General Instructions

1. For each page, synthesize the reading and research by writing in complete sentences in essay format.
   a. Use the green instructions in the notes below each page to focus your research and writing.
   b. Write about each question, prompt, or process provided in those notes.
   c. Write a full page of text with lots of detail (about 250 words).
      i. Don’t generalize so much that your writing is devoid of detail.
      ii. Don’t repeat yourself.
   d. Cite each source by adding a hyperlink in the Title of the Article or law.
   e. Do not change the template:
      i. Text must be 14 point Lato left-justified type.
      ii. Refrain from adding extra margins or double spacing.
      iii. Do not bullet the paragraphs. Write in essay format only.
   f. Add additional pages if you need more room.

2. Add all sources to the Bibliography page.
   a. Include author, year, title, publisher, and URL.
   b. Number or bullet them using the list button.

When in doubt, write to the instructor for clarification using the Canvas Inbox.
Free and Hate Speech, Censorship, and AI

Though the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States states that “...Congress shall make no law...abridging freedom of speech,” there are some limitations on the protections the First Amendment’s freedom of speech clause grants. According to the U.S. Federal Courts website in their article [What Does Free Speech Mean?](#), there are certain acts that are not protected by the freedom of speech. These include performing actions that may cause harm to others (the classic example of this is shouting “fire” in a crowded building), creating or distributing materials considered obscene by law, or burning draft cards to protest war. There have also been Supreme Court decisions that restricted the free speech of students at school-sponsored events and ensured that school administrators maintain control over certain school-associated things, like school newspapers.

Since coming to power in China, Xi Jinping, has introduced restrictions and regulations on online content, according to the Reuters article [China's Xi says internet control key to stability](#). Though the increased stringency is purportedly a matter of national security, other nations have criticized it as being a crackdown on free speech. In particular, this has led to rising tensions between China and the United States, which is also in part a result of the technological arms race between the two nations.
According to the Reuters article "YouTube deletes 5 million videos for content violation," the video and streaming site YouTube has started using an automated system to detect, flag, and remove videos containing inappropriate content at a higher rate than was previously possible. Although approximately 5 million videos were removed for violating YouTube's content rules, approximately 1.6 million had to be verified as inappropriate by humans, while another 1.6 million were missed entirely. Specifically, YouTube has attempted to target videos promoting extremism and videos that target children with inappropriate content. YouTube also wishes to curb the spread of misinformation on its site, but doing so directly through a policy or content ban would be a tricky affair.

The top answers for the Quora question "What are the main differences between artificial intelligence and machine learning? Is machine learning a part of artificial intelligence?" conflict greatly, despite the response authors being quite knowledgeable in the field. One perspective, explained by Monica Anderson, is that machine learning is the only example of true artificial intelligence, as prior to machine learning, so-called “artificially intelligent” programs were simply advanced programming tricks. The other primary viewpoint, explored by Jussi Raunio, is that machine learning and artificial intelligence differ in a fundamental way: machine learning achieves success through patterns, while artificial intelligence gives the ability to make decisions to influence the ultimate outcome.
Cyberbullying

With the rise of social media, cyberbullying has become a major problem worldwide. Due to the anonymity that technology provides, as well as the ubiquity of instant messaging and social media, cyberbullying is easy to perform and very difficult to escape. As explained in the article What Is Cyberbullying?, it can take many forms, some of which have consequences that are impossible to avoid even by turning off one’s computer or deleting one’s social media - for instance, a cyberbully may out a victim as gay against their wishes or share nude photos of an ex-partner online. Though cyberbullying takes place almost exclusively online, its effects on victims are similar when compared to typical bullying. Victims may feel humiliated, unsafe, depressed, and in some cases, even suicidal. Additionally, cyberbullying may spread beyond the screen and result in harassment and teasing in public spaces, such as at school.

Cyberbullies are often introverted and insecure, and the majority would not say to their victims’ faces what they say to them online. The mask of anonymity emboldens cyberbullies, as it removes the fear of consequences; on a related note, it is usually quite difficult to detect when cyberbullying is taking place, so even acts that are illegal in most states, such as revenge porn, often go unpunished. Although anti-cyberbullying laws are being passed, few cite cyberbullying as a criminal offense, so enforcement is typically up to school administrators.

When I was in sixth grade, I sent an email to all of my contacts (which included most of the students in my small school) instructing them to “...pass it on”. People started to use the “Reply All” function, and the thread grew to over a hundred replies. A parallel chain email was started up with the subject line “Kill Cameron”. Thanks to the intervention of one of my teachers the situation never got out of hand, but I felt awful when I learned about the other chain email.
According to Evaluating Information: The Cornerstone of Civic Online Reasoning, the majority of students are unable to tell the difference between advertisements, factual articles, opinion-based pieces, and works that are a mix of any of the previous three. This leads to a more uninformed populace, and causes even educated people to form opinions based off of intentionally skewed information, misinformation, or outright lies. In today’s social media age, the ability to differentiate between real and fake news is a valuable one, but it’s a skill that is getting harder and harder to perfect - various clickbait articles, misleading charts and photos, and sensationalized headlines crop up on every news or social media feed, no matter how carefully curated. The rise of fake news supporting or condemning certain political parties has thrown things into even more discord, as it can be difficult to tell the difference between a legitimate news article and a propaganda piece written to target a person’s specific party or demographic. Vanessa Otero’s Media Bias Chart is a useful tool that can be used to evaluate a source based off of its political leaning and its tendency toward fact or fabrication. Mostly neutral sources that primarily do fact reporting - with some occasional analysis mixed in - are considered news, according to the chart. Neutral analysis and opinion pieces are considered fair interpretations of the news, though a higher degree of political skew marks such sources as unfair or extreme interpretations. Sources that spread misleading or fabricated information are damaging to public discourse, no matter their political leaning. I personally don’t read from any particular news sites on a daily basis, but I do tend to avoid more skewed sites. While I’m willing to read articles from sources like the Huffington Post or Mother Jones, I tend to trust them less than articles from, say, the Washington Post or the Wall Street Journal.
Twitter recently used phone numbers and email addresses given by users for security reasons to help target advertisements, according to Lily Hay Newman’s Wired article *Never Trust a Platform to Put Privacy Ahead of Profit*. The data, collected for the purpose of two-factor authentication (a security measure in which an authentication code is sent to the phone of a user during a login attempt), was loaded into two of Twitter’s advertising systems and used to show more personalized ads on users’ feeds. A grievous example of data mishandling, using two-factor authentication data for marketing purposes is not a new occurrence; a little over a year ago, Facebook was found to have done something similar, resulting in a $5 billion fine from the Federal Trade Commission. Though Twitter claims that the usage of two-factor authentication information for marketing purposes was unintentional and was the result of an internal issue, such a problem is a very easy one to avoid, according to cryptographer Matthew Green.

This breach of privacy, which affected an unknown amount of users, is not one that should be happening for a massive tech company like Twitter; considering the ease of avoiding such an issue, it’s clear that the company prioritizes profits over user privacy. Facebook and Twitter have admitted their mistakes in this department, but it’s highly probable that this sort of privacy breach is not limited to those two sites. Despite the importance of keeping certain information private - a Social Security number or a classified work conversation, for instance - the digital age is making it much tougher to do so, and morally questionable invasions of privacy like the one explored in the article do not help matters in the slightest.
This image, posted by the Media Literacy Council on Facebook in September 2019, was intended to teach the general public about the various types of fake news. The post received harsh criticism for its portrayal of satire as fake news, with many arguing that satire belongs to a different category and should not be grouped together with actual fake news, like false context and misleading content. Ironically, the graphic itself was lambasted for containing misleading content.
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