

1 handout: slides

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

AI Safety

Topics in AI Safety

AI Safety

■ Topics

- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

- ethics for AI research
- lethal autonomous weapons
- trustworthy
- transparency, legibility, explainable
- value alignment

Break

AI Safety

■ Topics

■ Break

■ AI Ethics

■ LAWS

■ Trustworthy AI

■ Value Alignment

■ Trolley Problem

■ Learning Values

■ The Argument

■ Rules

■ The Off Game

■ EOLQs

- asst 12
- project presentations: Wed May 8, 9-12
- donuts, beverages

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

- should AI be pursued?
 - jobs, evil uses, danger
 - accuracy, efficiency, convenience
- how should AI be pursued
 - objective: accuracy vs equal treatment
 - data collection: accuracy vs privacy
- should robots be moral agents?
 - Bryson: no
 - transhumanism

Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics

■ LAWS

- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

examples

- mines
- Phalanx, Iron Dome
- cruise missiles
- Samsung sentry
- slaughterbots

ethics

- -: no human judgment, needs strong limitations
- +: no emotion, fatigue

Trustworthy AI

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

fears

- success in limited tasks \neq general intelligence
- intelligence \neq desire to replace, destroy, dominate

mitigation

- software engineering
- formal verification
- transparency
- legibility
- explainability

Value Alignment

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

- hard to formalize
- no malicious intent necessary
 - genie in lamp, Sorcerer's Apprentice, King Midas
- 'instrumental goals': ensure success of primary goal by preventing interference, acquiring resources (material and financial)
- how to prove alignment?
 - superintelligence inherently hard to predict

Trolley Problem

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

<http://modelai.gettysburg.edu/2018/ethics/Worksheets/Wor>

- head toward person wearing seatbelt or person not?
- push large person in front of trolley to save multiple people?
- your child or multiple old people?
- kill one person or give multiple permanent suffering?
- who is responsible?
- who certifies car?

Ideas for Learning Values

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

- direct programming
- observe humans
- debates between agents, scored by humans
- iterated amplification
- recursive reward modeling

The Standard Argument (Ben Goertzel)

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

1. among all possibilities, mind that respects human values is statistically improbable
 - even getting close to human values might not be enough. also, could diverge over time
2. AGI likely to reach singularity ('hard takeoff')
3. aligned superintelligence likely dangerous

retort:

1. not obvious
 - evolution implies likely or robust
2. soft take-off seems more likely
3. not clear. plenty of more pressing things to worry about

Rules for Robots

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

Steve Omohundro: scaffolding: each system proves safety of next

or system shuts itself off if it can't meet safety constraints

Eliezer Yudkowsky: coherent extrapolated volition: be what humans would want you to be

human does not get to choose!

David McAllester: servant mission: within the law, fulfill my requests

society makes laws

avobot might have incentive to lie or restrict information access

The Off Switch Game (Hadfield-Menell et al, IJCAI-17)

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

- robot maximizes human's utility
- human utility uncertain
- switching off provides useful information for future robot actions
- even high confidence that a is good for H allows off

EOLQs

AI Safety

- Topics
- Break
- AI Ethics
- LAWS
- Trustworthy AI
- Value Alignment
- Trolley Problem
- Learning Values
- The Argument
- Rules
- The Off Game
- EOLQs

- What question didn't you get to ask today?
- What's still confusing?
- What would you like to hear more about?

Please write down your most pressing question about AI and put it in the box on your way out.

Thanks!