

CHARITY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND AND WALES
THE TEMPLE OF THE JEDI ORDER - APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION
DECISION OF THE COMMISSION 16 December 2016

Background

1. The Temple of the Jedi Order (“TOTJO”) applied to constitute as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (“CIO”) and be entered onto the register of charities on 7 March 2016.

Decision

2. The Commission’s decision made under section 208 of the Charities Act 2011 is to refuse the application to constitute and register TOTJO as a charity because it is not satisfied that the proposed CIO would be a charity at the time it would be registered. The Commission is not satisfied that TOTJO is established for exclusively charitable purposes for the advancement of religion and/or the promotion of moral and ethical improvement for the benefit of the public. The detailed reasoning is set out below.

The issue for consideration

3. The issue to be determined is whether TOTJO would be established for exclusively charitable purposes for public benefit as defined by section 1 of the Charities Act 2011 (“the 2011 Act”). That is to say:
 - a. Do the purposes of the TOTJO fall within the descriptions of purposes in section 3 of the 2011 Act?
 - b. Are the purposes for the public benefit?

What are the purposes of the Society?

4. The purposes of the proposed CIO are:
To advance the religion of Jediism, for the public benefit worldwide, in accordance with the Jedi Doctrine. (See Appendix A for further information)
To advance such charitable purposes (according to the law of England and Wales) as the Trustees see fit from time to time.
5. Appendix A provides a definition of Jediism and sets out: the beliefs of Jedi; 3 Tenets; the Jedi Creed; the Jedi Code; the powers, teaching and who can get involved.
6. The definition of Jediism is “...*a religion based on the observance of the Force, the ubiquitous and metaphysical power that a Jedi (a follower of Jediism) believes to be the underlying, fundamental nature of the universe.*”

Do the purposes fall within the descriptions of purposes in section 3 of the Charities Act 2011?

THE ADVANCEMENT OF RELIGION - section 3 (1)

7. The advancement of religion is a description of purposes in section 3 (1) of the 2011 Act. Religion is partially defined in section 3 (2) to include (i) *a religion which involves belief in more than one god, and (ii) a religion which does not involve belief in a god.*

8. The Commission, like the court, is not concerned with the truth or otherwise of the beliefs in question but will not recognise as a religion everything that chooses to call itself a religion.¹ The courts have held that “to give [a] purpose the name of “religious” or “education” is not to conclude the matter”.²
9. The definition and characteristics of religion for the purposes of charity law are distilled from charity law and the partial statutory definition introduced by the Charities Act 2006. Recently, the Supreme Court has considered the meaning of “religious worship” for registered places of worship³ in the case of *Hodkin*⁴. As the Commission’s published guidance⁵ pre-dates the *Hodkin* decision, it has considered the extent to which that decision, which did not relate to a matter of charity law, might influence how it assesses whether a particular purpose is charitable as being for the advancement of religion.
10. Lord Toulson, who gave the leading judgment in *Hodkin*, reviewed the relevant case law, including case law on the question from other jurisdictions.⁶ At paragraph 57 he states that:

“For the purposes of PWRA, I would describe religion in summary as a spiritual or non-secular belief system, held by a group of adherents, which claims to explain mankind’s place in the universe and relationship with the infinite, and to teach its adherents how they are to live their lives in conformity with the spiritual understanding associated with the belief system. By spiritual or non-secular I mean a belief system which goes beyond that which can be perceived by the senses or ascertained by the application of science. I prefer not to use the word “supernatural” to express this element, because it is a loaded word which can carry a variety of connotations. Such a belief system may or may not involve belief in a supreme being, but it does involve a belief that there is more to be understood about mankind’s nature and relationship to the universe than can be gained from the senses or from science. I emphasise that this is intended to be a description and not a definitive formula.”

11. As regards the meaning of “religious worship”, Lord Toulson interprets it as being:

“.....wide enough to include religious services, whether or not the form of service falls within the narrower definition adopted in Segerdal. This broader interpretation accords with standard dictionary definitions. The Chambers Dictionary, 12th ed (2011) defines the noun “worship” as including both “adoration paid to a deity, etc.” and “religious service”, and it defines “worship” as an intransitive verb as “to perform acts of adoration; to take part in religious service”. Similarly, the Concise Oxford English Dictionary, 12th ed (2011), defines “worship” as including both “the feeling and expression of reverence and adoration of a deity” and “religious rites and ceremonies”. The broader interpretation accords with the purpose of the statute in permitting members of a religious

¹ *Re Coats’ Trusts, Coats v Gilmour* [1948] Ch 340 (CA) 346-347

² *National Anti-Vivisection Society v IRC* [1948] AC 31

³ Section 2 of the Places of Worship Registration Act 1855

⁴ *R (on the application of Hodkin and another) v Registrar General of Births, Deaths and Marriages* [2013] UKSC 77

⁵ *The Advancement of Religion for the Public Benefit and Analysis of the law underpinning The Advancement of Religion for the Public Benefit*

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/358531/advancement-of-religion-for-the-public-benefit.pdf

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/358534/lawrel1208.pdf

⁶ He cites the judgments of Wilson and Deane JJ in *Church of the New Faith v Comr of Pay-Roll Tax (Victoria)* (1983) 154 CLR as helpful on the question.

congregation, who have a meeting place where they perform their religious rites, to carry out religious ceremonies of marriage there.

Their authorisation to do so should not depend on fine theological or liturgical niceties as to how precisely they see and express their relationship with the infinite (referred to by Scientologists as “God” in their creed and universal prayer). Those matters, which have been gone into in close detail in the evidence in this case, are more fitting for theologians than for the Registrar General or the courts.”

12. The court in *Hodkin* has taken a broad view of what it means to be a religion and the requirements of religious worship, recognising the inherent difficulties of attempting to attach a narrowly circumscribed meaning to the word, including “*the different context in which the issue may arise, the variety of world religions, developments of new religions and religious practices, and developments in the common understanding of the concept of religion due to cultural changes*”⁷. Lord Toulson emphasised this was not a definitive formula but intended to be a description.
13. From the statute and these cases, the Commission draws the principles that religion in charity law is characterised by belief in one or more gods or spiritual or non-secular principles or things, and a relationship between the adherents of the religion and the gods, principles or things which is expressed by worship, reverence and adoration, veneration intercession or by some other religious rite or service. In addition, that it must be capable of providing moral and ethical value or edification to the public⁸ and characterised by a certain level of cogency, seriousness, cohesion and importance⁹.
14. The Commission has considered TOTJO against this framework and concluded that Jediism does not meet the characteristics of a religion for the purposes of charity law for the reasons set out below.

Belief in one or more gods or spiritual or non-secular principles or things

15. Jediism is based on the observance of the Force, described as “*the ubiquitous and metaphysical power that a Jedi (a follower of Jediism) believes to be the underlying, fundamental nature of the universe*”. Jediism does not involve belief in a god but the statutory definition of religion includes religions which do not involve belief in a god. It is recognised that some religions for example Buddhism and Jainism do not believe in a god. The Commission considered whether Jediism is characterised by belief in a spiritual or non-secular principles or things.
16. The Jedi Doctrine states that Jedi believe “*In the Force, and in the inherent worth of all life within it.*” The Teachings state “*Jedi are in touch with the Force. We are open to spiritual awareness and keep our minds in tune with the beauty of the world*”; and “*Jedi believe in eternal life through the Force. We do not become obsessed in mourning those who pass. We may grieve at their passing but we are content, knowing that they will forever be a part of the Force and so always a part of us.*”
17. The definition of Jediism also states “*The Jedi religion is an inspiration and a way of life for many people throughout the world who take on the mantle of Jedi*”. TOTJO acknowledges that “*there is some scope for followers to simply view Jediism as a philosophy or way of life...Some Jedi prefer to avoid the word religion to describe their*

⁷ Per Lord Toulson para 34.

⁸ *Cocks v Manners* LR 12 Eq 585; *Gilmour and Coats* (HL) [1949] A.C. 426, p444.

⁹ *Campbell and Cosaus v UK* (1982) 4 EHRR 293 at 304; *JP v South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust* [2012] UKUT 486 (AAC); [2013] M.H.L.R. 148.

theological beliefs, ethical framework and way of life. We do not insist that members use the word religion....”

18. Based on the proposed governing document, the evidence received in support of the application and the content of the website of TOTJO, the Commission is not satisfied that the observance of the Force within Jediism is characterised by a belief in one or more gods or spiritual or non-secular principles or things which is an essential requirement for a religion in charity law. Despite being open to spiritual awareness, there is scope for Jediism and the Jedi Doctrine to be advanced and followed as a secular belief system. Jediism therefore lacks the necessary spiritual or non-secular element. The Commission noted that in *Hodkin* Lord Toulson did distinguish and exclude secular belief systems from the description of religion.

Relationship with the gods, principles or things which is expressed by worship, reverence and adoration, veneration, intercession or by some other religious rite or service.

19. The Commission noted that TOTJO is an entirely web based organisation and the Jedi are predominantly, if not exclusively, an online community. The information available on TOTJO’s website and provided in support of the application, to include the content of the sermons and transcripts of the Live Services which are based upon the Jedi Doctrine and recite the Creed (adopted from the Prayer of St. Francis of Assisi) were considered. The Commission also noted that TOTJO promotes meditation as a means of connecting with the Force.
20. Although these publications borrow from the prayers and texts of world religions, in the context of TOTJO the Commission is not satisfied that the “Live Services” on the website, the published sermons and the promotion of meditation evidence a relationship between the adherents of the religion and the gods, principles or things which is expressed by worship, reverence and adoration, veneration intercession or by some other religious rite or service. In particular, it is significant that Jediism may be adopted as a lifestyle choice as opposed to a religion and the website states that TOTJO provides “an online space for anyone to explore non-denominational spirituality.”

Cogency, cohesion, seriousness and importance in the form of the belief system

21. It is clear that the law does not concern itself with the truth of a religion but based on principles distilled from case law, the Commission considers that a religion/belief system should be characterised by a certain level of cogency, seriousness, cohesion and importance. This requirement was discussed in *Campbell and Cosaus v UK*¹⁰ in relation to a claim in the context of Article 2 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights which considered the requirement of the State to respect the right of parents to ensure their child’s education and teaching is in conformity with their own religious and philosophical convictions. The European Court of Human Rights held that ‘belief’ in this context extends beyond just mere opinions or deeply held feelings: there must be a holding of spiritual or philosophical convictions which have an identifiable formal content. One may expect it to concern something relating to an important aspect of human life and it would require “a certain level of cogency, seriousness, cohesion and importance”¹¹ This approach has been applied by the Upper Tribunal in *JP v South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust*.¹²

¹⁰ (1982) 4 EHRR 293 at 304

¹¹ *Campbell and Cosaus v United Kingdom* (1982) 4 EHRR 1)

¹² [2012] UKUT 486 (AAC); [2013] M.H.L.R. 148.

22. The definition of Jediism in Appendix A to the CIO Constitution states that it sources its terminology in the books, films and video games comprising the *Star Wars*. It uses the mythology of *Star Wars* and draws on many faiths, including, but not limited to: Taoism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Sufism, Judaism, and Paganism. It also draws on a number of secular philosophical teachings including the existential phenomenology of Heidegger, Kierkegaard and Buber.
23. There is no worldwide authority or structure for Jediism. It is open to different interpretations and there are a spectrum of groups that classify themselves as Jedi. It appears that Jedi are an amorphous and diverse group with a framework that allows individuals to pursue Jediism in different ways and not as a religion but as a secular belief system. TOTJO has set out Jediism as it is understood and promoted by it.
24. The Jedi Doctrine promoted by TOTJO borrows heavily from other world religions and philosophical teachings but the Commission does not consider that the aggregate amounts to a sufficiently cogent and distinct religion.
25. TOTJO confirm that Jediism may be adopted alongside any other religion, and that many interpretations of Jediism are possible. Also that TOTJO is open to different perspectives, self-realisation and individuals paths. It is inclusive and different viewpoints are accepted.
26. The TOTJO website confirms the diverse and differing nature of Jediism:
“There are many Jedi communities across the internet with a great variety of beliefs, customs and policies. As a community we will do our best to address your concerns and take on board your views, but no one site may offer you exactly what you are looking for. If you'd feel more comfortable elsewhere maybe one of the other Jedi communities would correspond more to your needs.”
27. The Commission noted the following analysis of Jediism presented by TOTJO in support of its application: *“Jedi Religion, or Jediism, continues to be an incredibly decentralized system of belief. While various groups have sprung up to teach it to others, there remains a large amount of variance between individual Jedi and multiple Jedi organizations. Jedi teachings are generally considered suggestions and guides rather than rules, so the difference of teachings between groups is not necessarily viewed as improper or incorrect.”*
http://altrreligion.about.com/od/alternativereligiionsaz/a/jedi_religion.htm
28. The Commission also noted the decision of the Board of the New Zealand Charity Commission¹³ declining registration of The Jedi Society Incorporated on the basis that *“Jediism is not sufficiently structured, cogent or serious to advance religion; nor to advance moral or spiritual improvement in a charitable manner”*. On the basis of the evidence the Board considered that *“the belief system is merely a collection of interconnected ideas based on the Star Wars universe, rather than structured cogent and serious religion.”*

¹³ dated 14 September 2015

29. The Commission considers that there is insufficient evidence that Jediism and the Jedi Doctrine as promoted by TOTJO is a sufficiently structured, organised or integrated system of belief to constitute a religion. There is insufficient evidence of an objective understanding of Jediism as opposed to a self-defining system which may be pursued outside the confines of a religion and in a secular manner. It comprises a loose framework of ideas with some common ground which individuals may interpret as they see fit. In particular, it is not obligatory to interpret and follow the Jedi Doctrine as a religion.
30. There is scope for individuals, consistent with Jediism and the Jedi Doctrine promoted by TOTJO, to pursue a spiritual path, a philosophy or way of life outside of the scope of a religion, as that term is defined in charity law. Any cogency and cohesion that is present is eroded by the individual's ability to develop themselves within a loose framework and follow an individual experiential philosophy or way of life as a secular belief system.

Doctrines and practice of benefit to the public - capable of providing moral and ethical value or edification to the public

31. The belief system to be a religion for the purposes of charity law must be capable of providing moral and ethical value or edification to the public. The court in *Cocks v Manners*¹⁴, stated "*It is said, in some of the cases that religious purposes are charitable, but that can only be true as to religious services tending directly or indirectly towards the instruction or the edification of the public*". This statement was approved by Lord Simonds in *Gilmour and Coats*¹⁵.
32. Jediism as promoted by TOTJO draws on many moral and ethical frameworks from other religions and philosophies. The Commission accepts that moral and ethical frameworks rooted in other religions and philosophies may be capable of providing moral and ethical value or edification to the public. In addition, the Commission accepts that such moral and ethical frameworks, in the context of other religions, may to some extent be open to interpretation by individual followers. However, the Commission considered that the general lack of structure to support a coherent religious belief system and latitude for individual acceptance or rejection and interpretation of the Jedi Doctrine affects the capability of TOTJO to promote doctrines and practice of benefit to the public which provide moral and ethical value or edification to the public.
33. The Commission noted there is some evidence that Jediism upholds particular values which might be capable of having a positive and beneficial impact on the public. However, the morals and ethics are not formally set out and are open to individuals to accept, reject and interpret. Given the lack of formality around the expression and promotion of values and behaviours coupled with the ability of individuals to interpret and develop their own guidelines, the Commission is not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that TOTJO promotes doctrines and practice of benefit to the public.
34. It is not evident that TOTJO reaches out into the community so as to have a positive impact. The Jedi Doctrine and services are accessible to the general public but the supporting information confirms that the pastoral care is focused on the provision of a support service for TOTJO's members who are in need to help them seek solutions themselves. This suggests an inward focus on its members rather than an outward focus on the general public.

¹⁴ LR 12 Eq 585

¹⁵ (HL) [1949] A.C. 426, p444

Summary of purpose - the advancement of religion

35. The Commission concluded that there is insufficient evidence that the characteristics of a religion in charity law are met for the reasons set out above. The Commission then considered whether the purposes might further another charitable purpose, the promotion of moral and ethical improvement for the benefit of the public, as an alternative to the advancement of religion.

THE PROMOTION OF MORAL OR ETHICAL IMPROVEMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC - section 3(1) (m)

36. The promotion of moral or ethical improvement is a charitable purpose that falls under the description of purposes in section 3(1) (m). The case law to support as charitable the promotion of ethical and moral improvement of the community is sparse. There is very little judicial reasoning within the cases for the recognition of this purpose. The relevant cases are *Re Hood*¹⁶, *Re Price*,¹⁷ *Re Scowcroft*¹⁸ and *Re South Place Ethical Society*¹⁹. Commentary on this purpose is in Picarda *The Law and Practice relating to Charities* (4th Ed) p.220-221 which describes a purpose for “the promotion of moral or spiritual welfare or improvement” and Tudor *Charities* (10th Ed) p.237-238 which discerns a purpose for the promotion of “mental and moral improvement”.

37. *Re Scowcroft* and *Re Hood* were both cases concerned with the promotion of temperance primarily as a means of advancing Christian principles. *Re Price* was concerned with advancing the teachings of Rudolf Steiner which promoted mental and moral discipline. *Re South Place Ethical Society* was concerned with promoting the study and dissemination of ethical principles and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment.

38. The Commission’s understanding of the law relating to this purpose is set out in the Commission’s *Church of Scientology Decision*²⁰ and previously published *Analysis of the law underpinning Public Benefit and the Advancement of Moral or Ethical Belief Systems*.

39. To be charitable under this purpose the Commission considers that TOTJO must evidence the following:

- Clear and certain objects relating to the promotion of Jediism which incorporate a coherent definition identifying the beliefs, principles and practices.
- The beliefs, principles and practices are accessible to the public and capable of being understood and accepted and applied or rejected by individuals according to their individual choice or judgement from time to time.
- Moral improvement is central to the beliefs and practices.
- Evidence of directly promoting moral improvement within society generally.
- Evidence of a positive beneficial impact on the wider society not simply the followers.
- Evidence to show it is not an inward focussed organisation benefitting members only.

¹⁶ [1931] 1 Ch 240

¹⁷ [1943] Ch 422

¹⁸ [1898] 2 Ch 638

¹⁹ [1980] 1 WLR 1565

²⁰ 17 November 1999 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/church-of-scientology-england-and-wales> and <http://forms.charitycommission.gov.uk/media/94857/lawrel1208.pdf>

40. For moral or spiritual welfare or improvement of the community to be advanced in a way that is charitable for the public benefit there must be ethics or morals promoted which can be shown by evidence to be for the benefit of the public. It is not sufficient to advance spirituality or spiritual beliefs on their own. Neither is it enough that there is a presumption that individuals will behave in a way that impacts beneficially on society.
41. The Commission considers that for moral or ethical improvement to be shown a belief system would share characteristics with the beliefs attracting the protection of Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights as explained above.²¹
- **Clear and certain objects relating to the promotion of Jediism which incorporate a coherent definition identifying the beliefs, principles and practices**
42. The Commission is not satisfied that Jediism and the Jedi Doctrine as promoted by TOTJO demonstrates sufficient coherence and a sufficiently distinct set of beliefs, principles and practices to meet this criterion for the reasons set out above²².
- **The beliefs, principles and practices are accessible and capable of being understood and accepted and applied or rejected by individuals according to their individual choice or judgement from time to time.**
43. There is a lack of clarity as to what beliefs, principles and practices are promoted given the diversity within Jediism and the concept of liberty of thought and individual choice. Whilst TOTJO may encourage individuals to uphold particular values and promote individual behaviors, it appears that individuals are free to develop their own guidelines. The morals and ethics are not formally set out and are open to individual interpretation.²³
- **Moral improvement is central to the beliefs and practices.**
44. Although Jediism and the Jedi Doctrine as promoted by TOTJO includes the promotion of spirituality, there is insufficient evidence that moral improvement is central to the beliefs and practices of TOTJO. Particularly, as the Jedi Doctrine can be accepted, rejected and interpreted by individuals as they see fit.
- **Directly promoting moral improvement within society generally.**
45. There is insufficient evidence of Jediism directly promoting moral improvement within society generally.
- **Positive beneficial impact on the wider society not simply the followers.**
46. Although TOTJO is web-based and accessible to the public, it is not evident what positive beneficial impact TOTJO has on society in general.
- **Not an inward focussed organisation benefitting members only**
47. To be charitable, there should be some element of public benefit in the sense that it must not be merely devoted to the self-improvement of its own members. Some of the

²¹ Paragraph 21

²² Paragraphs 22-30

²³ Paragraphs 22-30

services are focused on TOTJO's members which raises a concern that it may, in part, have an inward focus on members.

Summary of purpose – the promotion of moral or ethical improvement

48. The Commission concluded that there is insufficient evidence that the purpose of TOTJO is the promotion of moral or ethical improvement for the benefit of the public for the reasons set out above.

Are the purposes for the public benefit - for the advancement of religion or the promotion of moral or ethical improvement?

49. The Commission concluded that the purposes of TOTJO do not fall within the descriptions of purposes in section 3 of the 2011 Act for the advancement of religion or the promotion of moral or ethical improvement for the benefit of the public and did not need to consider whether the purposes are for public benefit but for the sake of completeness has considered this issue consistent with the law and principles set out in its public benefit guidance.

• A purpose must be beneficial to the community (public benefit in the first sense)

50. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate both the organisation's impact upon the community and that the impact is beneficial. The courts have held this to mean "*that the benefit must be capable of proof in a court of law.....When, however, the question is whether a particular gift for the advancement of religion satisfies the requirement of public benefit, a question of fact arises which must be answered by the court in the same manner as any other question of fact, i.e., by means of evidence cognizable by the court.*"²⁴

51. The demonstrable benefits of a religion/belief system are generally identified within the belief system to include doctrines and practices and the moral and spiritual values and how they will be promulgated and the general effect of their promulgation.

52. The Commission's view is that it is not sufficient to advance spirituality or spiritual beliefs on their own. '*Charities promoting non-religious philosophical beliefs will usually have to demonstrate social impact by reference to welfare or improvement. It is, however, unlikely that purely 'spiritual' benefits, not having a moral content, could be demonstrated by evidence cognizable by the Court. Certainly, the belief evidenced by an organisation's teachings that any given practices are of spiritual efficacy is insufficient to establish that as a fact. Further any alleged spiritual benefit arising from the edification by the example given to the public by followers of any particular teachings is similarly insufficient to establish public benefit. The court has established that the existence of a benefit of the necessary public character must be shown to exist by proof of matters 'having a demonstrable impact on the community or a section of it'.*'²⁵

53. The Commission's position is that it is not enough that there is a presumption that individuals will behave in a way that impact beneficially on society having received guidance.

²⁴ *Re Coats' Trust, Coats v Gilmour* [1948] Ch 340 Lord Greene MR

²⁵ *Analysis of the law underpinning Public Benefit and the Advancement of Moral or Ethical Belief Systems*

54. The Commission is not satisfied that Jediism and the Jedi Doctrine is sufficiently structured so as to have a beneficial impact. Further, there is insufficient evidence of the beneficial effects of TOTJO to find that the purpose is beneficial. Whilst it may be possible for TOTJO to undertake some analysis and provide some quantification to demonstrate a positive impact on the public, it is first necessary to evidence that the characteristics of a religion in charity law are met or that the purpose is otherwise charitable.

- **Benefits must be balanced against any detriment or harm**

55. No issues of harm or detriment flowing from the purpose were identified by the Commission. Jediism as promoted by TOTJO does not within its teachings include anything contrary to the law, or in contravention of public policy. The Commission, like the court, is not concerned with the truth or otherwise of the teachings.

- **Benefit must be to the public or a section of the public (public benefit in the second sense)**

56. In relation to charities advancing religion and moral or spiritual belief systems, one generally expects to see a wide public benefit going beyond the members of the belief system concerned. The benefits, tangible or intangible, must be available to the public at large or to a sufficient section of the public. The purpose must not simply be for the benefit of the followers themselves but it should be outward looking extending to the public.

57. The Commission concluded that it is not evident what benefits accrue to the public as opposed to TOTJO's followers through the promotion of Jediism as a web based doctrine.

- **Charging fees**

58. TOTJO provides free services on-line through its website. There is no evidence that the poor are excluded.

- **Personal benefits must be incidental to carrying out the religious purpose**

59. No issues of personal benefit were identified. TOTJO appears to be an altruistic organisation which relies upon volunteers. The practices are not private or limited to a private class of individuals but extend to the public generally.

Summary of public benefit

60. The Commission is not satisfied that the public benefit requirement is met either for the advancement of religion or the promotion of moral or ethical improvement for the reasons set out above.