

[Add a comment](#)

[72 comments](#)



• [Vicky Reed](#) · Peterborough

who the fuck is Randi Suckerberg to tell the world about digital etiquette.

[Reply](#) · [420](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:20am](#)



○

[Daniel Duncan](#)

especially after she wanted to end internet anonymity.

[Reply](#) · [88](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 8:54am](#)



○

[Joe Youngblood](#) · Top Commenter · [Arlington, Texas](#)

I find irony that I liked this comment with my facebook account but have no idea who will end up seeing it and have zero control over that fact.

[Reply](#) · [153](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 11:57am](#)



○

[Jason Smyth](#) · [Donabate](#)

lol. exactlywhat i thought. stuck-up ****

[Reply](#) · [13](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 12:48pm](#)

[View 5 more](#)



• [Travis Love Benson](#) · Top Commenter · Port Jervis Senior High School

Welcome to the Internet, Randi. Just wait for the memes of you being a douchebag. The way you act it shouldn't take long.

[Reply](#) · [70](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 9:51am](#)



• [Ridwan Jaafar](#) · [Saint Neots](#)

Not sure why Callie Schweitzer apologised? As per FB, everything is OK! Randi needs to get a grip on her brother's privacy invading social network.

[Reply](#) · [64](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:51am](#)



• [Tom Bielecki](#) · Top Commenter · University of Calgary

Absolutely hilarious. Particularly because I hate this 'feature' (showing tagged posts to every friend of whoever is tagged).

[Reply](#) · [48](#) ·

· [December 25, 2012 at 11:08pm](#)



○ [Tom Hunter](#) · Top Commenter · Binghamton

Then don't tag. Plain and simple. It is obvious when you tag someone that the reason for this is for their friends to see it. And Facebook makes it very clear that they will be able to.

[Reply](#) · [26](#) ·

· [December 25, 2012 at 11:53pm](#)



○

[John Albert Pinion](#) · [Melbourne, Florida](#)

No, they don't. (Not unless you read very carefully, which I certainly never did before I realized that was the way it worked.) Wow - and the photo is such a scandalous private "kitchen shot"! Interesting the Zuckerbergs are so interested in under-sharing, while encouraging everyone else to over-share.

[Reply](#) · [155](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 3:00am



[Kevin McDonough](#)

Tom Hunter " It is obvious when you tag someone that the reason for this is for their friends to see it."

Not really. If I tag people in a post or a picture is because I want THEM to see it, the person I'm tagging usually. Not their extended friends whom I'm sure I won't know a lot of.

[Reply](#) · [9](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 3:29am

[View 7 more](#)



[Tuğbay Şahin](#)

Why apology? It is not like her fault? How could she know it was a private photo?

[Reply](#) · [48](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 12:32am](#)




[Francois Pichard](#) · Logica

She could have started by not reposting the picture but linking to it instead and the Fb privacy settings would have been respected...

[Reply](#) · [7](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 6:59am



[Chris Duffy](#) · Top Commenter

Francois Pichard Why are Randi Zuckerberg's privacy wishes in the hands of someone else? Seriously, this is the fundamental issue for everyone who uses the site. If I post a private photo and a friend likes it, all their friends can click through and see it even if they couldn't see on my profile otherwise.

[Reply](#) · [28](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 7:13am



○

[Matt Gilbert](#) · Top Commenter

That's a bit like walking down the street and screaming "don't look at my face!". slackerborg needs to learn to keep private things private, because as much as she might not like it, the world doesn;t have time to double check things with her before doing them.

[Reply](#) · [45](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 9:45am

[View 2 more](#)



●

[Mark Kress](#) · Top Commenter

Reminder: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/27/randi-zuckerberg-anonymity-online_n_910892.html

[Reply](#) · [41](#) ·

· [December 25, 2012 at 10:47pm](#)



●

[Molly Porter](#) · [Digital communications, social media, content strategy](#) at [DLA Piper \(Official\)](#)

This is why I have tag review set up. Unless I approve the tag, my friends can't see the pictures.

[Reply](#) · [38](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:12am](#)



○

[Tyler Hurst](#) · Top Commenter · [The Wordherder](#) at [Writer](#)

Same here. Seems pretty simple.

[Reply](#) · [5](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 12:30pm



○

[Mau Sandoval](#)

Even if you don't approve the tag, the photo is already out there... with your face on it.

[Reply](#) · [12](#) ·

· December 26, 2012 at 12:56pm



○

[Waseem Sindhu](#) · [Newports Institute of Communications and Economics](#)

Ditto, because when you're really concerned about your privacy you spend a bit time digging into those complex settings ;)

[Reply](#) · [6](#) ·

· December 27, 2012 at 9:45am

[View 2 more](#)




•

[Michael Anderson](#) · Top Commenter

BOO HOO

[Reply](#) · [24](#) ·

· [December 25, 2012 at 11:37pm](#)



•

[Zahim Anass](#) · High-Tech

Even Zuckerberg is feeling offended due to Facebook's privacy.

[Reply](#) · [26](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:02am](#)



• [Tyler Hurst](#) · Top Commenter · [The Wordherder](#) at [Writer](#)

Wait a second here...if the Zuckerbergs can't even figure out Facebook's privacy settings, how are we supposed to?

[Reply](#) · [17](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 12:30pm](#)



• [Matthew Jones](#) · Top Commenter · [Los Angeles, California](#)

I see the Zuckerbergs live in the model home from Arrested Development.

[Reply](#) · [12](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 1:56pm](#)




• [Pete White](#)

So Zuckerberg complains, Schweitzer explains, apologizes, and deletes, and Zuckerberg calls her indecent anyway. The Zuckerbergs are just a peach of a family, aren't they?

[Reply](#) · [9](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:55pm](#)




○

[Candice Grant](#) · [Comox, British Columbia](#)

I was going to say this exact thing. Who the hell is this lady to be so damn preachy about something so stupid and inconsequential. Boohoo, grow up and act like a decent human being.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 8:46am](#)



•

[Martin Van Der Harst](#)

If its on fb baby, its public domain.
Your bro should have told you how fb works....

[Reply](#) · [9](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:10pm](#)



[Robert Anhalt](#) · Top Commenter · [Iowa State University](#)

Facebook: It's about the human decency!

[Reply](#) · [9](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:32am](#)



[Damien Fox](#) · Top Commenter · [Agent](#) at [S.H.I.E.L.D.](#)

If you don't want it to show up around the net, here's a novel idea: Don't bloody post it.

[Reply](#) · [7](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 1:01pm](#)




[Matt Dolloff](#) · Top Commenter · [Digital Producer](#) at [CBS Radio](#)

What's the point of the "Share" button if we're supposed to ask permission before using it?

[Reply](#) · [6](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 1:43pm](#)



[William Huang](#) · [Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan](#) · 1,228 subscribers

It's not "Share" it's "Steal". If it's on fb, doesn't matter what settings one uses, things will still find its way to the public domain. That woman needs to shut up. Now we all know she's an idiot.

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· December 27, 2012 at 9:51am



• [Matt Gilbert](#) · Top Commenter

Why is she getting the arsehole with someone who reposted something that she made public? If she doesn't like private photos becoming public then she shouldn't make them public. It would have been fine to say she made it public by accident and ask the person to remove the tweet, but it's stuck up to make out that the person who reposted it done something wrong.

I wonder if he brother suggested that she state it's "not about privacy settings" when it obviously is.

[Reply](#) · [5](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 9:43am](#)




• [Igor Oliyarnik](#) · Top Commenter · [Cleveland State University](#)

Sorry, but Randi is a complete nobody. She comes off as a spoiled brat in these tweets and this is not the first time she's made a fool of herself.

[Reply](#) · [5](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 11:59am](#)



• [Matt Lush](#) · Top Commenter · Works at [BSN SPORTS](#)

Zuck it, Randi. Zuck it long, zuck it hard.

[Reply](#) · [5](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 9:58am](#)



• [David Allard](#) · Top Commenter · [San Jose, California](#)

HEHE! The irony is mind-boggling! LOL!

[Reply](#) · [5](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:24pm](#)



• [Nithin Savio](#) · Top Commenter · Works at [Capital Results LLC](#)

Unless you are a huge celebrity, nobody cares.

[Reply](#) · [5](#) ·

· [December 25, 2012 at 11:46pm](#)



• [Gina Darienzo Galante](#) · [Associate Broker/Realtor](#) at [Signature Homes of NY](#)

Randi - Don't know who you are and really do not care. Your family Christmas photo means absolutely nothing to anyone who saw it. You are not any more important than any other human being walking on this Earth....how obnoxious to think anyone would give your photo any thought or concern. Get over yourself - no one cares - or even knows who you are for that matter.

[Reply](#) · [4](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 11:49am](#)



• [Joel Armstrong](#) · [Vancouver, British Columbia](#) · 245 subscribers

yeah... where did you post the photo! oh right, the internet... on the social media platform your bro invented with a massive percentage of people around the world using on a daily basis and you're worried about digital etiquette... Half a billion people at your finger tips and I have trouble with etiquette at a 6 person family gathering. How stupid are you woman?

[Reply](#) · [4](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 5:13am](#)



○

[Oliver Moldan](#) · Works at [Red Basement Studios Meerbusch - Germany](#) · 639 subscribers

So true!

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 12:41pm](#)



• [Chao Liao](#)

My confusion is that if Randi is so "sensitive" about privacy, why would she publicize that "Callie and her sisters are facebook friends" on Twitter?

[Reply](#) · [3](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 8:52am](#)



• [Trisha Sherman Coleman](#) · [Saint John, Kansas](#)

um...actually is IS about privacy settings - at least that's what the commoners are told...

[Reply](#) · [3](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 1:20pm](#)



• [Lee Edge](#)

If you don't want it shown publicly, then don't post it on Facebook you twit!

[Reply](#) · [3](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:45pm](#)



• [Pamela Blalock](#)

If you want to keep it private, duh, don't post it! Does the former marketing director for facebook really not understand the 5 degrees of separation (with friends tagged and commenting) concept that means everyone can see everything!

[Reply](#) · [2](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:30pm](#)



○

[Mari Hyatt](#) · Top Commenter · Works at [Online Marketer/Gather blogger](#)

Probably why she's a "former!"

[Reply · 1 ·](#)

· [December 29, 2012 at 11:15am](#)



[Darlene Rojas Wilson · Austin, Texas](#)

maybe no one told her FB has a feature where she can preview a photo that she is tagged in before she permits it to be posted! lol...idiot...btw, etiquette is being kind and respectful - not a bit[h.

[Reply · 2 ·](#)

· [December 26, 2012 at 4:12pm](#)



[Sun Sarose Shk](#)

I am beginning to think there is some family beef going on between the siblings don't you think so? Wonder who is the pig in the family? <http://bit.ly/UtUCUb>

[Reply · 2 ·](#)

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:29pm](#)



[Tomas Sancio · Top Commenter · Baruta](#)

That's why I stopped posting personal pictures on Facebook and stuck with making stupid comments like this one.

[Reply · 2 ·](#)

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:03pm](#)



[Ginger Leialoha Hawelu · Empire Beauty School at Manhattan](#)

WELLLP now EVERRYONEEEEEEE saw the triple chin photo of shame. shoulda just kept her mouth shut.

[Reply · 2 ·](#)

· [December 26, 2012 at 5:44pm](#)



• [Melanie Curtin](#) · Top Commenter

If you don't want something posted all over the internet, then don't post it on the internet. It's as simple as that.

[Reply](#) · [2](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 11:22am](#)




• [Jason Nemeth](#) · [University of Victoria](#)

Anyone not realize this is just marketing for "Poke"? Look how much fun they are having with FB!

[Reply](#) · [2](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 9:34am](#)



○

[Craig Turner](#) · Top Commenter

Exactly. Nobody reacts to "Poke" like that. A realistic picture would show all of them rolling their eyes at whatever lame person hit the "Poke" button.

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 29, 2012 at 6:16am](#)



• [Cat Elizabeth Robbins-Figueroa](#) · Top Commenter · 38 years old

She sounds very stuck up!

[Reply](#) · [2](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 1:00pm](#)



• [Kia Fierce-Spokenword McClain](#) · Top Commenter · [Fort Lauderdale, Florida](#) · 718 subscribers

I know it's wrong but I can't help but gleefully enjoy this moment. Now you know how we feel when we try to make things private on so called "private" facebook pages just to find out that it's not really private after all. Oh the irony and karma! I had to announce my pregnancy before I wanted to because on my PRIVATE facebook page that I thought had privacy settings that would allow no one to see ANYTHING I posted on my page showed my positive pregnancy test to every friend of family members tagged on the photo. I had a flood of email on my private account asking if I was pregnant or saying congrats. So excuse me for being smugly satisfied right now! :o)

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 10:14pm](#)




• [Angel Calvillo](#) · Top Commenter

well tell your brother to quit making it so hard to make your profile private.tell him to make a one click private button only show picture and some info..nooo he wants to make it so complicated.

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 8:14am](#)



• [Nathan Lee](#)

Not sure what is more pathetic, the notion of anything being "private" on FB, or 4 people within 10 feet of each other needing "smart" phones to communicate with each other.

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 7:00am](#)



• [Sam Duffield](#) · Roundhay School

its not even an embarrassing photo! if anything its kinda nice, family at home having a nice time, way to blow things out of proportion media masses!

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 7:41am](#)



• [Survivor Ties](#)

Lets get to the root of the problem here...WHY POST A PRIVATE PHOTO ON A SOCIAL NETWORK? The REST of the irony of this event is pure icing...

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 10:03am](#)



[Jeffrey Goldberg](#) · [Del Mar, California](#)

First I gave it the standard RT..now with this comment I'll watch it spread on my FB..and only for my own laughing pleasure...here it goes.

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 12:34pm](#)



[Tara Dawes](#) · Top Commenter

I think the real question is why do they all look so damn excited over such a stupid "feature".

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 10:27pm](#)



[Colin Mustapha Bigga Stiffie](#)

id be more concerned about the amount of crap that's already on facebook rather than what looks to be a publicity photo!

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 8:39am](#)



[Winter Slaughter](#) · Top Commenter · Utica

There is no such thing as privacy on the internet. She of all people should understand that.

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 5:30pm](#)



• [AC Smith](#) · Top Commenter · Rice

My favorite is the dog, all "I didn't even have a say in being a part of this family", in the lower left ;)

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 5:17pm](#)



• [David Latham](#) · Top Commenter

...poor 'lil baby bunny.... better call the waambulance...

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:28pm](#)



• [Jack Smith](#)

Cheap an effective PR trick. Is Facebook's share price things so bad?

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [January 2 at 5:22pm](#)



• [Cat Elizabeth Robbins-Figueroa](#) · Top Commenter · 38 years old

Wahhhh Boo hoo hoo lmao now they know how it feels! Who Cares really?

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 12:59pm](#)



• [Mark Green Solomons](#) · [TimeSlips Facilitator](#) at [Villa Marin](#)

Why is this photo so innocuous?

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 12:48am](#)



[Timothy Ryan White](#) · CUNY Hunter

wahhhhhh

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 1:01pm](#)



[Clea Jenkins](#) · SUNY Purchase

retarded

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 1:03pm](#)



[Robyn Hyman-weiss](#) · [Real Housewife of Weston, Florida](#)

This Randi Idiot Zuckerberg ought to stop taking money from facebook if she can't take it. She dishing it out everyday by living of of the proceeds. She could have laughed it off and then she would have looked classy...now she can see how it feels to be a "victim" of her brother's creation, like so many have been in the past. This is a classic case of what goes around, comes around!

As far as her preaching etiquette to that girl, she should be apologizing to her instead. So proud of that girl for making that post. YOU GO GIRL!

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 4:28am](#)



[Basil Farano](#) · [Toronto, Ontario](#)

Digital étiquette Randi Zuckerberg : Don't post images to the internet that you don't want people to see.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 29, 2012 at 12:31pm](#)



• [Timothy Tan](#)

How the hell can her tweet about digital etiquette even get 110 retweets as of the time of that screenshot?

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 28, 2012 at 11:41am](#)



• [Maggie Kooperman](#) · Top Commenter

Wow she's rude!

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 29, 2012 at 8:05pm](#)



• [BusinessLeads.com](#)

We are looking to talk to Mark Zuckerberg about privacy. We've even put a \$2.5k bounty on that convo. Know Mark? Know someone who knows Mark?

Get cracking: <https://businessleads.com/post/592-Mark-Zuckerberg-Wed-Like-to-Speak-With-You>.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 7:48am](#)



• [Lincoln L H Ho](#) · Top Commenter · [Technical Solutions Specialist](#) at [TELUS](#)

That's NOT a privacy breach! Someone else reshared the photo.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 31, 2012 at 10:08am](#)



• [Geddy Cordova](#) · Top Commenter

I am wondering if the reason she (Zuckerberg) was so upset about this photo being made public was because her little dog is unkept, neglected looking, and dirty? Poor dog. Do they not have the money to get it groomed or to TAKE CARE of it? Nope, that would not be the case, would it. A real shame.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 7:42pm](#)



• [Tyler Dylan Brown](#) · Top Commenter · [CEO & Founder](#) at [American Business Consulting, LLC](#)

Welcome to the privacy devoid realm within the world wide interweb your brother created.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 8:51pm](#)



• [Gary Vineyard](#) · Top Commenter

Victims of their own design.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 9:44am](#)




• [Gueule D'enfer](#) · Top Commenter · [Pirate](#) at [Boredomlands](#)

Welcome to the club.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 5:26pm](#)




• [Wei Chen](#) · Top Commenter · [Freelance bolly photographer](#) at [Inviso AS](#)

Lol, zucker!

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 11:37am](#)



[John Loggia](#)

Snotty

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 10:17am](#)



[Ana De Freitas](#) · Top Commenter

Wait, I read some people are talking about a privacy setting so only the tagged person can see the picture. where on earth is that? because I cant find that since 3 privacy setting chages ago lol. I know it ised to be that way but on some point it changed and believe me I've looked cause I hace pictures where all of the comments are people I don't know chatting! so again, where is that?

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 9:40am](#)



[Michael Mielke](#) · [Thompson Rivers University](#)

When was this? As long as I've known (over many years), if someone's tagged in the picture, it's up to the person who is tagged in the picture for who the picture is available to. And there also was a time, that if you could see a picture in that way, you could also look through its entire album (pictures you might otherwise not see).

Yes, there's a reason my only picture is a cat..

[Reply](#) · [1](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 4:33pm](#)



[Mark Happyman Riley](#) · [Rapper/Songwriter](#) at [Myself](#)

Oh thought it was a nude photo of Randi..lol. Just another family friendly picture. Otay..

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 9:34am](#)



[Ed Miranda](#) · [President](#) at [Luxury Development Consultants, Inc](#)

I have another complaint. I want to post a picture and select only a few friends to see it. I choose custom in the audience selector and I am prompted to type in the names of the friends I want to include. Is there a way for a window to pop up with a list of all my friends so I can just check off the friends I want to include instead of having to type each of their names?

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 5:52pm](#)



[Bethany Taylor Myers](#)

Where are all the servants?

[Reply](#) ·

· [January 1 at 11:28am](#)



[Felix Mak](#) · [Top Commenter](#) · [UC Davis](#)

it's callie's fault, never mind privacy, it's copyright infringement, even if the photo were public, it is not hers, she has no right to do anything with it, downloading a photo and copying it to somewhere is bad.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 2:20pm](#)



[Angus MacKenzie](#) · [Calgary, Alberta](#)

there no boobies...relax Zuckerberg...your big brother will buy you a country...you be better soon.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 10:36pm](#)



[Shelby Hays](#) · Salisbury

It's a stupid photo anyway.

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 9:22am](#)



[Brandon Barajas](#) · [Portales High](#)

Why in the blue fuck is this news!

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 2:46am](#)



[Virgil Looney](#) · [Earlham College](#)

ERMAHGERD! Part 2

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 27, 2012 at 12:17pm](#)



[Adam Clark](#) · Top Commenter · [London, United Kingdom](#)

has she only one arm?

[Reply](#) ·

· [December 26, 2012 at 6:37pm](#)