

MITOCW | Ethics_of_AI_Bias_clip3

We just showed that because of the intrinsic incompleteness of models eliminating bias in all dimensions is mathematically impossible.

We could no doubt decrease bias among some groups to a certain degree, with an acceptably small but still significant margin of error.

Even if we got rid of bias in some predefined dimensions, we would still have it in other dimensions.

But that's precisely it.

We want equality in at least some dimensions, the important ones.

That is good.

How do you choose which dimensions are important?

Alvis.

One important dimension is wealth.

Good.

So even you five, the top engineering students in your class at the top engineering school, should get paid just as much as someone like Dean, the paper collector.

Well, he is a very nice fellow, if a bit strange.

But no, we think we should be rewarded for the contributions that we make to society.

But wealth should be distributed more equally.

That's right.

But how do you decide how equal it should be? Perhaps the problem is once again that mathematics in its homogenization of kinds is not the right way to address the problem.

Let me ask you this-- is it really equality that you want, or is it justice?

Justice.

Yeah.

I'll go with justice.

Great that you two agree on something.

Glenda.

They should go hand in hand, justice and equality.

Yeah.

Isn't equality justice?

I think we need to add another consideration, since we are beginning to delve into the complex human questions underlying our definition and perception of bias.

So let me ask you this.

Which is most important-- equality, justice, or happiness?

Sophie.

I would say happiness.

Even if someone has more than you do, and even if they don't deserve it, it doesn't matter to you as long as you are happy.

Think of all the people born into rich families.

They're typically not happy since they don't need to have a goal, and therefore they don't have one.

I would still have a goal if I were born into a rich family.

Why do they need a goal if they're having such a good time?

Because people need to have a purpose to be happy.

And how can people be happy if they're not treated fairly?

So we have equality, justice, and happiness, but it is unclear which is most important.

Glenda.

Can't they be of equal importance?

Actually, no.

They are certainly interrelated.

But since they are at least somewhat different and since, as we saw, they can conflict, one of them has to be most important, has to take precedence over the other.

I think that justice is more important than equality.

After all, we don't want everyone to be the exact same, but still justice and equality are related.

People can be unequal because they're treated unfairly.

They can also be unequal due to luck, good or bad.

I don't think that happiness can be the standard.

We need equality, and that's why mathematics is still so important, because we can employ it rigorously to make everyone equal.

But if everyone is the same, wouldn't the world be drab?

I mean, what if all of us were the same?

We wouldn't even be able to have this dialogue, as we'd all be making the same point.

There would be nothing interesting, as everyone is reduced to a forced homogeneity.

Besides, how do you make everyone equal without violating their rights?

We're going to have to violate some rights to make people at least more equal.

But then maybe I guess that's not justice.

Yeah.

Isn't it the essence of tyranny when rights are violated in the name of justice?

Yes.

We have strong reasons not to want that.

We want equality, but we certainly don't want to violate people's rights to get it.

But what do we do?

Here we are at an impasse again.

How do we understand this conflict between equality and rights?

By the way, professor, what about that other way that you promised?