Reading Response March18

Kritika Chugh
SUID: 882046659

kchugh@syr.edu

We cannot be 100 percent fair with risk scoring and prediction algorithms. The 2 papers discussed in depth with numerous examples to show that it is impossible to check all the boxes of fairness and be completely done with. In-fact there will always be tradeoffs, and those tradeoffs could be so detrimental to society if brought to the criminal prediction system. I completely support the argument that there should be randomness in the criminal justice system rather than using the actuarial math to show if some one is going to be an offender again. Why you might ask? Well, because they administer a criminal justice outcome based on a group trait and past-present and future criminal behavior. What surprises is that these methods use criminality of groups or more simply group-traits to decide the outcome. Think about it, how can you generalize the cases that are exceptional within this generalization and there fore not fare to them. Racial generalization is just a very common example within that. There might me other naïve examples such as snot showing a jersey uniform ad to a woman because of a popular notion that women are not that interested in football, or may be predicting a disease in one gender more than the other. Random sapling does seem right in few of these cases and should be incorporated whenever necessary. Future danger should not be solely decided by the prediction algorithm because it is mathematically impossible to be fair across all the constraints and there will always be tradeoffs and do not forget this is people's life we are talking about here. And even though we still decide to use these algorithms, then to the very least we could be very transparent about what tradeoffs were appointed. That could be the very start of even talking about fairness.