

(A propriedade privada e um roubo? Vejamos no que da levar isto a serio)

Private Property is Theft (Robbery)? Let's See What Believing This Can Lead To

By Claudio Shikida

Translation by Joao Martins

Since 2002 I've observed a trend in the media. It's not that it didn't exist before; however, it has become increasingly prevalent in recent times. It centers on an application of an alternative paradigm of Tupiniquim socialism (indigenous tribe of Brazil), today discretely know as "Bolivarian". It is a historical heritage, evidently, of socialism itself. Proudhon became famous for having stated that "private property is theft" and socialists say that the "right to private property is the origin of theft".

If the right of private property is "evil", then it's difficult to imagine individuals demanding rights about their own work. After all, the work is not a property, even though according to the non-liberals, it would still be theft. But who was robbed? Normally, it's the "working class". After all, work has a "social function", which would signify that working for Stalin is not slavery, but working for Hitler is an erroneous decision, as a result of an illusion created by the Bourgeoisie.

Having said this, suppose that an individual that truly believes in the intrinsic evil of the private property rights attains a public service position. In principal, there is a certain personal satisfaction; the post is not private, it is public. However, what about in time of routine (repetition)? And when documents fall upon the work desk in need of a signature? He'll probably think that this is a "bureaucratic thing", of Weberians, and not of socialism, but instead a heretical practice originating from a superficial theory (he would create a jargon for this: "a sociological fetish") that doesn't take into account the complex and dynamic class relations.

If this individual were to commit a mistake, intentionally, accept a bribe, by his logic, he can't be responsible because there is no way of attributing his actions to him. Why is that? This is because the rights of private property are illegitimate. If there is a crisis, such as there has never occurred in this country, such as in the aviation sector which is regulated by the public sector, there won't be any way of attributing blame. It is not anybody's fault. So that things do not get out of hand, we can always lay blame on something generic and imprecise. It could be our "darn heritage", "society" or the "slave-owner history of this country." Moreover, what if a presidential promise is not followed through by the ministries? There is no one to blame. There is no way of assigning guilt. Since one cannot attribute responsibility to the individual, we are back at the initial point of the article. Ah yes, one could say, "I was possessed by (**tinioso**) ??", but that seems like an argument based on private property.

This vision of the world, or at least this *modus operandi*, if we imagine such a discussion to be hypocrisy, has been very prevalent in our media, where there is a lack of accountability. Societies more interested in the redistribution of wealth (also known as “socialization without risk”) instead of efficiency are not populated by four legged beasts. On the contrary, they usually show high levels of education, as Carraro and Dame recently demonstrated. A paradox does not exist here: you need a lot of lip service to lift blame off one’s shoulders and hoist it on “society”.

Greater education doesn’t always produce the desired effect. For example, the case of the economics profession in Brazil:

The creation of the economics profession in Brazil is not simply the implementation of a modern curriculum. There exist cultural and institutional problems in Brazil that complicate the development of the social sciences. The intellectual traditions of Brazil and other Latin-American countries gravitate towards a thinker that is proud of his vast culture and resentful of specialization. This thinker often writes about literature and his studies with the same facility that he writes about sociology and modern politics.(...) the fact that authors that used to ponder social issues generally wrote without any reference to monographic studies, that were cited in Romania prior to the first World War (...).

In Brazil, that fact is the primary reason university students are in decline in the fields of law, journalism and public service.

(...)

A sociological explanation for the perseverance of the thinker is that Brazilian institutions of higher education rarely return to research. (Joseph L. Love, “A Construcao do Terceiro Mundo”, Paz e Terra, 1998, p.350-1) “Construction of the Third World, Peace and Earth”

In conclusion, I would say that educated individuals are ideal candidates for the development of a discussion that will negate the responsibility of an individual for his actions, so much so that the opposite can rise, a discussion that is aware of private property rights as fundamental in rewarding us and punishing us for our acts. It’s not because you have made a mistake that I’m to blame, right?