

# 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?

i. I prefer proposal two because, as in the first proposal, a simple banner after retweeting or sharing possibly misleading information isn't enough.

A simple button that allows the user to share an article for maybe expressing their ideas, simply sharing information they find interesting, saving it on their profiles for later checking, or many other uses. That's the problem with the share button. There are so many uses with it that the user, in the context of saving an article, might be "lazy" and completely ignoring the banner and sharing it anyway. Or a stubborn person that wants to spread a certain piece of information might do the same even though they see the banner.

By preventing the user to share a piece of information after confirming it's being disputed, makes the platform a little bit better in the sense of fake news sharing, because you're blocking it from being spread. You're not censoring the information because you're not removing it, if you want to find it you're going to find it. But you're making it harder to spread, that is one of our bigger concerns in the modern society we live in nowadays

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. I'd say proposal 1. Everyone has the right of saying what they want to, independent of power, gender, or social position. In a public space though, we can say what we think while respecting other people.

In the context of sharing information, I would say that if it's a news article that shares contradictional information, it should be blocked from sharing, because it's probably an article written to spread false information. But if it's a person saying something, we have to be more careful, because as said before, we have to respect their rights to say something they think.

We should also consider the impact this person has to influence other people and, of course, everything has a limit. If the person is promoting a sort of hate speech or anything that hurts other people, this should be deleted from the service.

b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?

i. I think it would be proposal 1. If we block the right to share information, even misleading ones, we are kind of making the opportunity of expression of this person weaker.

c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?

i. In this context, I'd say proposal 2.

If the goal is to get reliable and good information, the person should be able to do minimal effort to get it. Even though we block a piece of misleading information from being shared, if we search for it online, we should be able to see the real version of the history and doing so, expanding our point of view by seeing the bigger picture.

d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?

- i. The more points of view we hear from a certain story, the more informed we get about it. So, on proposal 1, we're not blocking any information from being shared, making it my choice for thinking it's a good proposal in terms of diversity.
- e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
  - i. I think proposal 1 preserves communicative power because by seeing the problem, in this case, a news article or speech marked with a "disputed" flag, users can be aware of the problem and maybe, propose other solutions to solve the problem.