

is obviously ignorant of the categories. Mutually exclusives break down upon critical analysis as a "totalitarianism" example. Clearly the establishment simplistic, and obnoxious personnel, so they will re-

"possessive individualism" is freedom and order, and crime which is presented in the book.

wards the liberties of each by liberty of all."

th its avoidance of restraint, the seeds of license."

of liberty and dislike of re- sistance to go from liberty to average person desires an order and is willing to share in the order."

erprise, initiative, and service e always commended in a de- sistence is thus well ordered."

erse, it is the police who im- discipline — sometimes called "in the book as if each per- act with the police at birth to e common good."

t that is, "the sworn enemy nd and protector of all law- he police enforce it. It is as

to be that simple, then the y feel justified in being arbi- trary, and even "militant"

## competition

Rousseau, who developed eoisie developed out of feud- ideas reified into the quasi- terprise capitalism.

erprise society does not, nor quasi-philosophies still serve of justifying the competitive alism societies.

there is the "Individual"— nd asocial—who is "Free." tic and liberty is thus lic-

cture. Law ensures that this doesn't infringe on other's Those who determine and or the "Common Good." The s the logical outcome of this

double-talk; quite unrelated

to human beings (who are interdependent from birth to death) and in contradiction to any historical or sociological study of authority, power and ideology, which cloaks the distortion of human beings within capitalist and other authoritarian societies.

Possessive individualism, has a corollary of an authoritarian moralism which poses as a self-sacrificing public service ethic.

Though a competitive ethic dominates the society, force, police force if necessary, is required to control the conflict resulting from the exploitation, and attempts to end exploitation, in the market place.

The policeman is trained to view himself as such a public servant. It rationalizes his work and gives a meaning to his life.

Since many police recruits are from the lower classes, they can compensate for their frustrated status needs, and reconcile the dissonance between the free-enterprise rhetoric and their actual lack of opportunity by becoming such a public servant.

They see themselves as having status, and success. They are also self-sacrificing, even a bit martyred for others.

Look at the following quotes taken from the selection on the policeman in the RCMP book:

- To be a policeman "requires skill, intelligence, forbearance and compassion to live one's own life within the law, yet it requires much more than these to apply that law...to the acts of others."

Once again we see the simple equation of conformity and good. The policeman must just be that much better than others. Such a Superman self image can justify almost anything—sadism and brutality included. Giving the police such a view of "intelligence" makes the "law-breaker" almost sub-human.

- The Policeman needs "...comprehension of democratic philosophy .. intelligence .. (to) study, understand and interpret laws..."

## The "philosopher cop"

What occurs to me is the image of a "Philosopher-Cop" (not unlike Plato's Philosopher King), viewing society and other humans in a detached and objective way; enforcing laws according to their "True" interpretation.

Again words that suggest "being smart" have immense power for those not upwardly mobile, yet who possess all the values of such mobility.

- The policeman needs "...strength of character... (he must) resist the many human impulses excusable in the private citizen but disastrous to the policeman, requires not only self-control but an understanding of the short-comings of others."

Here is the self-sacrificing, all-understanding policeman. A combination of paternalism, moralism and authoritarianism is nurtured both to ensure that the recruit will not rebel against his restrictive job and will impose the laws on others unquestioningly. People with a history of abuse and neglect often fit well into this submissive-authoritarian role.

- The policeman needs "...understanding... tolerance... physical excellence...bravery and heroism...courage..."

The policeman is getting closer and closer to the male stereotype that has dominated the society, and which fits so nicely the needs of a militaristic and regimented system

- His is "...The true desire to serve the public—A belief in the worthiness of mankind—a desire for variety and adventure and the spiritual need for self-sacrifice for the benefit of other people."

The highest good, doing for others. It is amazing how a self-sacrificing self image, for one identifying so totally with authority, making only pseudo-choices (within the law), not moral choices about the effects of what he does for other people, can maintain such a self view. The double-talk that operates for police about "freedom and order" also works at another level, the very center of personality.

## Contradictory theory

With possessive individualism and authoritarian-moralism "established" the "book" goes on to dis-

cuss the causes and prevention of, and punishment for crime.

Criminology is used in a reified, anti-intellectual manner. "Police forces practice crime prevention", and the raising of "young citizens", not "young criminals" also helps. Deterrence and rehabilitation ("repression" and "repressive tolerance") are mixed into a self contradictory theory of punishment.

Next we get a 40-page summary of treason, sedition, communism, fascism, and national socialism. It has the same assumptions of many university courses taught by those intimidated by McCarthyism, though the blatant statement of them would never succeed in passing as value-free social science, even to the most indoctrinated students. Order is again the main emphasis. Order and civilized (versus primitive) societies are even equated.

And the inevitable contradiction within monopoly capitalism is exposed. The "State", not the "Individual" now becomes important per se. Sedition helps to preserve "The tranquility of the state."

The political oppression of the police is thus "justified" not by some quasi-humanism but by a pseudo-totalitarianism. Humanist rhetoric might even subvert the RCMP if it was articulated clearly.

Mention is made of the conviction of R. B. Russell, a leader of the Winnipeg strike (1919) for sedition:

"While there was no evidence produced at his trial to show that Russell was a Communist... still his speeches showed that he believed and advocated the principles of revolution adopted by the Communists."

Here is an example of how policy ideology reduces specific to its own metaphysics. And this is aided by the same old double-talk: "no evidence... that he was a Communist... still his speeches showed that he believed and advocated the principles adopted by the Communists."

According to the "book" sedition protects societies from "outside influences... suppressing all activities" which would lead to "civil war and anarchy." "Every serious minded citizen" should assist in "eradicating this menace to his way of life, his home, his freedom of thought and his country."

The wording almost incites the true believer in the conspiracy theory to go out and kill himself a commie for the good of mankind. It never ceases to shock me how words can be conditioned to such irrationality, with no valid meanings whatsoever.

After this, communism and fascism are both defined as totalitarian, and arguing from general, tautological principles, to specifics about history the simplistic conspiracy theory is again perpetuated. Any possible understanding of the history of Europe since the turn of the century is destroyed. "Fellow travellers" are implicated in the plot, and again the policeman becomes the true protector of peace, law and order.

Then there is the task of controlling riots. Doing his duty of breaking strikes, protest demonstrations or whatever, "criticisms, and there will always be some, will be levelled at him. He must be big enough to accept these without faltering."

He can do no wrong, for he is carrying out the "law." And, anyway, he is a better human than the "rioters." He also has great "degrees of freedom" in his approach, and is confident and protected by his modern equipment. The law gives him immense protections against "rioters", and he is again told that it is "the actions of a few" that endanger the rights of the many.

The "book" concludes on the same note it began, and with the same irrational language about "crime".

"The field of crime is not static, and no agency engaged in combating this insidious and contagious disease can afford to be static. In these days the impact of crime upon society and subversive efforts to deprive us of our hard-won freedoms and democratic principles is of importance to us all."

## Civil disobedience

I know of no instance where those who identify so totally with conservative authority have aided in the ongoing struggle to put social institutions in the control of people.

Though the RCMP book emphasizes the vote as basic to democracy, police ideologists handily forgot that it took forms of civil disobedience to win the franchise for the working people.

### CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND REFORM STRATEGY

The liberal rhetoric that cloaks the authoritarianism of this society appears to have immense power over the population, including the student reformers themselves.

Underneath their own radicalism there seems to be a naive belief in the ability of this society to progress. Often what appears as "militancy" also turns out to be naive.

It is not that their experience isn't radicalizing them, for it is. It is their lack of understanding of the latent power of the state, that keeps them naive.

What I suggest may serve to undercut some of this naivete and help build a historical foundation on which to build a viable militancy in the student movement. My conclusions, interestingly, turn out to be much the same as those made by Thoreau a hundred years ago. Here is what he wrote about laws:

"I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as the right. . . Law never made men a whit more just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice.

"A common and natural result of an undue respect for law is that you see a file of soldiers... marching in admirable order over hill and dale to the wars, against their wills, ay, against their common sense and conscience. . . The mass of men serve the state thus, not as men mainly, but as machines, with their bodies.

"They are the standing army, and the militia, jailers, constables, etc...others—as most legislatures, politicians, lawyers, ministers, and officeholders — serve the state chiefly with their heads; and as they rarely make any moral distinctions, they are as likely to serve the Devil, without intending it, as God..."

I would add "academics" to the list of those who now serve the state chiefly with their heads. And I would suggest that the power of the state is far greater in monopoly capitalism, and far more oppressive, than when Thoreau lived. I question the strategic worth of civil disobedience in the face of this system which links laws, police ideology and elite power in such a fashion that oppression of reform movements is so integrated.

Where a system is so integrated that rhetoric remains credible to those conforming; and oppression of reformers can be "legalized" in the eyes of those unaffected, long-range planning for a thorough social revolution seems the only just thing to do.

Jim Harding, formerly a graduate student at Simon Fraser university in British Columbia was a teaching assistant at the University of Saskatchewan until last fall when his contract was not renewed.

Canada's criminal code gives law officers and court officials the right to oppress minorities and stifle reform movements.