On the contrary to your pretentious assertion.)

November 16 at 9:16pm · Like · 1

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

"You, in fact, haven't even yet determined *what* the proper volume of a circulation *ought* to be!"
I have: my take is that money must be added until prices start to rise.

Oh, thank you for your gem!

I WOULD rest my case — MOSTLY in fact so the likes of you and those you hang with don't have the only rightful answer to *imitate* (as if it were yours).

You have just discredited yourself for eternity, for what you claim "to know" is merely to experiment until the consequence you fear from something which cannot transpire manifests!

Now, I suppose you're just going to spend or "issue credit" into existence, when it is possible there isn't even a need thereof. However that's to transpire in your experiment, I leave to the imagination of your fellow pretenders — who must (if they should purportedly "agree") like you, presume that ensuing owners will pay more than they have to pay... when they don't have to do so at all.

You know, any idiot can simply claim *they* can break both from need and principle to precipitate an aberration which truly free enterprise will only sustain instead, to remain faithful to its commitment to truly free enterprise.

What you're basically claiming, is that just because we free ourselves from exploitation, this results in such prosperity as we would ourselves negate by paying more and more for each other's production. But even if that were the unnecessary case, the *general* (uniform) manifestation precipitates likewise then in an increase in earnings (as opposed to price inflation caused by maldisposition, decreasing what we keep from every unit of currency)... and so the cost would itself be cancelled.

And you're claiming still that this thing which is not *caused* by MPE™ nonetheless precipitates instead in the same kind of penalty we suffer under maldisposition (perpetual multiplication of falsified debt [your "credit"]).

Neither are increasing prices likely under MPE™ — even if manifested by general public divorce from principle — for the remaining value of existing things, together with the fact industrial means perpetually improve as decreases cost, competes against anyone asking more in wages (and thus cost) than before. If you can own a lovely $35,000 home built in 1963 for $9.00 per month under MPE™ by simply taking over its remaining promissory obligations, and if that home is better built and far better resplendent in rewarded ownership than a $100,000 home just down the street (the costs of which were inflated by maldisposition — which neither transpires in MPE™... you're saying that even if MPE™ refuses to re-monetize *anything* but across its one lifespan... that somehow we're just going to pay $500,000 for the latter home.

Nothing can be done to prevent price inflation under truly free enterprise (and thus *sustaining* truly free enterprise), but to monetize once, over *the* lifespan of the subject property, and to pay and to retire the principal *of promissory obligations* at the rate of consumption. By definition then, there is *never* any price inflation *by* mathematically perfected economy™.

What you're merely saying then, is that although it is impossible for MPE™ *to cause* price inflation — that even as *no one* is *ever* compelled to pay more than the remaining value of *any* property — still "somehow" we will destroy the principle by paying more and more and more — when the circulation is instead *dedicated* explicitly to paying only the same and the same and the same — and when even normative competition and industrial development rule out *ever* paying more.

That's a remarkable pretended understanding or principle.

And you, just increasing the circulation without that fundamental principle and restrictive linkage, would just somehow, otherwise accomplish the same object *experimentally*!

(lmfao)

November 16 at 9:16pm · Like · 1

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

MPE monetizes at market value. This market value may be inflating.

———

I note you keep *saying so*, anyway.

———

Anthony Migchels wrote:

I don't see how MPE addresses this

———

Yes, obviously you don't. But that's why you're not fit even to identify monetary solution — much less pretend to have resolved the issues by compromising or denying the only just means to accomplish them.

Thanks for the confession.

I also note that in *all the time* you pretend to be desired "a colleague" (as *you* put it), that you have never once asked about anything you don't understand.

Not once.

colleague |□käl□ēg|
noun
a person *with whom* one works, esp. in a profession or business.

Instead *you pretend* to understand *otherwise* — always by mere assertion. It isn't even practical, you understand (I hope) for a problem solver and "protagonist" (as you claim to be) to work in such ways. Nonetheless, if you were worthy of producing solution, certainly you would all this while, have instead produced the terms of your solution.

I'm counting. And all I see is instead, mere claim.

———

November 16 at 9:17pm · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Anthony Migchels wrote:

and since it denies circulatory inflation's implications, it's unlikely to address it at all.

———

I see how you work, Migchels. By definition, no circulatory inflation exists in a system which sustains a circulation which is always equal to the remaining value of represented property and entitlement.

That isn't do deny circulatory inflation's purported implications — which neither you nor conventional "economics" prove. You *can't* prove circulatory inflation as a cause, because it doesn't even exist in the *deflationary* environment you merely claim is inflated — without either data or math.

Moreover (as I have so many thousands of times pointed out), you couldn't claim circulatory inflation *caused* price inflation, *IF* circulatory inflation *did* exist in contemporary systems, *because it is ***also*** possible for example that a person buy two houses if their possession of circulation relative to the costs of producing a house double*.

So your mere boast is just dead in the water in every conceivable respect.

After all, can you point to a proof circulatory inflation can only precipitate in price inflation (even as circulatory inflation doesn't exist)?

Absolutely not.

Anthony Migchels wrote:

So you see Mike, I'll stick to my guns for the time being.

If you were *remotely* skilled in firearms, you'd know much better than threatening with your epic water pistol.
November 16 at 9:21pm · Edited · Like · 1

Mike Montagne ALL OF WHICH, Migchels, only repeats the ground I covered yesterday.
November 16 at 9:22pm · Like · 1

Anthony Migchels Jeepers Mike! Is this how you create this cult like following? Blowing so much steam the independently minded run and the easily cowed submit?

Do you really think this is going to impress either me or anybody reading this?

The fight against Usury and the Money Power, the conflict between sovereign credit and bank credit (even when it paraded as Gold based money, fractional reserve banking is very, very old) goes back 5k years pal. You, as am I, are just a drop in the ocean.

- Well, it would be grand if everybody could just monetize whatever they possessed. I'd be all for it. Too bad it explodes prices, not? That's the whole issue.

So no, the promissory is note is not such a good idea, is it? Simply because more than one person is involved. The macho stuff doesn't work. Money is a function of community.

I don't claim fame, nor do I claim to have invented the idea of Money as part of the Commons. Like the whole thing, it's much older than the two of us together.

Listen, if you come around to writing a readable response to my take on circulatory inflation, so that I don't have to dig in 15 posts of endless blowing of smoke to hide your insecurity in the face of serious analysis, then be my guest.

But I'll say this: you'll have to do a great deal better than that last post, because you cannot make the clear and present fact go away that growing volume has always been associated with higher prices by saying 'you can't prove it caused it'.

No way pal.
November 16 at 9:37pm · Edited · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Nobody would expect you to understand or appreciate your preposterous claim of circulatory inflation and asset bubbles under MPE™, Anthony, because you're a pretender.

Yes, you pretend that all of you just suddenly understand an obfuscation and its singular resolution, which not even Thomas Jefferson resolved for you.

You dilute that to a drop in the ocean, only to claim your piss is gold.

Right.

You call it a cult, that others can articulate that fact... but only because you can't even prove your assertion of circulatory inflation. Now you prove you don't even know what circulatory inflation is — leveling your claim as yet another pathetic insult.

Inflation is not simply growing volume of circulation, for if for example production increases more than circulation, it is impossible to afford increasing prices (all other things being equal). So you don't even understand that the traditional definition of [circulatory] inflation was never just increasing volume: on the contrary, it's an increase *in the ratio* of circulation per commerce, which might only *allow* for prices to increase (but which does not necessarily *cause* such a thing). You have circulatory inflation (according to the traditional definition) in regard to a decrease in circulation for example, if the volume of industry or commerce decreases *more*, because this is a re-adjustment of the governing *ratio* between circulation and "goods and services." After all, its the disturbance of the ratio between money and represented property which ostensibly provides leeway to skew prices.

So you're going to tell us if the circulation increases 2% while production increases 200%, that's circulatory inflation; and that 2%, which precipitates in *less* money per goods and services, nonetheless precipitates in price inflation?

Thanks for edification. We couldn't hope for better invalidation of your credibility.

So, Jordan. I hope you are satisfied, and that you'll preserve Anthony's testimony for posterity. Seems to me however, that we're not all drops in the ocean. After all, Migchels has even resorted to denial of the definition, hoping to prevail that inflation exists. I hardly think that can't reflect on any claim he makes, for what is he measuring and claiming to be inflation, if it's only an increase in the circulation — as opposed to increased circulation *per* represented property?

There's all the difference in the world. And that's why Anthony didn't show up for his debate.
November 17 at 3:25am · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne Webster's 1969 and 1975 definitions (poor, but nonetheless indicative of proportional disparity):

November 17 at 7:48am · Like · 1

-

Mike Montagne There is of course no proof whatever that circulatory inflation *causes* price inflation, because additional money *can* instead sustain additional industry and commerce, *unless* *something else* (maldisposition) dedicates ever more of every unit to sustaining a perpetual escalation of falsified debt. The only plausible *cause* between the two therefore is the latter, because 1) the former *can* instead sustain further industry and commerce; and because 2) the former cannot even transpire where debts are collateralized.
November 17 at 7:52am · Like · 1

-

Anthony Migchels Quite clear Mike.

I indeed consider inflation to be a rising volume (relative to goods). And this CAN lead to rising prices. But it does not always. For instance: if you have a 20% real unemployment rate, it most assuredly will not lead to rising prices. No, it will lead to higher output.

That's why I have been maintaining for years now that Bernanke should have reflated Mainstreet directly, with interest -free business credit and even mortages, instead of this maniacal QE nonsense.

However, if the economy is at max capacity, close to zero unemployment and all factories buzzing, then a growing money supply WILL lead to rising prices.

This is exactly where you go wrong. You think new money will always be used for productive purposes. Nothing could be further from the truth! How could it, if society is at max production level?

I'm not some Austrian maniac, programmed to think there is only one danger, adding liquidity. I know full well that money scarcity (caused by usury and, during the crunch, deflation) is the main problem and that extra money is needed.

But you go overboard and say, hey, you can do this forever, Volume is irrelevant!

It most certainly is NOT irrelevant! Volume is key!
Too little money: depression. Too much money: rising prices.

I don't have to prove that the Continental was obliterated by excess printing! This is the common knowledge of the ages. If you disagree, you have to prove there was another reason.

Go right ahead, prove Weimar was not a matter of money printing.

And don't tell me it's just a matter of collateralizing the debt: the housing bubble of the previous decade WAS collaterlized debt.

It was a growing volume of money on an overheating housing market and OF COURSE prices rose. Or look at the dot.com bubble, where the debt was collaterarlized with stock at inflating prices and OF COURSE prices rose.

This is the whole issue. It's not black and white. Extra money can be much needed and it IS much needed today.
But yes, it CAN be overdone and it HAS been overdone in the past. Many times. And this has ALWAYS led to rising prices.
November 17 at 8:33am · Like

Mike Montagne AGAIN you switch sides? NOW, "inflation" is not just an increase in circulation as you maintained? You don't even *define*, "Too much money: rising prices." "Too much?" Before you were decrying MPE™ caused inflation (price inflation) merely because it provided to increase the circulation — which *you* then proposed yourself to do! What a load of crap! It's increases in the ratio of circulation per represented property which were supposed to be a cause of price inflation — as I said, which increases cannot even exist if promissory obligations are merely collateralized. So you've only back-peddled with more gibberish, hoping to sustain your denigration that MPE™ could sustain asset bubbles, when your own words here confess the asset bubble of the so-called "housing market" was sustained by *RE-"financing"* property at [falsely] escalated valuation. You hung yourself again, Migchels. As to whatever intellectual aberration you suffer, I care not what explains your intention to divide people who depend upon solution. Your intentional confusion is a a crime against all better people. You didn't even have the nerve to show up for the debate you wanted — *because* you know you're wrong. Which makes you a criminal equal to banking and its usurpations, as far as I'm concerned. You're telling ME "volume is key," when you can only define proper volume by answering you'd just increase circulation until prices rose? You're so preposterous Migchels, it's a wonder *any* intelligent person would not consider you the lowest of the lowly, crying this and that against a solution you only want to disprove to claim a higher place for nought.
November 19 at 12:06am · Like · 1