

* Metaethics

1] Whether the argument is right or wrong.
→ require Normative ethics.

2] Ability to convert ethical conclusions to real life statements
→ require applied ethics.

a] Description of nature : Earth is flat (doesn't matter right or wrong it's descriptive)

b] ~~Moral~~ Not descriptive : Murder is awesome

Q Are the moral statement equivalent to describing the nature of reality?

Mostly thought : Moral statement are attempt to describe reality. (truth-apt having true false answer)
↓
(Cognitivist)

(Those who think a, b — similar)

* Cognitivism

3] Error theorist : Believe that there has an answer true/false
All have answer false

Moral Realist : Some moral statements are true/
some false
(can be objectively true)

Moral subjectivist : Morality doesn't exist in reality
(social) (subjectively true)

eg: Believing "Murder is bad" bcoz society believes

AVUOY Page No.: Date: M T W T F S S YOUVA

* Non-Cognitivism

- Not descriptive statements [order, will on nature]
(so no true false answers)

Emotivism: Morality is emotion.
(Believing 'murder is bad' as
~~murder~~ it's ill)

Prescriptivism: Not a description, but a prescription.
(Murder is bad not should be done)

Quasirealism: Though morality not real but people
decide it's real to live life.

- Realist would say There can be objective ways
to correctly use AI or not correctly use AI.

Error theorist would say all these discussion happens
is nonsense.

* Is-ought gap?

It's often easy to describe reality
eg: Earth is round, Earth is square,
Humans are 7ft tall.

But Humans ought to have justice
(difficult to question)

AI uses this much energy,
does this much

AI should be non-biased.

(description changed to
prescription)

① Where does the Reality "ought to" come from?

We should not have climate change?

Why not?

What is the problem with all of us dying.

* Ethics

1] Technology ethics much older than AI ethics.

2] Ethics boards

3] Lack of accountability actionability

4] Project Maven.

— Idea of Pentagon after 9/11.

— Pentagon said we want to know about everyone on this world.

— Entire biodata of any person on earth at any time

Google employee Mike saying they won't do it.

↳ Humans make AI, so humans can refuse them.

Regulations come from top, but the bottom are the ones who make AI so it's in their hands.

5] Lack of transparency

How ethics decided — very non transparent.

In Bureau of Indian Standards — decides the standard.
(People working in these bodies: neither elected nor selected)

They are invited. (same for all standard bodies)
formation of these bodies - often non transparent

* Issues with tech ethics

- 1] eg: Project Maven
Google employees refused but maybe other company
can agree.
So project problem is not solved.

Main problem: American government asking about
these projects.

Need to make standard that can work all across
government bodies.

2] Corporate logic.

3] Contradictions

- 4] Determinism & solution → thinking tech can solve social problem
↳ belief that
history is determined
by technology.

Technology entirely affecting the human evolution
(If so then why need of policies)

Determinism: eg: People thought think railway
& engine resulted in industrialisation
in reality converse.

5] Ethic washing.

* So, what is a mind?

1] Mind is not an organ.
Mind thing which makes consciousness.
Asleep - not conscious.

2] Chinese room.

Imagining a room without any doors, &
Just a window. A sheet can be passed.
Magical dictionary in room, - all Chinese words
with English translation.
So person inside translated Chinese → English
without getting the meaning involved.

Person outside thinks person inside knows Chinese.

AI can just play with symbols, nothing else.
Computers, AI does symbol flipping.
Does not have its own intelligence.

⇒ So human mind is not a computer.
(Computers have millions of windows doing tasks)

So says hard AI is not possible.

↳ computers to have a sense of 'I'
purely human like
(I exist)

3] Theories of mind :-

Dualism:

Mind, body separate
Mind & body is separate from matter.
Comparing mind with soul

Monism

Not separate

as using mind to think

It's impossible to think about matter. Can just think about ideas → idealism
(Hegel, Hume)

Think from mind to think outside mind
Reality outside mind can → Materialism
be measured. happen. (Karl Marx, scientist)

4] Some philosophy of mind problems

- If body, mind separate then how can there be related & dependent.

If not separated → then how related.

- If mind is subject to laws of physics (as matter "), mind related to matter so free will?

- Intentionality:

5] Materialism

- a) Mind expressed itself through behaviourism
(not correct : most of the time not happening like that)

electroshock therapy, drilling hole in mind

- b) something happening in neurons whenever an activity happens.

Thoughts of brain are connected (but don't know how)

- c) Qualia: internal subjective experience
(everyone experience different qualia)

6] What is fairness, Accountability & transparency

- a) Bias on certain protected feature

- People trying to debias at the level of data.
Statistical sampling: sampling the data correctly
(should represent entire data)

- Bias at model level.
(should not draw conclusions based on protected features (race, genders))

- Output level.

b) Transparency - explainability.

mostly the focus on neural networks.

Trying to figure out what layer what is happening.

explanation to engineers, policy maker, end users
different (not to conflate between procedure,
technical explainability)

Issues with FAT

1) Can explain how the system works
(can't explain the social-political-economic nature)

2) ~~the~~ McNamara fallacy -
Vietnam war

Robert McNamara philosophy -

Anything that can't be measured is ^{not} knowledge.
Not a knowledge - should be ignored.

Why?

Qualitative knowledge also knowledge same as
quantitative knowledge

It's trying to put a number on knowledge
How much bias. Many things not problem
which not measured

Debiasing numbering - also a problem.

FAT

3] Epistemic contention: (Does not take into account the source of knowledge)

(Sources different)

(Engineers & lawyer different world views)
Who should be heard?
→ eg for Facial Recognition.

4] Political economic contention

FAT doesn't take into account ↑.