

1: German addresses are blocked - [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*Forecasting the future*  
*The end of the war*  
*Nations in liquidation*  
*Braintree, Bocking and the future of the world*  
*How far will Europe go towards socialism?*  
*--Lawyer and press*  
*The new education*  
*What the war is doing for women*  
*The new map of Europe*  
*The United States, France, Britain, and Russia*  
*"The white man's burthen."*  
*--The.*

Source Why Capitalism is Good Capitalism and socialism: These systems present two very different futures for our world, and both have strong supporters and opponents. Capitalists cover quite a chunk of the right and center spectrum, including everybody from moderates to libertarians to every-man-for-themselves money grubbers. Same for socialists; there is definitely a fair amount of contrast between the far left and the center. What I mean by capitalism is a free market governed by supply and demand and private property, including the ownership of the means of production. What I mean by socialism is public ownership on varying levels, but always the means of production. When you go towards the extremes, there are of course far more differences, but my views deal with the more viable and debatable center. So before we go further, allow me to write a quick summary of why neither extreme works. Source Why Both Extremes Fail Like I said before, my views are comfortably in the center, the reason being that going too far to either side will simply not work. Capitalism Capitalism, in its right-most form, is every man for himself. A capitalist society is set up so that those who work hardest and smartest not counting get luckiest in this explanation get more resources - which makes good sense, as until there are enough resources to accommodate everyone, there will always be conflicts of interest. The only way to get more resources, after a certain extent, is to create it, which can only be done through improving technology, like agriculture, electricity, and the Internet. If we must divide our resources, it seems reasonable structure our system so that it provides incentive for productivity. How would this happen? If we go to the extreme of having little or no government intervention, like no tax estate, income, etc. Without wealth distribution, those who are born poor must remain poor. This is - for lack of a better word - bad for their happiness, as well as detrimental to all of society on several levels stability, for one. As the wealthy have more influence, they have connections to politicians and appointed officials - very dangerous in a representative democracy. The government must represent the entire constituency, which will certainly not be the case if the wealthy own our political processes. Basically, products necessary for everyone will be in the control of only a few. Without government to check them, those who are greediest and most selfish will rise highest in society. Socialism Far left socialism is no less dangerous. Though I think the socialist ideal of a worldwide and local cooperation is good, the socialist model is not the way to do it. The problem with the really far left model, involving equal work and equal distribution, has already been discussed in depth by many, so I will only cover it briefly. Europe is still great, but the cracks are starting to show. The two major reasons are 1. Socialism discourages work and effort by shifting consequences positive and negative onto others. Socialism restricts freedom of the individual. In a future world of more resources, perhaps that will become possible. The entire point of a security net is to make sure those who are deserving have the ability to exercise their potential Note: I am aware that the ultimate point is to allow the happiness of everyone. I mean in the sense of its function in a developing society. Why work your hide off to drag along those who are just kicking back? This system encourages laziness, and after a while even those who naturally would work will stop because of their unjust load. This problem with socialism has a solution: By arranging society so that those who work harder, smarter, more creatively, and more productively are rewarded, all of society will ultimately benefit from their advances. If a safety net is retained, and it should be, downward spirals can be prevented and a basic standard of living can be available to all. However, problem 2 Socialism restricts freedom of the individual. I will address this in detail later on, when it flows more appropriately. Solutions in the Center Clearly, there are problems once society leans too far in either direction. However, even though I see problems in the capitalist model, I see more flaws in the socialist one - and those cannot be resolved except by adjust socialism so much that it becomes capitalism. The flaws in capitalism can be addressed, but ultimately, the problems with socialism are fundamental. Addressing Flaws in Capitalism Let me begin with how to address the flaws in capitalism. The most prominent problem is wealth gap and its consequential

injustice wealthy owning democratic process, lack of social ladder. This needs to be addressed through a better wealth distribution system, to allow all individuals the potential, regardless of circumstances they were born into, to earn the best society can offer. This involves taxes, including income tax, sales tax though exempting necessities like food and rent, and especially estate tax. Some seem to think that taxation of any sort is unfair; however, taxation is necessary like mentioned above to prevent the wealthy and corporations from monopolizing and owning the democratic process, which would quickly make society unjust and unproductive. Even if we had a good wealth distribution system, however, I believe the problem would remain with the wealthy ultimately owning the democratic process. The role of the government should be to work without bias for the happiness of all the people, and that will not happen if a section of the population has greater influence. The representatives in representative democracy are not infallible or necessarily virtuous, and money can corrupt the process and consequently the society. The government being transparent would help the problem, but over time I think money will cloud the transparency again. The most apparent problem today is democratic government not being democratic, whether because of corrupt politicians or the machinations by the rich. But even if we assume that the democratic government is functioning as it should, fairly and most importantly transparently, there is still a problem if there is no private property. This problem is that the society will have no protection of individual rights and will denigrate into a tyranny of the majority over the minority. Because the "common hordes" were "uneducated and incapable" of placing the "correct" vote, representatives would help them along. Now, I think the "common hordes" are ready to truly evolve into a democracy, but this would not be a good thing if the evolution was done without safeguards. Too much power leads to abuse, whether intentionally or unintentionally; in this case, it would be too much power in the hands of the majority. Clearly if the majority with transparency, this would be effectively the same thing as the government would destroy individual rights if it had control over individual property. Individual enjoys black licorice, while the majority does not enjoy black licorice. The individual is unable to get black licorice, as the ingredients and means of production belong to the group, and therefore the majority controls the black licorice. For the socialist model to work, the majority has to be both altruistic and empathetic. To do so makes the society incredibly unstable. Means of Production Moving even closer to the center, the ownership of the means of production is the final thing I want to address. My reasoning against common ownership is the same as my reasoning for individual property. In addressing essential items, like agriculture, common ownership would give the majority an incredible amount of leverage. Once society culturally evolves and more people gain an understanding of both the mechanics of the world and also of a common goal, perhaps then we could discuss public ownership of large, national industries, like mines and farms. But that would require a great deal of reform in public education and government transparency, and neither of those should be rushed. The means will be everything in creating a stable, happy society. The above paragraph was added after several insightful comments were posted by both socialists and capitalists. Comments are welcomed and like always will not be censored, but please do not post generic hate and spam. Also, if you have the time, I highly recommend reading through the comments section - there are several waves of productive, intelligent discussion there. Readers are still encouraged to post their thoughts and add to the fantastic collection of comments.

### 2: How Far Will Democratic Party Violence Go? | Power Line

*Recent Ben Shapiro broadcasts have been advertised as a "Warning Against the Socialist European experience, some far-reaching reforms could be adopted cannot go very far."*

Fortunately for Marx the man and his reputation, he never personally gained control of the machinery of any state. Thus, the dirty work of actually implementing the necessary "dictatorship of the proletariat" was left up to others. The leaders like Lenin and Mao succeeded for some time, at least because they invented new proverbs, which means that they imposed new customs that regulated daily lives. Thus, the problem in Venezuela is not that countless private business have been seized, property rights been destroyed, and countless citizens deprived of basic freedoms. But how is that break from the past to be brought about? The truth lies in the language used by Zizek himself. It involves "enforc[ing] a set of customs" and "impos[ing] new customs. From the point of view of the socialist purist, if only a new Lenin or a new Mao were to come along and try harder, well, then socialism might finally succeed. In practice, this has always meant using the power of the state to force a new way of life on people. Moreover, thanks to economic realities, it has also meant that the more socialism is applied, the lower the standard of living sinks. But "the thinking goes" so long as the socialist planners keep forging ahead, and refuse to be sabotaged by capitalist thought, then utopia can be reached. Yes, there will be a lot of suffering in the interim, but the ultimate payoff will be incalculably great. Represented graphically, the idea looks like this: Both Marx and Stalin admitted this unfortunate "interim stage" was a problem. As Ludwig von Mises notes, Marx even had to invent a two-tiered evolution of socialism: In a letter, Karl Marx distinguished between two stages of socialism "the lower preliminary stage and the higher stage. Historically, this is obvious. The countries that embraced free trade, industrialization, and the trappings of market economies early on are the wealthiest economies today. We also find this to be the case in post-war Europe where the relatively pro-market economies such as those in Germany and the UK are wealthier and have higher standards of living than the more socialistic economies of southern Europe " such as Greece and Spain. In West Germany after World War II pro-market reforms helped usher in a period of immense economic growth " with only half-way reforms. Obviously, in the case of Germany, the West German state did not adopt "pure" capitalism. And the economy expanded. And yet, we call the results "the German economic miracle. Where markets are more relatively free, the higher the standard of living, and the greater the economic growth.

### 3: Misesian Destructionism - LewRockwell

*Contents Forecasting the future -- The end of the war -- Nations in liquidation -- Braintree, Bocking and the future of the world -- How far will Europe go towards socialism? -- Lawyer and press -- The new education -- What the war is doing for women -- The new map of Europe -- The United States.*

In the meanwhile, click here to go to the current home page. Morales, an Aymara Indian, is the first indigenous president of Bolivia. The election campaign shaped up as a national referendum on neoliberal economic policies. After 20 years of privatization and cuts in social spending, Bolivia remains the poorest country in South America. In the days immediately following the election, Morales met in Cochabamba with leaders of the social movements who had supported him. This step broke the traditional pattern of meetings between the president-elect and the heads of political parties that will form the official opposition. Shortly after, Morales announced that he would repeal a decree that provides for privatizing state enterprises and imposing "flexibility" on Bolivian labor. That strikes at the heart of the legal foundation of neoliberalism in Bolivia. Morales moved simultaneously to placate the conservative leaders of the oil- and gas-rich eastern provinces, who want autonomy and have threatened secession if Morales goes too far in dismantling neoliberalism. Morales also issued a statement guaranteeing the private property of big business and large landowners. And despite what many consider irrefutable proof, he absolved Repsol, the Spanish-Argentine transnational corporation, from allegations that it trafficked in contraband hydrocarbons. The need to negotiate with foreign investors for development capital will limit how far Morales can go toward full nationalization. His stated plan is to nationalize only subsoil resources--the gas, oil and minerals in the ground--and leave surface property and exploitation largely in private hands. Despite continued dependence on foreign investment, Morales will find himself in a strong position for other reasons. Natural gas prices have risen quickly--even faster in percentage terms than oil prices--since the start of the Iraq War. Morales was instrumental in bringing about a settlement to the gas wars of and In , Morales was the last prominent figure to sign on late to the popular campaign to nationalize natural gas and oil. But socialism remains a project that the MAS claims must be postponed for 50 to years. Instead, Morales is seeking a new accommodation with global capitalism based on a revitalized role for the state in providing for the wellbeing of its citizens. At stake in Bolivia is whether neoliberalism can be reformed away--or whether ending neoliberalism, like overthrowing capitalism, requires revolution. It is extremely unlikely that neoliberalism--still backed percent by Washington and the bulk of the European Union--will be surrendered without a struggle. Morales deserves the support of socialists for every blow he strikes against these policies. And he deserves our criticism for every accommodation he makes to global capitalism. In the end, the fate of neoliberalism and capitalism in Bolivia rests in the hands of the masses who are increasingly asserting their own control over the future.

### 4: Lenin: /ichtci: Can We Go Forward If We Fear To Advance Towards Socialism?

*V - How Far Will Europe Go Towards Socialism? 96 VI - Lawyer and Press*

Setting the record straight about socialism March 29, 1: Millions of Americans are considering alternatives to a system run by and for the 1 percent. They are taking an interest in socialism, a word that has meant a great many things to activists, trade unionists, politicians, and clergy around the world over the last century and a half. The article below is one of a series on socialism, what it can mean for Americans in the 21st century, and how we might get there. In every age, scientific reasoning takes a beating from entrenched prejudices, fears, and hatreds. In the most extreme cases, life itself has been the price: Of recent vintage we have the vilification of socialism. Such was to be expected. There has never been a socio-economic system in which those in power passively and peacefully surrendered that power to a more equitable system. Yes, I believe that socialism is more equitable than capitalism. But you may also ask why China and Cuba, both socialist countries with leading Communist Parties, have survived. In any case, socialism ought to be considered for what it actually is, not for what we are told it is by those who would be out of business if we went in that direction. While the classical definition of socialism is public ownership of the basic means of production, it also includes aspects we already enjoy, such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the many federal departments established for the betterment of the entire population. Recent polls show that some 20 percent of Americans now view socialism favorably. Witness the candidacy of Bernie Sanders, an avowed democratic socialist. The word democratic is well-chosen, whether or not Sanders favors an all-out socialist state, because the intent of socialism is to advance democracy, not curtail it. The economic and social complexities in modern society, including human fallibility, will be negative factors in whatever social system is established. Cynics would have us believe that greed is endemic in humans, and that it will undermine any socio-economic structure. History tells a different story. True, as I noted earlier, none of these historic events brought an end to injustice. But they were steps forward. Greed and oppression have always been forced to give way to greater equality and justice. So it will be in the future. As humans change society, so society changes humans. No one has been burned at the stake in a long time. He is also a poet and blogger on current events. This article originally appeared at his blog.

### 5: Why Capitalism Works and Socialism Doesn't | Soapboxie

*All forms of Communism are considered "far left", but how far left is the difference. The part of the political spectrum that denotes the beginning of the left fifth (where liberalism ends and radicalism begins) is the breakpoint between social democracy and democratic socialism.*

Donate In his classic book *Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis* first English edition published in Ludwig von Mises wrote of how the object of socialists everywhere had always been the destruction of existing society. It does not build; it destroys. For destruction is the essence of it. It produces nothing, it only consumes what the social order based on private ownership in the means of production has created. This scenario has been played out in country after country that adopted socialism, from the Soviet Union to Venezuela. And of course once-prosperous Venezuela completely destroyed itself in a mere decade after Hugo Chavez, the latest in a long line of Castro-loving communist presidents, nationalized virtually all of industry and imposed universal price controls. Ludwig von Mises Best Price: Some things never change: The attack on Western culture, by the way, is not exactly new. Of course, *The Communist Manifesto* is even more comprehensive in its recipe for societal destruction. The Problem with Social Thomas DiLorenzo Best Price: The so-called working class only wanted better pay and working conditions, not to take over the factories after a bloody revolution. Mussolini smelled a rat and imprisoned Gramsci. The Hungarians hated this and kicked out the communists. This reminds me of how one of the television networks interviewed the valedictorian of a large New Jersey high school and asked him what was the most important thing he learned in school. How Capitalism Saved A Constitution, is supposedly just another tool of the oppressor class. The female faculty member who invited Murray was grabbed by the hair by one of the Middlebury College Hitler Youth and jerked so hard that she injured her neck and had to be rushed to a hospital. Violent spectacles of extraordinary ignorance and narcissism such as this are result of several decades of cultural Marxist indoctrination at all levels of schooling in America. It was the largest gift ever given to Yale at the time. It means hiring only socialists as faculty members, but from various cultures â€” an Asian socialist, a Hispanic socialist, an Indian socialist, etc.

### 6: Merkel 'outraged' over far right's Nazi chants at German protest rally | World news | The Guardian

*He also said, 'The inherent virtue of Socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.'" "Under socialism in Eastern Europe," Graham continued, "churches were burned and pastors were imprisoned.*

Fascism is an existential threat to the working class. It targets the oppressed and persecuted minorities with the overall goal of the decimation of working class movements and the left. It grows through terror and violence. But history shows us that it is possible to stop this spread of organized violence and hate through the mobilization of a mass opposition. That is why the International Socialist Organization calls for a new, anti-fascist united front to confront, demobilize and discredit the growing far right in this country and around the world. The urgency of such an effort is clear. Protesters march against far-right violence in Washington, D. Mobilus In Mobili flickr Recent weeks have exposed the results: These attacks followed the organized fascist mob violence by the Proud Boys in Portland, Oregon , and New York City – where Proud Boys founder Gavin McInnes was invited to speak by the Metropolitan Republican Club, after which his supporters brutally assaulted anti-fascist activists. Far-right militias promise mobilizations to the border that will create a more dangerous climate for the approaching refugee caravan from Honduras that carries a wave of victims of a U. Far-right activists have also pledged to show up at polling stations during the midterm elections to harass and intimidate those seeking to vote. These actions contributed to major setbacks for some sections of the neofascist movement in the U. However, while far-right figures Steve Bannon and Sebastian Gorka have been forced out of the White House, and media personalities like Milo Yiannopoulos and Richard Spencer have been discredited, the far-right threat is escalating again. Some of these forces now seek to organize a much more militant and violent core, a highly dangerous prospect at a time when we are already beset by far-right violence. The conditions that made the development of this odious movement possible – social polarization and crisis – still exist. Anti-immigrant attacks organized by the government promote nativism and racism. Voter suppression and brutal police violence target the poor and Black people in particular. Ongoing anti-Muslim discrimination and violence are so frequent that they are scarcely discussed in the mainstream media. The confirmation of sexual assaulter Brett Kavanaugh to the U. Supreme Court and the eliminationist attitude of the Trump administration toward transgender people will incite more gendered violence incited by the far right. Political attacks on the media and exploitation of fears of an unstable world are encouraging a new push by various far-right forces to regroup and make new inroads. These threats of physical violence are frightening, to be sure, but far-right movements thrive on fear. Massive mobilizations that are not just symbolic, but actually march to confront the Nazis, are necessary, especially because these demonstrations can demoralize the far right. While it is true that neo-Nazis who operate in the shadows can be highly dangerous, a fascist movement that is allowed into the light has a much more ambitious – and genocidal – goal. That is why this new movement must be defeated before it can gain a foothold. The left is coming to terms with the same phenomenon internationally. Brazil has just seen the victory of a neofascist in Jair Bolsonaro. This victory was preceded by physical attacks against the organized left, against women and LGBT people across Brazil, as well as threats to academic freedom. In Germany, Sweden, Denmark and other countries, far-right parties have won large numbers of legislative seats. In Italy and Austria, they participate in coalition governments. Narendra Modi, the prime minister of India, has given the green light to pogroms against Muslims and oppressed castes and the persecution of activists and intellectuals, while his right-wing government continues the occupation of Kashmir and fights a brutal internal war against insurgents. Far-right activists in the U. Tommy Robinson, the leader of the violent, white nationalist English Defense League, has recently been invited to tour the U. But organized fascists seek something far beyond intimidation. And Trump is not the only U. Steve King of Iowa has direct ties to European fascist parties. History tells us that we should not – and must not – wait until the threat of fascism is stronger before we confront it. It must be dealt a decisive blow at its conception. There is nothing inevitable about the rise of the far right. We in the International Socialist Organization believe that the left must unite with the broadest social layers and largest numbers possible to oppose these racist intimidators. The ISO calls for collaboration among organizations and

individuals on the left in common activity to confront this upsurge in fascist violence. International Human Rights Day, December 10, provides one opportunity among others to speak out against the fascist threat in the U. The words of Martin Luther King Jr. And so this afternoon in a real sense they have something to say to each of us in their death. They say to each of us, Black and white alike, that we must substitute courage for caution. They say to us that we must be concerned not merely about who murdered them, but about the system, the way of life, the philosophy which produced the murderers.

### 7: Matteo Salvini and Viktor Orbán to form anti-migration front | World news | The Guardian

*When you go towards the extremes, there are of course far more differences, but my views deal with the more viable and debatable center. So before we go further, allow to me to write a quick summary of why neither extreme works.*

What has been said so far may easily arouse the following objection on the part of a reader who has been brought up on the current opportunist ideas of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. This current objection, one that is usually raised in one form or another in the bourgeois, Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik press, is a reactionary defence of backward capitalism, a defence decked out in a Struvean garb. It seems to say that we are not ripe for socialism, that it is too early to "introduce" socialism, that our revolution is a bourgeois revolution and therefore we must be the menials of the bourgeoisie although the great bourgeois revolutionaries in France years ago made their revolution a great revolution by exercising terror against all oppressors, landowners and capitalists alike! The pseudo-Marxist lackeys of the bourgeoisie, who have been joined by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and who argue in this way, do not understand as an examination of the theoretical basis of their opinion shows what imperialism is, what capitalist monopoly is, what the state is, and what revolutionary democracy is. For anyone who understands this is bound to admit that there can be no advance except towards socialism. Everybody talks about imperialism. But imperialism is merely monopoly capitalism. That capitalism in Russia has also become monopoly capitalism is sufficiently attested by the examples of the Prodigol, the Prodomet, the Sugar Syndicate, etc. This Sugar Syndicate is an object-lesson in the way monopoly capitalism develops into state-monopoly capitalism. And what is the state? It is an organisation of the ruling class "in Germany, for instance, of the Junkers and capitalists. And therefore what the German Plekhanovs Scheidemann, Lensch, and others call "war-time socialism" is in fact war-time state-monopoly capitalism, or, to put it more simply and clearly, war-time penal servitude for the workers and war-time protection for capitalist profits. Now try to substitute for the Junker-capitalist state, for the landowner-capitalist state, a revolutionary-democratic state, i. For if a huge capitalist undertaking becomes a monopoly, it means that it serves the whole nation. If it has become a state monopoly, it means that the state is either in the interest of the landowners and capitalists, in which case we have not a revolutionary-democratic, but a reactionary-bureaucratic state, an imperialist republic. Or in the interest of revolutionary democracy—and then it is a step towards socialism. For socialism is merely the next step forward from state-capitalist monopoly. Or, in other words, socialism is merely state-capitalist monopoly which is made to serve the interests of the whole people and has to that extent ceased to be capitalist monopoly. There is no middle course here. The objective process of development is such that it is impossible to advance from monopolies and the war has magnified their number, role and importance tenfold without advancing towards socialism. Either we have to be revolutionary democrats in fact, in which case we must not fear to take steps towards socialism. There is no middle course. And therein lies the fundamental contradiction of our revolution. It is impossible to stand still in history in general, and in war-time in particular. We must either advance or retreat. But to fear to advance means retreating—which the Kerenskys, to the delight of the Milyukovs and Plekhanovs, and with the foolish assistance of the Tseretelis and Chernovs, are actually doing. The dialectics of history is such that the war, by extraordinarily expediting the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism, has thereby extraordinarily advanced mankind towards socialism. Imperialist war is the eve of socialist revolution. And this not only because the horrors of the war give rise to proletarian revolt—but because state-monopoly capitalism is a complete material preparation for socialism, the threshold of socialism, a rung on the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism there are no intermediate rungs. They picture socialism as some remote, unknown and dim future. But socialism is now gazing at us from all the windows of modern capitalism; socialism is outlined directly, practically, by every important measure that constitutes a forward step on the basis of this modern capitalism. What is universal labour conscription? It is a step forward on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism, a step towards the regulation of economic life as a whole, in accordance with a certain general plan, a step towards the economy

of national labour and towards the prevention of its senseless wastage by capitalism. In Germany it is the Junkers landowners and capitalists who are introducing universal labour conscription, and therefore it inevitably becomes war-time penal servitude for the workers. But take the same institution and think over its significance in a revolutionary-democratic state. It will be a tremendous step towards socialism, a step from which, if complete democracy is preserved, there can no longer be any retreat back to capitalism, without unparalleled violence being committed against the masses.

### 8: A call to unite and fight the far-right menace | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*Can We Go Forward If We Fear To Advance Towards Socialism? What has been said so far may easily arouse the following objection on the part of a reader who has been brought up on the current opportunist ideas of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.*

On May Day this year, while the CTV struggled to mobilise more than a few thousand people, one million workers participated in a march organised by the UNT under the slogan "Workers building Bolivarian socialism". Can you tell us why you came to Britain? I am in England thanks to an invitation from the RMT [Revolutionary Marxist Tendency] to attend their congress and so that I can have personal contact with trade unionists and explain the revolutionary process in Venezuela: You should know that the workers of Venezuela and the people as a whole are participating in a process of change. We have been deeply affected by capitalism which is the cause of all the evils inflicted on our peoples, and now we are on the way towards socialism. We will defend ourselves as we have done so far, with all the legal weapons in our hands, like the constitution, looking for support from world public opinion. But if they at any time invade us, we will respond in the same way "a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye. They should not think that if they try to invade Venezuela they will be able to leave unharmed. The answer would be much worse than the one Iraq is giving to the Empire right now. We are refounding the whole of the trade union movement, building it anew. What we are raising [as a demand] is co-management both in the state-owned and in the private sector. We are also raising the issue of co-management in the private sector. If a private company receives a loan from the state, we raise the need for co-management, so that we can guarantee jobs and better production. And in the state-owned sector we are clearly saying that all state-owned basic industries should be under co-management. Co-management from the point of view of the workers is something very simple "we want power and participation in the management of the companies, in order to create new jobs, guarantee that the wealth reaches the people and that corruption is rooted out. We must say it clearly: It was us, the workers, who restarted production in the company after the managers had left, and we did so without managers. This is what we want with co-management. We have all the rights "to elect the managers, look into the accounts, to make proposals; the workers have all the rights. This is what we are demanding in an audacious way and we think this is the way forward. Hugo Chavez has said that within the limits of capitalism, the problems of misery suffered by the Venezuelan people cannot be solved and that we must go towards socialism. How do you see this from the point of view of the UNT? The way is socialism. This is the way that we must discuss all the different opinions on socialism, and how in Venezuela we are going to implement it according to our reality. We are in complete agreement with what the president said. Through debates and discussions we will reach a definition of what we need in order to implement socialism in Venezuela. What are the main threats facing the Bolivarian revolution right now? The Empire has many problems. We have told the US that we have a trade relationship with them "we sell them oil and they buy it at whatever price is fixed by the market. But the US government has always believed that Latin America is their backyard where they can do whatever they want and as they please "install governments, remove presidents, grab all of our natural resources and take them to their country, add value to them and then sell them back to us at 50 or times their original price "to exploit us. With very few exceptions, the natural wealth of our countries belong to the country as long as they are underground, but from the moment they come to the surface they become US-owned, because of capitalist aggression. I also wanted to ask you, what do you think of the Hands Off Venezuela campaign and other solidarity campaigns that have been organised internationally to defend the Bolivarian revolution? What would you say to these activists? Please continue your work. We cannot deal with the mass media on our own. The main news agencies in the world are in the private sector. They do not like what is happening in Venezuela and therefore they do not tell the truth. The only chance we have of getting the truth out is through the alternative media, and also through the Hands Off Venezuela campaign and other bodies that are organising support and telling people in Europe what is really happening in Venezuela. What would be your message to British workers? The main thing is that the struggle against privatisation here

in England must be conducted in a radical way. The people must be made to understand and feel the problem. Only with the support of the people can we stop privatisation. English people should be aware that these famous policies of privatisation, that carry the trademark of [former British PM Margaret] Thatcher, are being defeated in Latin America. In Venezuela there are no more privatisations and the other countries are also resisting them. In Peru we stopped the privatisation of electricity. In Argentina it has been proven that the capitalist system and its highest expression, this aberration called privatisation, are starving the people. And this is the case in the whole of Latin America. In Mexico, we have the example of the electricity workers who are confronting [President Vincente] Fox, almost in a violent way one could say, to prevent privatisation. Is there anything else you would like to add? Yes, I would like to make a personal comment. Those of us who have always been left-wing in Latin America and in Venezuela, we recognise the role of Hugo Chavez. Cuba resisted for 40 years on her own, and with Hugo Chavez the revolution has become a Latin American revolution. It is still in its infancy, but it will bear fruit. Many of us who are over 50 years of age, we always dreamt of being able to confront the Empire in a successful way, and we thought we would never see it. Now, for many, the very fact that we are confronting it with success means that we must continue fighting on, in order to achieve the best for our peoples in Latin America. Paraphrasing Che Guevara I would say: From Green Left Weekly, July 20,

### 9: VENEZUELA: 'We are on the way towards socialism' | Green Left Weekly

*It's just a question of how far they are willing to go. That is an important disagreement. I'm quite happy for the government to be paternalistic, where doing that yields a better outcome.*

*Who are we? Where did we come from? Where are we going? Stanley Crouch Probability and statistical inference 9th torrent How To Draw Nintendo Heroes And Villains Once a fighter pilot- Introduction : emerging webs of regional connectedness T.J. Pempel Etel Solingen Geoffrey McNicoll Andrew Protocols for all Objects Indian wars in Stephen F. Austins Texas Colony, 1822-1835 Abraham Van Assum. Cycling along the canals of New York State Infections of prosthetic joints Martha Stewart Living, August 2006 Issue Waiting and after In search of a wife The Jesus films: the 1960s The Land of the Midnight Sun The growth of the New Testament John M. Court The one selection Rounding off numbers worksheets grade 5 Uncle Bernac (A Memory of the Empire) Unilateralism as a Prerequisite for Multilateralism 74 Human body nerve system Panic on page one Speech of Senator S.A. Douglas on the invasion of states V. 1. Preparation of liposomes Standing up MACVSOG Why Do I Need to Sleep? Jee main paper 2 question paper 2018 Petrophysical Properties of Crystalline Rocks Comprehensive school reform : lessons learned James Meza, Jr. Lesley Dahlkemper, and Joan Buttram Child labor, by Theresa Wolfson. Corel videostudio pro x2 product activation code Play like youre dead 5. Five myths about raising personal support An unshakable identity Spark tutorials with scala Hafiz: Tongue of the Hidden Application of metaheuristics to large-scale problems Blueprint for victory: Northern strategy and military policy Gary W. Gallagher Readers guide to the suspense novel T.R.O.G.S. Book Two*