

# Facebook and Fake News

Consider each of the below proposals, and fill in each of the below TODOs.

## Proposals

### Proposal 1

Facebook relies on an algorithm as well as individual users' reports to identify content that is potentially "fake news." Once the content has been identified, it is sent to third party fact-checkers for verification. If the content is verified as fake news, it is publicly flagged with a warning that the content is disputed by fact-checkers.



### Proposal 2

However, a designer at Facebook believes that there needs to be a different approach to content regulation. Their proposal is that content deemed problematic by third-party fact-checkers should be prevented from being shared on the platform altogether.

# Questions

1. Which form of content regulation, Proposal 1 or Proposal 2, do you feel is better? Why?
  - a. *I feel that proposal 1 is better. because it arms the public on Facebook with more information as to the credibility of a given story or article without engaging in censorship. 3rd party fact-checkers are fallible and can also be biased, so it is still important that information be allowed to circulate freely, albeit with hopefully some more clarity.*
2. Which form of content regulation, Proposal 1 or Proposal 2, do you think best preserves or promotes the [five rights and opportunities necessary for a democratic public sphere](#)?
  - a. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Rights? Why?
    - i. Proposal 1 because it preserves the right to the access of information. Any form of censorship, even well intentioned, artificially limits that access.
  - b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
    - i. Proposal 1. This proposal does not contain any censorship. The censorship implied in Proposal 2 consequently would end up limiting the Opportunity for Expression for some peoples. Facebook is an incredibly powerful organization, should we tolerate a powerful organization editing the information available to us, even if it is being done for our own good? Even if it's information that I disagree with or is of dubious nature, my aunt or friend or co-worker might support it. I would like to be able to see that, read it and maybe understand them better; if that story is prevented from being posted I will be denied that opportunity.
  - c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
    - i. Proposal 2. The censorship that would result from the implementation of Proposal 2 would by design limit the views, including problematic ones, that are brought to the forum of public debate and conversation. This could potentially lead to further polarization between different epistemic groups, echo chambers, and more open minded communities and individuals.
  - d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
    - i. Proposal 1 because it would still allow the problematic content to be published after being flagged.
  - e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
    - i. Proposal 1 simply because it allows for more access to information containing the ideas and interests and ideas of others when compared to Proposal 2.