**Passage 1: Facebook could easily make privacy the default. It still hasn’t:** Mark Zuckerberg's testimony overlooked one very easy fix.

Staci D. Kramer, the former editor of [paidContent](http://paidcontent.org/), writes about media and technology from University City, Mo.

While Facebook chairman and chief executive Mark Zuckerberg was boasting to Congress on Tuesday and Wednesday about how much his network is doing to protect privacy for its billions of users, I set up a new account to test what he was saying.

I wish the result had come as a surprise.

Instead, here’s everything that was public or turned on by default: My friends list. My profile, which could be indexed by search engines. I could be tagged in any post, even if I hadn’t reviewed it first. The site would suggest that my friends tag me in images. Ad targeting would let Facebook sell marketers the ability to find me based on my relationship status, employer, job title, education and interests. And Facebook would use my app and browser activity to decide which ads to show me.

Those were just a few of the settings I allowed automatically by clicking “Create Account.” It could have been a lot worse, too: Instead of “public,” many defaults, such as who could see future posts or who could see posts I’m tagged in, were set to “friends.”

As a Facebook member since 2007 and a journalist covering tech and media, I know how to look for these settings and update them. But what did Facebook do to prepare me as a new 2018 user? Precious little.

Some of that onus for being prepared rests on the consumer. After all, Facebook warns: “By clicking Create Account, you agree to our Terms and that you have read our Data Policy, including our Cookie Use .” Unlike some sites, Facebook doesn’t even require you to click anything after scrolling through the terms and data policy.

It’s legal. But it’s not even close to enough.

Despite what you find when you sign up for his service, Zuckerberg apparently agrees. Wednesday morning, he told the House Energy and Commerce Committee : “I think that a lot of people probably just accept terms of service without taking the time to read through it. I view our responsibility not as just legally complying with laying it out and getting that consent, but actually trying to make sure that people understand what’s happening throughout the product.” During questioning by Rep. Michael C. Burgess (R-Tex.), Zuckerberg added: “It’s contextual. You want to present people with the information about what they might be doing and give them the relevant controls in line at the time that they’re making those decisions, not just have it be in the background sometime or up front [to] make a one-time decision.”

Yet that’s basically what Facebook asks new users to do. As a former publishing executive, I get it: Setting default permissions — making users opt out of settings instead of choose them — is the fastest way to bring a new member onboard and the most efficient way to create critical mass for advertisers. And Zuckerberg was right when he told the Senate hearing Tuesday that users want an environment that matches their interests and needs.

Opt-in, though, is the best way to ensure that people understand what they are choosing to share. Facebook deploys it frequently once a member is on the platform, as Zuckerberg repeated often during his testimony. For instance, the permission settings are next to the “Post” button when I’m ready to publish.

The Cambridge Analytica reveal that brought Zuckerberg to Capitol Hill this past week sent me on a dive into my own account, where I was reminded of how many apps or sites I had connected to with Facebook — 37 — and how much information I had agreed to share with The Washington Post and other third parties. (I chose Facebook over Google to log in at a lot of sites because it felt more private and containable. Ha.)

After some repair work — limiting permissions to the bare minimum in most cases, deleting some apps or connections completely — I signed into my dad’s more recent account to check the privacy landscape that resulted when someone who didn’t pay any attention joined Facebook. It wasn’t pretty. He might have agreed to it all, if asked, or gotten so irritated he wouldn’t have signed up, but instead, “Create Account” meant he consented to everything unless and until he told Facebook otherwise. So here is the information that my father, now deceased, allowed friends to share with third-party apps: his bio; his birthday; his family and relationships; whether he was online; his timeline; his home town and current city; his education and work histories; his activities, interests and likes; and his activity in apps.

What makes this even more frustrating is that Facebook’s privacy check does a decent job of walking users through the various ways they can protect their data, as Zuckerberg suggested on the Hill. (If you’re on Facebook and haven’t already done it, make the time. Now. Then repeat for Google and Oath — the Verizon subsidiary that owns Yahoo, HuffPost and AOL — and check for the option at other sites.) But it the default permissions could be transparent from the start, and any changes should be possible from Facebook’s app or its mobile site, not just on desktop.

As Rep. Joe Barton (R-Tex.) told Zuckerberg, “You can pretty well set up your Facebook account to be almost totally private, but you have to really work at it.”

Facebook is already updating and streamlining its terms of service , which haven’t been changed in three years, and promising more clarity on privacy. But the seven-day comment period for those updates ended Wednesday.

Sweeping retroactive fixes for existing members are difficult enough. There’s no excuse for baking in problems for newcomers. New users shouldn’t be required to make privacy repairs that could be avoided at sign-up. At the very least, the welcome email and screen message should include a privacy-check link.

# Passage 2: Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg says sorry in full-page newspaper ads

**By Sheena McKenzie, CNN.** Updated 1817 GMT (0217 HKT) March 25, 2018

**(CNN)**Facebook founder [Mark Zuckerberg](https://www.cnn.com/2013/05/07/us/mark-zuckerberg-fast-facts/index.html) took out full-page ads in several British and Americannewspapers Sunday to apologize for a "breach of trust" in the [Cambridge Analytica](https://edition.cnn.com/2018/03/24/europe/raid-cambridge-analytica---intl/index.html)scandal.

"You may have heard about a quiz app built by a university researcher that leaked Facebook data of millions of people in 2014," said the ads signed by Zuckerberg, referring to the political consultancy company accused of manipulating Facebook data during the 2016 US election.

"This was a breach of trust, and I'm sorry we didn't do more at the time. We're now taking steps to ensure this doesn't happen again," read the ads appearing in the UK's The Observer, The Sunday Times, Mail on Sunday, Sunday Mirror, Sunday Express and Sunday Telegraph, along with American newspapers The New York Times, Washington Post and Wall Street Journal.

Mark Zuckerberg's apology comes after the company's value plunged by almost $50 billion last week

The ads, featuring black text on a white background with the Facebook logo, said the social media company was now "limiting the data apps get" when users sign in, and was also "investigating every single app that had access to large amounts of data before" it fixed the problem.

According to the ad, Facebook will be reminding users which apps they'd previously given access to, giving them the opportunity to "shut off the ones you don't want anymore."

"I promise to do better for you," said Zuckerberg, who has come under harsh criticism for the scandal which sent the company's value plunging by almost $50 billion last week.

What is Cambridge Analytica accused of?

The ads come as Facebook announced last week it was suspending Cambridge Analytica's account over concerns the firm violated the social media site's policies. It followed reports from The New York Times and UK's The Observer newspaper (the Sunday edition of The Guardian) that Cambridge Analytica allegedly harvested the personal information of more than 50 million users.

Now Cambridge Analytica, which worked for Donald Trump's presidential campaign, is being accused of using that data in strategies for the US 2016 election.

Cambridge Analytica has repeatedly denied that the firm used any of Facebook's data in the work it did for Trump's campaign. The company also said it deleted the data when Facebook alerted them in 2015 that it had been improperly shared.

Facebook said the data in question was properly gathered a few years ago by psychology professor Aleksandr Kogan, who said he was using it for academic purposes.

But then the information was later transferred to third parties, including Cambridge Analytica. The transfer violated Facebook policies.

What is the fallout?

Scrutiny of Cambridge Analytica is growing as top officials from the firm claimed credit for President Donald Trump's stunning 2016 victory.

Last week, the embattled analytics company suspended its CEO, Alexander Nix, in the wake of a UK Channel 4 report showingundercover footage of Nix claiming he met Trump "many times" and that the company was responsible for a wide swath of the Trump campaign's activity.

On Friday, the company's offices in London were searched by enforcement officers from the United Kingdom's Information Commissioner's Office, following reports the organization had been harvesting data.

What's Steve Bannon got to do with it?

Cambridge Analytica was the creation of conservative billionaire Robert Mercer and conservative activist Steve Bannon, who later helped run the Trump campaign and served as chief strategist in the White House.

According to The Guardian, Bannon said at a conference Thursday that he "didn't even know about the Facebook mining."

Is there a Brexit connection?

On Sunday, the controversy surrounding Cambridge Analytica began to engulf to Britain's 2016 Brexit referendum.

Brexit campaigner Shahmir Sanni told Channel 4 that the British referendum's "Vote Leave" campaign spent over its legal limit by using the Canadian data firm called Aggregate IQ -- adding that the company had links to Cambridge Analytica.

British election law enforces a spending cap on donations, however Sanni claims a donation of £625,000 ($883,000) by Vote Leave to another Brexit group, "BeLeave," was funneled to AIQ.

Channel 4 says it has seen documents that it claims show multiple ties between AIQ and Cambridge Analytica's parent company, SCL.

However, attorneys for AIQ have distanced themselves from Cambridge Analytica, saying in a statement to Channel 4, "AggregateIQ has never entered into a contract with Cambridge Analytica."

An attorney for Vote Leave also told Channel 4 that the campaign had "twice been cleared on this matter by the Electoral Commission," but acknowledged the network's report presented new allegations and said it would investigate.

*CNN's Sophie Tatum, Hilary Clarke and Katie Polglase contributed to this report*

Answer the following questions

1. What are the purposes of each passage?
2. Examine the writers’ attitude in each passage towards the data leak in Facebook, is it positive, neutral, or negative? (explain in 150-200 words)
3. Is there any similarity and differences in point of view? (explain in 150-200 words)
4. Is there any bias in each passage? Is it supported by evidence? (explain in 150-200 words)