

# APPENDIX Sd

Mid-Sussex District Council  
Oaklands, Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1SS

29th May 2025

Dear Lucy Corrie,

**Re: Proposed voluntary code of conduct.  
Application by the Church of Scientology for a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) on  
Saint Hill Road**

Thank you for your letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May regarding a proposed voluntary code of conduct for protestors in response to Scientology's application for a PSPO to be implemented to ban protesting on Saint Hill Road. As the organiser of the two protests that took place in 2023 and 2024, I would like to stress that great care is taken to ensure our demonstrations go ahead both peacefully and safely and do not cause disruption to local residents or those wishing to attend Scientology's annual IAS (International Association of Scientologists) anniversary event.

As you mentioned, we already have a code of conduct on the protest website that lays out clear rules and expectations for those wishing to participate in our demonstration. We also liaise with Sussex Police before, during and after any protest to ensure our actions do not result in anti-social behaviour, harassment or intimidation. At both protests no arrests, cautions or warnings were issued and there is no evidence to suggest that the Police have found it necessary to restrict our rights or limit our protest activity in the past. It is also not possible for us to situate ourselves on the eastern side of Saint Hill Road opposite the entrance to Scientology's property due to a fence, hedging and wooden sleepers the Church have installed on public land, which West Sussex Highways have ordered to be removed.

We have also attempted to engage in meaningful dialogue with the Church of Scientology to make arrangements that ensure our protests do not disrupt their event, but have never been afforded a response. We would be more than happy to negotiate and liaise with all parties concerned and amend our existing code of conduct in a way that is mutually agreeable, however in its current form your suggested voluntary code raises several significant concerns for us as a community.

Firstly, I would like to seek further clarity on the legal implications of entering into such an agreement. Who is responsible for overseeing its implementation, and what are the repercussions for either party should there be any breaches?

At present, the Police have sufficient powers with which they can restrict protest activity and take action against harassment and anti-social behaviour. Through our liaison prior to the event, it was agreed in both years that the Sergeant on duty each day will make an assessment as to the safest place for us to protest. The verge to the south of Scientology's entrance was identified as the most appropriate due to the space it affords us to stand with our signs, be seen by passers by and also allow members of the public to access the property without having to walk in the road. At no point have the Police indicated our location needs to be designated prior to the day itself, and our freedom of assembly is protected under Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

In order for restrictions to be placed on protests in the United Kingdom, the Police, Crime, Sentencing & Courts Act 2022 (PCSC Act) says that an officer must *reasonably believe* that a protest may cause serious public disorder, serious damage to property, serious disruption to the life of the community, that noise generated by the protest may lead to serious disruption or have a relevant impact on people in the area, and/or that the purpose of the protest is to intimidate others. In both 2023 and 2024, there is no evidence to suggest our demonstration met any of these criteria and the Police have not found it necessary to restrict our rights in any way as a result.

Although we would be more than happy to agree to comply with any instructions given by the Police and/or Council officers, we are already required to do so under existing legislation and so it is unclear why an additional voluntary code of conduct would be necessary to ensure any future protests remain lawful.

I am also happy to agree to remain on public land, and not to enter (or attempt to enter) Scientology's property at any time. However, I feel it is important to note that although we all share a common goal, we are not an organised or incorporated group and so individuals taking part in protests must be held responsible for their own actions. Implementing a voluntary code of conduct raises concerns over enforceability; although I have been given the mandate to represent the views of protestors in attendance last year and in 2023, I do not have the authority to enter into an agreement on the behalf of any and all individuals who may wish to organise their own protests at Saint Hill in the future and so I am concerned that this code may impact the rights of others who I do not represent, and who do not consider themselves part of our community.

Similarly, those who do not wish to agree to the voluntary code of conduct may engage in demonstrations that do not align with our values as a group and as such, I am concerned their behaviour may be used as an example of a breach, leading to potential reason to further restrict our rights. The Police have sufficient powers to ensure any and all protest activity remains lawful, and it is unclear whether a voluntary code of conduct would result in further complications should there be any anti-social behaviour in the future that is not connected with me or our community.

With regard to obstructing (or attempting to obstruct) and/or harassing, intimidating or abusing any persons entering Church premises, our website makes it clear that this is something we would not tolerate, and have never engaged in historically. Any individuals found to be doing, or intending to do so, would be asked to leave and immediately reported to the Police.

I would like to seek clarity on point 6, which states "Protesters will not display images, text, banners, placards, posters or similar which include: a. Foul or abusive language; or b. Images which actually depict, or which might reasonably be considered to depict, members or leaders of the Church"

Under section 5 of the Public Order Act 1986, It is an offence to say things that are threatening, abusive or insulting or to behave in a threatening, abusive, insulting or disorderly manner. It is also an offence to display any sign that is threatening, abusive or insulting. Although signage displayed at protests may be deemed offensive to some, Article 10 of the Human Rights Act 1998 protects our freedom of expression and right to communicate in any medium, including through words, pictures and actions.

Our message is one of kindness and compassion and our signage has consistently avoided foul or abusive language. Agreeing to this would arguably fall under the first point that we will comply with the law and any requests made by the Police, and so it is unclear to me why it is necessary to add an additional clause specifically around signage.

On images that depict members or leaders of the Church, I take issue with the idea that we as protestors would be restricted from doing so, whilst Scientology continues to use our images on their websites and social media channels in order to characterise us as criminals and “anti-religious bigots”. For context, since organising the first protest in 2023 the Church of Scientology have used my picture to create offensive memes, articles and social media posts across their various channels in a deliberate attempt to harass and discredit me as an activist. My business associates have received letters from Scientology under the guise of their ‘Freedom Magazine’ which describe me as a “promoter of hate speech” and just last weekend they published an article attacking one of my previous workplaces, suggesting my employment is “not just inappropriate, it’s potentially a public safety risk.”<sup>1</sup>

In the last few months alone, I have received over 10,000 attack Tweets<sup>2</sup> – many of which use highly edited photos of me with captions such as “Stalker-bigot [redacted] made himself unemployable”, “Forlorn, pitifully sad and abandoned or lonely”, “No morals and no principles”, “Serial stalker”, “Disgrace” and “Stalker [redacted] was erased by his own Mum”.

In contrast, our signage carries messages such as “When was the last time you saw your family? They love you and so do we”, “Abuse in Scientology must end. We are here to help” and “It’s not out-Ethics to put your mental health first.”

In reference to the elf doll, no complaints were made when it was displayed during our protest in 2023, and it is only in response to the ongoing PSPO process that Scientology complained about it in 2024. It features in photographs published in the national press, which would not have been allowed if it were deemed likely to cause offence and in order to avoid any potential conflicts arising we agreed to remove the doll in 2024. However, evidence has yet to be supplied to us that it genuinely caused alarm or distress and it is my belief this is just one example of an artificial confrontation, manufactured in order to cause concerns over our behaviour. David Miscavige, the leader of Scientology, which the Church argues the doll represents, is not revered as a holy figure within their religion and there is nothing in Scientology scripture which suggests showing his likeness would cause genuine distress. In fact, Miscavige is referred to as “Chairman of the Board”, a corporate-sounding role and his picture is routinely shared in Scientology’s publications and online. Similarly on the FAQs portion of their website, on whether their founder L. Ron Hubbard is worshipped, it says “No. L. Ron Hubbard personally stated he was a man as others are men. He was a much-loved friend and teacher and continues to be respected and loved.”

On point 7, “Protestors will not play or use amplified music, voice or audio”, this could be seen as a disproportionate restriction on our freedom of expression, and I would argue is unfairly balanced in Scientology’s favour when compared to their corresponding code of conduct, which permits the Church of use amplified music, voice or audio at designated times agreed in advance with MSDC and the police. In both 2023 and 2024, Scientology placed large loudspeakers on their property, aimed directly at protestors that played a short and repetitive playlist of bagpipe music at an unreasonably loud volume. This not only caused a disturbance to local residents but had the effect of drowning out protestors in an attempt to silence us. Existing legislation allows the Police to restrict the use of loudspeakers and other forms of amplification in the event that it breaches the peace or causes disruption, and I fail to see how including this clause in a voluntary code of conduct would result in any change to Scientology’s behaviour. I am more than happy to mitigate any potential noise disturbances caused by our protest through liaison with the local authority, residents and the Church, but I will not agree to a measure that could inadvertently result in our voices being silenced due to Scientology’s outdoor speaker system.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.freedommag.org/news/is-hap-solutions-placing-the-public-at-risk-by-employing-stalker-alex-barnes-ross-0e848b>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/mar/23/uk-scientology-critics-targets-harassment-online-abuse>



Point 8 states "Protestors will not film or photograph any person entering or exiting Church premises", and this has been the source of great concern in our community.

Members of the public do not need permission to film or photograph in a public place, and according to the British Film Commission, "you do not to ask passers-by for permission to feature their faces in a film."<sup>3</sup> Our protest activity has often been recorded and live streamed as a way of promoting our message to a wider audience, but also for our safety and in order to document our behaviour and the response we have received from Scientology.

We fully respect people's rights to attend religious worship ceremonies in private, and as such we have never organised a protest that coincides with Scientology's Sunday Services or other such occasions. The IAS event is the largest fundraising event in Scientology's calendar, and does not involve anything they argue is an act of worship such as group auditing or processing. It is open to Scientologists and non-Scientologists to attend, and there is no way for us to differentiate between those who choose to follow Scientology's teachings and those who do not when protesting outside Saint Hill. We would be happy to commit to not intentionally singling out those who enter or leave the property by zooming in on their faces, however by recording our event, which takes place on public land, we cannot guarantee that attendees will not be captured on camera incidentally or in the background of the footage.

At both protests, Scientology had a number of agents armed with camera equipment pointed directly at us. They have the same right to do this as we do, and we do not have any objection to them doing so. Similarly, a number of CCTV cameras along the perimeter of their property are aimed at the areas in which protestors stand and one camera is permanently aimed at the road and captures any and all traffic that passes by on Saint Hill Road. Although Scientology's corresponding voluntary code stipulates that the Church "shall not film or photograph protestors who remain within the space designated by the police for their use", this would require them to remove or cover their CCTV cameras and there is no guarantee they would not capture footage of us arriving or leaving the designated area.

The footage we captured in both 2023 and 2024 was supplied as evidence for MSDC to consider as part of this PSPO process, and has served as a valuable resource for law enforcement and the local authority to review our actions and Scientology's response. Due to previous aggressive behaviour on the part of the Church (in 2023, a protestor was shoved into the road in front of moving traffic), and the history of false accusations made against us, we feel it necessary for our own safety and security to film our activities and as a result, those entering and/or leaving the Saint Hill property will inadvertently be captured on camera. We have always displayed signage stating that we are live streaming on Youtube, and the numerous media outlets who have reported on our protest demonstrates there is a valid and significant public interest in Scientology's event and our protest.

There are multiple entrances to the Saint Hill property and those who see our sign and do not wish to be caught on camera are able to avoid the protest entirely by using an alternative gate, or using the grass verge to walk behind us.

The Police have not suggested any of the footage captured by protestors amount to an invasion of privacy, harassment or intimidation. I consider it would be a restriction on our rights to stipulate what can and can't be filmed, and would add unnecessary burden on both sides to enforce.

After the IAS event, Scientology puts out a press release every year and publishes numerous photographs of those attending their event which clearly shows the faces of every person in

---

<sup>3</sup><https://britishfilmcommission.org.uk/guidance/regulations/#:-:text=Advice%20about%20permission%20and%20Rights%20clearances&text=You%20do%20not%20need%20to,place%20resides%20with%20the%20filmmaker.>

attendance.<sup>4</sup> It also displays a notice at events that states "Scientology Media Productions will be filming in this area today. By entering this area, you irrevocably consent to and authorize Scientology media Productions, its successors, assigns and licensees to photograph you and make recordings of your voice and to use said photographs and/or recordings for worldwide exploitation, in perpetuity in any and all media, whether now known or hereafter devised, for any purpose whatsoever." And so restricting our right to film would be unbalanced and result in Scientology being the sole entity permitted to capture the event, setting a dangerous precedent in the context of media bias and controlling the narrative.

It is also important to us that the event and our protest is documented and broadcast as it sends an important signal to those we seek to help that there are thousands of people watching who are prepared to support anybody who wishes to leave Scientology.

As I mentioned, I have been the target of a prolific campaign of harassment as a result of speaking out about the abuse I suffered in the Church and their policies require Scientologists to actively attack and intimidate those it perceives as enemies. Scientology have systemically weaponised the internet in an attempt to silence dissent, censor free speech and scrub any record of our protests taking place, and so it is vitally important we retain the right to document our activities – and Scientology's response to them on the day.

I am also concerned about the clause that would prevent protestors from approaching persons entering or exiting Church premises with leaflets or similar. Scientology retain tight control over the lives of its members, particularly those who work at Saint Hill. These staff members in particular are part of the 'Sea Organisation' and they have signed one billion year contracts dedicating their lives (and all future lives) to working for the Church. They are provided communal accommodation in Crowborough and are often expected to work 14-18 hour days, 7 days a week with no time off in return for a weekly stipend of just £50. With the exception of a limited number of public-facing executives, for the most part Sea Org staff are not permitted to own mobile phones and any access to the internet is closely monitored and heavily censored. They are required to ask permission before leaving the property and are not allowed to do so unaccompanied and as a result, any contact with the outside world is incredibly limited.

Our main goal with protesting Scientology's abusive practices is to raise awareness of the community and support that exists for these Sea Org staff, should they choose to leave and as such, leaflets and signage is an incredibly important part of our campaign. Any material we have distributed at protests has offered a message of compassion and has directed people to contact the Michael J. Rinder Aftermath Foundation, a non-profit set up to support people in landing on their feet after leaving Scientology. Often, a flyer or card is the only way to reach people stuck at Saint Hill and there has been a notable increase in calls made to the Foundation's helpline as a result of our protests and card distribution.

As with our signage, we would be happy to agree to ensuring any printed materials do not contain malicious communications, religious hate speech or abusive language, but I would like to stress the importance of distributing information about the support and mental health services available to those visiting Saint Hill and the local area.

The decision on whether any signage, printed materials or imagery is offensive should be made by the courts, and I worry that a voluntary code of conduct may circumvent the judicial system's autonomy over such matters.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.scientology.org.uk/scientology-today/events/ias-event-2024.html#slide7>, <https://www.scientology.org.uk/scientology-today/events/ias-event-2024.html#slide36>, <https://www.scientology.org.uk/scientology-today/events/ias-event-2024.html#slide37> and <https://www.scientology.org.uk/scientology-today/events/ias-event-2024.html#slide56>

In order for such a code of conduct to be meaningful, it would need to specify exactly how it will be enforced, the repercussions for not abiding by its rules and what implications it may have on all parties concerned.

It is my view that Scientology's request for a PSPO has placed an unnecessary burden on limited council resources, and I am concerned that MSDC implementing a code of conduct would invite future complaints that would need to be assessed and reviewed by the Council, which comes at a cost to the taxpayer.

The Church has already demonstrated its willingness to interfere with protestors' activities by obstructing the public right of way with planters and barriers on the western side of Saint Hill Road, and with an unauthorised fence and hedgerow planted opposite their entrance on the eastern side. Similarly, last year MSDC issued Scientology with a Planning Contravention Notice for the unauthorised construction of a 4,000sq metre marquee that is used as the venue for their event. This demonstrates a consistent lack of respect for the local area and its laws. My worry is that although they may agree to a voluntary code of conduct, it would only be weaponised to be used against us. Given Scientology's flagrant disregard for safety, Highways laws and planning regulations, there is precedent to suggest they also would not abide by any code of conduct issued by the Council.

The Church has consistently acted in bad faith throughout this process, and its own policy states that we as protestors have "no rights of any kind"<sup>5</sup> and "may be deprived of property or injured by any means by any Scientologist without discipline of the Scientologist. May be tricked, sued, or lied to or destroyed".<sup>6</sup>

I fundamentally object to any proposal that would require us to forfeit rights to my abusers, especially considering they are actively seeking to "destroy" me by any means necessary.

Nonetheless, we agree that communication can be a universal solvent and remain open and willing to have meaningful dialogue with the Church and the Council. There have only been two protests in the last six years, and although there is no guarantee there will be any in the future, we are committed to working together in order to ensure that if they do, they do not result in anti-social behaviour or persistent, ongoing disruption to the local community.

In summary, as you mentioned we already have a code of conduct in place on our website, and we are open to making an informal agreement or amendments to our existing guidelines in order to address any concerns the Council may have, however we must be careful not to place unnecessary sanctions or restrictions on our basic human rights.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted email address]

---

<sup>5</sup> HCO Policy Letter 23<sup>rd</sup> December 1965, 'Suppressive Acts, Suppression of Scientology and Scientologists' – L. Ron Hubbard

<sup>6</sup> HCO Policy Letter 18<sup>th</sup> October 1967, 'Penalties for Lower Conditions' – L. Ron Hubbard