Index

adaptive preferences, 22	deliberative challenges, 100, 109–111, 172, 181, 185
agency, 76, 99	social challenges, 100, 111–112, 172, 181, 185
cognitive agency, 77–78, 81–82, 93, 94–95, 99, 184	ChoicePoint, 79, 80, 88
practical agency, 76–81, 92–93, 94, 99, 184	Christman, John, 27–29, 30–31, 37–38, 41, 103,
agency laundering, 137, 185 algorithms, 8–9	166–167, 172, 180 Click Cop. 116
Angwin, Julia, 7	COMPAS 4 6 3 42 45 60 65 65 68 03 02 04
Arroyo, Carmen,54.1–,73–76, 81–82, 87, 88–89, 115	COMPAS, 4, 6, 11, 13, 45, 60–65, 67, 68, 91–93, 94, 115, 116, 156, 157, 182, 183, 186, 188
artificial intelligence, 10	EVEN COMPAS, 64–65
automated decision systems, 8–9	SIMPLE COMPAS, 62–65
autonomy, 8, 11, 14–16, 99	CoreLogic, 72–73, 82
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	CrimSafe, 72–73, 116
authenticity, 28–31, 37–38, 42, 45, 70, 123, 172 autonomy as a capacity, 24, 38, 102	Gillisale, /2-/3, 110
autonomy as a condition, 25, 38, 102	democracy, 11
autonomy as a right, 26, 39	democratic agency, 85
autonomy as an ideal, 25–26, 39, 50, 182	digital platforms, 12
autonomy of persons, 23	4.5.4.1 p.4.1.1.1.1.5, 12
competence, 28–31, 40, 42, 45, 70, 123, 166, 172	echo chambers, 120
feminist critiques of autonomy, 39–41	epistemic bubbles, 120
global vs. local autonomy, 23–24, 79–80	EVAAS, 5–6, 45, 59–60, 93–95, 115, 116, 183, 186
personal autonomy, 26, 29–34, 38, 70–71	
procedural autonomy, 35, 51	Facebook, 12, 116, 121–122, 132, 152, 160, 179
procedural independence, 37, 39, 41, 45, 70-71,	Fair Credit Reporting Act, 74, 75
123, 127	fairness, 65–68
psychological autonomy, 26, 27-29, 38, 51,	anti-classification, 67
70–71, 76, 166	calibration, 62, 63, 67
relational autonomy, 29–39, 182	classification parity, 62, 67
substantive independence, 32-33, 38, 39, 41, 45,	formal fairness, 66
70–71, 123, 127, 172	substantive fairness, 66–68
	Feinberg, Joel, 24, 25, 26, 38, 50, 182
Big Data, 9, 109	freedom, 11, 42
Braeuner, Jennifer, 5, 58, 115	ecological freedom, 38, 113, 185
Brainly, 110–111	negative freedom, 33, 100–104, 185
	positive freedom, 33, 104, 185
Cambridge Analytica, 16, 111, 116, 164–165, 173, 176–182, 183	republican freedom, 33, 101–102, 103–104, 185
challenges to freedom, 186	General Data Protection Regulation, 86, 90-91, 95
affective challenges, 100, 109, 172, 181, 185	Golden Rule, 49–50, 53

Index 205

Hieronymi, Pamela, 77 Principle of Informed Practical Agency, 79 Houston Fed of Teachers v. Houston Ind Sch Dist, ProPublica, 60, 61-64, 145 5-6, 7, 45, 59-60, 93-95, 161 PublicData.com, 74 IMPACT, 45-47, 53, 54-56 Rawls, John, 51, 52, 167-168, 169 Raz, Joseph, 116, 168-169 incels, 128-132 Instagram, 179 reactive attitudes, 52 Internet Research Agency, 16, 178-182, 183, 184 Reasonable Endorsement Test, 52-53, 71, 99, 168, 185 relative burden, 56-57, 59-60, 61-65, 184 Kant, Immanuel, 25, 47, 48, 50 the Categorical Imperative, 48 reliability, 54, 184 Korsgaard, Christine, 48 responsibility, 138-141, 184 Kumar, Rahul, 51-52 stakes, 55, 184 Reddit, 128-129, 133-134 legitimacy, 42, 185 responsibility, 141 access constraint, 168, 173, 176 capacity responsibility, 139, 148, 162 descriptive criteria, 165-166 causal responsibility, 139, 146 disjunctive conception, 169-171 role responsibility, 139, 148 responsibility gap, 138, 156-158 epistemic criteria, 168-169 will-based conceptions, 169 right of access, 86-87 right to explanation, 86, 87-90 legitimation, 85, 173-176, 185 Loomis, Eric, 3-4, 7, 13, 14, 91 counterfactual explanations, 89 loot boxes, 113-114, 116 ex ante explanations, 87-88 ex post explanations, 87-88 machine learning, 9-10 right to object, 90-91 unsupervised learning, 10 specific decisions, 87 specific explanations, 88-89 manipulation, 116-117 Mill, John Stuart, 48 system-level explanations, 87 moral theories right to object, 86 consequentialist moral theories, 39 right to rectification, 86-87 deontological moral theories, 39 virtue-based moral theories, 39 Scanlon, Tim, 51, 52 stop-and-frisk, 33-34 Strong Principle of Informational Control, 81 new media, 119-122 Northpointe, Inc., 3, 4, 60, 61, 62 Strong Principle of Informed Cognitive Agency, 81 Strong Principle of Informed Practical Agency, 79 O'Neil, Cathy, 7, 12 Sweeney, Latanya, 84-85 Oshana, Marina, 26, 27, 29-33, 38, 41, 42, 140-141, 167, 172 Taylor, Catherine, 72, 73-76, 78-81, 88, 115 TVAAS, 5, 6, 58-59, 183, 186 Twitter, 121, 179 Parfit, Derek, 49, 51, 53 the Consent Principle, 49 paternalism, 117, 122-126 Uber, 107-109, 119, 149-152, 160-161 epistemic paternalism, 42, 121-122, 126-128, 185, 186 vaccine hesitancy, 121, 123-124 perfectionism, 28 VAMs, 4, 55, 182–183, 188 weak perfectionism, 30 Peter, Fabienne, 168-171 Wagner, Teresa, 5, 58, 115 Pettit, Philip, 33, 42, 169 Wagner v. Haslam, 4-5, 7, 11, 13, 45, 58-59, 93-95 predictive analytics, 9 Wisconsin v. Loomis, 3-4, 7, 11, 13, 45, 60-65, PredPol, 163-165, 180, 183, 186 91-93, 115, 154-156, 161, 182, 188 Principle of Informational Control, 80-81 Principle of Informed Cognitive Agency, 81 YouTube, 111-112, 114, 116, 121, 179