

ON APPEAL FROM THE POOLE MAGISTRATES' COURT

BEFORE:

The Honourable Mr Justice Saini
Sitting with Mr N. Butler JP and Mr J Griffin JP

THE KING

V

DAVID SKINNER

APPROVED JUDGMENT

Hearing: 23 April 2026

Oral judgment: 24 April 2026

Michael Phillips (instructed by Andrew Storch Solicitors) for the Appellant, David Skinner

Simon Jones, Senior Crown Advocate, CPS, Wessex, for the Prosecution (Respondent to the appeal)

I. Overview

1. This is a case about freedom of expression and freedom of religion in the context of the abortion debate. The appellant, Mr David Skinner (“Mr Skinner”) is a person of strong Christian faith. Mr Skinner opposes abortion, as part of his understanding of Christian belief and doctrine.
2. On 28 April 2023, Mr Skinner sent two identical letters (“the Letters”), as attachments to emails, to Temporary Inspector Fern Graham (“Inspector Graham”) of the Dorset Police, and to the Office of the Dorset Police and Crime Commissioner (“the PCC”). PCCs are elected in areas of England and Wales to make sure that local police meet the needs of the local community. They are a form of local official, and often from a mainstream political party. The PCC that the Letter was sent to was David Sidwick.

3. The subject heading of the emails was “*Reporting mass murder in Ophir Road*”. This was a reference to the British Pregnancy Advisory Service (“BPAS”) clinic (“the Clinic”) in Ophir Road, Bournemouth. The Clinic provides a variety of medical services, including pregnancy termination.
4. We have attached a redacted copy of one of the Letters to our judgment, rather than seeking to summarise the contents. We have redacted all of the photographs. The Letters contained, amongst other pictures, what are said to be photographs of aborted fetuses (“the Images”) and make forceful comments about what were said to be “*brutal killings taking place in Bournemouth*” and what was said to be “*terror and torture*” suffered by babies in the process of termination.
5. We record at the outset that the Images are difficult to view and are upsetting. They appear to show complete babies who have been aborted and also the head of a baby under the heading “*These are not unwanted tissue, clusters of cancerous cells, or parasitic growths, belonging to the woman’s body. They are the fruit of her becoming one flesh with a man. They are babies*”.
6. The Letters also contained photographs of victims of the Nazi concentration camps which are equally distressing but no complaint is made about those in these proceedings.
7. The Letters were sent not only to Inspector Fern and the PCC. They were also sent by Mr Skinner to the Chief Constable and to the Bournemouth local Councillors. Those Letters (which are in the same form) are not however the subject of any criminal complaint.
8. Inspector Fern opened the email and Letter attachment, and was highly distressed by the Images. Within the PCC’s office, Yvonne Fenwick, an employee, opened the attachment although it had been addressed to the PCC himself. She also found the contents distressing.
9. The sending of the Letters and attachment by Mr Skinner to Inspector Fern and the PCC, led to his prosecution under section 127 (1) of the Communications Act 2003 (“the 2003 Act”). That section provides as follows:

“Improper use of public electronic communications network

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if he (a) sends by means of a public electronic communications network a message or other matter that is grossly offensive or of an indecent, obscene or menacing character; or (b) causes any such message or matter to be so sent”.

10. On 1 May 2024, Mr Skinner was convicted by the Magistrates. As regards the offence concerning Inspector Fern, he was fined £675 and ordered to pay compensation of £500 to her. He was also fined £675 in respect of the offence against Ms Fenwick and again ordered to pay £500 compensation to her. In addition, he was ordered to pay £950 in prosecution costs and the victim surcharge.

11. This is our judgment on the appeal against conviction and sentence brought by Mr Skinner. In the normal way, the appeal is by way of a re-hearing and not a review, and we heard evidence yesterday from Mr Skinner and the Officer in the Case, Constable Calloway. There was ultimately no real dispute of fact and our summary below is based largely on the written communications and history disclosed in the appeal bundle.
12. The scope of section 127(1) and how it interacts with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), in particular Article 10, was considered by the Divisional Court recently in Cobban and Borders v Director of Public Prosecutions [2024] (Admin) (“Cobban”). Mr Jones, Counsel for the Crown and Mr Phillips Counsel for Mr Skinner, each agreed that the summary of the principles at [111] of that judgment contained the relevant law for the purpose of this appeal. We set out that summary at [17] of our judgment below.

Expert evidence

13. During the hearing we refused the application made on behalf of Mr Skinner to adduce the evidence of two experts in support of his appeal. These were the reports of Dr Gregory Gardner a GP, and Dr Martin Parsons (a doctor of Christian Theology). We read the reports of these experts in advance of the hearing of the appeal.
14. Dr Gardner gives evidence about what an abortion is, and the effects of it on the unborn child. He also says that the Images in issue in this case appear to be of 2nd or 3rd trimester abortions. Dr Parsons gives evidence of Christian beliefs regarding abortion and a commentary on the language, imagery and concepts used in the Letters, which he says are drawn directly from the Bible.
15. We do not doubt that the experts are expert and knowledgeable in their fields. However, as we explained in brief reasons given at the trial, applying the principles helpfully summarised in the Crown Court Compendium Part 1 (October 2025) at [10-3], we did not consider these experts could provide us with relevant information likely to be outside our own knowledge and experience: see also R v Turner 1975] QB 834 .
16. We are well aware of the broad nature of the pro-life and pro-choice debate, and there is no issue before us that Mr Skinner’s strong opposition to abortion, and the way in which he expressed that opposition in the Letters, is based on his sincerely held Christian beliefs. Whether the Letters meet the test of being “grossly offensive” for the purposes of section 127(1) is an issue of fact for us. Experts cannot assist us on that matter. We turn to the law.

II. Legal Framework

17. In [111] of Cobban the relevant principles governing section 127(1) of the 2003 Act were summarised as follows (our emphasis):
 - (1) The object of section 127(1)(a) is to prohibit the use of a service provided and funded by the public for the benefit of the public for the transmission of

communications which contravene the basic standards of our society. It is the use of the public network which is the core of the offence;

(2) Whether a message sent over an electronic communications network is “*grossly offensive*” within section 127(1)(a) is a question of fact to be answered objectively by reference to its contents and context, and not its actual effect. In determining whether a message is “*grossly offensive*” the tribunal of fact must ask whether its contents are liable to cause gross offence to those to whom it relates, or whether reasonable persons in our society would find it *grossly offensive*. That test requires the application of the standards of an open, just, multiracial and multifaith society;

(3) There is binding authority in the form of *Collins* to the effect that the ingredients of the offence under section 127(1)(a) are as follows:

- i. The actus reus of the offence comprises three elements, namely: (a) sending a message; (b) of the proscribed “*grossly offensive*” character; and (c) by way of a public electronic communications network. Provided that all three elements are proved, the actus reus is complete at the time of the sending. It makes no difference whether the relevant message is received or read;
- ii. As regards the mens rea of the offence, the defendant must have intended his message to be grossly offensive to those to whom it related, or be aware that it may be taken to be so;

(4) However, before a defendant can be convicted for sending a message prosecuted under this section, the court must also be satisfied that the conviction is a proportionate interference with such Convention rights as apply.

...”

18. In this appeal, it is common ground that Mr Skinner sent the Letters over a public communications network for the purposes of section 127(1). It is in issue however whether (as regards the *actus reus*) the Letters were “*grossly offensive*”, and whether the *mens rea* has been proved.

19. Aside from these points, the main arguments of Counsel were focussed on the interference of any conviction with Mr Skinner’s Article 9(1) and Article 10(1) ECHR rights, as they apply in domestic law through the Human Rights Act 1998. Mr Phillips rightly did not suggest that for the purposes of this case, there was any material difference between the scope of Mr Skinner’s rights under each of these Articles and Counsel each focussed their submissions on Article 10 which provides:

“(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. This

Article shall not prevent States from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.

(2)The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary”.

20. It was rightly accepted by Mr. Jones for the Crown that a conviction for the speech based acts of Mr Skinner under section 127(1) would amount to an interference with his rights under Article 10(1), but he argued that it would be justifiable as protecting the rights under Article 10(2), of Inspector Fern and Ms Fenwick, respectively, not to be offended by the contents of the Letters. Mr Jones submitted that the conviction would be a proportionate interference, necessary in a democratic society for the protection of the rights of others.

III. The Facts

21. Although the section 127(1) offence is concerned with a limited issue focused on inappropriate use of a public communications network (as described in the Cobban case at [28], citing R v Collins [2006] UKHL 40; [2007] 1 WLR (HL)), the context in which Mr Skinner came to send the Letters is crucial as far as the ECHR points are concerned. So, we must begin earlier in the chronology.
22. Mr Skinner is a veteran Christian campaigner and activist who is fervently opposed to abortion. Mr Skinner has a particular opposition to the Clinic and the public spaces protection order (PSPO) which has been put in place in the area surrounding the Clinic. This has created a so-called “buffer zone” outside the Clinic, which is enforced by Dorset Police. The PSPO was made following a statutory process under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, in which Dorset Police had played a role. They also have a role in future extensions of the PSPO.
23. Mr Skinner joined another veteran Christian campaigner, Steve Green, on 8 February 2023 outside the Clinic to protest against the buffer zone. There appears to have been an altercation with the police on that occasion, and Mr Skinner complained that the Dorset Police had unlawfully seized his property and harassed and bullied him, He set out those complaints in a detailed letter to the PCC, David Sidwick dated the 13 February 2023. In that letter, Mr Skinner referred to what he called the “Peelian principles” and said:

“[PC Castle] was breaking all of Robert Peele’s 9 Principles of Policing, especially rules, 5 and 7:

5.To seek and preserve public favour, not by pandering to public opinion, but by constantly demonstrating absolutely impartial service to law, in complete independence of policy, and without regard to the justice or injustice of the substance of individual laws, by ready offering of

individual service and friendship to all members of the public without regard to their wealth or social standing, by ready exercise of courtesy and friendly good humour, and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life.

24. The letter also said: “[t]his certainly did not include protecting and preserving the lives of unborn infants or their mothers who suffered as a consequence of being forced to have an abortion...It is incumbent on every citizen to stop the genocide of over 200,000 babies each and every year...”.
25. There was a response to this letter to the PCC from Inspector Graham by an e-mail dated the 3rd of March 2023. The email said: “*Good afternoon Mr Skinner I have been passed your complaint to manage with regard to PC Castle. I am grateful for your correspondence and note the points you have raised. I will ensure we speak to BCP Council to highlight your concerns. PC Castle is no longer an employee of Dorset Police however on behalf of the organisation I apologise for the way you felt you were treated and will ensure all staff are reminded of the peelian principles. [original emphasis]. Due to PC Castle no longer working for Dorset Police there is nothing further I can do with respect to the individual however I hope this email serves to answer your complaint sufficiently however if you have any further concerns please do get in touch*”.
26. Mr Skinner responded that same day thanking the Inspector for her e-mail. He said in evidence, and we accept, that he considered Inspector Fern to be open to further dialogue as a result of these communications.
27. Over the next 2 months, Mr Skinner undertook detailed research to collect the information and photographs in relation to abortions which he set out in the Letters. The Letters include a number of hyperlinks to documents about matters including policing by consent, the Care Quality Commission Report about the Clinic, as well as a number of press reports on abortion-related matters. As Mr Skinner underlined in his evidence in cross-examination, he firmly believes that God is the creator of all things and created humans in his image. As a Christian pro-life campaigner, Mr Skinner considers that babies are being sacrificed in abortions to pay for “*the sins of sexual promiscuity in this country*”. He wishes to end abortion in the UK and considers he has a duty to save and preserve those in utero. Mr Skinner explained how the buffer zone around the Clinic was first imposed in October 2022 and how he was involved in the extensive consultation before its imposition. Mr Skinner said there was a connection between his faith and the Images that he included in the Letters, and his ultimate aim was to persuade people to “*bring them to the Lord*”, and to realise what a “*terrible sin abortion is*”.
28. As we have said, Inspector Fern and Ms Fenwick opened the attachment (the Letters) and each of them found the Images highly distressing.
29. Turning to the Letters, they speak for themselves and a summary is not appropriate given that one needs to see where the Images appear in relation to the

text. We find that they use the Images to seek to persuade the recipients of what Mr Skinner regards as the horrors of abortion. The Images are part of his persuasive efforts to expose what Mr Skinner believes is morally wrong, and to encourage action in relation to the Clinic and towards the eventual complete prohibition of abortion, through the use of analogies with other areas including the acts of the Nazis.

30. It was properly accepted by Mr Jones that, within the scheme of Article 10(1), the Letters (including the Images) are an expression of political views which are entitled to the highest levels of protection.

IV. Are we sure the section 127(1) offence was committed?

31. We turn then to the ingredients of the offence, aside from ECHR issues. We are sure, applying the standard in the Cobban case the Letters (as a result of the inclusion of the Images) are of a “grossly offensive” character. Although ultimately this is a matter for us as judges of fact, we note that Mr Skinner in his own evidence before us considered them to be “*more than*” offensive and indeed they were deliberately so to make the message he wished to convey effective. As he said “*offensive does not even cover it*”. As to mens rea, we are sure that Mr Skinner met the second part of the test set out in Cobban at [111(3)(ii)] which we have set out above at [17]. We are sure that Mr Skinner was well aware when he sent the Letters that the Images included within them were grossly offensive. Indeed, in submissions Mr Phillips did not seriously seek to suggest otherwise given Mr Skinner’s oral evidence. He rightly focussed his submissions on Article 10(1).
32. Accordingly, subject to ECHR issues, we would have found Mr Skinner guilty on the two charges arising under section 127(1) of the 2003 Act.

V. ECHR Article 10: proportionality

33. The focus of the arguments was on the fourth limb of the well-known test in Bank Mellat v Her Majesty’s Treasury (No. 2) [2014] AC 700 (“Bank Mellat”), 771. In particular, as applied in this case, the fourth limb of that test expressly requires a “fair balance” to have been shown as between the rights of Mr Skinner and the acknowledged rights of those who saw the undoubtedly highly distressing Images.
34. We are not satisfied that when all the facts and circumstances are taken into account that the conviction would be a proportionate interference within Article 10(2) with Mr Skinner’s rights under Article 10(1) of the Convention. We can summarise our reasons in three parts as follows.
35. **First**, the views expressed in the Letters (as supported by the Images) are political speech entitled to the highest form of protection. The abortion debate raises important matters of public interest where strong views are legitimately held and expressed, often in forceful terms, by persons on each side of the argument. In some respects, the views of the pro-life groups reflect deeply held religious convictions but they are nevertheless also plainly properly regarded as broadly

“political” opinions in our democratic society. Great caution is required before a state can restrict the expression of political standpoints. As has been said in many cases, Article 10(1) protects actions or behaviour which is an affront to other people, and which is shocking or highly offensive. As has also been said, freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having: see DPP v Coskun [2026] EWHC (Admin) 437 at [15(2)], per Warby LJ and Obi J.

36. **Second**, an individual has the right to use *images* as a form of speech in a way which will shock and offend and indeed it is of often the power of an image which carries the message in its strongest terms. We found persuasive the example given by Mr Skinner in his evidence of the decision of the mother of the murdered black 14 year old child, Emmett Till, to have an open casket (which was photographed) at his funeral. These photos of Emmett Till, who had been lynched and murdered by a racist gang during the civil rights movement in the US in the 1950s, showed his abused and mutilated body. His murder and the widely distributed photograph of him in a casket was seen as a catalyst for the next phase of the civil rights movement. While the images which are before us are far removed from this situation, Mr Skinner’s core point that photographs have a powerful speech impact was plainly correct. We also consider Mr Skinner’s example of distressing medical images on cigarette packets as an effective form of communication is a useful analogy. Mr Skinner said, and we accept, that the pro-life organisation of which he is a member CBRUK, unlike SPUC, uses images in its efforts to change public opinion and we consider that to be a form of particularly powerful political expression.
37. **Third**, the intended recipients of the Letters were public officials. As we have described, Inspector Fern had communicated with Mr Skinner for the PCC in relation to concerns about what had happened earlier at the Clinic; and the PCC is plainly a political actor. Inspector Fern can be expected to have a higher tolerance as a police official and part of Mr Skinner’s reasons for communicating with her was his belief, right or wrong, about the duties of the police to protect life of the unborn under what he calls the *Peelian* principles. As to the Letter to the PCC, Mr Skinner had no way of knowing that anyone other than the PCC would open this correspondence. It was for his attention and Mr Skinner should not be held responsible for the fact that an administrator in his office, Ms Fenwick opened the email.
38. In support of his arguments on proportionality, Mr Jones relied strongly on the case of Connolly v DPP [2007] EWHC 237 (Admin) at [32]. In that case the defendant sent letters containing images of aborted fetuses to pharmacies selling the morning after pill. She was convicted under section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 and relied on her ECHR rights on appeal. The Divisional Court held that the interference with Mrs Connolly’s rights was proportionate and necessary in a democratic society. Her right to express her views about abortion did not justify the distress and anxiety caused to those who received the photographs. Of particular significance however was the fact that those who worked in the pharmacies were not targeted because they were in a position to influence a public debate on abortion.

39. We do not consider this case helps us because the facts before us are very different. The recipients of the letters were as we have said in the broadest sense public officials and one in particular, the PCC has a political role. The Letters were also, in context, part of a wider debate with the police and PCC surrounding the Clinic, the buffer zone and the abortion issue. As the end of the Letters states, Mr Skinner wished to recipients to take action.

VI. Conclusion

40. In summary, the Crown has not satisfied us under the demanding standard applied to restrictions on political speech, that the conviction is a justifiable interference with Mr Skinner's Article 10(1) rights. On the facts, that restriction has not been demonstrated to be necessary in our modern democratic society.

41. Finally, we should record that we have no doubt that those who viewed the Images found them deeply distressing. But we underline the Images are part and parcel of a debate on an important matter of public interest, where there are strongly held views both for and against abortion. Nothing we have decided is to be taken as a view on the pro-life or pro-choice debate. Our task has been simply to decide whether the conviction is a justifiable interference with the free speech rights of a person on one side of that debate. We have found on the facts that this has not been established.

42. For these reasons we allow the appeal. We set aside the conviction and sentence.

ANNEXE: THE LETTERS ATTACHED TO THE EMAIL WITH SUBJECT-HEADING
“Reporting mass murder in Ophir Road”

Dorset Police Commissioner and Officers,

28TH April 2023

BPAS OPHIR ROAD ABORTION CLINIC BOURNEMOUTH

Dear Sir/Madam,

Brutal killings are taking place in Bournemouth, on a daily basis in the Ophir Road BPAS (British Pregnancy Advisory Service) and will continue unless the police investigate this atrocity. According to the Care Quality Commission which **inspected Ophir Road** in June 2022 and which gave a **damning report**, it has killed thousands of healthy babies over decades. In the 12 months alone from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022, BPAS completed 8,527 killings. On any reckoning that is mass murder.

1. These are not unwanted tissue, clusters of cancerous cells, or parasitic growths, belonging to the woman’s body. They are the fruit of her becoming one flesh with a man. They are babies.

[REDACTED PHOTOS OF WHAT ARE SAID TO BE ABORTED FOETUSES]

By about **the end of the third** A baby’s heart is beating its own blood, not that of the mother. **At ten weeks**, a foetus, has ten fingers, ten toes, a mouth and a nose is **clearly recognisable**. Unwanted appendix, excess fat or a bad tooth being removed from a woman do not have these characteristics. With advances in modern technology premature babies of **21weeks, 22 weeks 24 weeks** and **26 weeks old** have with intensive care in pre-natal wards developed into healthy children and adults.

The following stills are taken from a film showing what is euphemistically called an abortion, the real definition of which is a miscarriage. The police **should see this video for themselves**.

[REDACTED PHOTOS OF WHAT ARE SAID TO BE ABORTED FOETUSES]

Though it appears that capital punishment for murder was abolished in 1965 - all in the name of creating a **“more civilised society”** - the reality is that the death penalty was never repealed - but simply transferred onto the heads of unborn children to pay for crimes committed mainly by men. Their guilt and shame have been dumped on the innocent child and now offered up as the spotless lamb sacrificed for the sins of others.

[REDACTED PHOTO OF A NEW BORN BABY]

Since 1967, **10,000,000** citizens or **15% of the population** have been sacrificed on the altars of passion, ambition, materialism and pride.

2. **At 12 weeks** babies have the capacity to feel **physical pain** and cry and struggle fiercely when threatened. The image below and **video** of a baby prematurely born show it is distressed even with the most intensive care from loving medical staff. What must it look like when being torn limb from limb?

[REDACTED PHOTO OF A PREMATURE BABY]

During an “abortion” victims are torn apart or burnt alive. They are not even anaesthetised but must suffer terror and torture no less distressing than that experienced by those condemned to death in Medieval times. Ultra sound technology pioneered by Professor **Stuart Campbell**, shows the baby “walking” in the womb and apparently yawning and **rubbing their eyes**, well before the mother can feel any movement. As yet no actual film has been made public of the baby being killed inside the mother’s womb, but a sonographer in America equipped with the new imaging technology was asked to assist in an abortion and was so shocked by what he saw that he created an animation film of the event. These babies must surely suffer agony as they **are ripped apart** in their mother’s wombs. Even animals in the abattoir are killed with less cruelty. This is another film the police **should watch** in their “diversity, equality and inclusivity” training.

There are increasing cases of botched murders where babies are born alive **but left to die**. To this number we must add the growing numbers of babies who have survived attempted murder such as **Gianna Jessen** and **Melissa Ohden** and have been left permanently scarred and disabled, like this poor **disfigured woman**.

[REDACTED PHOTO OF A WOMAN]

If foetuses had no abnormalities or disabilities when conceived, they certainly had them after a botched abortion. What is taking place at the human waste disposal unit in the BPAS clinic in Ophir Road, Bournemouth, is neither natural nor spontaneous. It is violent act carried out by a team of medical practitioners. This is why they have created a ghetto around the clinic – a buffer zone - to keep away witnesses who would alert the public to the carnage taking place behind their closed doors.

Christians like **Christian Hacking, Adam Smith – Connor** and **Isabel Vaughan – Spruce** who pray silently,

or offer counselling and practical help to the pregnant women are accused of grotesque, harassing, threatening and **antisocial behaviour**, liable to incite violence and therefore to arrest, unpayable fines and prison. But it is they who are the target of **violent assault, threatened** with violence - sometimes simply for **being recognised as pro-life**. Their being physically attacked is justified by the police because silent prayer and offering help are considered to be **equivalent to physical assault** and equally liable to a heavy fine or **a prison sentence**.

3. The fact that people **change their minds** when shown images of “aborted” babies enrages the abortion providers who do everything they can do to stop themselves being exposed. This includes their silencing and taking away the Human right to Freedom of speech and silent screams of the babies **and their mothers** who **suffer from being coerced** into having an abortion by **rapists covering up their crime**; adulterers, **like Boris Johnson** covering up their lust; parents covering up **family shame**; **boyfriends** not wanting the expense of raising a child; employers not wanting to pay maternity leave; **LGBTQs** coping with their promiscuity; **Feminists** driven by personal ambition; Ecco- warrior ideology **and the worship of Gaia**; **BPAS** and **MSI** making a fortune from pregnancy and **Satanists** offering up babies as living sacrifices.

4. The police will say that they cannot get involved in matters of opinion, belief, ideology or politics and that according to the **nine Peelian Principles of Policing**, they have to remain apolitical and impartial. But this is blatantly not true. They **march to the tune** of the LGBTQ+ lobby, the Gaystapo, and **dance and prance in uniform** in Gay Pride Parades, ride in **rainbow -police cars** and have dedicated **Lesbian and Gay Liaison Officers**.

The police will say that the law is the law. I am afraid that argument did not do “law-abiding” Germans any good when they stood trial at Nuremberg for crimes against humanity.

Let’s remember, killing Jews in Germany during the Third Reich was legal. Likewise killing babies is also legal in Britain. But be warned. Those German authorities who silenced those like **Sophie Schol** and even high ranking **German soldiers** who attempted to expose the Nazism, did finally receive recompense for their wickedness at Nuremberg.

5. January 27th is **International Holocaust Remembrance Day**. In same way that the population of German cities, beginning with **city officials** and finishing with **respectable citizens** were given conducted tours around the concentration camps at the end of WWII, so the Dorset Police Force, starting with senior police officers and finishing with Community Police should visit the clinic and see for themselves what they are supporting - **10,000 foetuses** every week in Britain being transported to 37 regional incineration units where they are burned with clinical waste material produced by the NHS.

REDACTED PHOTOS OF VICTIMS IN NAZI CONCENTRATION CAMPS

In the same way that the Nazis made soap, lampshades and other products from Jews in the concentration camps, so the harvesting of the organs and the tissue of aborted babies are used for making **vaccines** and **other products** including **flavouring in food and drink**.

How long will these atrocities continue?

I am yours sincerely.

David Skinner:

[ADDRESS OMITTED]”