## **Abandoning Criminal Risk & Recidivism**

**On Dangerous Goals in ML Scoring-Decision Systems** 

Benjamin Laufer NeurIPS 2020 Resistance AI

Formulations of Risk	Critique	Alternative
<ol> <li>Risk as Prediction         <ul> <li>Earnest Burgess (1928)</li> <li>Tools explicitly using race to predict recidivism '20s-'70s</li> </ul> </li> <li>Risk as a Condition to be Treated         <ul> <li>Barabas et. al., "Interventions over</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ul> <li>All three formulations (1)(2)(3) adhere to the <i>risk principle</i>: that risk should be measured to inform criminal interventions.         <ul> <li>Risk is rooted in the theory of incapacitation. Greenwood &amp; Abrahamse (1982).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Faux Exogeneity: Risk is not as scientific as it seems.         <ul> <li>Risk and recidivism are assessments made by judges, related to subsequent decisions made by judges. Risk is not innate to an individual.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Risk</i> is rooted in theories of human delinquency, punitive logic and incapacitation. The goal of reducing <i>risk</i> or <i>recidivism</i> can justify massive increases in policing or sentences. Instead the goal should be reducing <i>harm</i> , which includes violence carried out by the state.
<ul><li>Predictions" (2017)</li><li>Harcourt, "Against Prediction" (2007)</li></ul>		Faulty Goals in Other Domains
<ul> <li>Criminal "Elasticity" to police stops</li> <li>1980s: "Risk, Needs, Responsivity"</li> <li>3) Risk as a Benchmark for Establishing</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Perfect prediction (which satisfies fairness defs) can be racist &amp; unjust.</li> <li>Is it enough that an algorithm is "fair"?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lending &amp; credit: capital accumulation</li> <li>Hiring: capital accumulation; ability</li> <li>Education &amp; test scores: ability</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Fairness</li> <li>Northpointe-ProPublica</li> </ul>	Pitfalls of Faulty Goals	Making NeurIPS "Impact" Direct
debate • Incompatibility studies (Kleinberg, Corbett-Davies) rediction Fails Differently for Black Defendants <u>Labeled Higher Risk, But Didn't Re-Offend</u> 23.5% 44.9% Labeled Lower Risk, Yet Did Re-Offend 47.7% 28.0%	<ul> <li>Formalize existing biases</li> <li>Legitimize decision-making as data-driven or scientific</li> <li>Justify more infrastructure in the name of reducing risk ('war on risk')</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is unclear if CS research helps people.</li> <li>Idea: use NeurIPS "Impact" section to center and direct resources to communities that need it, i.e. ongoing direct action and mutual aid efforts.</li> </ul>