

Philadelphia Inquirer
[Trump spells doom for set-top box reforms at FCC, observers say](#)

precursorblog.com
[What to Expect from a Trump FCC](#)

Nashville Tennessean
[Nashville files motion to dismiss AT&T lawsuit](#)

TVNewsCheck Newspapers
[Appeal FCC Ownership Decision](#)

New York Times
[A 10-Digit Key Code to Your Private Life: Your Cellphone Number](#)

pennlive.com
[Op-ed by Sen. Scott Wagner \(R-York\): The next legislative session offers new opportunities for change](#)

Allentown Morning Call
[Power sharing between governor, GOP enters new territory](#)

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
[Effort underway to prevent Kathleen Kane from ever again holding public office](#)

Regulators say AT&T's free-data offering for DirecTV violates net neutrality rules. But come January, the regulators may be out the door and those rules may be under threat.

Last Thursday, AT&T received a letter from the Federal Communications Commission saying its practice of exempting its own video-streaming service from data-usage caps may violate net-neutrality rules. AT&T has until Nov. 21 to



OUR RED CARPET TREATMENT GETS BUSINESSES NOTICED.

Comcast Spotlight makes it easy for advertisers to be seen on the shows and screens people use the most. We partner with our advertisers to provide extraordinary, full-circle sales, marketing and research support.

▶ Visit us at ComcastSpotlight.com or call (610) 350-2720 for more information.

Comcast Spotlight is a registered trademark of Comcast Corporation.

COMCAST SPOTLIGHT
SUCCEED ON SCREEN

respond, and analysts say the FCC is likely to issue a final ruling halting the offering over the next couple months.

But the election of Donald Trump last week has thrown the agency's willingness to uphold such a ruling into the air. That makes AT&T's position the most visible example of the speculation and uncertainty brewing over Mr. Trump's stance on net neutrality—the signature issue of the Obama FCC. Regulators say AT&T's free-data offering for DirecTV violates net neutrality rules. But come January, the regulators may be out the door and those rules may be under threat.

Last Thursday, AT&T received a letter from the Federal Communications Commission saying its practice of exempting its own video-streaming service from data-usage caps may violate net-neutrality rules. AT&T has until Nov. 21 to respond, and analysts say the FCC is likely to issue a final ruling halting the offering over the next couple months.

But the election of Donald Trump last week has thrown the agency's willingness to uphold such a ruling into the air. That makes AT&T's position the most visible example of the speculation and uncertainty brewing over Mr. Trump's stance on net neutrality—the signature issue of the Obama FCC. "I think he'll be a pro-business Republican with a populist tinge," said Paul Gallant, a regulatory analyst at Cowen. "But right now, you don't know where the populism is going to show up."

Companies are hoping a Trump administration at least ends some of the uncertainty that have surrounded the rules since they were issued. The current FCC said it would evaluate so-called zero-rating of data on a case-by-case basis to determine whether it complied with the rules. It apparently decided AT&T's plan to remove data caps for subscribers to its planned \$35-a-month internet-TV service crossed a line, but it hasn't challenged similar offerings at Comcast or Verizon Communications.

Still, even a cooperative Trump FCC might need to formally approve AT&T's data plan after last week's letter, a move likely to lead to outcry from internet companies and public interest groups. For telecom companies, the Trump card is still a wild card. — *Wall Street Journal*

Ongoing complaints about misinformation and hate speech on the internet are forcing social-media companies to confront whether they need to take more responsibility for the content on their sites. Twitter Inc. on Tuesday said it would let users block notifications of tweets that include specific words, among other moves, in an effort to combat harassment on the short-messaging service.

On Monday, Facebook Inc. said it would bar websites that post fabricated or misleading news articles from using its ad-selling tools. But it is unclear how Facebook will identify those sites, and they might still appear in the more-heavily-trafficked news feed, a source of news for 44% of Americans, according to Pew Research.

Both the Twitter and Facebook moves may fail to address many users' concerns. They show technology companies that have grown into powerful media voices struggling to find a balance between being havens for misinformation and censors of free speech.

Concerns about false news stories on Facebook intensified during the recent presidential election campaign after erroneous claims were shared widely on the network, such as reports that Pope Francis had endorsed Donald Trump and that the Clinton Foundation bought \$137 million in illegal arms. Some critics say the social-media sites should do more to promote accuracy and civil discourse. But the companies are wary of prescribing what their users should read or how they should act.

Facebook Chief Executive Mark Zuckerberg in a Facebook post on Saturday played down the impact of fake news, while also saying that his company is developing tools to curb it, including one that would allow users to flag news that they believe is fake. But Syracuse University communications professor Jennifer Grygiel, who studies social media, said relying on users is inadequate. Instead, she said Facebook should hire more workers to review widely shared articles and remove those that are false. "What he needs to do is hire more humans instead of pushing (the responsibility) onto the end user," Ms. Grygiel said. "Know how much the community is trained in identifying fake news? Zilch."

In his Saturday post, Mr. Zuckerberg said Facebook won't try to separate fact from fiction, because defining the truth is complicated. "We must be extremely cautious about becoming arbiters of truth ourselves," he wrote. Karen North, director of the social-media program at the University of Southern California, agreed. "Do you really want Facebook and Twitter deciding what you can talk about?" she asked. "It's

a slippery slope and these companies already have massive control over what we see and what we don't."

Facebook has strained to appear objective, particularly after reports in May that certain politically motivated workers prevented conservative news from appearing in its "trending topics" feature. Executives have been uneasy about taking steps that suggest Facebook is restricting free speech, current and former employees say. That has stirred dissent within the company, with some employees urging Facebook to do more to weed out misinformation, according to two people familiar with the matter. They said the topic was discussed during an all-hands meeting Thursday with the 32-year-old CEO.

Google parent Alphabet Inc. had largely avoided the controversy around internet propaganda, because it doesn't operate a thriving social network and because its search engine rewards websites that are linked to by established sites. Still, the company was pulled into the debate on Sunday when a post from a little-known right-wing blog erroneously stating that Mr. Trump defeated Hillary Clinton in the popular vote appeared atop the Google search results for several election-related queries. Mrs. Clinton is leading by almost 700,000 votes in the Journal's tabulation. "In this case we clearly didn't get it right, but we are continually working to improve our algorithms," a Google spokeswoman said in an email.

On Monday, shortly before Facebook's similar announcement, Google said it would ban fake-news websites from using its ad-selling system, likely hurting those sites' revenue. Google's AdSense program, which helps website operators sell ads on their sites, is the most popular way to monetize websites and has helped fund many propaganda sites. Google pulled AdSense from several sites on Monday. Twitter, meanwhile, has long grappled with complaints that some users repeatedly post abusive and harassing messages. The moves announced Tuesday include a feature that lets users block notifications of tweets that include specific words or phrases. Users will still see such tweets on Twitter's website and app.

When flagging problem tweets, users will be able to note that the messages include hate speech or "targeted harassment." Users can also now block specific conversations between other users that include them. Del Harvey, Twitter's vice president of trust and safety, acknowledged the steps are "not going to solve the problem of abuse on Twitter." Ms. North, the USC professor, said the burden to report abuse falls largely on the victim. "While they keep making these small steps...there's still no major consequences for abusing anyone on Twitter," she said. – **Wall Street Journal**

President-elect Donald Trump warned that the election would be "rigged," and he was right. But not in the way that he suggested.

There was no valid basis for his prediction of tampering in his race against Hillary Clinton. In contrast, elections for the House were rigged years ago when the dominant parties in many states created districts so tilted toward their candidates that opponents have little or no chance of ever winning. Every decade after the census, the 43 states with more than one congressional district are required to redraw House boundaries to ensure equitable representation. But party bosses pervert the process, especially in the 37 states where the legislature is responsible for redistricting, by using their muscle to create "safe" districts for their candidates.

Pennsylvania is one of the worst cheaters. Republicans stretched the Seventh District across five counties, from Delaware to Berks, to make it safe for U.S. Rep. Patrick Meehan. He easily won a fourth term against a worthy Democratic challenger, Mary Ellen Balchunis. The rest of Pennsylvania is almost as outrageous. The state has 4.2 million Democrats and 3.3 million Republicans, but only five

House seats are held by Democrats, while 13 are held by Republicans. To no one's surprise, that didn't change Tuesday.

Such gerrymandering breeds polarization. It creates an artificial terrain where incumbents aren't challenged by having to make decisions that serve diverse constituencies. Instead of thinking out of the box, they follow a straight path, fearing that if they fall out of lockstep with the hive mind of homogenous voters, they might face a more formidable primary foe.

Because general election outcomes are all but guaranteed in tilted congressional districts, primaries provide the best route to replace incumbent House members. But primary voters tend to have a narrow focus, so candidates dare not venture too far from party orthodoxy if they want to win. That's how the tea-partyers who bully moderate Republicans infiltrated Congress.

Pennsylvania has a redistricting commission, with the Democratic and Republican legislative leaders each choosing two members and a fifth tiebreaker member chosen by the state Supreme Court. The good-government group Common Cause of Pennsylvania recommended replacing the commission with a panel of qualified volunteers who would ignore party preferences and draw district lines based on demographic and other objective data. But that idea died when the Republican-controlled legislature buried the bill in committee on April Fools' Day.

That shows the Republicans aren't serious about reform, but the joke will be on them if they ignore the clear message in Tuesday's election that voters want candidates who don't represent the status quo. – *Philadelphia Inquirer* editorial



127 State Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101
717.214.2000 • bcaps.com

**First in Broadband.
The Future of Broadband.®**