

July 22, 2006.

To the 21 brothers: Francis Ball, Benjamin Chen, Minoru Chen, Joe Davis, Lin Hong, Kung-Huan Huang, Ron Kangas, Elton Karr, Joel Kennon, James Lee, Albert Lim, David Lutz, Ray MacNee, Ed Marks, Benson Philips, Liu Suey, Dick Taylor, Ron Topsom, Dan Towle, Paul Wu, Andrew Yu.

Dear brothers,

I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 27, 2006. I am grateful for your response to my letter (October 2, 2005), requesting a meeting for fellowship with you. You raise 7 points which you feel make it “extremely difficult...to expect...a further time of fellowship...to be profitable...” You have enumerated a number of specific incidents. This allows me to address your specific points, rather than speaking in generalities. Dear brothers, I would ask for your patience as I try to answer your points one-by-one. After that I wish to bring to your attention some matters which are of concern to me. Before doing so, let me reassure you of my love and respect for all you brothers in the Lord.

### My Response to Your 7 Points

1. You say, “Since Brother Lee went to be with the Lord, many of us have had special times of fellowship with you and some of your co-workers in person. Some of these meetings lasted for days. These times of fellowship have thus far led us nowhere, and sometimes they have even made the situation worse. It seems to us that after many of these times of fellowship, your claim that you are one with all the other co-workers simply gave you the boldness to speak and do things in a more unrestrained way, to the harm of the recovery.” (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

May I begin by asking you by way of a reminder, who initiated those times of fellowship? When did any of you brothers (with the exception of brother Andrew returning my calls) call me by telephone? It seems to me that out of many many phone calls requesting fellowship, almost all were initiated by me.

You mention, “Some of these meetings lasted for days. These times of fellowship have thus far led us nowhere...” You assert that “these times...led us nowhere.” I disagree. Permit me to ask you: where did you expect them to lead? The most crucial time, according to my realization, was the gathering in Phoenix, AZ, in Feb. 2003. That resulted in the so-called “Phoenix Accord.” I personally felt that was a profitable result. Moreover the saints who became aware of the “Phoenix Accord’s” contents, had a positive response. I feel it is a shame that you brothers did not abide by its principles and applications. Instead, you accuse me of using it for my own interests. You say that I “used” that document. However, may I ask, if the statements contained in the “Phoenix Accord” are scriptural, what are you afraid of? If the principles and applications enumerated there correspond with tenets of the Bible, why are you worried about it being misused? If the items of the “Phoenix Accord” are biblical, shouldn’t we all abide by it? Why then did you brothers unilaterally abrogate that agreement? My conscience testifies that I tried my best to abide by the “Phoenix Accord.” Again, I was surprised when you brothers annulled it (for example by attacking brothers from the podium and in print). Your putting aside of that “Accord” may cause some to question your sincerity in signing that document.

Further, you assert that “your claim that you are one with all the other co-workers simply gave you the boldness to speak and do things in a more unrestrained way...” I disagree with this assertion and wonder if this is your practice. Are you so self-exalting to think a genuine servant of the Lord will do things like this? Surely this is based upon your subjective idea of how I would have acted in the absence of those interactions with you brothers.

2. You say, “We are very sorry to say it, but we have discovered that often your words to us in some of these times of face-to-face fellowship were false. We give as one example a time of fellowship among a dozen or so brothers in the summer of 2000 concerning the work in China. At that time you told us that although you had been to China many times, your trips were just for sightseeing and that you had never held any training or conferences there. You said that at most you had had only some informal fellowship with groups of no more than a dozen brothers. But afterwards we learned that in the spring of 1998 you conducted a nationwide training in Zhuhai of approximately sixty brothers, including many leading ones from all over China. This example and others like it have made us feel that you are not honest with us and that you will easily change the truth or hide facts from us.” (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

Your principal example is China. I am happy to be given an opportunity to fellowship in writing about China. I regret that you have twisted the few words I uttered in verbal fellowship with you. Please allow me to remind you of the “larger picture.” Early in the 1980’s many saints in China received four volumes of my writings, entitled “Sweet Savor.” They copied and distributed these among themselves. This material was circulated to numerous localities and saints and was instrumental in sustaining the mainland believers through a difficult era. Through this literature, they became aware of me and many appreciated my help. Because of this, I had the opportunity to fellowship with leaders from various parts of China on two occasions. They appreciated my fellowship and asked for help. In response we sent some Chinese-speaking co-workers from the Great Lakes area. Their portion was also greatly appreciated.

However, I was told that Brother Paul Wu from Taiwan had fellowship with Brother Lin of Foochow and other leading ones in China, in which he indicated the Taiwan brothers had a burden to conduct trainings in mainland China. Therefore, in order to avoid the appearance of rivalry, shortly after, we dropped all our labor in mainland China. Once you brothers declared your burden for China, I and the co-workers in this area withdrew from that field. In the past few years I have done very little in mainland China in order to try to cooperate with you. However, it seems you have little appreciation for my efforts to facilitate your labor and avoid complicating the situation in mainland China. After this I did visit China with my family members, as from this country their origin stems. Is there anything in this to be accused of? Why are you brothers so small? It was only later, after receiving your June 2005 letter, when I realized that you brothers were not for Brother Lee’s ministry, but seemed to have other motives—including the control of all the workers world-wide—that I resumed my labor in China.

When matters concerning China were raised on the occasion you refer to I was not able to give you detailed fellowship about the situation in China. As I recall, at the start of that session, in speaking about China, Brother R. Chen rebuked all the attendants who had labored in China. That caused me to realize that it was not possible to have sweet fellowship for the profit of the saints in China. Rather, it seemed to me that the fellowship was overshadowed by feelings of declaring something on the part of some. Consequently, in that atmosphere, I lost my heart to share.

In your June 2005 letter, you also refer to China. Let me ask you: Do you realize why so many saints are there in China? Who stood with them during their period of suffering? Who brought the leading ones into fellowship with one another? If the saints were helped and sustained by the writings of a certain brother, why do you hold him guilty? Is it because you claim the right to control everything on the globe? Dear brothers, once you expressed your interest in China, I and the co-workers here withdrew, except one who is burdened for one particular locality. It seems that you wish to make an issue over whether I met with a dozen or twenty or sixty brothers while in China. Have you lost sight of the “larger picture” that when you brothers wished to labor in China, I “scaled back” my exercise there? We have “bent-over backwards” to accommodate your non-fellowshipped feelings. In a pure conscience I can say that for years I have done very little in mainland China, compared to what I could do and should do. Yet it seems you have no appreciation. If you are not satisfied with my response, I don’t know what will satisfy you.

Again I regret that Brother R. Chen's attitude caused me not to have the liberty to fellowship these matters in detail at the gathering to which you refer. However, it seems to me that you do not appreciate the extent to which we have tried to accommodate you brothers. It seems rather, that you take these things for granted. It seems that you assume that every saint, local church, worker and every aspect of work (in China and world-wide) should belong to you and be under your control. Yet, even the apostle Paul never took this kind of dominating stand. Can you give me one verse to back up your unhealthy practice? As a brother, may I advise you to beware of Catholicism.

Finally on the topic of China, in your June 2005 letter you accused me of causing "*confusion and parties in the land where Brother Nee and Brother Lee labored many years and in which Brother Nee died as a martyr.*" Yet, I would ask: who is causing confusion in China? It is widely reported that a saying is circulating which says "*Brother Nee served his generation. Then Brother Lee served his generation. They are over. Now it is the generation of the 'blended co-workers'.*" Who has produced this? Is this really what you brothers want? Who is causing the saints to become their followers? Isn't this a shame to both Brothers Nee and Lee? At least I can testify that my limited labor in China caused the saints there to appreciate Christ, appreciate the Church and to appreciate Brother Lee's ministry.

3. You say, "After some of these times of fellowship, you did not keep promises that you gave to us while we were together. Again, we give as one example a time of fellowship in London in August 1998. In fellowship with the brothers at that time, you agreed that your ten-month training in Cleveland being held that year would be your last one. But that was not your last training, and to this day you continue to hold these ten-month trainings in the Great lakes area, contrary to what you agreed to do in fellowship with the brothers. Now many saints feel that your ten-month training is a source of rivalry with the training established by Brother Lee in Anaheim. This broken promise and others like it make us feel that you will not be faithful to your own word of promise and that you will easily say one thing in face-to-face fellowship but do something else afterwards." (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

The statements I made in London were based upon certain prerequisites. They were conditional on an understanding of our relationship which existed at that time. According to my perception, in London we brothers were in good fellowship. I was not excluded from you. Do you still recall I abided in you brothers' feeling by not going to Ghana even though I was warmly invited by over one thousand saints there? My understanding at the time was that we would all abide in Brother Lee's arrangement; that is, from that time forward we would work together closely. My dear brothers, don't you recall that Brother Lee sent eight of us to Hong Kong, and later to Indonesia? My understanding was that Brother Lee desired us to work together closely. Under these circumstances, I owe you brothers a proper fellowship concerning all I'm burdened by the Lord to do. Also you brothers owe me a proper reciprocal fellowship, so that we can serve the churches together.

I was surprised when you brothers abruptly cut me off, because (as brother Minoru Chen stated) the saints broke into applause after a message I gave in the Bay area of N. California. Thereafter, I was prohibited by you brothers from ministering at the (so-called) "seven feasts." Only the strenuous intervention of Great Lakes brothers facilitated my participation in gatherings in Cleveland and Chicago. Events that transpired in those places were symptomatic of a change in the basis underlying my relationship with you brothers. After you brothers have "cut me off," do you expect me to continue as if everything was the same? In fact, it is your actions which have changed our relationship. As a result, you are no longer open concerning my realization of the Lord's leading. What could I do to help? Moreover, I no longer feel bound by you brothers' understanding as it existed in London. May I ask you brothers—You felt free to unilaterally abrogate the principles and practices agreed upon in Phoenix. Why then do you seek to bind me to your interpretation of our

fellowship in London? Isn't this a double standard? In part this explains why I have proceeded with other "10-month labors."

Moreover, Brother Lee himself established my labor along these lines, which was firstly carried out in 1973-74 and then continued irregularly. Brother Lee personally called us and wrote to us with encouragement, both privately and publicly. Even in 1995 he strongly encouraged me with words like, "Brother Titus, you should do this. This is your portion." Concerning this type of exercise, I feel I still have to be faithful to the Lord."

I should add that as a servant of the Lord, I should have the freedom to follow His leading. At the time in London I may have felt (under the conditions existing at that time) that probably I would not conduct further 10-month labors. Yet, thereafter the conditions underlying our relationship were changed by you brothers. Moreover, a number of leading brothers in the Great lakes area churches had a strong feeling before the Lord, concerning the need to perfect brothers. Even though they realized there might be some misunderstanding, they were insistent. As one serving the Lord, I had to take their consideration before the Lord. I received a strong confirmation from the Lord.

You say that "many saints feel that your ten-month training is a source of rivalry with the training...in Anaheim." Some brothers have questioned whether "the saints' feelings" (of the kind you refer to here) are not the result of "seeds sown" in your messages and print. Brother Lee emphasized the perfecting of the saints. That should include all the saints, not merely those who are able to attend the FTTA (and similar trainings). Why are you offended by my occasional, irregular 10-month labors? Why are these automatically assumed to be in "rivalry" with the FTTA? May I remind you that Brother Lee was aware of and even blessed the "10-month labors" which I conducted (eg. 1995-96) while he was with us (both before and after the establishment of the FTTA). Why should you consider this as rivalry?

4. You say, "On many occasions you have accused the other co-workers of trying to persuade the churches to close their doors to you and not to invite you to minister to them. However, it has come to our attention that in many cases it was your own unbecoming speaking and actions in various localities that made the churches there decide not to invite you back. To accuse the brothers of things that your own actions have caused indicates that you do not realize what damage you are causing among the churches and that you hold the other brothers at fault for how the churches view you. This makes us feel that you will easily dismiss what concrete concerns we have for the churches as unwarranted persecution of you personally." (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

Your accusations are vague and non-specific. I do recall that one leading brother from New Zealand told me that they [in New Zealand] desired to invite me. However, after they fellowshipped with brother Ron Kangas, the matter was dropped. Doesn't that at least suggest the possibility that something was said to "close the door" to my visit? I have also been attacked repeatedly through thinly disguised innuendos by you brothers from the podium. Are you suggesting that your speaking has no effect upon the saints and the churches? Isn't it conceivable that this would cause some churches not to invite me? In fact, I don't know which local church, while striving to be loyal to you brothers and the LSM, would continue to invite me! Can all you 21 brothers declare with a pure conscience that you have said nothing to damage my ministry? Isn't it a fact that some of you (eg. Brother Albert Lim) have been on a world-wide mission to undermine my ministry? Why is it that in many local churches (eg. Baton Rouge, LA) there has been gossip concerning me, even though I have never visited there even once?

More generally, I can only respond that as a servant of the Lord, I travel and minister according to what the Lord committed to me. On occasion this may be offensive to some. However, I have no bitterness, since I know that as a servant of the Lord I will receive both honor and shame, both good and evil reports. I realize that I and many other genuine servants of the Lord will be called the scum

of the earth and the off-scouring of all things. Yet, I am peaceful. I only hope that, as a New Testament minister, I can faithfully fulfill my portion of the New Testament ministry.

5. You say, “In your letter of October 2, 2005, you said, ‘We are co-workers.’ For us that means that we are co-workers according to the vision and pattern of work that we received from Brother Lee, who brought us into the work of the Lord’s recovery as co-workers. We co-workers do not feel to depart in any way from that vision and pattern of work; rather we receive Brother Lee’s ministry entirely. However, you have been selective in your acceptance of Brother Lee’s ministry and on some matters you have even spoken contrary to this ministry. For example, your disagreement with the matter of one publication in the Lord’s recovery, which both Brother Nee and Brother Lee practiced and which Brother Lee taught definitely, has made clear to us that you wish to take a different way in the work. This example and many others like it make it manifest to us that while we all may be workers, we are not in practicality, and thus in reality, co-workers, and that your basis for fellowship with us has changed.” (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

Concerning departing from Brother Lee’s pattern, permit me to address the (so-called) “seven feasts” as a specific case. I know for a fact that Brother Lee’s proposal was for five gatherings a year. His proposal didn’t include two elders’ gatherings. Yet some brothers prevailed upon Brother Lee to add the two elders’ gatherings. Perhaps due to Brother Lee’s health and age, he would agree to proposals which are not his best desire. I wish to ask you brothers: Since Brother Lee proposed five gatherings per year, why did you brothers ask for two additional times, resulting in your “seven feasts”? Why have your “seven feasts” become part of the “constitution” of the recovery, rather than Brother Lee’s five times? Moreover, Brother Lee made it clear that the two annual trainings should be for new ones and young people. Brother Andrew made this clear at the co-workers’ gathering shortly after Brother Lee’s departure. Concerning this, why was Brother Lee’s wish never acted upon? Why were the elders and saints never informed that the semi-annual trainings were intended for new ones and young people? Why did you brothers continue Brother Lee’s crystallization studies? Do you really receive Brother Lee’s vision, pattern and ministry entirely? Shouldn’t this involve following his direction and leading in these matters? I’m afraid that your actions contradict your claims.

Concerning ‘one publication’ I would say the following. First, I am surprised that you would use the case of ‘one publication’ to argue that you receive Brother Lee’s ministry entirely and are not being selective. May I ask, did Brother Lee give ‘one publication’ the overwhelming emphasis which you brothers have given this issue since June 2005? Is ‘one publication’ the center-piece of Brother Lee’s ministry, as you have made it a center-piece of your ministry recently?

You assert concerning me that, “you have been selective in your acceptance of Brother Lee’s ministry,” implying you are not selective. Yet, in the same elders’ training where Brother Lee addressed ‘one publication’, in another meeting he also addressed other matters of the church life. In the same Elders’ Training (Book 8), Brother Lee talked of the need of “cooking the groceries” from his ministry and each church needing a different supply. He said,

“I would not prepare such messages for all the churches and charge the churches to read the same message. Each of the many churches in this country needs a different kind of spiritual help each Lord’s day. Different churches on different Lord’s days need a different supply. You cannot serve the same kind of meal to everyone in a hospital... You must have different meals to feed different people. Only you as the elders in your locality know what kind of meals your family needs. No one else knows your family’s needs.... This must be done by each respective local church. The family cooking must be done by the family, each one respectively. Although in principle all the local churches should be the same, in this aspect all the churches could not be the same.” [W. Lee, The Life-Pulse of the Lord’s Present Move, Elders’ Training Book #8, p. 67]

Brothers, forgive me for asking, but have you ever emphasized this portion of Brother Lee's ministry? I, for one, don't recall hearing such a message by you brothers, saying, "in this aspect all the churches could not be the same." Brother Lee said, "I would not...charge the churches to read the same message." Have you brothers taught this in recent years? On the contrary, it seems to me, that you brothers tirelessly emphasize the need of all the churches to be the same in every way. From Elders' Training Book 8 you emphasize 'one publication' but not the points I mention above. Yes, Brother Lee taught that the churches should be identical in some aspects. But he also taught the other side, saying, "in this aspect all the churches could not be the same" and "I would not...charge the churches to read the same message." Aren't you brothers in danger of being an "unturned cake," in contrast to Brother Lee's balanced ministry? In this respect aren't you brothers "selective"? Are you fair to Brother Lee's ministry and all the local churches he served? Aren't you brothers misleading all the local churches, making them ministry churches just for your purpose?

When you brothers raised the issue of 'one publication,' I soberly considered it before the Lord. I recall that when I personally passed on a copy of the "New Man," containing some of my writing, Brother Lee graciously received it, without criticism or condemnation. I remember also how my publication, "Sweet Savor," benefited thousands of Chinese-speaking saints in mainland China. In an advanced way, it also introduced them to Brother Lee's ministry. It is clear from Brother Lee's tape-recorded fellowship with Brother Silas Wu, that Brother Lee's message on 'one publication' (Feb. 1986) was aimed particularly at Bill Freeman's publishing. Moreover, the audio-tape of Brother Lee's 1986 message on 'one publication' shows that he was also directly addressing Joseph Fung's unethical use of the Recovery version text in his own Greek Interlinear. Knowing this background and the context of Brother Lee's sharing on one publication should surely affect our evaluation of it. Brother Lee did not address 'one publication' in a vacuum. Neither did Brother Lee present it as a scriptural truth, contrary to your current position on this issue espoused on [www.AFaithfulWord.org](http://www.AFaithfulWord.org).

After much consideration and prayer, I realized that I must follow the Lord and work according to the pattern in the Bible. Peter and Paul wrote epistles virtually simultaneously (eg. 1 Peter and Ephesians, approx. AD 64) to churches in Asia. Didn't Peter's and Paul's "publications" (epistles) circulate at the same time? Where is the example of 'one publication' in the New Testament? Therefore, isn't the New Testament ministry inclusive of different brothers' writings within the one vision of God's economy? Concerning this issue, I have a deep conviction that you brothers do not receive Brother Lee's ministry in its entirety, but selectively. Brother Lee spoke about 'one publication' in 1986. Then subsequently, he was greatly concerned about the practice of the church-life (including the 'New Way'). In the latter context, Brother Lee encouraged publications to enhance the fellowship among the churches. He said,

"We need to keep fellowship with the churches and the saints in the concern of the Lord's new move...The church in Chicago publishes a newsletter with testimonies concerning the effectiveness of the Lord's new way. This is very good. ...I hope that many churches could publish something to let the saints in other countries and continents know how the Lord is moving in their localities. This may nourish, support, and contribute some help to all the saints, even to the saints outside of us in the denominations." (W. Lee, *Speaking Christ for the Building Up of the Body of Christ*, p. 143).

Brother Lee's speaking quoted above, was after his word to the elders in 1986. Brother Lee's statement was a clear encouragement for publications among the churches. Brother Lee also expressed to Jim Reetzke his regret that Chicago ceased their publishing of *The Firstfruit*, which contained some series of my messages. Yet, you brothers have chosen to ignore these items of Brother Lee's speaking. Why was the selection above never included in your "Quotes from the Ministry" concerning publications? Do you indeed take Brother Lee's ministry in its entirety? Why then was this word excluded? Based upon what criterion can you willfully ignore this and other relevant writings of Brother Lee's? Was it conveniently ignored because it violates the parameters for

permissible publications mandated by the “blended co-workers” in your document, “*Publication Work in the Lord’s Recovery*” (LSM, June 30, 2005)? How can you exclude what Brother Lee evidently included? How can you prohibit what Brother Lee permitted?

6. You say, “We are co-workers.’ But how are we genuinely co-workers when you insist on conducting a work that distracts many saints from the one work in the Lord’s recovery? Specifically, while all the recovery respects the seven annual gatherings which our Brother Lee himself encouraged us all to pursue, you have no hesitation in holding different gatherings at the same time and to promote different burdens in your speaking during these times. Last November, while we were having the annual Thanksgiving conference in Atlanta, and saints throughout the earth participated either in person or via Webcast, you held your own conference at exactly the same time in Naperville, Illinois. Then, last December you conducted a training of your own, and so timed its conclusion as to make it impractical for your ‘trainees’ to attend the winter training, again one of the seven annual gatherings that are respected by all the recovery. This past January you conducted a conference in Columbus at the same time that the international Chinese-speaking conference was being held in Taipei. Are we really co-workers in the same work? Your actions indicate that you are doing your own work to deliberately draw the saints away from the one work in the recovery, and we feel that since this is your practice, there is little ground for us to fellowship genuinely as co-workers in the one recovery.” (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

You allege that I “*insist on conducting a work that distracts many saints from the one work in the Lord’s recovery.*” You mention my “*holding different gatherings at the same time*” as the “*seven annual gatherings.*” I would remind you that, as I mentioned earlier, Brother Lee’s initial arrangement involved only five such gatherings. (see my response under point 5 above.) More importantly, the “*one work in the Lord’s recovery*” is the one work of building up the organic Body of Christ. It is organically one and not organizationally and institutionally one. It is not necessarily coincident with the work conducted under the auspice of Living Stream Ministry, a registered non-profit organization. Neither is that “one work” restricted to the “seven annual gatherings” which you mention. May I ask you brothers: in the days of the early apostles, were Peter and Paul both engaged in the “one work” or not? Based upon the New Testament pattern, was the “one work” carried out by the Lord’s servants working according to the heavenly vision and the Spirit’s leading or was it organizationally and institutionally one, directed and coordinated by a human “directorship”? What kind of “oneness” are you brothers seeking to produce in the recovery? What is your understanding of the “one work”? Your comment seems to imply that “the one work in the Lord’s recovery” equals the Thanksgiving conference in Atlanta and the Chinese-speaking conference in Taipei. This causes me to question, are you brothers clear about the truth? Surely the “*one work in the Lord’s recovery*” is the building up the organic Body of Christ. That work is organic, in the “divine and mystical realm (like the Body).” It is not exclusively confined to a physical gathering in Atlanta or Taipei nor their associated “virtual gatherings” via Webcast, which your writing seems to imply. Brothers, I am forced to inquire, doesn’t your reasoning betray an underlying institutional concept of the “one work”? It seems that according to your organizational concept, you conclude that my “*work... distracts many saints from the one work in the Lord’s recovery.*” I am obligated to reject your organizational and institutional concept of the “one work in the Lord’s recovery” as unscriptural. Consequently, I also reject your implication that what I do “*distracts many saints from the one work in the Lord’s recovery.*”

You mention my Chinese-speaking conference in Naperville, IL. as being in conflict with the Thanksgiving conference in Atlanta. You claim my conference in Columbus, OH. was in conflict with the Chinese-speaking conference in Taipei. Are you brothers that small? Do you expect that every local church and worker on the whole globe should cease their labor, because you are holding a conference somewhere on the globe? Where is the New Testament pattern for this? Do you really expect the Lord’s work to cease in all languages—English, Spanish, Portuguese, Korean, etc., —

throughout the globe, because a Chinese-speaking conference is being held in Taipei, Taiwan? This is beyond comprehension!

Please be advised that I have done my best to accommodate your schedule. I have considered with the brothers how to minimize the effects of my exercise upon saints participation in the “seven annual feasts” (as you call them). For instance, we had scheduled and posted a Chinese speaking training for July 3-8, 2006, since we assumed the LSM training was at the end of June as usual. When we learned that there was a conflict in the schedule, we quickly changed our time to one week later, even though many had already asked for vacation time according to the original. Do you brothers know how to appreciate our effort? How come you only know how to judge? I am puzzled why you don’t exhibit the grandness of the apostle Paul who rejoiced whenever Christ was announced (Phil. 1:17-8)? Why can’t you apply the maxim of the Lord Jesus concerning service: “*He who is not against us is for us*” (Mark 9:40; Luke 9:50)? Rather, your attitude seems to mirror that of the disciples prohibiting others (Mark 9:38; Luke 9:49). Why don’t you have the enlarged heart of Moses: “*Would that all God’s people were prophets*” (Num. 11:29)? Rather, it seems that you exhibit the narrowness of the young Joshua, wanting to prohibit and restrict the operation of the Lord’s people (Num. 11:28). Yet, only leaders with hearts like Moses and Paul can cause the divine commitment we’ve received from Brothers Nee and Lee to flourish. Will not your smallness and narrowness frustrate the Spirit’s work? Doesn’t your assumption—that when the Lord leads you to work, all others ought to cease their work—make us a mockery in the eyes of Christians at large? I exhort you brothers to be enlarged!

7. You say, “You tell others that you served with Brother Lee closely for many years, but we who also served with Brother Lee for many years know that you were not as close in your service with him as you lead others to believe. Further, Brother Lee himself warned groups of us at different times over a period of many years about your work, and we take his warnings most seriously. We offer these examples of Brother Lee’s warnings about your work, which various groups of us heard from him over the years:

- In May 1986 Brother Lee pointed out to a few leading brothers in Taipei that “the work of Titus Chu is not the work of the Lord’s recovery at all, because”, he said, “his work is to put people into his own pocket.”
- Because of the situation related to your work, Brother Lee said the following in August 1995 to a group of co-workers in Southern California: “What Titus has done is to build up a division.”
- In a meeting with a group of co-workers from Taiwan in July 1996, Brother Lee warned a number of the co-workers not to follow you and not to work according to your way. In this meeting he said, “What kind of work does Titus Chu do? In the work in the United States he gives people a bad impression. The work he does is an individualistic work, without fellowship.” Then Brother Lee pointedly told a number of these co-workers, “If I were you, I would definitely not follow Titus Chu. You simply cannot follow him! For so many years I tried to help you many times, yet you are still following him. Only the blind would follow him!”

As Brother Lee’s co-workers and ones who view him as our spiritual father, we feel that we must follow his warnings about your work. Further, we feel that if you were indeed Brother Lee’s close co-worker, as you claim, you should have been the first to take his admonition regarding your work and to accept his very grave assessments of it. We know that Brother Lee tried for many years to help you, but as it was then, so it is now to no avail. Because you have remained unaffected in your work even by Brother Lee’s own personal shepherding, we wonder how we, his co-workers, could possibly hope to persuade you to have a change in your way to work.” (Your letter, June 27, 2006)

It is not easy for me to clarify these points, since anything I say may be viewed as self-vindication. Moreover, I loved Brother Lee dearly while he was among us and still today I cherish his memory and remember with appreciation his personal shepherding of me as well as many local

churches. Further, Brother Lee is no longer with us to clarify the meaning of his statements which you quote. If he was with us today, I would eagerly seek a time together with him in the presence of you brothers. I deeply regret that such a course of action is not possible today.

Dear brothers, under the Lord's sovereignty, I have been manifested as a serving one in the Lord's recovery from an early age, both in the Far East and in the West. It seems that because of this, I have often been a "target" of whoever has an ambition to "lead the Lord's recovery." I am thankful, that I have never had such an ambition, since I know that the manifestation of the one Body, through the local churches with Christ as their content and the Bible as our unique standard, can never be institutionalized. I have the realization that God's goal can only be achieved when many of the Lord's servants fulfill their ministries, as portions of the New Testament ministry (Ephesians 4). The Lord's servants should fellowship together (as Peter and Paul did), yet each is free to follow Christ as they labor for the profit of the local churches and the saints within the boundary allotted to them.

I don't recall that I have made an issue of my having "*served with Brother Lee closely for many years,*" as you appear to allege, even though this statement may have been made during my ministering. I realize that I was not as close as some brothers who had the opportunity to be with him all the time. I do recall times when certain brothers boasted of their closeness to Brother Lee. In the 1980's in Taipei, some brothers declared their "rank order" in relation to Brother Lee. One of those brothers quickly turned his back on Brother Lee when he failed to win the favor of the one considered to be #2 (to whom Brother Benson reported on a daily basis, according to his word in my presence).

It is my conviction that a servant of the Lord should have the Lord as his Lord. I am aware that many rumors and innuendoes have circulated concerning me for many years, with little or no factual basis. One of the strongest rumors was that some brothers (which may include some who are now considered as a blended brother) reported to Brother Lee that I had told some brothers I wished Brother Lee would die earlier so I could take over the work. Dear brothers, how ugly is this kind of report! Yet once these rumors were successfully put into Brother Lee, whatever I would do would become impure. Dear brothers, if such things were to have happened to any of you, would you still be in the recovery today? Nevertheless I rejoice that after so many years, I have not forsaken the ministry under which I was raised. Through this ministry I was constituted with a portion and have had an opportunity to grow even until today.

There is another aspect of my relationship with Brother Lee which I wish to point out. I am happy that on several occasions when some of you brothers "messed things up," that I was able to stand with Brother Lee. One example was 1977 in Chicago. I don't know all that happened, but the determination of some to destroy the Church in Chicago surprised me. At least one of the current "blended co-workers" was present, standing on his chair, supporting Max Rappaport's damaging work. A similar lawless event took place simultaneously in Berkeley, CA, concerning which some of you brothers have direct personal knowledge. I'm thankful that in the ensuing turmoil, Brother Lee found a "peaceful land" in which to minister, when he came to Cleveland, Ohio. It was Brother Lee who initiated this. It was in the "despised region" of Ohio that Brother Lee ministered on "The Spirit and the Body" (August-September, 1977) and began to restore a peaceful situation among the churches. At that time many considered that the Ohio churches were "not in the flow." Yet a spiritual man knew the churches there provided a healthy base for the release of his burden. This is a significant "chapter" in my relationship with Brother Lee.

Approximately 10 years later, in the 1980's, some of you brothers "messed up the situation again." You may dispute this, but who among you was able to stand with Brother Lee during the 1980's turmoil. At that time, how many of you were "part of the problem," when you should have been "part of the solution"? In the darkest days, I went to be with Brother Lee and spent around seven to ten days with him. Brother Minoru should still recall the difficult times when we two joined with Brother Lee to fast and pray for the Lord's testimony. At that time, Brother Lee declared publicly and privately that he was not able to meet in Anaheim for two years. Let me ask you brothers (who declare you are so close to Brother Lee), where were you at that time? Eventually it was I who invited Brother Lee to come to Cleveland to minister again. I still remember vividly Brother Lee's tears as he

realized that the warm welcome he received by so many saints at the airport was spontaneous. It was in Cleveland again that Brother Lee began to release messages on the Body in Ephesians. That conference was so filled with the anointing of the Spirit that Brother Lee testified that “there is a flow in the Great Lakes area.” It was based upon this word of Brother Lee that people began referring to this district as “the Great Lakes Area.” Brother Lee’s visit to Cleveland, Ohio, began the “restoration” of his ministry which continued in Boston and Atlanta. I consider this also to be a significant “milestone” in my relationship with Brother Lee.

Furthermore, in 1988-9, Brother Lee formally challenged me to labor in the New England area. His word was, “produce there what you have produced in the Great Lakes area.” I don’t believe that Brother Lee was being “political” in saying this. Neither can I consider Brother Lee as a double-tongued person. Hence, I visited the Boston area several times and even asked Brother Silas Wu to provide an apartment to facilitate my labor there. I only regret I was unable to carry out Brother Lee’s desire, due to a severe sickness of one of my family members. Also because of this I was unable to spend more time with Brother Lee during his final years. Until today I regret these missed opportunities.

You mention occasions when Brother Lee talked about me to some brothers. Surely you also realize that Brother Lee also spoke concerning some of you in my presence. Yet (unlike yourselves) I don’t feel the liberty to quote these in detail. Some of you have mentioned Brother Lee’s comments about yourselves in your public speaking. For example, Brother Ron Kangas said, “*Brother Lee personally told me ...I am concerned that you would be proud.*” [*The Ministry*, Vol. 8, No. 6, (June 2004 ) p. 16] Brother Lee also publicly expressed his concern that Brother Ron is “too perfect.” Dear brother Ron, may I ask you, have you fulfilled the “prophesy implicit in Brother Lee’s word of concern? Aren’t you indeed “proud”?

In addition, you brothers have taken the liberty to take Brother Lee’s comments about me which were made to a small group of workers (for a special reason or in a particular mood stirred up by persons beside him) and make them known more widely. Brother Lee has made comments about many of the “blended co-workers.” If you’re going to make his comments about me more widely known, shouldn’t you also make his comments about you all known to the same audience? Why the double standard? Furthermore, why are you selective? You take those comments of Brother Lee which (in your eyes) cast me in a “negative light” and quote them. Shouldn’t you take Brother Lee’s positive comments about me and quote them also? Wouldn’t this be reasonable, fair and balanced? In contrast, doesn’t your selective quoting of only “negative” comments about me suggest that you brothers may be biased and acting according to some impure motive?

More than a decade has passed since Brother Lee’s words regarding me which you quote. You emphasize his 1996 warning to Taiwan co-workers not to follow me. Let me ask you brothers—Today, have I asked any to follow me? The answer is no. Or, which of the Taiwan co-workers are following me? They are not following me. Doesn’t this history prove something? Some objective observers might conclude from this that I am not the kind of person I had been portrayed to be before Brother Lee in the mid-1990’s. Some might further infer that because some saints appreciated my portion, some brothers close beside Brother Lee were motivated to stir him up to denounce me unfairly. Nevertheless, I leave all this to the Lord, the righteous judge.

Dear brothers, don’t you realize that Brother Lee spoke about us for our perfecting? If I should learn from Brother Lee’s speaking concerning me, shouldn’t you brothers also learn? Haven’t you brothers arrived at a state where you are “proud” and consider yourselves “too perfect,” so that you cannot tolerate anyone who is not totally submissive to your authorities and purposes? As an aside, let me mention that I am aware that an audio tape is being circulated of a telephone conversation between Brother Lee and myself. There is also a transcript and English translation of that transcript. The audio tape was a product of a stirring by a certain brother and others beside him. I had a feeling that while the telephone conversation was being taped, he was beside Brother Lee. Brother Paul Wu told me that he was not sure that he could take it if this would have happened to him, and that immediately after the taping, this brother had held up the tape and triumphantly declared, “Now Titus

is in my hand!" Also, as I stated before to brothers Andrew Yu and Minoru Chen, I question whether that tape has not been edited, since some statements I recall are not included. Lastly, those who heard that tape know that I gave no response to all the challenges addressed to me on that occasion.

## Matters I Wish to Fellowship with You

Dear brothers, before concluding this letter I would like to raise some points with you. Nine years have passed since Brother Lee's departure and since you brothers assumed the leadership in the Lord's recovery. I am deeply concerned for the Lord's recovery, for the local churches and for you brothers. Therefore, I wish to bring the following points to your attention:

### 1. Are you brothers clear about the truth?

Are you brothers clear about the truth? For example, initially you referred to yourselves as the "blending brothers" or "blending co-workers." Later, you designated yourselves as the "blended co-workers." (Eg. "Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery, June 30, 2005 was issued by "The blended co-workers in the Lord's recovery") Now, it seems the designation has reverted to "blending co-workers." [eg. "there is an open group of being-blended brothers" *The Ministry*, vol. 10, No. 1, (Jan./Feb. 2006) p. 150]

I acknowledge that Brother Lee did refer to "brothers who would serve with him in a blending way." Yet he never emphasized a designated and distinct group of "blended co-workers" which has come into being among us. Moreover, doesn't the term, "blended co-workers" tend to imply that some brothers have attained a perfected state of being "blended"? Haven't you produced a *de facto* hierarchy in which there is a class of "blended co-workers" and another class of "saints." What is the difference between this situation and the Roman Catholic system of cardinals (clergy) and laity?

It is reported that a number of you referred to yourselves as "co-workers of Witness Lee" during an elders' gathering during the LSM Winter 2005 Training. Since the departure of our dear brother Lee in 1997, his active work as a servant of the Lord has ceased, although the riches of his ministry remain with us through his writings and other media. May I ask, since our brother's departure has ended his own active service to the Lord, how can you brothers still claim to be his co-workers presently, today? It seems that only brother Liu Suey spoke according to the truth on this point, by declaring that he is God's co-worker. Why didn't Liu Suey, as a senior brother, help you all to be clear on this point? Moreover, to Brother Liu I say directly: "Brother Liu Suey, since you know the truth on these points, why didn't you correct your brothers? Are you more afraid of them than of God?"

May I ask how one becomes a member of the so-called "blended co-workers"? It seems to some that such membership in this "elite club" can be gained through money. Brother R. Chen had little involvement with the work for a number of years. However, by the Lord's mercy, he came back practically to be among us again. For this I worship the Lord. Yet, when, soon after his return, he was asked to minister at the LSM Elders' Training, many questioned whether this was related to his financial strength. Some wondered why a recently restored multi-millionaire was ministering to the elders, while those who had faithfully served for many years were required to listen. Doesn't this kind of case taint the saints' perception of the "blended co-workers"?

What concerns me the most is your understanding regarding the local church. In 2004 Brother Ron Kangas wrote to Brother Ron Brubacher in London, Canada, an email in which he accused him of embracing "the notion of a local Body," saying: "*It seems you have embraced the notion of a local Body implying that the body, like the church, is both one "universal" and many "local." Is this a correct definition of your doctrine? Do you believe that just as there are many local churches there are many local bodies? The idea of the local body as distinct from the truth that a local church is a local expression of the body of Christ lead to such a conclusion.*"

It seems that Brother Ron Kangas rejects the idea that there is a local aspect of the Body of Christ. Yet Brother Lee clearly taught that the Church as the Body of Christ in 1 Corinthians 12 is “both universal and local.” (W. Lee, Life Study of 1 Corinthians) Brother Lee’s terse statement surely implies the Body has both universal and local aspects. Moreover, Brother Nee strongly emphasized that the Body of Christ in 1 Corinthians refers to the believers in Corinth, the local church there. (W. Nee, Further Talks on the Church-life) First Corinthians 12:27 says, “You (the believers in Corinth) are Christ’s Body.” [Note the absence of the definite article in the Greek.] We definitely “embrace the notion” that the Body of Christ is a “two-fold divine truth” revealed in the Bible, as taught by Brothers Nee and Lee, having both universal and local aspects. Moreover, we question whether the statement “local aspect of Christ’s Body” expressed in 1 Cor. 12:27 is adequately encompassed in the phrase: “a local church is a local expression of the body of Christ.” The apostle Paul did not say that. He said in 1 Corinthians 12:27, “You (the believers in Corinth) are Christ’s body.” Since this is a “two-fold” divine truth, the statement that there is a local aspect of the body is not inconsistent with the propositions that the universal Body of Christ is expressed by many local churches and that all the local churches are the expressions of the Body of Christ. We firmly declare that there are many local churches but one Body, as all the local churches are the expression of the one Body.

However, it seems that you brothers diminish the “local aspect” of the Body (even as you diminish the local church) in order to emphasize the universal aspect of the Body. You denounce any who talk about the local aspect of the Body as “embracing the notion of a local Body” (as Ron Kangas has done in his attack on the elders of the church in London, Canada). Such a statement risks denying the “local aspect of the Body,” and ignores the importance which Brother Nee gave it. Might not brother David Wang of London, and others who make similar points, be presenting the same balanced view of both the universal and local aspects of the Body, as was presented by Brother Nee?

I am surprised at the statement made by Brother Ron Kangas. How could he cut off a verse (1 Cor. 12:27) from the Bible? And if Brother Ron does not even see the sense expressed by Brother Nee in which all the local churches are the Body of Christ, how can he lead all the local churches? No wonder you brothers keep on de-emphasizing the local church by quoting what Brother Lee once spoke, that the local churches are merely the procedure. Dear brothers, don’t you all realize that Christ and the local churches are the basic commitment revealed to us by our dear respected brothers Nee and Lee. We should all clearly know that the universal Body of Christ is expressed by many local churches. All the local churches are the expressions of the Body of Christ. And not only so, but there is a sense in which a local church is Christ’s Body (1 Cor. 12:27). We firmly declare that there are many local churches but One Body, as all the local churches are the expression of the one Body. Dear brothers, I do not understand how Ron can even disagree with the Bible itself. If the apostle Paul wrote to the church in Corinth that, “you are the Body of Christ,” for sure the church in Corinth – a local church – is the body of Christ. Also, I am often grieved at your spirit when you speak that the local church is merely a procedure – a spirit of belittling the local church. My dear brothers, don’t you know the procedure decides the outcome, just as eating is a procedure and why we all pay attention to eating healthily. The local churches are a procedure. When the New Jerusalem appears, there will be no local churches. But the New Jerusalem can only come when the local churches are healthy – the Spirit is able to lead each church, Christ becomes the content of the church life, the Bible becomes the unique standard in their belief and practice, and the local church takes the stand which is inclusive to all the saints in that locality. Dear brothers, I am concerned about your clarity on this matter.

Moreover, I am concerned that you brothers may not be clear about the universal aspect of the Body either. Brother Minoru Chen has said that “the recovery equals the Body.” In addition, brother Ron Kangas referred to the (so-called) “seven feasts” as times when the Lord speaks “to the entire Body.” Yet, if the Body of Christ is universal, including all believers in time and space, how can you brothers declare that “the recovery equals the Body,” and how could an LSM gathering “speak to the entire Body”? If this is indeed “a body,” what kind of “body” is it? A “global LSM body”? Are you

brothers clear about the truth concerning “the Body,” a topic you’ve repeatedly emphasized for the past nine years? Moreover, during the LSM Summer Training which has just ended, brother Ron Kangas conveyed the idea that believers can be in the local church, yet not be in the Body. Brothers, what kind of teaching is this? Are you brothers seeking to produce a two-tier system where some saints are “merely in the local church” and others (the elite) are in the Body? Where is this thought in the Bible? Where is this concept in the teaching of Brothers Nee and Lee? Do you brothers remember the illustration given by the apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 12, even if a member says it is not of the body because it is not a particular member, it is still a member?

## 2. **Did You Brothers Lie About the Smuggling of RcV. Bibles into China?**

In May 2001 a brother from the Church in Hong Kong was arrested for smuggling a large shipment of LSM Recovery Versions into mainland China. Several leaders, such as Zhu-Di Yu, of the local churches in China (derogatively known as “the Shouters”) were also arrested. The Hong Kong brother, Mr. Li Guang-qiang [Lai Kwong-keung in Cantonese] faced the death penalty for his “crime.” I will not recount all the details of this case, which are known to you brothers (especially brother Andrew). This case received high-profile treatment in the Press, both in the Far East and N. America. [In the *South China Morning Post (Hong Kong)*, *Washington Post*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Los Angeles Times*, *The Times (London)*, *Orange County Register* etc.]

My point is that the behavior of you brothers, LSM and its representatives, was shameful and exposed the Lord’s recovery to public ridicule. Despite published reports of the close links between Mr Li (Lai) and the local churches (“Shouters”) in China, the Church in Hong Kong and Living Stream Ministry, the Los Angeles Times reported, “*In a telephone interview, Living Stream Ministry spokesman Chris Wilde in Anaheim denied any link between his organization and either Li or the Shouters. “We don’t have any connection with them, and we really don’t know that much about them,” he said.*” (LA. Times, Jan. 9, 2002, p. A3) Isn’t this an unabashed lie? Isn’t this unethical for upright people, to say nothing of believers in Christ? How was it the LSM-spokesman “*denied any link between [LSM] and either Li or the Shouters*”? Brother Chris Wilde is the official media spokesman for LSM. Yet, on behalf of LSM, he flat-out “*denied any link*” saying, “*We don’t have any connection with*” the churches in China (the “Shouters”) and Mr. Li, a brother facing execution. LSM and Andrew Yu were clearly implicated in this “*bungled smuggling scheme that became an international incident*”. Yet LSM “*denied any link... any connection.*” Moreover, I was told that brother Abraham Ho even called a news conference in the Chinese community to deny any link with this smuggling of these Bibles. Dear brothers, what was gained by LSM’s denial? Were you brothers trying to disassociate yourselves from a Bible-smuggling scheme gone horribly wrong? How could LSM simply abandon this brother to his fate? Were Brother Li and Brother Yu being used as “scapegoats” in this LSM-Taiwan Gospel Book Room misadventure? Didn’t your actions expose the recovery to public shame and ridicule?

In the event, Brother Li (Lai) was released, instead of being executed. However, no credit belongs to LSM or to you brothers. Rather US President George W. Bush’s impending official visit to China (Feb. 2002) was used by the Lord to gain Brother Li’s release. Isn’t it shameful to LSM that the Press reported “*no real orthodox religious group...showed any concern about his case during the whole process; on the contrary, the people most zealous about his release were the human rights groups....*”?

## 3. **Haven’t You Brothers Ignored Brother Lee’s “Will”?**

You make frequent reference to Brother Lee’s “will.” Surely Brother Lee’s final public speaking constitutes an important part of his “will.” In his final speaking at the Chinese New Year conference, 1997, Brother Lee said,

*“We have much to learn concerning receiving people according to God and according to His Son. Because of our negligence in this matter in the past, we have offended the Body of Christ and many brothers and sisters in the Lord. For this reason, I had a deep repentance before the Lord. Brothers and sisters, I hope that we can see our past mistakes by getting into this message through pray-reading, studying, reciting and prophesying. Of course, sectarianism in the denominations is wrong; it is something very much condemned by God. Nevertheless, those who are genuinely saved in the denominations are children of God and have been received by God. Hence, we also should receive them, but we would never participate in the division in which they are.”* (W. Lee, *The Experience of God’s Organic Salvation Equaling Reigning in Christ’s Life*, Chp. 6)

Brother Lee was ministering in Chinese. A more literal translation of his words, conveying his genuine repentance would be:

*“Concerning the matter of receiving people according to God,...we co-workers in every place all need to learn, the responsible ones in every place all need to learn, the brothers and sisters in every place all need to learn....too many things cause us to learn. We all made mistakes in this matter in the past, I myself included; I confess that, I had, for this matter and before the Lord, a very painful repentance. I am really sorry...toward the Body of Christ, also really sorry, not only toward the brothers and sisters among us, but even to those in the denominations, also really sorry toward them...You must bring this message back, read it once, read it twice, and come together to fellowship with one another. Then you will see that, we, in the past, were wrong! Of course, denominations are wrong. The sects are what God condemns the most. However, the Lord still hopes that all His children...can be free from such condemnation [against those in denominations]. Such an understanding and verification will require much effort. I say again, you must, some people, a few people, come together to read, pray, speak and say...”*

Brothers, aren’t these words, uttered by Brother Lee in his final conference gathering prior to his departure, a most crucial statement? Aren’t they also a serious challenge to us to reconsider our ways?

Dear brothers, Brother Lee’s final public utterance expressed his deep regret (“painful repentance”) to the Body of Christ and an apology for “past mistakes” to the brothers and sisters, both among us and in the denominations. Why haven’t you honored Brother Lee’s final speaking concerning receiving the believers? Why do you brothers always declare that you are one with Brother Lee, yet totally ignore what was his real concern and his final charge to us all? Did you brothers ever come together to study this matter and if so, what is the outcome? Rather than endeavoring to effect a change in attitude towards believers who don’t gather with us, you have caused the recovery to become more exclusive. Rather than emphasize Brother Lee’s “will” expressed publicly through his messages (including this one), you have emphasized selected private utterances of Brother Lee. Rather than correcting our “past mistakes” in receiving believers, you have changed the emphasis of Brother Lee’s final speaking. Brother Benson Phillips is on record saying, *“...from Brother Lee’s final message. We must receive all the believers. But the burden here is that we might receive all the local churches and all the saints in the local churches. They must be received by us,...God has received us....Since God has received every local church, we must have fellowship, and we must receive one another into the fellowship of the Triune God. Then we must receive all believers.”* (*The Ministry*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 108). Doesn’t Brother Benson’s speaking here deviate from Brother Lee’s emphasis? Brother Lee talked about receiving the believers, apologizing to those in denominations. He made no reference to receiving local churches. Yet, you Brother Benson, inserted the idea of receiving all the local churches and all the saints in the churches. Moreover, you made receiving “*all the local churches*” and the saints therein priorities above receiving all the believers, saying, “*the burden here is that we...receive all the local churches and all the saints in the local churches...Then we must receive all believers.*” In this context Brother Lee didn’t talk about receiving the local churches, yet you have introduced this “new teaching” which de-emphasizes and

postpones the receiving of other believers. Let me ask: In this matter are you really faithful to Brother Lee's "will," or are you implementing your own agenda? Brother Benson, what do you mean by this extra-biblical teaching? Do you intend to imply that a local church needs to be received by you brothers, before it will be recognized by all the local churches under your leadership (control)?

Dear brothers, there are those (including myself) who wish to be faithful to Brother Lee's final speaking and seriously consider how to implement this aspect of his "will." How can we participate in your activities which deviate drastically from Brother Lee's ministry and deny or deemphasize the desire expressed in his final speaking?

#### **4. Aren't You Brothers Insisting on Non-essential Items?**

Throughout his ministry, Brother Lee made many statements which were intended to help the saints and lead them into the experience of God's economy through His dispensing. Many of these terms were designed as "helps" and were never intended as essential truths. Yet, since Brother Lee's departure, you brothers have repeated, enlarged, and stressed these items, even to the point of twisting them, until they have become part of the "constitution" of the Lord's recovery. Dear brothers, having been trained by Brother Lee for many years, you ought to know the difference between essential matters of the faith and non-essential matters. You should be able to distinguish between items of speciality and those of generality. Yet, with scarcely one Bible verse as foundation, you have repeatedly emphasized items such as:

1. The "blending brothers"—"blended co-workers"—"blending co-workers"
2. "One with the ministry" "Closely follow the ministry"
3. Those who "know the Body," "have the feeling of the Body" and "move in the Body"
4. "In the flow"
5. Minor differences in interpretation of Scripture imply someone is "not holding the Head"
6. The "Ministry of the Age" and especially "the Minister of the Age"
7. The one "wise Master Builder who is the acting God" supervising God's building work on the entire globe
8. One unique continuation of the one "Minister of the Age" & "Wise Master Builder"
9. "Brother Nee—Brother Lee—Brother 'We' (The 'blended co-workers,' 'Brother ABCDE')"
10. One global "band (company) of co-workers"
11. One publication
12. "seven annual feasts"

I admit that some of these terms might occasionally be useful to help the saints or meet certain specific needs. However, under your ministry, these items have been developed into a systematic teaching until they have become part of the "constitution" of the Lord's recovery. This has developed to the point that many saints no longer care for the truths of the Bible. Many saints in the recovery no longer discriminate between the essential matters of "the faith" for which we should contend and other non-essential items. Moreover, it seems that when you brothers minister, all items become essential, non-negotiable items which all the saints are expected to uniformly uphold. This also encompasses practices in the church-life which are being insisted upon. This has generated an atmosphere of intolerance among the saints. Surely this is unhealthy and displeasing to the Lord. Brothers, there are saints who were educated by Brother Lee and desire to abide in and apply the ministry of Brothers Nee and Lee. How can such ones partake of the above extra-biblical items which you effectively insist upon to the extent that they have become a condition for fellowship with you?

I recall when, in fellowship with a few of you brothers, I mentioned the maxim attributed to Augustine: "*In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, love.*" Brother Benson was impressed and asked that it be written down. Yet, haven't you brothers made practically everything "essential"? Even your emphasis that—if we differ in the interpretation of even a minor item, someone is not holding the Head—will surely lead to a uniformity of interpretation of all scripture.

(Yes, I am aware that Brother Nee said this. But he also said many other things which you have chosen not to emphasize. So, why do you emphasize this particular statement above others?) Augustine's maxim is also consistent with Brother Lee's distinction between items of "speciality" and those of "generality." Again it seems that you are placing everything in the realm of "speciality"—including the 12 items listed above. In that case, are you really following Brother Lee? Do you in fact take his ministry in its entirety (as you assert)?

You end your letter by calling on me to repent. Dear brothers, I would like to repent. In fact I feel that, given the present condition and direction of the recovery, we should all repent. May I ask you to join with me in a session of repentant prayer before the Lord for His mercy on us and His recovery?

In closing let me say that I love you brothers and wish to strive together with you for the divine commitment the Lord has given me and many other brothers through our brothers Nee and Lee. I am thankful for your openness and the prayer you've had for me and for your desire to build up the entire Body. I sincerely hope that praying together regularly will become our practice. I love you brothers in Christ and expect the same in return. I hope this will be our last letter like this. Rather, we can have face to face fellowship. We should intercede and pray together for one another and for all the local churches. May the Lord bless you.

Your brother in Christ,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Titus Chu', written in a cursive style.

Titus Chu

PS I note that all your letters to me (dated Aug. 25, 2005 and June 27, 2006) have the identical signature block as your first letter (dated June 4, 2005). It seems that you've simply "cut and pasted" that set of signatures into your later letters. This leads me to wonder whether all the 21 "blended co-workers" have participated in these letters or whether some are merely "rubber stamping" others' writing.

PPS I have received reports that your latest letter to me (June 27, 2006) has already been translated into Chinese and is being circulated in the mainland. If that is true, it is a direct and serious violation of the confidentiality to be expected in this type of correspondence. I therefore am forced to post this letter immediately on the website of the church in Cleveland.