

Electronic monitoring

[Law](#), [Criminal Justice](#)



Electronic Monitoring Throughout the years, the government has created numerous strategies in order to make prisons less populated. Electronic Monitoring, one of the newest inventions, is a prime example of how to keep the population to a minimal in penitentiaries. It has also helped monitor other community corrections programs for people on parole, which is actually the main point why electronic monitor was invented. In addition it is constantly used in day programs and probation circumstances that a court puts upon a criminal. Due to its great success rate, it has even been used in different parts of the world. Countries like Canada and the United Kingdom have adopted this new monitoring system due to its effectiveness. Electronic Monitoring is used in any circumstance in which a criminal has been given the liberty to be on any kind of probation or during their parole. Although the convict may not be in prison, constant supervision is provided without the need for a prison cell. This surveillance is used during both the pre-trial monitoring and post-trial monitoring process. Pre-trial monitoring is enforced when the criminal has the opportunity to spend time at home because of financial problems or when the court decides that it would be best to refrain from this person being behind bars while awaiting a sentence. This system is more efficient not only for the government but for the prisons as well. Post-trial monitoring is also another expression the court uses for electronic monitoring. Post-trial is very similar to what a pre-trial system does; for example when a person being sentenced needs to be home for in order to maintain a steady income for the stability of the family, the court recognizes that it would cost too much to have the criminal in prison while trying to support their family. The government along with the court system

consequentially needs to consider the financial strain that imprisonment may cause, as well as overpopulation that it could potentially cause in a prison. Here in the States, electronic monitoring is used more in post-trial monitoring than in pre-trial defendants, in which sometimes the court makes some type of new special release program for those criminals. In most cases it is used in severe supervision, where the criminal is not trusted to be without any kind of supervision. The way the electronic monitoring works is by having three simple components, a transmitter, a central computer, and a receiver. In the near future, electronic monitoring will come together with GPS to pinpoint exactly where the parolee is, and anywhere he has been throughout the day. Although the cost of supervising a criminal is expensive, which the parolee eventually pays for, by the government automatically taking a portion of his paycheck; it makes prisons less populated. Since the 1960's when the first electronic monitoring appeared, it has been the fastest growing tool in the community corrections field. Year after year more convicts are put under the electronic monitoring for a few reasons, because more money does come into the justice department which means less money spent in prisons. The percentage of criminals going to prison is diminishing however it does not mean that people are committing fewer crimes. This unfortunately just makes the Criminal Justice department look better, but the crime still remains. The author of the article I read on Electronic Monitoring gave some valid points that I am in complete agreement with. For example I do agree that we should monitor every step of a criminal. He or she violated the law so that surrenders every right they have. That means that the government has the right to place any rules upon

the person, which in this day in age, is electronic monitoring. I also agree that they should let a person live at home rather at a prison, if there help is needed to pay off bills, or if the family is in an economic struggle. I also agree with there is no more privacy issued to the criminal, privacy should be seen as a gift not as a right. At the point where a criminal breaks the law, he or she has forfeited certain rights, and consequently needs to be given certain rules in order to prevent a recurrence of the same mistake. However I do not agree to the fact that some parolees have to pay this off. They barely made enough money to survive in the first place, and this might contribute to being a reason as to why they got in trouble. I would suggest that those that can pay the services of electronic monitoring should pay it, and those who unfortunately do not make enough to feed their own families should have to be responsible of paying this off by another mean. For example, a great way of repayment for a parolee could possibly be performing acts of community service. This way the government will not pay for outside services, rather they can put parolees to work in return for a repayment of this expensive monitoring process. One of the big points made by John Howard (author) that I agreed with is the point of Cruel and Unusual Punishment. Some people say that wearing the ankle bracelet violates the cruel and unusual punishment standard. But is it not less humane to put someone in a little room, surrounded by walls with the only way to get light in or see someone else, is through bars. To have the person locked down, or not leave those little premises for 23 hours a day is not humane at all. The events that often happen in prison can also be extremely inhumane such isolation, and even the treatment that inmates impose upon each other.

Everything that has to do with prison is not civilized. By just wearing an ankle bracelet, which most of the time is covered by clothing, seems like the furthest thing from violating human dignity and life. Wearing a bracelet verses living in a prison cell, seems almost too simple and far from a punishment. The fact that now instead of checking in with a parole officer, you can be monitored with the touch of a button, makes this system almost too easy for both the convict and for the government as well. Overall, this article was extremely interesting and almost ironic at some points. The author put everything in perspective and brought up a lot of great points, in regards to what is legal verses what is illegal when monitoring a criminal. He also made me realize that with every advancement in technology comes certain disadvantages, in this case the cost. More importantly I was able to understand the governments' electronic monitoring process in further detail and appreciate the efforts that the government has made in making our society more productive.