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. Proposal 1 is a better form of content regulation. By providing users with the option of whether they wish to share content that has already been flagged as questionable, they still maintain their personal liberties and rights to information. However, proposal 2 removes that right from people and gives the power of regulating information to third-party fact-checkers all together. This proposal relies on third-party fact-checkers being wholly impartial and unbiased, but there remains the possibility that their partiality may become compromised through underhanded deals, bribes and investor pressures etc. to deem accurate content as fake news for the benefit of a select group of people.

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. It still gives people the rights to expression and allows them to bring their ideas to the table as they are not prevented from sharing the content that has been flagged as questionable.
   b. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Opportunity for Expression? Why?
      i. Proposal 1. By allowing people to still view, share, and by extension discuss the disputed content, it enables people the opportunity to still participate in public discussion on the issue. On the other hand, proposal 2 removes that from the table completely and is reserved for the third-party organisations who are fact-checking only.
   c. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Access? Why?
      i. Proposal 1. It promotes access by letting people know that certain content is disputed, and they can then in turn go to find out why it's being disputed, making themselves more informed in the process. However, proposal 2 removes this step from the people as if the information is not available, there is no need for people to dig deeper and inform themselves. They would have to just take the organisation's word for it.
   d. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Diversity? Why?
      i. Proposal 1. It still enables people to hear a wide diversity of views, whether they are disputed or not as the option to view, share and discuss such content are not removed from them. However, proposal 2 removes such content and people will only have access to one point of view - the one of the fact-checking third-party organisation as they have the power to dictate what is deemed appropriate or inappropriate content.
   e. Which proposal best preserves or promotes Communicative Power? Why?
      i. Proposal 1. This method allows individuals to view a variety of views which may raise or challenge their own perceptions, and develop new concerns that challenge the mainstream view that otherwise may not have come about had they been exposed to only one point of view.