

# 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. In my opinion, the most appropriate regulatory content is to limit the content that contains fake news. In this case, I agree more with the statement in the second proposal. Because currently, it is very important to maintain the value of freedom, especially in communication and information. This is no longer the 20th century when dictatorships are rampant as we have seen in Germany, the Soviet Union, and even my own country, Indonesia. It is time for us to revolutionize the traffic of information by maintaining the full value of freedom of speech, expression, and receiving information. In connection with the coming industrial revolution Society 5.0, it is necessary for us to restore the main nature of humanity which is based on freedom and justice. Because social media that was created today has the initial goal of uniting those who are out of reach, not distancing those who are already within reach.
  - b. For regulation itself, it is still necessary to hold supervision. Both on the initiative of each individual or from large-scale agencies such as Facebook, Instagram, and others. Facebook's policy of limiting hoax news is considered appropriate. Maybe in the future, this regulation needs to be added and revised a few things to always approach the word perfect.
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. In this case, freedom is an important thing that must be carried out because freedom has mastered most of the values of human rights. So logically, every human being should have the right to commit lies and deception as happens in most of our lives through hoax news. And the recipients of the information also have the right to reject the lies they make. But there is one problem that makes all this will be messy if left alone. In human rights, there is also a value of justice that is far greater than the value of freedom. Because the value of justice is a benchmark for achieving the total value of humanity. So, a state of freedom can never be balanced without justice. Justice functions as an authority that manages all things so that the balance is always maintained. Including the case of the hoax news earlier. We need to have regulations to balance all kinds of information to achieve our justice and humanitarian goals. But we also can't block one thing because it will cause an imbalance again later.
  - b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
    - i. I have the opinion that the authority over the regulation of information is currently held by a few people. Like the Facebook group that holds the biggest share in the regulation of information and online communication today. The company, led by Mark Zuckerberg, has become the largest information technology company in history. From this alone, it can be seen that the policies of every information traffic that exists today are mostly controlled by them. So even if Facebook will make a policy to eradicate hoax news on a large scale to act in an authoritarian manner, we have no right to protest what they are doing. Because the institutions they have are individual property and not joint property. The right to express themselves also belongs to them and not to Facebook users. Our right to express ourselves is not that we express what we like on social media. But our opportunity is whether we want to use social media which is under their authority or become free human beings without social media.
  - c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
    - i. As described in points (a) and (b) that every human being has the right to freedom and the opportunity to choose whatever he wants. Included in this discussion is access. So it

is appropriate for all the people of every country to get good quality information from the government without the need to add anything else so that the state seems authoritarian with its propaganda with the information media they control. So the state or the party having the authority should not block all access to that information. It's better to limit the spread of false information. Because the people themselves have the right and access to assess and seek the truth of a news story. If corrections are only made by one party such as the government, then a balanced truth will never be created.

- d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
  - i. Considering the principle of diversity, it is appropriate for agencies that have regulations not to stop all kinds of information that are considered bad. Because unilateral blocking of bad information is also a mistake. Actually the information is free and not bound by anything. Freedom is also what causes the information to always evolve. If there is a unilateral blocking of information, how can we take other sources and views to develop other information? One-sided blocking is only an indirect fooling of the people. So the party who has the authority is sufficient to supervise the traffic of information in general regardless of any party. It also provides opportunities for the people to participate in preventing, eradicating, and carefully assessing which information is true and which is false.
- e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
  - i. Communicative power is the end of our discussion about communication and information today. After discussing so much about freedom, rights, and regulation of information, it will be lacking if we don't discuss the sometimes destructive nature of human psychology. That is, following along. How many people have gone down the wrong path because they were in the wrong environment? How many people are mentally damaged because of bad households? Most of the human error is in the miscommunication and follow-up due to lack of information or wrong. All of this is due to the social nature of humans so that they are interconnected with one another. The lesson for us is not how not to get into a bad environment, but how to have a strong personality so that it will not be easily carried away by bad currents. So, learn to go against the flow, have a different mind from others, and keep yourself to the principles and commitments so that you can practice sticking to your personality.