Defining Misinformation:

As social media gained more and more popularity, it became the mainstream for people to share and consume information. when social media platform decides whether or not to delete posts containing misinformation, they need to consider individual rights, such as the freedom of speech. According to the freedom of speech, each individual should have the right to speak, write, and share their idea or opinions without fear of receiving punishment from the government. From that perspective, people should have the right to post information on social media regardless of the truthfulness of the information. They also need to consider the potential harm that the misinformation can bring to society and to what extent it will be detrimental to society as a whole. Moreover, the social media platform should also be transparent about their policy on the censorship of content, and the way how they moderate individual content. They should also treat everyone equally when it comes to exercising their right on the social media platform. Additionally, social media platforms should also consider the impact of public disclosure. Social media platforms deleting posts containing misinformation also suppress certain perspectives which can limit the exchange of ideas and can harm diverse perspectives. This poses a challenge for social media platforms to evaluate the good and bad of deleting posts containing misinformation. Also, consider the net benefit of deleting posts to combat misinformation while also taking into account the potential impact on public disclosure.

Misinformation is disseminating false or misleading information that has an impact on the society. What qualifies as misinformation from an ethical standpoint is false information that harms the individual and society. There is certainly some misinformation that is more harmful

than others. For example, a friend of mine lied to a teacher that I cheated on the exam which only impacted me, whereas one person misled the election by spreading misinformation on one politician which can impact many voters and might mislead the outcome of the election. The latter is more harmful than the former. Generally, misinformation related to public safety, politics, and finances is more harmful than the others.

Evaluating Approaches to Misinformation:

According to Kant's view on freedom of speech, he thinks limited intervention and censorship in exceptional circumstances are allowed. Mill's view on freedom of speech also leans towards opposing censorship as long as no one is harmed by their actions. From an ethical perspective, I think it is more ethical to delete COVID-19 misinformation if we know the information is misinformation. I think it is good to delete COVID-19 misinformation because false information that is related to public health can lead to fatal outcomes. For instance, posting false cures or preventatives like consuming some substances that might be harmful or even fatal to one's health. Additionally, conspiracy theories such as one group or race having a higher chance of getting COVID-19 can lead to marginalize those groups and even induce hate crimes against those groups. I support Kant's view since misinformation related to health issues is not going to benefit society and instead going to put society in danger.

Warning Labels and Fact-Checking:

I think it is ethical for social media companies to be required to put warning labels on articles that are proven to be false as their platform can spread that information to millions of people which might mislead a large amount of people negatively. It is the responsibility of that

platform to keep their information as accurate as possible. Likewise, from Kant's perspective, he thinks everyone has the moral right, to be honest and protect the truth, which makes more sense for the platform to protect information integrity when they have the power to do so. Additionally, Mill's principle of harm also states that we should interfere individual's freedom of speech when their action can harm other people. Therefore, I think it is ethical to require a platform to put on warning label on the article can increase the quality of the platform's content also prevent people from getting harmed.

According to the principle of utility, we should label all false statements regardless of their intent, since the outcome is to prevent the user from getting harmed and we can achieve great happiness by labeling all the false information. On the other hand, Kant argues that labeling all false statements regardless of their intent violates an individual's autonomy, and it is unethical to treat an individual who unintentionally spreads misinformation as a tool for preventing misinformation. However, Kant also argues that intentionally disseminating misinformation is considered unethical because he states each individual should uphold their moral duty to be honest and not lie. From the perspective of Mill's principle of harm, we should only label false statements are the potential to cause harm to others. Labeling misinformation is similar to restricting freedom of speech which can lead to the suppression of democracy limit access to diverse ideas and information and harm an individual's autonomy.

Political Speech and Accountability:

I think social media platforms should handle false information fairly, that is treat everyone equally, and the rules and regulations of the social media platform should not change because of who they are. Politicians also have the responsibility to verify the information before sharing it on any social media platform, they should not use misinformation as a tool to achieve

some goals. Preventing others from getting harmed by labeling false information violates freedom of speech in some way. Therefore, we should know which one has the priority. The social media platform has the mortal right to uphold freedom of speech to foster diverse ideas and provide a bridge for the exchange of information. However, social media platform also has the moral right to prevent their user from getting harmed by the dissemination of misinformation on their platform. This tension creates a complex ethical dilemma for the social media.

Social media should fact-check political advertisements because they have to prevent misinformation that might mislead its users. According to Mill's principle of harm, we can restrict freedom of speech if there is potential harm, therefore it is reasonable to verify the integrity of those advertisements. Additionally, the role of social media in public discourse is to facilitate communication and the exchange of ideas. According to Kant, we should be honest and don't lie. Helping politician spread misinformation is also considered unethical since the misinformation is disseminated on their platform. Therefore, It is ethical to assess the truthfulness of political advertisements. In order to respect others' freedom of speech, social media platforms should be transparent in the process of assessing the truthfulness of politicians' advertisements.