

to take the staff jobs? When the pressures of collateral bureaucracies become more significant than the rules of the system? The article tells us quite a bit about how the system will look if the most positive ideals of parole work are realized, including the glittering but ever-elusive goal of therapy. But what we really need to know is what routine level the system will actually find if the future bears out our experience of the past. Here again, research and technical ingenuity might come in very handy to tell us how such mass systems might be kept up to the mark. But here again ingenuity is absent.

Finally, Mr. Schwitzgebel has given us a most provocative and well-considered discussion. But we will not be surprised if, in spite of his efforts, his idea in practice turns out to represent his worst fears rather than his highest hopes.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR BECK'S COMMENTARY

With his usual clarity, Professor Beck has commented, "The summary question is this: We are told several things *could* be done or *should* be done in applying the system humanely. But what confidence can we have that any of them *will* be done?" The answer to this question is, in my opinion, "None." No guarantee can be given that our present institutional arrangements will realize the human potential of this system or, conversely, will prevent its wide spread misuse.

I agree with Professor Beck that the present rules of procedure may not be adequate to prevent routine abuse within typical correctional systems. This is why the suggestion was made that demonstrated, long-term therapeutic effectiveness should be a prerequisite for the use of the system. However, I did not make it sufficiently clear that therapeutic effectiveness was also to be a continuing standard for the permissible use of the system. Additional criteria such as adequate interpersonal privacy might also be put into the form of a standard to be met subject to periodic review (*e.g.*, FCC license renewal).

However, as a society, we have very little experience in regard to methods for the regulation of the growth or effects of technology. Research is needed to provide the data necessary for finding suitable regulatory methods. In this sense, the electronic rehabilitation system is a case study now in progress within the broader area of science policy. Of course, even with very much research data there are very few

suitable rationales, as Jerome Skolnick has noted, for the translation of empirical findings into policy.

Professor Beck concludes appropriately, "But we will not be surprised if, in spite of his efforts, his idea in practice turns out to represent his worst fears rather than his highest hopes." While correct, Professor Beck does not perhaps go far enough. Although not surprised, I would be deeply saddened and I would feel that many of us share the responsibility. We can not unknow what is now known; nor can we claim innocence based upon an ignorance of technological potential. Ironically, it is precisely the recognition of this potential and the desire to control our technological fate through research that lead to the development of the electronic rehabilitation system.

RALPH K. SCHWITZGEBEL
Harvard University