To: all staff, Channel 8

From: Rupert Sawyer, chief executive

Subject: Privacy and the role of the press

The issue of press intrusion into the private lives of common folk has once again reared its ugly head in the past week – most notably in the case of the daughter of two flight
attendants from Berkshire, better known to most of us as Kate Middleton.

Of course, unlike the sanctimonious tabloids (and "bored" sheets, like the Guardian) that have spent seven days condemning the French, the Swedish, the Danish and the Irish while writing relentless stories that include the keywords "Kate Middleton", "topless", "nude" and "photos" to deliberately attract disappointed red-blooded readers to their rags, my publications have had the courage to print the royally racy photos on the front page – and hang the consequences.

Like any decision made at this level, it was not one taken lightly – after all, pap shots of the Queen-in-waiting-in-not-very-much are not cheap. But of course there is always an ethical question when a publication chooses to put famous flesh to paper (not literally, that would be abhorrent), and I’d like to talk you – my staff – through my thinking.

In short, privacy does not exist in the 21st century. This is a price we pay for having the Facebook and online Scrabble games at our fingertips via the shape of the information super highway. Whereas once a hard-working celebrity could happily indulge in the services of a discreet lady of the night and/or rent boy while hooovering up cocaine in the privacy of their home with a relatively low chance of being exposed, now everyone around them has the ability to document such events and publish them to the world as it happens. We don't need the News of the World to follow people around in 2012 to get a scoop, because there's plenty of money grabbing "friends" willing to hang their "celebrated" associates out to dry.

But what has this got to do with paparazzi photographers snapping Kate Middleton over a fence, Rupert, I hear you ask. Well, it's simple – once we accept privacy does not and cannot exist in 2012, everything becomes fair game, not exclusively, but especially, if it's in the public interest. And considering the response to Boobgate, I think it's fairly clear that the public are interested in seeing candid pictures of our Royal Family.

The Sun justified running pictures of Prince Harry with his crown jewels on display by claiming that he was at a party with people in possession of cameras, therefore he was exposing himself (if you'll excuse the pun) to coverage of this sort. They also suggested that because the images were circulating on the internet, it was reasonable to publish the pictures in the paper. However, they stopped short of running the pics of Kate. Why?

In my mind, if someone is aware that they are in the public eye and then choose to sunbathe topless outside in an age where they are also aware that long lens cameras exist, they are as good as in public. There is only one way to ensure that those pictures
never make it into the press, and it's not injunctions, the courts or the PCC ... it's simply a bikini top, or an indoor sunbed.

As a senior member of the media elite, I am aware that my competitors are always after a compromising picture of me – that's why I don't walk around on my balcony in Ha Noi with my dungeon gear on or a thousand dong note hanging out of my nose. I keep my private life private, behind one-way glass in my futuristic laser-guarded Victorian-style orangery – and that, because of the precautions I take, is where it stays.

If your computer gets a virus, but you're not running anti-virus software, who is to blame? You are, because you've not taken reasonable steps to protect yourself against something you know is out there. In the same way, if you're famous and you don't want to be photographed – you have two options: don't go outside, or only go out with a bag over your head. It's not rocket science, case closed.

Therefore, as the media circus continues to condemn things they desperately want to publish, but are too afraid too – we here at Channel 8 Corp can hold our heads high. We have given the people what they want – and as you can see, the ethical foundations of our business are solid and unshaken by this madness.

If you have any questions, you're clearly too stupid to understand common sense.

Best wishes,

Your moral guardian and superior life form, Rupert