

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. I feel proposal one is better as it does not exclude certain views from the public sphere. This could cause a harmful echo chamber. It may also help to train people to spot fake news better in future.
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. Option 1. Views are not excluded, while also building the sense of civility mentioned in the final article. These views are required to undergo a process of justification.
 - b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
 - i. Option 1. Option 2 would exclude people with controversial opinions, which is likely to alienate those people and entrench them further in their views. Depending on the view, it may be that it is controversial now, but over time and discussion in the public foren is adopted. Just consider the social advances in the last century.
 - c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
 - i. Again Option 1 promotes access, as it does not physically bar people from the public sphere.
 - d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
 - i. Diversity in the sense of diversity of opinion would be ill-served by deleting or removing opinions not inline with the editorial stance of a particular platform. Diversity would seek to allow a range of opinions to be aired in public discussion, though rightly highlight those that are controversial or under dispute.
 - e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
 - i. In some senses Option 2 improves the communicative power of mainstream ideas as there is less competition. But in the sense that is intended, I think option 1 better preserves this. Option 1 allows for the identification of disputed views and possibly even encourage a debate on whether a view should be considered disputed.