"Today's textbooks are as alienating and dehumanizing as computers ever could be," Schank declares. But suppose the computer alienates the child further?

views, then we should do so. Electing plans of action as opposed to actors will appear much more realistic as the possibility for election becomes more real.

I do not believe that we should vote on every action that our leaders take in general, the understanding is not well enough informed to do so. Yet, we cannot invent our country at a particular time, or to decide how many weapons of what type we actually need. Nevertheless, we could vote for the beliefs on which we would like our leaders to operate. By this I mean that we could vote for the conditions under which an invasion should or should not take place, in principle.

Schank appears to be blind to the inherent immorality of his system, as most basic, his concept implies two vital human factors that all actions, good or bad, may be weighed in the balance to produce a determinate result and rejects the notion that actions is simply wrong. Berkeley systems philosopher C. West Churchman would have us respond with "moral outrage".

For example, the problem of world-wide starvation is morally outrageous: it is morally outrageous that a species that has the resources to feed every member adequately and the intelligences to solve the problem do so, in fact, only a few million starving. But my speculation says that this problem should unfold into other problems of national politics, or would of trade, of religion, of culture etc. To try to define starvation carefully at the outset, I think, to prevent the unfolding, so that we planners remain stick to the bounded problem region."

Along similar lines, we should be morally outraged at the possibility that nations might eliminate each other and look at the effects of war by replacing ethical human systems with deterministic models. The possibility that human reason and goodwill will save the world is only the more we dare to take a broader view and see our little system of ethics as no more than a small part of unfounded and interconnected areas of human problems that we realize that we must attend to the potential causes of war rather than prepare a computer time-bomb for a contingency destined to become a self-fueling problem.

But such thinking is anathema to the computer approach which must segmentize everything, in which not only does an expert in one field not provide advice for another, but the layman should not be a part of the policy implementation process. It does not matter whether the man in the restaurant talks about nuclear war because to Schank and the rest of the "restaur- ant" script, but only part of the "nuclear war" script where the computer expert will tell us what is to be done once people are not well enough "informed."

Perhaps in the end it all comes down to insecurity: that human have a natural ten- dency to reduce their view of the world to make it seem more manageable. But Churchman suggests that wisdom is thought combined with a concern for eth- ics and law, and that it is their search and so let people be the war" script where the computer expert will tell us what is to be done once people are not well enough "informed."

Schank's "intelligent legal advisor" would "have a knowledge of all the basic factors that judges take into account when sentencing particular kinds of cases. These systems could aid even the most impartial of judges, as well as intelligence. If a machine recommends a judge to dispense a particular sentence based on an analysis of case precedents, the judge may not only feel compelled to comply because "who am I to question the judgment of science?" but also accord responsibility for his actions to the machine. For all the reasons we have seen above, a computer could help to overcome some of the fac- tors judges take into account. About the compassion a judge might have felt in some bygone case when faced by the sight of a particularly bedraggled youth before him, of the tacit fear a judge might have felt within himself upon another occasion, that, in making such claims, the computer could provide even an crust, an excuse for detailing the basic human factors in making a judgment decision.

The concept of a prescription for government:

"In an age of intelligent computers, we also can elect programs, but those of the electronic variety. A politician is someone we expect will carry out our views, and it is possible to elect a system that embodies our views rather than a person who will administer those

"...the concept of a prescription for government..."

Jonathan Richmond