

I am choosing to focus on the Cambridge Analytica situation. I do believe boundaries were crossed here, but only to a certain degree. In my opinion, it is very unethical for a political consulting firm to use social media in order to attempt to sway the beliefs of voters, however, it is up to the voter to believe what is true and what is not. Social Media is not the end-all be-all of political information, but it is the easiest place for misinformation to be spread and I am sure that is why CA chose this route. So, how should it be handled by the social media platforms themselves?

Well, my grid is focused on mainly three things: what systems are affected in order to pinpoint the root of widespread false information, is it ethical to reveal who these users are, and how these systems can help appease the situation by enlisting data collection to remove false or intentionally biased posts. I believe the systems can use algorithms and data collection to see where a majority of fake accounts originate, possibly by location, and attempt to see the trend of who they interact with. Now that a possible pinpoint has been discovered, is it ethical to reveal who has caused the misinformation (thinking about the user's right to anonymity)? I believe since the terms of the platform have been violated in such a way that legal action may be needed, it is indeed ethical. Problems like these can be appeased by things mentioned earlier; using a large collection of false information to oversee the platform might be a good system for discovering where to flag and remove posts.