

**Group 113****Report criticizing the opponent team's defense****MP-3****Submitted to: Rashedul Amin Tuhin, Senior Lecturer, East West University, Dhaka**

Student ID	Name
2020-1-60-226	Sofia Noor Rafa
2020-2-60-010	Nisarga Mridha
2019-2-60-213	Md. Farhad Billah

**Summary of the opponents' scenario and ethical dilemma:**

The opponent team addresses social media platforms' user-targeted data collection procedures and raises concerns about the user's social media privacy issues. The dilemmas the team presented are as follows:

1. Social media should restrain from tracking a user's interactions, interests, or communication for its benefit.
2. Social media can track a user's interactions, interests, or communication for its benefits.

The decision phase focused on the fact that social media platforms collect user data to make the platforms rather valuable. It further pointed out that the platforms should abstain from sharing profits with users that help the platforms add value.

**Well-executed parts of Opponent's Work:**

The opponent team presented a ground of argument regarding the benefit sharing of social media platforms to users who contribute to the platforms through their activities. They point out

the importance of the data collection procedures of social media platforms by presenting talks on the financial benefits, privacy concerns, and platform competitiveness.

### **Weak Side of Opponent's Work:**

The absence of presenting facts related to the complexities of various social media platforms' profit-sharing policies. How further can the privacy concern extend is not well-spoken in the document. Solid grounds related to data breaches, lack of transparency of the data collection policies of social media, and lack of consent to protect user data are missing. Why would the platforms not opt for utilitarian solutions for greater benefits like developing alternate compensation models, engaging in stakeholder dialogue, or adapting to regulatory changes is not well presented in the document of argument.

### **Suggestions and Criticisms of the Opponent's Decision:**

The opponent's choice to put the social media platforms' profit-sharing idea forth raises concerns about the value of using any social media platform. Profit sharing, if implemented, can result in competition for attention and engagement. The decision disregards the potential long-term effects.

Profit sharing could give platforms an incentive to be less transparent about their data collection policies and how they use user data. This is because they may not want users to know how their data is being used to generate profits. The decision could be well-suited, raising an honest, heartfelt concern about a user's extremely personal information getting manipulated by social media platforms. The platforms don't necessarily promote humanitarian viewpoints but target humans, the decisions could point that out too.

Social media platforms would never implement a humanitarian-based profit-sharing policy. The companies would have to donate a portion of their income to aid organizations under a humanitarian-based profit-sharing model. As a result, they would have less money to invest in their goods and services and would be less profitable for their stockholders. If users are paid for creating content, they may be more likely to focus on quantity over quality. This could lead to a decline in the overall quality of content on the platform. It is unlikely that social media platforms will ever implement a humanitarian-based profit-sharing policy.

Social media platforms have a responsibility to use their profits to address the harms that they cause. For example, social media platforms have been linked to the spread of misinformation, hate speech, and cyberbullying. They should use their profits to invest in tools and technologies to combat these harms. The opponent team didn't present solid grounds for that.

Social media platforms should be more transparent about how they use their profits. Users should know how their data and content are being used to generate profits, and they should have a say in how those profits are used.

The opponent didn't present any ground tackling racism resulting from profit-sharing from social media platforms. There is a potential link between social media profit sharing and racism. If social media platforms share profits with their users, they may be more likely to focus on increasing user engagement. This could lead to platforms promoting content that is racist and inflammatory, in order to attract more users and generate more profits. For example, a social media platform might start showing more ads for products and services that are associated with white supremacy, or it might start allowing more racist content to be posted on its platform. This could create a hostile environment for users of color and could make it more difficult for them to find and enjoy content that is relevant to them.

Although the decisions proposed by the opponent team were presented from ethical viewpoints like Deontology, Utilitarianism, the presentation didn't address social media complexities like generation of unnecessary content aimed at value enrichment given that profit sharing policies are implemented. The Kantian ideology, as presented in the defense report, displayed direct consent for profit sharing for making the content generation process morally right but fails to address that social media value adding should not depend on profit sharing only, social media is a place for building connections, sharing information, and receiving education. Bringing profit-sharing would rather lead to a more cluttered and commercialized user experience.

Overall, the opponent's report provided a study of the ethical dilemma and the decision making process, although there are several areas that deserve more investigation and thought. As this is about ethical dilemmas, the decision can vary person to person. The report's depth might be increased and a more complete understanding of the ethical issues involved by looking at alternate possibilities, investigating different ethical theories, and extending the scope of stakeholder analysis