

05-31-2026

Dear Mike, you sent me a lot of stuff. I think the best way to respond is with annotations to your reply. So, let's begin. You start by writing:

<<Allah u Abha Robert, Glenn sent me his claims quite a number of years ago.

I read through them all. Neal showed up at my house with Victor almost 20 years ago. (,He had come into the restaurant in Aspen I was working at as a waiter and the maitre d' sat his group in my section while I was in the kitchen. We were both surprised by the coincidence. So I invited him to my place shortly later informing him I only wanted to listen to what he had to say. No one else. Of course he didn't listen and brought Victor along!>>

Interesting, that reminds me of when Rex King visited Mason in Florence, and brought his assistant.

<<Anyhow, I sat and listened to him explain his "proofs". And that was that. Never saw him again.) What he said was almost identical to what Glenn sent me. That is why I state that the both are almost the same.>>

Neal is showing people his "proofs" (more on this later), while Glenn shows people specifically how he alone fulfills the two criteria in the Will and Testament. I know them both and they are far from "the same." Like opposite ends of the pendulum swing.

<<Let's not nitpick here.>>

What you're calling "nitpicking" is the rhetorical equivalent of an attorney telling a jury, "*Let's not get bogged down in the details.*" In other words: *ignore the evidence.*

If what you mean is that I should be prepared to endure your nitpicking while refraining from offering any rebuttal, then say that plainly.

But let's be clear: what you dismiss as "nitpicking," I call **parsing the evidence** — and any engagement with me on matters of the Covenant, now or in the future, will always require that level of precision.

Was Doc "nitpicking" when he laid out the detailed evidence that established Pepe's guardianship? Or was he doing exactly what an honest investigation of the truth requires?

<<The fact of the matter is 4 individuals can't all be the Guardian. 3 of them have already been sent my offer to prove their case in front of a o` larger Bahai audience. Glenn was one that was invited. None of the 3 responded. You'd think a true Guardian would want the

challenge. Mason sure challenged many!>>

Sorry, Mike, but that is just a red herring, not relevant to the matter at hand. Responding to Mike's challenge is not one of the criteria. Your challenge does nothing to overrule the two criteria given in the Will and Testament; I repeat here: The succeeding guardian must 1. Be a son/Aghsan, and 2. Be appointed (in the lifetime of the present guardian).

Most Baha'is worldwide (7 million strong) believe that the Guardianship ended. It will take a bump on the head the size of Armageddon to wake them from their slumber.

Mike East, you were given the authority to **investigate** the Truth — nothing more. You were not given agency to convene conclaves, appoint successors, or determine the Guardian by any method outside the two-fold criteria established in the Covenant. That authority does not belong to you, nor to any individual.

Your role is to **accept or reject** what the evidence shows. But the real question is: *on what basis do you judge?* With wisdom? With emotion? Or is there some other, undisclosed agenda shaping your conclusions?

Anyone who attended a Covenant Fireside under Dr. Jensen and doesn't see that it all boils down to just two criteria by which we recognize the Guardian is suffering an affliction. They are afflicted in both heart and mind. The heart falters when it lacks love for the truth. The mind falters when it rejects rational proofs as though they carry no weight.

I'm concerned you may be suffering from this very affliction.

I'll remind you that Victor, Kay, and I attended your *Eagle of the East* presentation at Overland Reservoir on the Grand Mesa back in 1992. You spoke for roughly ninety minutes. Three-quarters of what you told those kids at Rainbow came straight from the Bahá'í teachings — more specifically, from the BUPC teachings you first learned under Dr. Jensen.

Of course, you've always been adept at blending in a little New-Age vocabulary to give it a different flavor. But what stood out to us that day was this: **through your entire presentation, you never once mentioned Baha'u'llah, 'Abdu'l-Baha, or Dr. Jensen.** Not even during the Q&A. Not until I confronted you directly did you finally acknowledge that the material you presented originated with Baha'u'llah and Dr. Jensen.

That omission — the deliberate withholding of your sources — was my first indication that you might be struggling with the very affliction I described earlier.

It makes me wonder what other details you may be leaving out when teaching the Cause.

You continue your reply to me with a series of **red herrings**, one after another, after another. You should know that I am not easily duped... or distracted.

<<Here's a few other important points to consider. Shoghi told the Bahai's in America to get out of the cities. Mason told the Bahai's to get above 5280 feet or over a mile high. Apparently most of the Bahai's haven't listened to those instructions from previous Guardians, with the exception of a few of us. What's the point of having a Guardian if those who say they believe in one haven't even obeyed the instructions and warnings of the previous ones? Those warnings had to do with the eventual catastrophes. Now if Glenn is residing in the Portland, Oregon area it seems pretty bizarre to believe in him as a Guardian, since even Two Kings of Bahauallah, two titled people with vast amounts of Bahai knowledge.....meaning Leland & Opal, listened to those warnings and did in fact move accordingly. (I heeded the warnings in 1986 when God instructed me to move. I discussed it with Leland at the time and he acknowledged it as valid and to move. But that's another fuller story I wouldn't go into here.)>>

Mike, this is just silly. There was a sizable BUPC community in Madison, WI, which is at 873' in elevation. Doc never demanded that those people move to a higher elevation. It did not make them lesser Baha'is. And, of course, if we seriously went by this as a criterion for Guardianship, then we could not accept that Mason was Guardian, as he lived his last years in Florence, Italy, which is 160' in elevation. Clearly, he did not follow his own advice. Fortunately, we only need to go by the two criteria specified in the Will and Testament.

It isn't my place to question Glenn's decisions on this matter. To be candid, it seems you're creating reasons to reject him that stem more from personal bias than from evidence. Rest assured that Glenn is highly capable, and he has prepared contingencies.

<<As I said, let's not nitpick here.>>

You seem to be operating under the assumption that the Aghsan Guardian possesses an ongoing form of infallibility — that whatever the guardian pronounces must be obeyed without question. But Doc settled that misunderstanding in the early 1990s. While you were... elsewhere, he made it clear that this idea of a perpetually infallible Guardianship is a misconception.

The reality is straightforward: Shoghi Effendi was the only infallible guardian. (See the paragraph in the Will and Testament, that refers to the "Sacred and Youthful Branch," a title reserved exclusively for Shoghi Effendi by 'Abdu'l-Baha.)

After Shoghi Effendi's passing, that mantle of infallibility was intended to rest with the **Universal House of Justice**, with the Davidic Guardian presiding as its head — not as an infallible oracle, but as the hereditary occupant of the executive seat.

So, if your dilemma hinges on the belief that every Guardian after Shoghi Effendi must be infallible, then this authoritative explanation of Dr. Jensen should dissolve that dilemma, if you are firm in the Covenant. Doc dismantled that notion decades ago.

You Continue...

<<"There's no way those of us who believe in a Guardianship are ever going to convince the mainstreams if none of us can't resolve the issue of the 4 out there making claims. They'll just laugh at us.

Now I hear from Jim Rawlinson that Laura Brooks is making the claim of being the Guardian! He's not following her, he's just aware of her rantings and ravings. She's pretty nuts. Far more so than Neal.>>

There are certainly more than four false claimants to the Baha'i Guardianship. This is what happens when people reject the Covenant and elevate their own suppositions above the Holy Writ. In doing so, they sever themselves from the single ray of the Holy Spirit that provides clarity; over time, they drift further from reality. Laura Brooks is likely experiencing the consequences of her choices regarding the Covenant. Still, it is difficult to imagine anyone surpassing Neal in this regard; he was clinically evaluated and formally diagnosed with bipolar disorder by one of the world's leading psychiatrists.

<<Another Bahai has commented..." why would Abdul-Baha go through all the trouble of adopting a gentile in Mason in order to open up the Guardianship process to the whole world of Gentiles and then have it go back to two Jewish individuals such as Neal & Glenn. Doesn't make sense.">>

Not much makes sense once a person begins interpolating the Covenant — adding to it, subtracting from it, causing division among the friends, until what remains is a reflection of their own vision rather than God's plan and the vision of Abhá.

Furthermore, there is absolutely nothing, other than someone's own imaginings, that would preclude a person of ANY particular heritage from being a successor.

The Book of the Covenant and the Will and Testament say nothing about the biological heritage of any future Guardians. Therefore, the Guardian being of Jewish heritage or non-Jewish heritage has nothing to do with the question at hand. As Paul said, “There is neither Jew nor Gentile.”

The only relevant questions are: 1. Is the successor an Aghsan, either through biology or adoption? 2. Is there evidence of appointment?

All other concerns expressed on the matter are just more red herrings.

That said, I am personally an eyewitness to Doc stating explicitly that a future Guardian COULD be of Jewish descent.

Know that I oppose Zionism in all its forms, but I want to be clear that my position is theological and political, not ethnic or racial. Your comment came across as if it were directed at people rather than at an ideology, so let me clarify the point by sharing what Doc explained to me. He told me that because the Aghsán line eventually included adoption, the position is open to a man from any background—regardless of race, creed, or nationality. He was clear that it is now possible that an Aghsan Guardian can be black, Asian, Native American, and even another person from the line of Judah could be grafted onto the Tree of Life (through faith) and into the Aghsán lineage (through adoption). Jews are not excluded from the Guardianship because ‘Abdu’l-Baha adopted a gentile. What an absurd notion your “other Baha’is comment” proposes.

<<Another has commented: “Doc never anointed Pepe as the Guardian. He called him a covenant-breaker and a pagan and that he was shunning him. Any reference by Neal or Glenn related to having been ‘adopted’ by Pepe is thus null and void as Pepe was not the Guardian “>>

Whoever this commentator is, they are extremely confused, and I hope you set them straight on the matter. Or, do you also believe that Pepe was not the Guardian?

It is not true that Doc did not anoint Pepe. Doc made it clear that the “anointing” was the education bestowed by the High Priest. This calls to mind Shem’s blessing of Abraham—inviting him into his school within his City of Peace. That invitation was Shem’s anointing of Abraham. In the same way, Doc conferred this anointing upon Pepe through his seven epistles, which constitute one dimension of his breaking of the Seven Seals.

Doc indeed called Pepe a covenant-breaker and a pagan. He said, and wrote, the same things about Mason. This did not negate their respective appointments by the only person,

granted the authority to appoint the successor in the Will and Testament: the previous Guardian.

Doc's authority to declare the Guardian a covenant-breaker did not in any way mean that Pepe was not still the Guardian. What Doc did say on the matter was the following:

"You can be absolutely sure, that I have positively no intentions to sit a non-Baha'i and Pagan indoctrinated person on the throne of David, who doesn't accept his Aghsan adopted genealogy, . . ." (Dr. Jensen, Epistle #5 to Joseph Pepe Remey, May 1990, p. 28)

He was not going to allow Pepe to sit upon the throne of David at the head of the slBC until he came to his senses. This demonstrates that a person could be the legitimately appointed Aghsan Guardian and not be allowed to sit upon the throne of David at the head of the body. This is one of the checks and balances built into the Covenant. The High Priest, and after him the body, can rule that the Guardian has violated the Covenant, and prevent him from sitting upon the throne. Until such time that Pepe would explicitly accept the truth of the Covenant, Doc had the Vice President of the slBC stand in as chair. This in no way negates the idea that Doc believed that Pepe was Mason's legitimately appointed successor to the Aghsan Guardianship.

<<And another comment: "Why would a Guardian who completed the Italian court adoption process to fulfill his Guardianship appointment think a token would suffice instead of adoption and appointment?" >>

Mike, if these people/commentators who are asking these questions are your students, you are not doing right by them by refusing to answer their questions in a covenant-informed manner.

First, Glenn does not rely solely on the fact that he received "TOKENS" from Pepe. What he says is that the tokens were the confirmation of Pepe's words of adoption, just as Doc had educated him to do.

Dr. Jensen had written to Pepe at length about the manner in which 'Abdu'l-Baha adopted Mason. He explained that it involved calling him His "dear son," and His "real son," and then having that proclamation confirmed through "institutive evidence." In the case of Mason, that institutive evidence was the packet of Hair and Blood that Shoghi Effendi passed to Mason as the executor of 'Abdu'l-Baha's will. In the included personal note, Shoghi referred to this as a "token." I trust that you would not refer to Doc's intentional emphasis on Shoghi Effendi's word choice as "nitpicking."

In other words, Pepe was made well aware of the legal precedent under Baha'i law of 'Abdu'l-Baha's method of adoption of Mason Remey. The people who insist that the only legitimate adoption in this context would have been adoption through the secular courts are just plain wrong.

What they are asserting, perhaps unwittingly, is that secular law trumps Baha'i law in matters of adoption into the Aghsan lineage. What Doc said was that the adoption had to be a LEGAL adoption. According to Doc, Mason's adoption by 'Abdu'l-Baha would have passed muster as a LEGAL SECULAR ADOPTION because it was in accord with the Palestinian adoption laws at the time. But that secular legality was never actually tested and confirmed by the secular courts. It didn't have to be, because anything not ILLEGAL under secular law is, in fact, LEGAL.

'Abdu'l-Baha's adoption of Mason Remey was an internal religious matter conducted for the purpose of continuing the Aghsan lineage. Its Baha'i legality was established by the fact that 'Abdu'l Baha, the Center of the Covenant, set the precedent, and that the High Priest, who was given charge over the courts by God, confirmed it.

He talked about the importance of Mason's adoption of Pepe through the secular courts, not to restrict the Guardian to a secular adoption, but to set Pepe apart from the others. Only Pepe was a son/Aghsan (in this case, adopted through the secular courts.) None of the others, like Donald Harvey or Joel Marengella, could legitimately claim they were sons.

Pepe was merely following Doc's teachings and the precedent set by 'Abdu'l-Baha. In this sense, it was completely legal under Baha'i Law as practiced by 'Abdu'l-Baha. And, again, it was also perfectly legal under secular law, as anything not illegal under secular law is, in fact, legal.

Some people have tried to argue that the ONLY thing that made 'Abdu'l-Baha's adoption of Mason legal was that it was in accordance with the Palestinian adoption law at the time, but this is wrong because the matter was never brought to a court of law in Palestine or Israel to confirm that legality. In fact, at one point Pepe complained to Doc that he had no right to refer to either himself or Mason as Aghsan unless Mason's adoption could be legally established in the Israeli courts. And this was Doc's reply:

"You write that until I can prove in an Israeli court of law, 'as to Mason's adoption by 'Abdu'l-Baha, no one has the right to publish either of our names in the Aghsan lineage.' You're dead wrong. The criteria for settling all Baha'i issues is the Sacred Will and Testament, not any court in Israel." (Dr. Jensen, Epistle #3 to Joseph Pepe Remey, Dec. 7, 1989, p. 5)

Doc, once again, makes it absolutely clear that a secular court can never take precedence over Bahá'í law in matters of Aghsán adoption. Absent any official secular recognition of

the legality of Mason's adoption by 'Abdu'l-Bahá, Bahá'ís are left with these two fundamental questions: Was 'Abdu'l-Bahá's method of adoption legal in a Baha'i context, as endorsed by the High Priest? Or did the Guardianship come to an end?

Those same two questions confront Bahá'ís today.

Clearly, a token does not suffice for the adoption or the appointment. Where does that idea come from? Pepe never argued this, and neither does Glenn. Your commentator may think it is valid to mock the very idea of the token, but they only end up disputing with Shoghi Effendi, who referred to the hair and the blood as a "token," and Dr. Jensen certainly espoused and promoted the importance of the tokens. The concept of tokens is essential to proving the adoption.

Why would anyone who claims to understand the Covenant dismiss their importance?

<<Another comment: " Why would Neal need 'proofs' for his Guardianship? The terms of appointment as stated in the W&T make no mention of proofs. ">>

That's a fair and reasonable question, Mike. The way I see it, Neal has constructed "proofs" for his claim precisely because he cannot demonstrate that claim within the framework of the Covenant itself. Since he is neither an Aghsán nor the Guardian, he instead asserts that he is "prophesied by the Golden Criteria." But those proofs apply only to the Promised Ones—like the Manifestations and the Seventh Angel, Dr. Jensen. Neal has even stated in his forums that he is a hybrid of the Báb and Shoghi Effendi, and that this is the basis on which he claims to function. This directly contradicts the *Kitáb-i-Aqdas*, where Bahá'u'lláh states: "*Whoso layeth claim to a Revelation direct from God, ere the expiration of a full thousand years, such a man is assuredly a lying impostor.*"

Neal knowingly violates the Covenant in order to prop up his false and baseless claim. He is also collecting Huquq internationally, a money-grab. So, 1. He lacks the evidence required by the criteria in the Covenant, so he has invented "proofs" instead. And, 2. Neal, in his delusion(s), actually believes he receives the Holy Spirit, in fullness, directly from God, rather than being dependent on a single ray of the Holy Spirit that we receive from fixing our spiritual gaze on Baha'u'llah.

<<Another comment: " I am glad that you are trying to resolve the issue of the Guardianship in a honest and transparent way. I agree that there needs to be unity, or at least acknowledgement of ambiguity until new information comes to light so that all factions can move forward with one unified vision. ">>

Some people seem to believe that one day they will be walking past an Aghsan tree and one of them will fall out and hit them on the head. THEN they will have certitude. Until then, they will remain tangled up in the “ambiguity” of their own making.

I prefer not to demand this kind of sign from God. I prefer to do it the way Doc taught us to: look at the totality of evidence and come to a conclusion based on reason.

You have a choice, Mike. Either the Aghsan Guardianship as described in the sacred Will and Testament went “BADA,” or Pepe, having had no biological offspring, adopted and appointed a successor. As no one else has been able to produce anything close to the evidence that Glenn has, I believe that the matter is not ambiguous. The choice is clear. Only people’s prejudices and perhaps personal agendas get in the way of their clarity.

As a reminder, the person Doc entrusted with delivering the hair and blood to Pepe’s successor was his wife, Wind. After careful examination of the evidence, she delivered the token into Glenn’s hands. I would not be so quick to dismiss Dr. Jensen’s will in this matter.

<<Another comment: “ This is the confusion in the end time. “

So you see Robert, things are not as clear as those who believe in their particular “Guardian “ believe they are. Unity is a major Bahai concept. There IS no unity within the Bahai believers in the world today. THAT’S a fact.>>

Except this does not apply to me, Mike, because I don’t believe in a Guardian. I believe in God and His Covenant, and under the Covenant, things ARE clear.

Regarding calls for unity, when I hear someone say anything that includes “protecting the unity,” it makes my Spidey sense tingle. I am reminded of these words of ‘Abdu’l-Baha:

“...and with Divine Unity for his excuse deprived himself and perturbed and poisoned others. No doubt every vainglorious one that purposeth dissension and discord will not openly declare his evil purposes, nay rather, even as impure gold, will he seize upon divers measures and various pretexts that he may separate the gathering of the people of Bahá.”

Of course, we are for unity, but “unity” under anything other than the Covenant is not true Baha’i unity. There is unity over here with the Guardian, under the Covenant. Where things get confusing is when one tries to understand and establish the Guardianship outside the guidelines or scope of the Covenant. Things get convoluted quickly when standing outside in the cold and rain with a broken umbrella and a hole in your hat.

<<So Robert, this issue is more complicated than you may want to believe. Directing your thoughts at me as if I’m the one not thinking right is not a viable solution to unity. You may

believe what you want to believe, but until it is actually put to the test by other points of view and knowledge it remains just your opinion. Facts stand up to scrutiny. Right?>>

Again, I am not moved by calls for unity, for unity's sake.

And I am not the one who warned the believers to beware of those calling for unity who are not themselves firmly under Covenant. It is 'Abdu'l-Baha who suggested that such people are not thinking right.

Mike, you obviously have some valuable teaching skills, you've been around as long as anyone and have never been declared a Covenant-breaker. You obviously can attract students. Anyone who is under the Covenant is welcome to board the Arc, and it is my sincere hope that you will join us and put your skills and talents to work where they reinforce the Covenant and truly benefit the Cause.

As I stated above, I don't "believe in [a] particular Guardian." I accept what is demonstrably true. I have no desire to believe anything for the sake of belief. I don't "believe what I want to believe." I support Glenn not because of his appearance or demeanor, but because my own independent investigation revealed to me that he is the Aghsán Guardian after Pepe. Glenn meets the criteria, and only the true Guardian can do so.

But I do not follow Glenn, or any personality.

I follow God, whom I really learned about from singing the *New Song* (Doc's teachings) and by drinking of the *living waters* (Baha'u'llah's Revelation). My heart belongs to God alone.

<<IN THE LIGHT OF THE SPIRIT, The Eagle of the East>>

Sincerely, from El Abha,

Robert "Peace" Wright, Knight of Baha'u'llah

PS. Feel free to share this document, Mike. I know I likely will.