**Prompt 1: [1-2 paragraphs]**

Describe the dilemma that an individual may face when they have the opportunity to use nonfactual data or misleading data presentations in order to attack and defeat a policy that they feel is wrong, perhaps even immoral? (A dilemma is when two "good" actions are in conflict, forcing an individual to potentially choose one while sacrificing the other.)

An individual may face a moral dilemma when they have the opportunity to use nonfactual data or misleading data presentations to attack and defeat a policy they believe to be wrong or immoral. On one hand, the person may feel compelled to use all available means, including deception, to fight against what they perceive as a harmful policy. They may rationalize that the ends justify the means, and that spreading misinformation is a necessary evil to achieve a greater good. On the other hand, the individual may also feel a strong ethical obligation to be honest and accurate in their arguments, as they understand that integrity is crucial for the healthy functioning of a democratic society. In this case, the person faces a conflict between upholding their values of honesty and transparency, and effectively fighting against a policy they believe to be wrong or immoral. This dilemma forces the individual to weigh the potential benefits of misleading others against the long-term consequences of eroding trust in public discourse.

**Prompt 2: [1-2 paragraphs]**

State the position you would take if you were the Congressional representative in the article and were preparing for this very important hearing in which you felt very strongly that Planned Parenthood was a bad organization and should lose federal funding. Would you use the graphic to justify that choice? Describe 2-3 pressures you would likely be facing as an elected politician that would make the choice you just made extra difficult.

If I were the Congressional representative in the article and were preparing for the important hearing, I would not use the misleading graphic to argue against Planned Parenthood. While I may feel strongly that the organization is harmful and should lose federal funding, I would choose to uphold the values of honesty, integrity, and accuracy in presenting my case. As an elected politician, I would likely face several pressures that would make this choice extra difficult. One such pressure would be the expectation from my constituents and party members to vigorously advocate for the policies and positions I campaigned on. Another pressure would be the highly polarized political climate, which often rewards extreme positions and tactics. Additionally, I might worry that if I do not use the most powerful tools at my disposal, including misinformation, my opponents may do so, putting me at a strategic disadvantage in the public debate.

**Prompt 3: [1-2 paragraphs]**

Do you believe that fact-checking organizations such as Politifact.com, the source of the article, are effective tools to combat nonfactual information in politics? Why or why not? Explain the broader consequences you foresee of increasing use of nonfactual information and misleading data presentations in national, state, and local government.

Fact-checking organizations like Politifact.com can be effective tools to combat nonfactual information in politics to some extent. They provide a valuable service by scrutinizing and verifying the accuracy of claims made by politicians and public figures, and by holding them accountable for their statements. However, their effectiveness may be limited by several factors, such as the growing distrust in media and the increasing polarization of society. People may be more likely to believe or disbelieve fact-checking organizations based on their own political biases, rather than assessing the evidence provided objectively.

The increasing use of nonfactual information and misleading data presentations in national, state, and local government has broader consequences for society. It undermines trust in public institutions and elected officials, making it more difficult for citizens to make informed decisions and participate effectively in the democratic process. Additionally, it can contribute to the polarization and division within communities, as people become more entrenched in their beliefs and less willing to engage in constructive dialogue with those who hold opposing views. In the long term, this erosion of trust and increasing division may weaken the foundations of democratic governance and make it more difficult to address pressing societal challenges.