

FACEBOOK LEARNS THAT THE STREISAND EFFECT CAN SHUT DOWN ALL OF
ZUCKERBERG'S BULLSHIT

Facebook rolling back controversial initiative to fight non-propaganda news

Fox News



Facebook announces it is rolling back its controversial “Disputed Flags” measure

Facebook

Facebook announced last week that it is rolling back its controversial “Disputed Flags” measure next to articles deemed fake news amid studies showing it does not stop the spread of such content and only encourages users to click on it.

The tech giant said the move was in response to academic research showing that a strong image like a red flag next to an article “may actually entrench deeply held beliefs” and lead to an opposite effect of encouraging users to click on false stories, according to the company’s [blog post](#) posted on Dec. 20.

Instead, Facebook will now show “Related Articles” next to fake news, giving more context to users on any particular story.

“Our research has shown (Related Articles is) a more effective way to help people get to the facts,” the social media giant said, adding that “it leads to fewer shares than when the Disputed Flag is shown.”

The company is also launching another initiative aimed at understanding how people decide if the information is accurate based on the news sources they depend on for news.

Facebook said it will not impact what people see on their feeds in the near term, but will help them to

 In recent months, former Facebook executives have expressed "guilt" over the social media giant, its growing influence on society and impact on culture. Here's a roundup of their comments.

Former Facebook executives express "guilt" over social media giant

measure the success in improving the quality of information on the platform.

Facebook partnered up last year with multiple media organizations,

including Snopes, ABC News and FactCheck.org, in an attempt to thwart the spread of so-called "fake news" – articles containing misinformation – that facilitated during the 2016 Presidential election.

The fact-checkers were given permission to dispute content on the platform in an attempt to help the users to identify fake news and stop the spread of hoaxes. Articles deemed fake by verified fact-checkers get demoted, which significantly cuts down the traffic and the proliferation of such content.

"Overall, we're making progress," the company said. "Demoting false news (as identified by fact-checkers) is one of our best weapons because demoted articles typically lose 80 percent of their traffic. This destroys the economic incentives spammers and troll farms have to generate these articles in the first place.

Sort by Newest



Fmember Leader44m

Facebook has never been about free speech. FB will judge each and every righteous post by others and label them evil, because FB is evil.

ReplyShare2 Likes



MugMayhem Leader52m

You can call out liberal social media and MSM for their bias and fake news all day long. They don't care.

They will only care when you hit them where it hurts. Their revenue.

ReplyShare1 Like





Netizen24601 Leader1h

The problem is these platforms doesn't given enough control to the users. It used to be just a few media moguls that controlled both creaiton and distribution. The internet democratized the distribution of content allowing anyone to create. In the early days we controlled the information because we have to search for it. These platforms built a system that makes ti easier to create and then used alogrytims to "improve" distribution. But Consumers still don't have equal power. We can choose other platforms but it's same as the old days. The platforms control what we see. Instead Facebook, and other platforms, should write the algorithms that leverage whatever they think is cool or important and tell users what stories they will add to their feed. Then the consumer gets to pick and choose which ones get turned on instead of just providing a system that anyone can game to get money. And these platforms need to stop using views as to determine something's value.

Fake news spreads because these platforms built systems to leverage automation to cretae content, and maximize views through platforms which makes cerators and the platform more money. The tools the consumers have for weeding out unwanted information have not scaled with the tools being given to creators. It's time the users of these platforms had a say in what information we see automagically.

ReplyShare



Fmember LeaderNetizen2460139m

Facebook has to have total control over others....hence, FB judges anyone who is NOT pro-abortion or pro-sodomy or pro-transpervert as evil and wants to censor their posts. Bottom line...Facebook would never allow Free Speech in a country of their own (because they KNOW the truth would win against them).

ReplyShare1 Like



Netizen24601 LeaderFmember19m

I think you are conflating seperate things. Most of the posts that are anti-abortion, anti-sodomy, and anti-transpervert are not being censored because people have those beliefs. I would suspect if you looked at the posts being censored it has to do with the manner at which they are presenting their opinion. I would suspect them to go after people who use those subjects to promote hate. Personally I am anti-abortion. I would never choose it, and would never suggest or advise someone else to choose it. But I don't judge anyone else who chooses it. It is possible to have an opinion about those subjects and not dispariage others for having a different opinion. But then again, some of the people in my circles would probably fit in all of those categories but can present their opinion respectfully. I find a lot of the people on the internet can not.

ReplyShare



2wocents Leader1h

They'll do whatever it takes to control the narrative.

ReplyShare4 Likes



jmhall52 1h

Here's an idea: Why doesn't Facebook get out of the "news" business entirely? Expecting people to trust FB for unbiased, verified news (especially on political issues) is only slightly less ludicrous than expecting them to trust CNN...

ReplyShare10 Likes



Netizen24601 Leaderjmhall5250m

FB isn't expecting people to trust FB for unbiased, verified news. FB is expecting that users of FB want to see news from their friends because if they are your friend they

have something in common with you and are likely to share some of the same beliefs as part of that commonality. So they built an algorithm that they believe can deliver you news based on that commonality.

But people are more likely to believe information that affirms their beliefs and not believe information that discredits their beliefs. And FB built a system that makes it easy for people to share content among a really big audience because views are what is valuable on the web which has nothing to do with unbiased, verified information. So the news that spreads among friends is more likely to be news that affirms your beliefs than unbiased, verified news.



FB had a good idea in how to "improve" distribution. After all, in person the information we get will most likely come from our friends because we typically trust our friends over strangers. But they built a system that can generate revenue (views) by exploiting human traits (confirmation bias), and evidently didn't realize that some people would take advantage of that.

ReplyShare  



Svlogo Leader1h


Are the 'fact checkers' approved' by NYT, WaPo, Snopes,, etc?

ReplyShare5 Likes  



contraryjim185 Leader1h



Those who use social media have no one else but themselves for the problems....just abstain.

ReplyShare4 Likes  



Enalysis Leader1h *Edited*

Would someone please explain to me why we should trust "fact checkers"? What reason do I have to assume that they will be any more competent, unbiased, and honest than those who provide the information in the first instance? As the Romans put it, who shall guard the guardians? Perhaps Facebook should simply stay out of it and let users decide for themselves. Based on comments I have read on Facebook, there is already vigorous debate on all such stories so I think users can handle it themselves.

ReplyShare6 Likes  



jmhall52 Enalysis1h

Sorry, Enalysis - too logical. The FB Collective would not appreciate your radical views...

ReplyShare1 Like  



Netizen24601 LeaderEnalysis42m

I would argue the internet / socail media is not capable of handling vigorous debate. Typically the "debate" is just insults, and naming calling. People don't like their beliefs questioned and will fight back when you try to discredit those beliefs.

But I do agree that users should have more power in this.

FB was hoping they could prevent confirmation bias from fueling the distribution of questionable material. But FB built a system that rewards views not truth. In order to reduce slow the spread of fake news, the revenue modle on the internet needs to change. Thats the only way fake news becomes less relevant.

ReplyShare  

SHOW MORE COMMENTS...
