


Masters of the Universe: Facebook Admits to Sharing User Data with Lobbyists at 61 Companies

 Facebook CEO and founder Mark Zuckerberg, pictured in April 2018, will attend a closed-door meeting with the European parliament's most senior deputies

AFP

Facebook has admitted to sharing the personal data of its users with 61 different companies.

Social media giant Facebook admitted recently to giving access to their user's data to 61 other hardware and software developers after claiming that they had stopped this practice in May 2015 [CNET reports](#). The company delivered a [747 page document](#) to Congress on Friday in response to the hundreds of questions left unanswered by CEO Mark Zuckerberg during his hearing before members of Congress in April.

The social media Masters of the Universe stated that they had arranged a special "one-time" six-month extension to the 61 companies, including AOL, USPS, a dating app named Hinge and many more, so that they could update their services to become compliant with the site's new privacy policy. Some of the data shared with the companies during this time period included friends' names, genders and birth dates.

In the documents submitted to Congress, the company stated: "We engaged companies to build integrations for a variety of devices, [operating systems](#) and other products where we and our partners wanted to offer people a way to receive Facebook or Facebook experiences. These integrations were built by our partners, for our users, but approved by Facebook." The company further stated that they had discovered that five other companies "theoretically could have accessed limited friends' data" due to a beta test on the platform.

The company further stated in the documents that they have ended 38 partnerships and have further plans to discontinue seven more by the end of July. This is the platform's second attempt to expand on Zuckerberg's comments before Congress. In June the company released a number of written replies to questions from Congress. This included replies to Congress' questions about Facebook creating advertising profiles of internet users that don't have a Facebook account, the company [stated](#).

"We do not create profiles for non-Facebook users, nor do we use browser and app logs for non-Facebook users to show targeted ads from our advertisers to them or otherwise seek to personalize the content they see," the company said in its response to Udall. "However, we may take the opportunity to show a general ad that is unrelated to the attributes of the person or an ad encouraging the non-user to sign up for Facebook."

Facebook also expanded on the type of content they remove from their platform stating: "When something crosses the line into hate speech, it has no place on Facebook, and we are committed to removing it from our platform any time we become aware of it."

DNC Strategist Reveals Insider Look into Bleak Future of the Party

 [DNC Strategist Reveals Insider Look into Bleak Future of the Party](#)

WES KOHLER JUN 17, 2018 10:18AM

SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Regardless of your view on Hillary Clinton, there was ample reason that she was the Democratic Party's presidential candidate in 2016.

Of course, Bernie Sanders supporters would contest justifiably that, were the playing field not skewed nefariously in her favor, she wouldn't have been the nominee. But, the fact remains that Clinton has done wonders for the DNC's funding, and another undeniable reality factored into her eventual status as presidential nominee.

The Democratic Party really didn't have many better options.

Now, the party's best shot at winning the next presidential election appears to be riding on a soon-to-be 80-year-old socialist. And, in the view of at least one Democratic strategist, this isn't a recipe for success.

A report in The Hill has painted a picture of a party with a crisis of leadership. Even with the recently reported return of Barack Obama from a political hiatus, he alone likely will not be enough

to catapult the party back to national prominence in 2020. Unless he plans on running for president once again – that seems extremely unlikely, and even that would be no guaranteed victory – the party will remain bereft of a clear-cut leader with a significant chance to move into the White House.

“There’s f---ing no one else,” one frustrated Democratic strategist [said](#). “[Bill Clinton](#) is toxic, [former President] Carter is too old, and there’s no one else around for miles.” (The Hill)

The DNC strategist laments the fact that Obama hasn’t been more active in politics since his presidency ended not even two years ago. The fact that the party is apparently so reliant on a former president – who apparently can’t even take a couple years off – is a signal of an unsustainable level of dependency on a former icon. It’s also an indictment of the fact that the Democrat Party, as it currently stands has no clear or coherent policy strategy.

“He’s been way too quiet,” said one longtime Obama bundler who rarely criticizes the former president. “There are a lot of people who think he’s played too little a role or almost no role in endorsing or fundraising and he’s done jack shit in getting people to donate to the party.”

No charismatic leaders with national cache and no clear policy platform is no way to start an election cycle.

Is the lingering association with Barack Obama really enough to propel a Joe Biden presidential bid?

Is anyone really getting excited by the prospect of voting for Elizabeth Warren?

On both counts, the likely answer is 'no'.

With a dearth of serious candidates, the continuing infatuation with Obama's influence on the party is concerning in and of itself.

"You have all these people running for office, some of them against other Democrats, and his strategy has been to not endorse anyone and that's what's been so f---ing ridiculous because not only are you not helping them, you're hurting them," said the bundler, who argued that candidates should be free to reflect their districts and not be pushed to political extremes that might make winning the general election more difficult. (The Hill)

Keep in mind that this source is reportedly a Democratic strategist. If your strategy as party is to look to the past for leadership, then you know you're in trouble.

It seems as if the furor over everything that Donald Trump does has, for the moment, subsided a bit. The Singapore Summit was nearly impossible to criticize, the economy remains strong, and the Stormy Daniels controversy appears to be all but dead.

The president's prospects for winning once again in 2020 seem stronger than they've been at any point during his tenure, and that's due in no small part due to an utter lack of serious

competition. If Trump hate isn't enough to cause a Blue Wave in 2020, where will the party go?

One defeat at the hands of a President who has created more controversy and hysteria than any in modern history didn't seem to serve as motivation for serious self-reflection by a political party at a crossroads.

If a second defeat in 2020 happens, the time for reflection may well be over. Party leadership is aging, and serious contenders to take hold of the torch have not emerged. It's not time to sound the death knell on the Democratic Party, but it's more than fair to wonder, as one DNC strategist has, who in the world will be the face of the party in 2020 and beyond.

[Big Government](#)[Tech](#)[facebook](#)[Mark Zuckerberg](#)[Masters of the Universe](#)[silicon valley](#)[Social Media](#)