Content Censorship on Social Media

Al-Ayham Maree
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Birzeit University
Ramallah, Palestine
1191408@student.birzeit.edu
Supervised by: Dr. Abdel Salam Sayyad

I.   Abstract & Introduction

The paper explores the dynamic problem of social media censorship, exploring issues related to government regulation, platform accountability, and the constraints on free speech. It focuses at cases from across the world, focusing on the Palestinian issue, in order to evaluate three main points: well-known cases of censorship, platform independence with regard to content laws, and possible government action. It goes through the challenging subject of finding a balance between platform independence and freedom of speech while raising concerns about potentially dangerous substances.

By a review of many global cases, such as the complex Palestinian issue, the paper aims to put a spotlight on the difficulties and results related to digital content regulation. It also aims to throw information regarding the specifics of censorship in relation to ethical standards for company behavior and actions by governments.

II.   What are the main cases of content censorship on popular social media sites? (Mention global cases but focus on cases related to Palestine)

Globally, social media companies, such as Meta's Facebook and Instagram, are having trouble finding a balance between allowing freedom of speech and banning harmful information. Events of censorship highlight the difficulties in an environment of geopolitical sensitivity, especially when it comes to the Palestinian cause and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

As an example of content censorship on popular social media platforms, the misinformation and COVID-19, many social media platforms saw an increase in false information about the corona virus and its treatments, the vaccinations during the COVID-19 epidemic, so social media platforms that mentioned previously have policies implemented to either report or deleting misleading content like YouTube has banned videos or reels that promoting ridiculous hypothesis theories about the virus origins, while Facebook removed messages that supporting experimental treatments, so in these examples the aim was a rapid detection and removal the misleading and misinformation content to ensure the public informing with correct information[1].

Another case about religious racism, during 2019 shooting at the Christchurch mosque, the systems of social media was tried to stop the propagation of hates speech and violent image, however, the attacker streamed his attack live on Facebook, and other platforms quickly discovered the video. As result on this attack, famous social media platforms removed the video and any related content. It also highlighted the challenges platforms have in preventing the rapid propagation of racist and violent content [2].

The most famous case on the content censorship it's the Palestinian case, based on the geopolitical conflicts and the mechanics of censorship content get interlinked. Social media platforms are currently under attack for reportedly deleting posts and suspending accounts that support Palestinian stories and condemn Israeli behaviors. Moreover, the complex nature of the Israel-Palestine conflict adds a subjective dimension to content moderation decisions that makes it difficult to draw a line between damaging content and political expression. As a current case that happens now in the time I wrote the answer, Meta has engaging systematic and global censorship of Pro-Palestinian content since the outbreak of the Israel-Gaza war on 7 October at 2023 which the right holders the blow of the century against the brutal Israeli occupation. So as a support from the social medial companies like Meta that has policies and practices have been silencing voices in support of Palestine and Palestinian human rights on Instagram and Facebook in wave of heightened censorship of social media amid the hostilities between Israeli forces and Palestinian resistance men. The systematic online censorship has risen against the Palestinians [3] [4].

III.   Are social media companies free to allow or ban content based on their own standards?

For large businesses, regulating information control on social media requires a careful balance, so it's difficult to find a balance between the risk of censoring significant information and society's demands for transparency. While many platform independence supporters highlight freedom of speech and creativity, others argue that harmful concepts should be handled.

The conflict between platform authority and community standards has been emphasized by recent events such as Texas' censorship law and Trump's Twitter ban, so effective user appeal processes, free speech laws, and unbiased oversight for ethical management while maintaining platform independence are necessary to close this gap [7].

IV.   Should there be a role for governments in regulating social media apps?

There is an increasing concern about social media platforms disseminating hate speech and false information, which has led to a complex argument regarding the authority of governments of these websites, so government those who regulate claim that

social media should be held responsible for the information it hosts and that the existing level of self-regulation is insufficient. Others, however, concern that increased government monitoring may restrict freedom of speech, limiting the voices of minorities and preventing legal demonstration.

Also, it can be difficult to identify and eliminate damaging information, and there may be consequences to differing legal perspectives, although regulating social media is a complicated issue, I think there is a case for a limited government role as long as it focuses on reducing serious damages like hate speech and false information, and it's important to find a balance between user protection and communication rights [5] [6].

V. Analyze Judgment using Kantian

The conclusions made in this investigation about social media censorship create an ethical problem of finding a balance between freedom of speech and responsibilities to society when seen through a Kantian perspective.

Content filtering violates the categorical imperative, which holds that people should be regarded as ends in and of themselves rather than as means, particularly in challenging environments like Palestine. It is against the Universal Law of Ethics to ban content based on arbitrary interpretations, as this might restrict minority voices. On the other hand, permitting damaging content such as hate speech and false information violates the Duty to Humanity and threatens the safety and comfort of the general public. While encouraging innovation, company's independent filtration runs the danger of arbitrary regulations and unfair enforcement.
Government regulations may limit free speech and expression and restrict critical conversation, even when they are meant for protecting humans.

In the end, Kant's dedication to evidence and generalization recommends to seek responses through transparent, objective standards, user appeals, and independent evaluation that respect individual rights while restricting damage. Preserving this balance in the complicated digital world requires constant communication and innovative solutions to protect both individual rights and society well-being.

VI. Analyze Judgment Using Utilitarian

Discussion around social media censorship, from a utilitarian perspective, focuses on finding a fine balance between encouraging satisfactions as a whole and avoiding damage, so on these platforms, unrestricted freedom of speech encourages many kinds of opinions and freedom of expression, which may improve user happiness, but technology also makes it easier for dangerous content to propagate, such hate speech and disinformation, which causes a great deal of suffering for those who are affected and has an unfavorable impact on society as a whole.

The problem of censorship, which aims to reduce these negative effects, involves restricting certain content without violating the right to free speech and fair conversation, by considering factors including the level of seriousness and potential for harm, searching in alternatives to complete removal, and taking into account the effect on free speech, especially for not represented

voices are all necessary to determine the ideal degree of censorship.

According to a utilitarian the most effective plan of action would be to emphasize efforts that maximize society well-being as a whole, such as focused censorship, open content filtering instructions, unbiased evaluation, and financial support for critical thinking education.

VII. Conclusion

In conclusion, the paper explores concepts of free speech, business transparency, and regulation in response to the rising challenge of social media censorship. It examines at major issues including content filtering, the independence of social media businesses, and possible involvement by governments. It focuses on globally cases with a focus on the Palestinian cause. The aim is to increase understanding in regards to a rapidly developing digital environment, which calls for careful compromises between platform independence, society's requirements, and efficient regulation. The challenges that social media platforms have in keeping this balance are shown by cases such as false information on COVID-19 and the Palestinian problem. In the end, the current discussion over the authority of governments shows the necessity of taking sensible actions regarding problems like hate speech and misinformation while preserving the principles of free speech.

VIII. REFERENCES

[1] World Health Organization: WHO. (2021, April 27). Fighting misinformation in the time of COVID-19, one click at a time. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/fighting-misinformation-in-the-time-of-covid-19-one-click-at-a-time.

[2] Mao, B. F. (2019, March 20). Christchurch shooting: Australia's moment of hate speech reckoning. BBC News. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-47620391

[3] Younes, R. (2024). Meta's broken promises. In Human Rights Watch. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://www.hrw.org/report/2023/12/21/metas-broken-promises/systemic-censorship-palestine-content-instagram-and

[4] Shankar, P., Dixit, P., & Siddiqui, U. (2023, October 27). Are social media giants censoring pro-Palestine voices amid Israel's war? Al Jazeera. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2023/10/24/shadowbanning-are-social-media-giants-censoring-pro-palestine-voices

[5] Van Alstyne, H. L. a. M., & Van Alstyne, H. L. a. M. (2023, October 17). Should the government regulate social media? Divided We Fall. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://dividedwefall.org/should-the-government-regulate-social-media/

[6] Team, B. R. C. (2020, February 12). Social media: How do other governments regulate it? BBC News. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-47135058

[7] Cusumano, M. A. (2021, January 19). Social Media Companies should Self-Regulate. now. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://hbr.org/2021/01/social-media-companies-should-self-regulate-now