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 a perfect world, where the third-party fact-checkers could be agreed upon by every user to be trustworthy, Proposal 2 would be more effective. However, Proposal 2 requires trusting that central authority, which may or may not have oversight. This would result in people not trusting the label applied by the third-party fact-checkers. Additionally, a blanket approach to preventing the sharing of stories as desired by an individual user would be a form of censorship and would interfere with a user's Rights for Participation (as discussed below). Therefore, I believe proposal 1 to be better because it does not infringe on any individual's participation in the public sphere, at the expense of potentially allowing bad actors to abuse the system.

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 preserves the right of participation more than Proposal 2 because it does not result in any censorship. Users are still able to share disputed stories if they so desire, whereas Proposal 2 would prevent that participation.
   b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
      i. Proposal 1 promotes Opportunity for Expression more than Proposal 2 because there is no gatekeeper (such as Facebook) who could be seen as more powerful and interfering with the user's expression with Proposal 2.
   c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
      i. Proposal 2 may be better than Proposal 1 with respect to Access. Preventing misleading information from spreading, even with a disclaimer, would help ensure only quality and reliable information is reachable by participants. However, Proposal 1 is superior to not including the disclaimer.
   d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
      i. Since Proposal 1 would allow for more ideas (regardless of accuracy) to be shared than Proposal 2, Proposal 1 would allow for more Diversity.
   e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
      i. Proposal 1 best promotes Communicative Power because it would give people a better chance to "explore interests and ideas" compared to Proposal 2, even if those ideas could potentially be misleading.