

Artificial Intelligence, Algorithms, and Human Rights

Class MW 1:30-2:50pm
Cochrane-Woods Art Ctr 153

Instructor:

Austin Clyde

aclyde@uchicago.edu

Office Hours: In Pozen Center room 200, W 11am-12pm, F 2:30-3:30pm, and by appointment

Course Description

Algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) are a new source of global power, extending into nearly every aspect of life. The High Commissioner for Human Rights recently called for states to place moratoriums on AI until it is compliant with human rights. This course will take the first steps toward developing a human rights-based approach for analyzing algorithms and AI. What makes an algorithm discriminatory, and is the algorithm the right place to look? Is algorithmic bias avoidable? Does human review of algorithms address the issue of power? Do predictive models violate privacy even if they do not use or disclose someone's specific data? When does nudging violate political or epistemic rights? How do algorithms impact democracy? We will closely read Shoshana Zuboff's *Surveillance Capitalism* on tour through the sociotechnical world of AI, alongside scholarship in law, philosophy, and computer science to breathe a human rights approach to algorithmic life. We will explore analytic toolkits from science and technology studies (STS), democratic theory, and the philosophy of technology. Course will be run mainly as a discussion on readings with a final project. No prior background in artificial intelligence, algorithms, or computer science is needed, although some familiarity with human-rights philosophy or practice may be helpful.

Learning goals for this class are to

1. Analyze technology through the structure of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law,
2. Develop an analytic and interpretive lens for technology as a research object,
3. Exercise interdisciplinary translation among law, computer science, human rights, and philosophy, and
4. Gain an introductory understanding of science and technology studies (STS) and the tradition of constructivism.



Kurt Schmidt
Der Mann am Schaltbrett, 1924/1972
Kunstsammlung Gera

Assignments and Grading

This course will mainly be lecture-driven but many classes will involve discussion components.

Participation (20%) – Attend class, read the assigned texts, ask questions in class or in-office hours – play a role in fostering an inclusive and collegiate environment in our classroom. Human rights issues address sensitive issues and require certain respect, dignity, and discretion to be exercised in class. Furthermore, as this is a class on technology ethics, please do not be disrespectful to the environment by engaging in attention-grabbing internet activities such as texting, checking social media, reading irrelevant articles, etc. As we will discuss in this class, this is of course not easy—entire divisions of companies and academic departments are spent on studying on to precisely steal your attention away from the present.

Discussion posts (20%) – Students are required to post at least three articles to the Slack with a paragraph or two describing why this is interesting to the class and how the article might benefit from a human rights-based approach. You are also required to respond to at least three students posts (a

few sentences or two). Join in the discussion and ask questions (it's part of your grade!). AI is luckily in the news quite often, so articles should be from 2020 onwards (ideally, not a strict cutoff). Please sign up for slack using this link and your UChicago email address: <https://bit.ly/3B80xlZ>.

Project Proposal (20%) – The project details are below, and I will share more details in class about what is expected for the proposal. For planning purposes, this will be roughly 2-3 pages per person.

Final project (40%) – **PLEASE SEE CANVAS FILE ON THE MAIN PAGE. THIS IS OUTDATED.** The final project can be done in groups up to size three and project requirements scale linearly with group membership (i.e., a project with three members should (roughly) appear to be 2-3 times the scope and scale of the requirements for one person). The requirements for a single person are listed below, and I strongly recommend discussing your project with me.

Imagine you just scored a new internship at the human rights council (HRC) (woo!). The HRC hired you based on your expertise in analyzing emerging technologies' social, political, moral, and legal considerations. It just so happens that the HRC is beginning a special procedure to study the human rights impact of technology X. Your job is to research and report back to the HRC on the issue thematized around a certain right (for instance, the use of search engines and self-determination, or automated data collection and privacy). Your report must be accessible to the HRC and the public, so the report is requested to not be overly technical regarding the technology. Therefore, you must carefully consider balancing interpretative flexibility regarding the scope of certain rights (to entice various delegates into your framework) with argumentative force of change (say broadly interpreting the right of self-determination as calling on democracy).

Your technology X should be approved by the instructor before you begin work. Some ideas to get you thinking: search engines, augmented reality devices, virtual reality devices, cryptocurrencies, algorithmic systems for eviction processing, robo lawyers, recommendation algorithms (for search, shopping, news, social media amplification), home security cameras, neighborhood watch apps (Citizen, Amazon Neighborhood), Chicago police algorithms, AI based science... But please bring some cool new ideas you have to the table! If you're excited about researching a technology, let me know!

There is no formal word count requirement; however, your main content should be no fewer than 2000 words (not including references). This means that a group of three, for instance, should have no less than 6000 words for its main content. I will circulate examples in class of reports along with a more formal requirement list during the first few weeks of the quarter but here are a few examples, which are much longer and more extensive than needed for this course, to treat as models: [AccessNow](#), [Berkman Klein Center](#), [Privacy International](#).

This is a challenging project with large ambitions, and the grading for this project reflects its difficulty. In practice, there are two portions of the report which you can break down into less daunting components: one explaining the technology through the analytic frameworks we discuss in class (where your framing of the issue, scope, actors, and scale matter) and interpreting and applying a human right (where your interpretative framework and arguments matter).

Required Books

All readings will be provided online in PDF form. If you like reading from books these are the ones I'd recommend (i.e. you might end up wanting to read the whole thing):

- S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019)

Optional books (we're only reading portions, but I recommend looking through the whole book if the topic is of interest to you):

- S. Jasanoff, *The Ethics of Invention: Technology and the Human Future* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2016).
- V. Eurbanks, *Automating Inequality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018).

Optional videos (somewhat in order of importance if you want to watch some):

- The Social Dilemma (Netflix)
- ["Machine Learning & Artificial Intelligence: Crash Course Computer Science #34"](#)
- [In the Age of AI](#) (PBS Frontline, November 5th 2019)
- Coded Bias (Netflix)

Be sure to always check the page numbers listed (often the reading is an excerpt from the whole chapter). There are also notes on what is important to focus on. Optional reading is sincerely optional. Most of the reading will most certainly be outside your disciplinary comfort zone. We are reading legal scholars, international legal texts, political philosophy, human rights, sociology, science and technology studies, new articles, and computer science articles...

Schedule (Subject to change: check the Canvas modules page for the readings to be sure): Each class has listed a title, followed by a set of discussion questions. These questions are not meant to be answerable by the text directly, but rather should be in the back of your mind as you read. These are difficult and complex questions.

The required reading is listed below. All readings will be posted in the module section of Canvas under the class number. The readings posted will often include many pages that are not required to be read. The required pages are listed at the end of each text's citation. **All reading is required unless its under optional.** Optional reading I recommend looking at but if you are short on time you should look at the topics that seem most interesting to you.

Introduction to Human Rights

Class 1: Introduction to Human Rights

Course introduction and syllabus. We will briefly discuss what are human rights? What is the international bill of rights (UDHR, ICCPR, ICESCR)? Who can claim human rights and who has the corresponding duty of rights? What are the big questions when thinking about a right?

The International Bill of Human Rights: Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) (through page 34 [here](#)). Skim very quickly to get an idea of the structure and general rights if you've never looked through this before.

Preamble UNCESCO Draft [text](#) of the Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (SHS/IGM-AIETHICS/2021/JUN/3 Rev.2), pp.1-4.

[Proposal](#) for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL LAYING DOWN HARMONISED RULES ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACT) AND AMENDING CERTAIN UNION LEGISLATIVE ACTS (COM/2021/206 final). *Section 3.5 ("Fundamental rights")*.

J. Niklas, "Human Rights-Based Approach to AI and Algorithms," in *The Cambridge Handbook of The Law of Algorithms* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. 517-542.

Optional:

- if human rights are new to you: C. Beitz, *The Idea of Human Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2009), Ch. 2 ("The Practice"), pp. 13-47.

Introduction to Science and Technology Studies

Class 2: Social Constructivism

What is science and technology studies (STS)? What is the relationship between facts and the public? What are the responsibilities and risks of science and technology? What does it mean to say facts are

made? How should we problematize technical facts? Can technology be self-governing? How does our characterization of technology matter to our characterizations of ourselves as autonomous agents and political actors? What is enrollment?

- S. Jasanoff, *The Ethics of Invention: Technology and the Human Future* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2016), Ch. 1 (“The Power of Technology”), pp. 1-30.
- L. Winner, “Upon Opening the Black Box and Finding It Empty: Social Constructivism and the Philosophy of Technology,” *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 18 (1993), pp. 362-378.
- M. Callon, “Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St. Brieuc Bay,” in J. Law, ed., *Power, Action, and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986), pp. 196-224. Give special attention to figure 5.

Class 3: What is an Algorithm?

How are algorithms constructed? Who picks which algorithm to use over another? What are features? What is machine learning? Where are choices dictated? How does our characterization of science matter to our characterizations of ourselves as autonomous agents and political actors? Are algorithms political?

- B. Mittelstadt, et al. “The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate.” *Big Data & Society* 3.2 (2016).
- H. Collins, “In a Constitutional Moment: Science and Social Order at the Millennium” in Bijker, Wiebe E., Hughes, Thomas P. and Pinch, Trevor eds. *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*, MIT Press, pp. 321-340.
- S. Jasanoff, *The Ethics of Invention: Technology and the Human Future* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2016), Ch. 2 (“Risks and Responsibilities”), pp. 31-58.

[Facebook's Internal Chat Boards Show Politics Often at Center of Decision Making](#)

3.1 Optional Movie/Discussion (sometime this week when it is best for students):

“Coding” from “Explained” Season 2

Class 4: Algorithms and Society

What might “code is constitutional” mean? What is the horizon that code produces and who creates it (if anyone)? What is legibility? How do algorithms produce legible subjects? Are there differences between a state or corporate datafication campaign? How do algorithms affect the way in which we live in the world?

- V. Eurbanks, *Automating Inequality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018), Introduction (“Red Flags”), pp. 1-14.
- S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019), Ch. 3 (“The Discovery of Behavior Surplus”), pp. 63-97.
- D. Beer, “The social power of algorithms,” *Information, Communication & Society* (20) 1 (2017), pp. 1-13.
- J. Scott, *Seeing Like a State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), Ch. 3 (“Authoritarian High Modernism”), pp. 87-102.

Optional:

- [Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for Teen Girls](#)

Discrimination, Racism, and Structural Violence

Class 5: Predictive Policing

What is predictive policing? What is reinforcing or reinscribing bias? Is it the software, the people, or maybe even the context? When does the project go wrong (if you think it does)? Is it at the very conception of software to predict crime? Is it the prediction itself that is an issue? Might there be something more insidious to prediction than just mathematical manipulation of demographic information? What human rights are relevant to this discussion?

S. Brayne, *Predict and Surveil: Data, Discretion, and the Future of Policing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), Ch. 3, 4, and 6 (“Dagnet Surveillance”, “Directed Surveillance”, and “Coding Inequality”).

K. Robertson, C. Khoo, and Y. Song, “To Surveil and Predict: A Human Rights Analysis of Algorithmic Policing in Canada” (September 2020), Citizen Lab and International Human Rights Program, University of Toronto. Pp. 1-7, 15-25, 57-65, 69-72, 101-117, 120-132. *Skim*.

Optional (the bottom four are videos, PLEASE WATCH ONE!):

- [U.N. Panel: Technology in Policing Can Reinforce Racial Bias | NYT](#)
- [The data revolution: privacy, politics and predictive policing | The Economist](#)
- [How predictive policing software works?](#)
- [Science Behind the News: Predictive Policing | NBC News](#)
- [How cops are using algorithms to predict crimes | WIRED](#)

Class 6: Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

What does it mean to say that algorithms discriminate? Is bias innate to algorithms? Is algorithmic discrimination a necessary condition of algorithms? To the previous question, how might you respond regarding the necessary conditions for an algorithm to be in the world? How is algorithmic discrimination identified? How are implicit biases transformed by algorithms? Do these biases only come from people and their data? How does the scale and scope of algorithms relate to their harms? Is it the context or the algorithm that is discriminatory?

O. Lynskey, “The Power of Providence” in *Digital Dominance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 176-201.

Rubel, A., Castro, C., & Pham, A. (2019). Agency laundering and information technologies. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 22(4). Pages 1017-1041.

D. Danks and A. J. London, “Algorithmic Bias in Autonomous Systems” in IJCAI 2017.

[We Teach A.I. Systems Everything, Including Our Biases](#)
[An Algorithm that Grants Freedom, or Takes It Away | NYT](#)

Optional:

- *Great time to watch Coded Bias (Netflix)*.
- Bowker and Star, “The Case of Race Classification and Reclassification under Apartheid” in *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 199), pp. 195-225.
- S. Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* (New York: New York University Press, 2018), pp. 15-46.

Class 7: Can Algorithms be Agnostic?

Can algorithms be agnostic? Can any procedure really be agnostic? Agnostic from where and to what and who decides? What might classification or datafication already presuppose? What stance has European law taken (Lynskey)?

K. Crawford, “Can an Algorithm Be Agnostic? Ten Scenes from Life in Calculated Publics” in *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 41, no. 1 (January 2016): 77–92.

V. Eurbanks, *Automating Inequality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018), Chapter 3 (“High-tech homelessness in the city of angel”), pp. 84-126.

Dastin, Jeffrey. “Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women.” *Ethics of Data and Analytics*. Auerbach Publications. Pages 2018. 296-299.

[Apple Card Investigated After Gender Discrimination Complaints](#)

Optional:

Kate Crawford NeurIPS [Keynote](#): “The Trouble with Bias”

S. Epstein, *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), Ch. 11 (“Sex Differences and the New Politics of Women's Health”), pp. 233-257.

Class 8: Rights, Protections, and Remedies (10/24)

How do we protect against (seemingly) unavoidable algorithmic discrimination? If algorithms are discriminatory, how can we ensure protection? What is the human-in-the-loop idea and why might it look like a rights first approach? Does it protect rights? What is algorithmic accountability? Who should hold algorithms accountable? Who decides on what fair (or agnostic) algorithms are? Is this a technological problem?

Enarsson, Therese, Lena Enqvist, and Markus Naarttijärvi. "Approaching the Human in the Loop – Legal Perspectives on Hybrid Human/Algorithmic Decision-Making in Three Contexts." *Information & Communications Technology Law*, July 27, 2021, 1–31.

R. Binns, "Algorithmic accountability and public reason." *Philosophy & technology* 31, no. 4 (2018): pp. 543-556.

Jones, M. L. (2017). The right to a human in the loop: Political constructions of computer automation and personhood. *Social Studies of Science*, 47(2), 216–239.

Optional:

- T. Gillespie, "Content moderation, AI, and the question of scale," in *Big Data and Society*.
- A. Clyde, "[Human-in-the-Loop Systems Are No Panacea for AI Accountability](#)," Tech Policy Press.
- V. Eurbanks, *Automating Inequality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018), Chapter 4 ("The Allegheny Algorithm"), pp. 127-173.
- Zimmermann, Di Rosa, and Kim. "[Technology Can't Fix Algorithmic Injustice](#)."
- T. Li, "Algorithmic Destruction" forthcoming in SMU law review. Pp. 1-3, 10-24

Class 9: Is there a right to a human decision or review? (10/26)

Think through these cases with respect to how we've discussed human rights so far! These are law articles dealing with different legal traditions and regional systems. What is a human decision in this context (think carefully about the when, where, and with what aspects of this question)? What is the right to a human decision responding to? Is deference to a human sufficient to remedy harms these rights are addressing? How do contestation and human review differ? In what sense are these rights "human rights" and why might it be a bad idea to consider them as such? How do states differ on their approach? Why might the Brazilian jurisprudence differ on responsibilities of the state (Huq, Mattiuzzo)?

Guest Lecture: Sushma Raman

Kaminski, M. E., & Urban Jennifer M. M. (2021). The Right to Contest AI. *Columbia Law Review*, 121(7), 1957-2003.

Huq, A. Z. (2020). Right to Human Decision. *Virginia Law Review*, 106(3), 611-688. 611-620, 628-629, 634-685

M. Mattiuzzo, M. (2021). "Let the Algorithm Decide: Is Human Dignity at Stake?" *Brazilian Journal of Public Policy*, 11(1), 343-370.

*Tip: law review footnotes are safe to be avoided for the context of this course **on your first read**, unless you are writing about that specific article and then you **should** read them! It looks like a lot of reading, but just wait until you see how many words end up per page because of the footnotes...*

Class 10: Dignity and Automated Decision Making (10/31)

Is human dignity judiciable? Is it an essentially contested concept or does this not matter? How does McCrudden's approach to dignity extend to algorithmic decision making? Is social scoring a violation of egalitarian values? What might a human rights defender look for in a civil scoring algorithm to determine if the state is violating any ICCPR or ICESCR rights? What would contesting a score look like before digital scoring systems? Is there due process to the kinds of injustices that scoring might entail?

C. McCrudden, "Human Dignity and Judicial Interpretation of Human Rights," *European Journal of International Law*, Volume 19, Issue 4, September 2008, Pages 655–663, 680-724.

A. Dao, "Human Dignity, the Right to be Heard, and Algorithmic Judges," *British Yearbook of International Law*, 2020, pp. 22-38

S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019), Ch. 17 (“The Right to Sanctuary”), pp. 475-492.

Optional:

- [China - Surveillance state or way of the future? | DW Documentary](#)
- V. Eurbanks, *Automating Inequality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018), Chapter 5 (“The Digital Poorhouse”, pp. 174-217.
- [Inside China's vast new experiment in social ranking | Wired](#)

Privacy

Class 11: What is Privacy? (11/2)

Is privacy a freedom? Immunity? What responsibilities are there to respect, protect, and fulfill? Why might privacy matter? Is privacy possible? What is contextual privacy?

Helen Nissenbaum, Symposium, Privacy as Contextual Integrity, 79 Wash. L. Rev. 119 (2004), pp. 136 – 146.

[A/HRC/43/52](#), “Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy”, pp. 1-5, 12-16, 19-23.

Paras. 243,

LA Bygrave, “Data protection pursuant to the right to privacy in human rights treaties,” in *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, Volume 6, Issue 3, pp. 247–284.

H. Shue, *Basic Rights* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), Ch. 2 (“Correlative Duties”), pp. 35-64

Optional:

- L. Francis and J. Francis, *Privacy: What Everyone Needs to Know* (New York: Oxford University Press 2017), Ch. 1 & 2 (“Conceptualizing Privacy” & “Protecting Personal Information”), pp. 1-40.

Class 12: Privacy and Automation (11/7)

What might the right to privacy correlate with? Do other human rights protections entail privacy? Look at ICESCR and discuss a few rights that might be necessitate or instrumentally benefit from the right to privacy. What is a positive conception of privacy?

Guest lecture: Prof. Raul Castro

S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019), Ch. 5, 8 & 9 (“The elaboration of Surveillance Capitalism” , “Rendition: From Experience to Data” & “Rendition from the Depths”), pp. 128-174, 232-291.

Class 14: Sanctuary (11/9)

What is the right to sanctuary? Is there a correlative right in UDHR? What are the many senses of privacy we have dealt with? What does the Goodwin case imply about a more expansive view of the right to privacy? Is this how Cohen sees it?

J. Cohen, “What is Privacy For,” Harv. L. Rev. 126 (2012), pp. 1904-1933.

Christine Goodwin v. the United Kingdom, European Court of Human Rights: [Legal Summary](#), [case details](#) (Paras. 12-19, 90-91).

Alicia Solow-Niederman, *Information Privacy and the Inference Economy*, 117 Nw. U. L. Rev. 357 (2022).

Self-Determination

Class 15: Human Rights, Democracy, and the Rule of Law (11/14)

What is the relationship between human rights, democracy, and the rule of law? If one imagines the most ideal democracy where welfare is flourishing, what might be wrong if there are no connotational rights? Is democracy really necessary if a state is rights protecting and lawful? And, more pressing for domestic matters, can you begin to speculate how the rule of law might be challenged by algorithmic technology?

J. Habermas, "On the Internal Relationship between the Rule of Law and Democracy," *European Journal of Philosophy* (3) 1, pp. 12-20.

J. Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998), Ch. 3 Excerpts ("Reconstructive Approach to Law I: The System of Rights"), pp. 82-84, 104-131

I. Kreide, "Human Rights and Human Rights," in *The Habermas Handbook* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018), pp. 558-561.

U.N. Human Rights Council (A/HRC/28/14), Human rights, democracy and the rule of law: resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council on 9 April 2015. Skim the preamble.

Optional if you're interested in the context:

- [How TikTok Reads your Mind | NYT](#)

Class 16: Non-epistemic Aspects of Democracy (11/16)

Is democracy only about equality? What is the epistemic and socially integrative dimensions of democracy? What is political alienation and how does it relate to democracy? How might nudge theory alienate publics? Is nudge theory alienating to begin with? Does AI nudge? How might political alienation be a human rights issue (look at ICCPR)? Do Introna and Nussenbaum point to socially integrative or epistemic issues?

C. Lafont, *Democracy without Shortcuts: A Participatory Conception of Deliberative Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), Ch. 1 ("The Democratic Ideal of Self-Government"), pp. 17-33.

R. Thaler and C. Sunstein, *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), Introduction, pp. 1-14.

L. Introna, H. Nissenbaum. "Shaping the Web: Why the Politics of Search Engines Matters" in *The Information Society* 16, no. 3 (July 2000), pp. 169–85.

Class 17: Algorithmic Justice (11/28)

Why is code the way it is? If algorithms nudge, is there a flip side? Does public reason benefit from choice architectures that are explicit? What power does anyone have over these choices? How might systematic and plural forms of injustice differ both in their impacts and solutions? How can we design a world that we want to live in? Is a right to a future a right to democracy? And is a right to self-governance violated by manipulative algorithms which are not public?

L. Lessig, *Code* (Version 2.0, New York: Basic Book, 2006), Ch. 3 ("Is-Isms: Is the Way It Is the Way It Must Be?"), pp. 31-37.

S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019), Ch. 10 & 11 ("Make Them Dance" & "Right to the Future Tense"), pp 292 -347.

U.N. OHCHR General Comment No. 25: The right to participate in public affairs, voting rights and the right of equal access to public service (Art. 25): 12/07/96. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.7, General Comment No. 25.

[Biased Algorithms Are Easier to Fix Than Biased People | NYT](#)

[Algorithms Learn Our Workplace Biases. Can They Help Us Unlearn Them? | NYT](#)

Epistemic Rights

Class 18: Epistemic Fourth Generation Rights (11/30)

What is the idea of epistemic fourth generation rights according to Risse? What is epistemic inequality? Take a broad perspective on the course, considering violations of egalitarianism, privacy, and self-determination posed by algorithms at scale – answer the following question: is AI a human rights issue or is something else? Is the very nature of the human rights capable of addressing AI harms?

M. Risse, "The Fourth Generation of Human Rights: Epistemic Rights in Digital Lifeworlds," *Moral Philosophy and Politics* (8)2 (2020), pp. 351-378.

Zuboff, *Caveat Usor: Surveillance Capitalism as Epistemic Inequality*.

S. Jasanoff and H. Simmet. "No Funeral Bells: Public Reason in a 'Post-Truth' Age." *Social Studies of Science* 47, no. 5 (October 2017): 751–70.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/01/technology/big-tech-amplification.html>

