

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 and proposal 2 both appear very compelling and even though I feel that proposal 2 will be very beneficial at handling some aspects of the social media problem I feel proposal 1 offers a more overall solution appealing to many factors. Although I feel that proposal 2 would be a much better step at preventing the spread of fake and potentially harmful information that even after the displayed warnings can influence the reader's mind and provoke easily swayed people, I feel proposal 1 is a more holistic and moral solution. In my opinion Proposal 1 is a better form of content regulation overall because even though it warns against incorrect information and dissuades the reader from disseminating it, it puts the choice in the reader's hand and allows them to make the decision for themselves. This freedom provided to the reader is something that has become increasingly important to people in this time and allows for content regulation without backlash questioning freedom of speech, expression and democracy. It also encourages the reader to think for themselves and actually try and investigate the information instead of just accepting it or not knowing about it which instills a critical eye in them for similar future altercations.
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 is best suited to preservation and promotion of rights as it puts the choice in the users hand like it should be in a democracy. It allows the user freedom of speech and association and also encourages them to think for themselves and then make the choice. It allows them to accountably think about the information provided and actually side with a minority or disputed viewpoint by endorsing it if they wish to. This upholds the basics of democracy that every individual has a right to exist independently and make informed choices regarding themselves. Proposal 2 takes away this choice from the user's hand it does not even allow disputed ideas to come into discussion and simply takes away the right of the user to even know about it making it unfit for preservation of Rights.
 - b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
 - i. Opportunity and Expression fundamentally means the right for everyone to express their views and opinions without any form of censorship. Since proposal 2 opposes exactly what the preservation of opportunity and expression means by censoring disputed claims, proposal one is the only proposal that upholds the promotion of Opportunity and Expression. Proposal one is apt because it allows all users to express their opinions with equal opportunity without any censorship even if their views are disputed.
 - c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
 - i. Access to information is best provided with proposal 1 as even though the information provided can be questionable it is still available to the user if they want to read and the information about it being disputed is also available so that the user can make an informed choice about whether they want to believe in the information they have reviewed or not. But with proposal 2 there is no method to access the censored information and the right to access information if we wish to is taken away therefore it is unsuitable.
 - d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
 - i. Proposal 1 best preserves diversity because it allows a multitude of diverse views to be expressed and read by the users and gives them access to a varied set of opinions so that they can make a stand about their own position regarding the subject. And even

though the views are disputed and can be against the reader's ideals the user is still provided with the option of reviewing a diverse array of opinions. But if proposal 2 is used and the disputed claims are censored the viewer loses access to a wide range of diverse views which takes away their right to information and only gives them half the tools to form their own stand.

- e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
 - i. According to me proposal 1 is the best fit for preservation and promotion of Communicative Power as it allows all forms of views and ideals to be showcased and it puts the choice in the users hands on whether they want to believe and endorse the views or disregard them because they are disputed. Proposal 2 would not be the good for communicative power because it censors any disputed views/facts and therefore does not allow the user access to all information so that they can create their own ideals even if they differ from the mainstream.