

Four and a Half Reasons Not to Worry that Cambridge Analytica Skewed the 2016 Election | The Washington Post

By Kris-Stella Trump

March 23, 2018

Observers have pointed out many reasons to be concerned about all this: The way that the data was collected from Facebook [arguably](#) did not allow for informed consent. The researcher who collected the data was not authorized to pass it on to Cambridge Analytica. Cambridge Analytica itself may have [broken U.S. election laws](#), if British individuals without U.S. green cards worked on any U.S. election campaigns.

But here's one thing you probably should not be concerned about: whether Cambridge Analytica successfully used this profile data to [manipulate](#) millions of Americans' [political behavior](#). When Cambridge Analytica [took credit](#) for Donald Trump's 2016 election victory, social scientists [mostly responded](#) with [eye-rolling](#) and [references](#) to "[snake oil](#)."

Why did social scientists so quickly [dismiss](#) the manipulation claims? Here are four reasons Cambridge Analytica's claim of psychological manipulation doesn't pass the social scientist's smell test.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/03/23/four-and-a-half-reasons-not-to-worry-that-cambridge-analytica-skewed-the-2016-election/?utm_term=.7a4dc2ef90e6