Reading Response April 25

Kritika Chugh
SUID: 882046659

kchugh@syr.edu

The paper points to look at a system that can become unfair and can cause manipulative behaviors and therefore can cause discriminate and harm. This paper points to the fact that agency and autonomy is important when it comes to discussing the legality and moral sides of an algorithmic system. Many of these systems are difficult to understand due to their mathematical models and thus make people more trustable towards them and reluctance to criticize them. Even though they want to criticize or in any way want more information about them they will be deemed as being nosy as these systems are protected under the intellectual property rights. This argument can be supported by the example from the paper – When Loomis wanted to appeal for COMPASS and even thought of gaining the public support, his agency in action was facing a setback due to his limited understanding of the software algorithm, the use of algorithm was fair or not in his case, and even the information that was fed into the algorithm was right or not. There was not much he knew to make his case stronger to challenge. I do agree with Loomis argument of being treated as an individual while deciding for his sentence rather than being treated because of what algorithm learnt from the group of other participants. Although courts recognized the right to be individually treated in the court, they still went on an used it on the grounds that it is still a human deciding in conjunction with the algorithmic inputs and are reluctant to overturn the conclusions of the algorithmic systems. But I feel such kind of hybrid decision opens up a problem – an accountability gap (meaning what part of the decision making came from the algorithm and what part came from the actual human understanding of the situation. Is the person using the algorithm (a judge) is self-governing anymore? If a device or an algorithm constantly steps into your decision making it has more chances of compromising, you as an agent. What if a judge feels that the algorithm is doing much better, will he listen to his own judgement or not? Will such cases fall into the category of "right to be individually governed" or not? I also think that for regular people we might not be able to manipulate these algorithms, but people who have the means to understand and are also subject to decision making by these algorithms, they may have an upper hand at citing and defend their case. There is definitely need to update a basic human rights.