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 think Proposal 2 has a better approach. I mean, it's very good that Facebook is capable of identify false information and take care of it, but I don't think they take care of it at its best way. Until they identify that a user has posted/shared/whatever a notice, that notice is sent to independent data verificators, it's verified, and marked that post as fake, a lot of people could go to see it, and never finish finding out that the post that they've seen before, it's in fact a fake new, and even worse; spread it. This could seem insignificant, but, if you scalate it to the hundreds of millions of users that a social media like Facebook supports, it's a real problem.
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. I think no one is better than the other. Because at the end of all, the results ends up being the same; the censorship of fake news. It's great to have liberty of expression, association, and everything, but, if you use it to misinform your social circle, even if that wasn't your intention; it's bad, and we have to take care of it.
    b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
        i. Both proposals promotes opportunities and spaces of expression, but, I think that Proposal 2 offers a better one. That's because we'll have "cleaner" spaces of expression and exchange of ideas due to its better performance at the time of censor fake news.
    c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
        i. Definitely Proposal 2 it's the best option for this. The fact that the misinformation could be censored BEFORE it enters the network, gives rise to a space for dialogue with a much more reliable circulation of information.
    d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
        i. Since with Proposal 2 we'll have more trustable and quality information, the users in general will be more informated, and they will be able to have much more critical and accurate points of view for anyone who sees it.
    e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
        i. The Proposal 1 with that opening of possible misinformation, could end up in a massive "broken phone". For example: **A recognized news page posts a new that Apple, with the intention of reducing its controversial costs of their new iPhone SE's, have decided to stop using ecological materials, and also stop replanting the trees that they use for its new quality-price model range of iPhone SE's.**
        This would end in a massive spread of misinformation with the rights conditions until the post it's censored.
        What would happen if a protest of people were brewing at the doors of Apple? Whatever happens, someone is going to have to take responsibility for it; from the destruction of private property, to being injured by the oppression of the police.

        The information and the influence that we have on other persons, it's a great responsiblity.