Different Teachings and Dissenting Views of Titus Chu and Certain of His Co-workers

Table of Contents

This paper documents some of the different teachings and dissenting views that Titus Chu and those who defend him[1] have propounded which deviate from the teaching of the apostles as passed on to us through the ministry of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee. During the past twenty years, Titus Chu has formed different opinions **(**1 Cor. 1:10; Matt. 16:24 & note 2; Gal. 5:19a, 20b & note 4; Rev. 3:14 & note 1) about many matters of truth and practice and has grown increasingly bold in putting out his own interpretations as different teachings (1 Tim. 1:3-4; 1 Tim. 6:3-4; 1 Cor. 4:17; 7:17; 11:16; 14:33; 16:1; Acts 2:42a; Rom. 16:17; Eph. 4:14). These different teachings produce a different practice (Phil. 4:9; 1 Tim. 4:15; 2 Tim. 3:10), a different ministry (Acts 1:17 & note 1; 2 Cor. 4:1 & note 2; Eph. 4:12 & note 3), and a different work (1 Cor. 15:58; 1 Cor. 16:10; Eph. 4:12). The result is that what is produced through his ministry is actually a different "recovery" (1 Cor. 3:10-13; 2 Tim. 1:15 & notes 1, 2, and 3; Rev. 3:14 & note 1).

In recent months Titus Chu and those who publicly defend him have grown increasingly reckless and reviling[2] in criticizing the group of co-workers who are serving in a blended way to continue the ministry of Brother Nee and Brother Lee and to carry out the work in the Lord's recovery.[3] This paper briefly compares the teachings and dissenting views of Titus Chu with the ministry of Brother Nee and Brother Lee on some significant points of truth and practice. It also highlights some of the attacks that Titus and those who defend him have made against the "blended brothers" and Living Stream Ministry. This document does not claim to be a definitive or exhaustive treatment of any of these subjects, nor does it claim to document all of the deviations of Titus and his defenders. Many of the points in this document[4] are addressed in more detail on http://www.afaithfulword.org/.

Examples of Different Teachings and Dissenting Views of Titus Chu and Certain of His Co-workers

A. Concerning the Ministry

1. Rejecting the Teaching of Brother Nee and Brother Lee on the Uniqueness of the Vision, the Ministry and the Minister of the Age and the Wise Master Builder

The dissenting ones accuse the co-workers of extra-biblical teachings regarding the vision, the ministry, and the minister of the age, as well as the wise master builder:

> In my view, 'one publication' is not a scriptural truth (implied or otherwise). Neither is it a "direct application" nor a "healthy extension" of "fundamental scriptural principles." It is the logical implication of the "blended co-workers'" [sic] teachings, which contain extra-biblical elements, including:
>
> 1. There is a unique "Minister of the Age," most recently Brother Witness Lee.
> 2. The "blended co-workers" are the unique continuation of Brother Lee's "Ministry of the Age."
> 3. There is a unique "Wise Master-builder," supervising God's building work on the entire globe.
> 4. The "Master-builder" (Brother Lee or his continuation) oversees one global company of workers.
>
> (Nigel Tomes, "LSM's Eisegesis – How Not to Interpret the Bible!")

Actually the co-workers' speaking on the vision of the age, the ministry of the age, the minister of the age, and the wise master builder are all based on the teaching of Brother Nee and Brother Lee which in turn is based on the Bible and their insight into church history. In *The Vision of the Age* Brother Lee traced the progression of the vision from Adam through Abel, Enosh, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, the prophets, John the Baptist, the Lord Jesus, Peter, Paul, and

John (pp. 30-47). At each stage the person through whom the vision advanced inherited all of the visions from the previous stages and advanced the vision further. The same kind of progression can be seen in the recovery of the vision of God's economy beginning from the time of Martin Luther (p. 27).

> The Bible shows clearly that in every age God gives only one vision to man. We cannot find in the Bible that there were two visions in any age. (*The Vision of the Age*, p. 23)

> …In every age there is the ministry of that age. These ministries of the ages are different from the local ministers. Luther was a minister of his age. Darby was also a minister of his age. In every age the Lord has special things that He wants to accomplish. He has His own recoveries and His own works to do. The particular recovery and work that He does in one age is the ministry of that age. (*The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, vol. 57, pp. 260-261)

> From these glimpses into the past we can see that the revelation of the Bible is progressive. The same is true with regard to the recovery of the Bible. Martin Luther's revelation was only to a certain point. Gradually, more and more has been uncovered and recovered. Our vision today is the most far-reaching, because we stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before. (*Life Messages*, #72, p. 271)

> …At the time of the Reformation in the 1520s, when Luther was raised up, anyone who wanted to serve under a vision had to join himself to Luther. In the seventeenth century, anyone who wanted to serve under a vision had to join himself to Madame Guyon. In the eighteenth century, anyone who wanted to serve under a vision had to join himself to Zinzendorf. Even John Wesley received help from Zinzendorf. In the nineteenth century, J. N. Darby took the lead among the Brethren, and the vision was with him. In the twentieth century, the vision came to us. (*The Vision of the Age*, p. 27)

> There is only one blueprint and one master builder in the proper, correct building. The only master builder is the architect who has the blueprint in his hand. This is true in every age. The Lord issues the blueprint, the revelation, and the utterance, and through one man He supervises and completes the building work. All those who do not build, speak, or serve according to the blueprint released by the Lord through that man are void of light and revelation and are not serving according to the vision. Today in the Lord's recovery, some are preaching and publishing messages. The portions in their messages that impart light, revelation, and the life supply invariably derive their source from this ministry in the Lord's recovery. Other than those portions, there is no revelation or vision in their writings. (*The Vision of the Age*, p. 30)

The dissenters claim that F. B. Meyer and T. Austin-Sparks were ministers of the age along with Watchman Nee.

> In 1934, Watchman Nee did not claim to be the unique minister of the age. Rather he viewed himself, together with T. Austin-Sparks, F. B. Meyer, and others, as ministers (plural) of the age. (Nigel Tomes, "One, Unique 'Minister of the Age'? – What Did Watchman Nee Teach?", *Fellowship Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 18)

F. B. Meyer saw something of the centrality and universality of Christ, but he never left the denominations. Although T. Austin-Sparks was prevailing in the matters of spirituality and the inner life, he was not at all for the practice of the church life on the ground of oneness. Brother Lee spoke many times of Austin-Sparks' attempt to tear down the ground of the church in his visit to Taiwan in 1957, and of the waning of his ministry thereafter. When confronted with the clear portions from Brother Lee's ministry contradicting Nigel's claims (such as those quoted above), Nigel defended himself by saying that

the scope of his article was only what Brother Nee taught. By putting words in Brother Nee's mouth, Nigel attempts to place him in opposition to Brother Lee.

The dissenters take the history of Christianity as a pattern, claiming that in every age there were many ministers whose ministries differed from one another on some points, but were "complementary".

> In each age, the Lord has raised up many to reveal the truth, not just one or two. This is what history reveals… In the last century, we know that there have been, in addition to Watchman Nee and Witness Lee, at least some other servants of the Lord raised up to speak for Him, such as T. Austin-Sparks and Jessie Penn-Lewis, as well as others. (Frank Lin, "God Speaking in Many Portions and in Many Ways," *Fellowship Journal*, vol. 4, no. 7)

They ignore Brother Lee's fellowship that the result of these ministries was division upon division.

> We need to see this principle throughout the entire Christian era. All the troubles, divisions, and confusions came from the one source of the tolerance of different ministries. Many Christian teachers have known the peril of different ministries; nevertheless, they have tolerated them. There has been a tolerance of different ministries. In the Lord's recovery, for the long run, we should not believe that this kind of creeping in of the different ministries would never take place. Rather, we must be on the alert. Such a peril is ahead of us. If we are not watchful, if we are careless, in one way or another the enemy would creepingly use some means, some ways, to bring in different ministries. Such a thing would end the Lord's recovery. (*Elders' Training, Book 1: The Ministry of the New Testament*, p. 16)

2. Protesting "Intolerance" toward Interpretational Differences to Justify Teaching Differently

The dissenters criticize Ron Kangas for saying that if believers are holding Christ as the Head, there cannot be interpretational differences (*The Ministry Magazine*, vol. 8, no. 7, July/August 2004, p. 183), thereby contradicting Watchman Nee's clear word:

> If we hold the Head, we cannot have different interpretations of Scripture. Differences arise when someone is not holding the Head, because He cannot possibly say one thing to one member and something else to another. (*The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, vol. 44, pp. 812-813)

Thus, the dissenters are actually opposing Watchman Nee. Titus Chu wrote:

> 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?) (Titus Chu, letter to 21 co-workers, July 22, 2006)

What Titus calls an "emphasis" of Brother Nee's statement was actually a single mention by Ron of Brother Nee's fellowship in one paragraph of one message. That message also reiterated Brother Nee's fellowship that the appropriate action when different interpretations arise was not to argue, but to hold Christ as the Head. Titus Chu and those who publicly defend his ministry by attacking the co-workers have completely cast aside Brother Nee's fellowship on this point.

What Titus Chu and those who defend him object to is the stress found in many places in Brother Lee's speaking on the need to teach the same thing under the same vision to preserve the one accord. For example, in *The Vision of the Age* Brother Lee said:

> Recently I have felt the importance of the one accord. As long as we have different views on a minor point, we cannot have the one accord. This is the reason that in this training, right from the beginning, I spoke concerning the vision in the Lord's recovery. I believe all the brothers and sisters love the Lord, and all of us want to be in one accord, but if our vision is not up to date, it is impossible for us to be one. (*The Vision of the Age*, p. 70)

The dissenters misapply the principle of generality exercised in receiving believers to justify teaching differently and building up their own kingdoms in the Lord's recovery. Generality in receiving believers is not a license for teaching differently by those who claim to be co-workers in the same ministry. Brother Lee's strong corrective to the ones ministering among the churches was:

> We also must teach the same thing in all the churches in every country throughout the earth. There should be no different trumpeting or different voicing among us. We should all voice the same thing, trumpet the same thing, and teach the same thing. We need to be one in teaching (1 Cor. 4:17; 7:17; 16:1; Acts 2:42; Rom. 16:17; 1 Tim. 1:3-4; 6:3; Eph. 4:13-14). (*Elders' Training, Book 9: The Eldership and the God-Ordained Way*, p. 16)

In his speaking concerning the need for one trumpet in the ministry in the Lord's recovery, Brother Lee made a definite distinction between the realm of the churches, in which generality applies, and the realm of the ministry.

> For this reason, this ministry cannot allow anyone to pretend to be in it and yet still say something different. This does not mean that I ask you to stay away from your local church or that your local church is no longer a local church. What I am fellowshipping about is the impact of the ministry for the fighting of the Lord's interest in His recovery.
>
> ...I am not talking about the churches, I am talking about the ministry. The ministry is one thing, and the churches are another thing. (*Elders' Training, Book 7: One Accord for the Lord's Move*, pp. 81-82)

The dissenters claim that their "freedom of speech" is being violated (Nigel Tomes, "The 'One Publication' Campaign," *Fellowship Journal*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 27), criticizing a message by Minoru Chen (*The Ministry Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 1, Jan. 2005, p. 186) in which he said, "…the Lord's Body is the place with the least freedom." Minoru's speaking was a respeaking of Brother Lee's ministry:

> In the new man there is no freedom to speak your own things. This is more limiting and restricting than being members one of another… In the one new man there is only one person. Only this person has the freedom to speak, and our natural man has absolutely no freedom of speech. The Lord has the absolute freedom to speak, and I absolutely have no freedom to speak. (*One Body, One Spirit, and One New Man*, p. 61)

3. Rejecting the Co-workers' Repetition of Brother Lee's Fellowship to Be Restricted in One Publication

The dissenting brothers claim that since being restricted in one publication is not explicitly prescribed in the Bible, it should be rejected as unscriptural.

> In my view, 'one publication' is not a scriptural truth (implied or otherwise). Neither is it a "direct application" nor a "healthy extension" of "fundamental scriptural principles." (Nigel Tomes, "LSM's Eisegesis – How Not to Interpret the Bible!")

Being restricted in one publication was the practice of Brother Nee, of Brother Lee, and of the co-workers generally since the Lord raised up His recovery in China. Being restricted in one publication was Brother Lee's direct fellowship with the leading ones, so what the co-workers stated was just a respeaking of his leadership to maintain the oneness among all of the churches.

> One thing that has caused the Lord's recovery trouble is the fact that we have different publications. If we mean business for the Lord's recovery, we must avoid any kind of involvement in problems. When we were on mainland China, only Brother Nee had a publication, and the Gospel Room belonged solely and uniquely to him... We only had one publication. Everything was published through Brother Nee's Gospel Room because the publication is really the trumpeting. The sounding of our trumpet is not just in the verbal message but more in the publication. (*Elders' Training, Book 8: The Life-Pulse of the Lord's Present Move*, pp. 161-162)

In their opposition to the co-workers' repetition of Brother Lee's fellowship, the dissenters completely distort its tone and substance. They use words like "insist," "mandate," "impose," and "policy" to describe the co-workers' fellowship in *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*.

> Why has an informal, voluntary, personal practice among workers (Brother Lee and Brother Nee) become a teaching which is now a public policy, mandated upon the saints and the local churches. (Nigel Tomes, "Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery—Analysis & Response")

> By promoting the "one publication" aren't the saints, local churches and elders being asked to insist "on something other than the common faith"? (Nigel Tomes, "Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery—Analysis & Response")

> You claim to be "merely reaffirming, just declaring, putting down in writing, and echoing Brother Lee's speaking," etc. while seeking to impose a publicly-mandated policy of one publication? (Nigel Tomes, "Response to the S. California Coworkers' Letter of 27 Sept '05")

The words "insist," "mandate," "impose" and "policy" are all foreign to *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery* both in content and in tone. In fact, the section of the co-workers' fellowship concludes with a word explicitly stating that one publication "should not be insisted on" as an item of the faith and indicating that the saints and the churches that choose not to follow the co-workers' fellowship to be restricted in one publication should still be received as genuine brothers and genuine churches.

> Finally, all the churches and saints everywhere must understand that the matter of one publication is not a matter of the common faith but something related to the one ministry in the Lord's recovery. The ministry is the sounding of the trumpet among us in the Lord's recovery, and there should be no uncertain sounding of this trumpet, as Brother Lee has mentioned on a number of occasions. However, the one publication should not become the basis of our accepting or rejecting any persons in the communion of faith or in the fellowship of the churches; it should not be insisted on as an item of the faith. If any are not inclined to be restricted in one publication, these ones are still our brothers; they are still in the genuine local churches. (*Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*, p. 9)

There are numerous articles under the Articles and Contributions sections of http://www.afaithfulword.org/ that address the issue of one publication, including:

- Is "One Publication" Scriptural? (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/Scriptural.html)
- An Application of and Deviation from the Pattern in Acts 15 (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/Acts15.html)

- Is "One Publication" an Item of "Speciality" or "Generality"? (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/spec_gen.html)
- "An Informal, Voluntary, Personal Practice"? (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/personal.html)
- Whose "Historical Revisionism"? (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/Hist_Rev.html)
- "Situation-specific" or "Person-specific"? (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/sit_pers.html) and
- Thoughts on the One Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery, by David Ho (http://www.afaithfulword.org/contributions/DHo1.html)

4. Attempting to Discredit Living Stream Ministry

The dissenters particularly attack Living Stream Ministry (LSM):

- Accusing it of conflict of interest and potentially criminal misconduct in the printing of *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*;
- Accusing it of lying about LSM's alleged role in the attempt to smuggle Recovery Versions into China; and
- Falsely attributing to LSM many things related to the blending co-workers, DCP or the present litigation.

Nigel Tomes accuses the blending brothers of having a conflict of interest and engaging in potentially criminal misconduct in the printing of *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*, characterizing the brothers' statement as a mere tactic to "'monopolize' the market for books in the Lord's recovery":

> Isn't the LSM board of directors open to the charge of seeking to "monopolize" the market for books in the Lord's recovery? Could not the statement, "Publication Work" be viewed in that way by objective outside observers? Moreover are the tactics being employed by LSM legal, ethical and fair under US legislation? (Nigel Tomes, "Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery—Analysis & Response")

Concerning the arrest of Li Guang-qiang for attempting to smuggle Recovery Versions into China, Titus Chu castigates LSM: "My point is that the behavior of you brothers, LSM and its representatives, was shameful and exposed the Lord's recovery to public ridicule." "Isn't this an unabashed lie? Isn't this unethical…?" He calls the incident an "LSM-Taiwan Gospel Book Room misadventure." Despite his strident tone and brash charges, the fact is that LSM, the Taiwan Gospel Book Room, and the brothers representing them spoke and behaved truthfully, ethically and in a manner honoring the Lord. Titus Chu's assumptions are unfounded and his accusations are self-serving, irresponsible, and untrue.

The dissenters' articles, including those written by Nigel Tomes, falsely attribute to LSM many things related to the blending co-workers, DCP, and the present litigation. These include:

- Portraying the present litigation as being carried out primarily by LSM.
- Identifying DCP as an LSM project.
- Identifying afaithfulword.org as an LSM Web site.
- Identifying contendingforthefaith.org and localchurch-vs-harvesthouse.org as LSM Web sites.
- Identifying the contributors to afaithfulword.org collectively as "LSM brothers."
- Attributing the fellowship in Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery to LSM.

B. Concerning the Work

1. Accusing the Co-workers of Establishing a Worldwide Organization to Oversee the Work

The dissenters claim that the work should be carried out through bands of independent workers and attack the attempts of the co-workers to carry out the work through a blended fellowship. They call the problems in Acts caused by the ministries of Barnabas, Peter, and Apollos "minor," and blame the divisive situation in Corinth on the saints there, not on the different ministers. Thus, they set aside Brother Lee's crucial fellowship in the first two chapters of *Elders' Training, Book 1: The Ministry of the New Testament* concerning the problems caused by different ministries. They equate the co-workers' attempts to blend through fellowship and prayer with establishing a worldwide organization to oversee the work. Emphasizing the regional nature of the work caused great damage in the 1980s. It became a basis for some to claim their region as the territory of their work. This caused Brother Lee to emphasize the uniqueness of the work in the Lord's recovery and the need for fellowship among the workers.

> While the ministry is going on, it is regional. This does not mean, however, that the Lord has different moves in different regions and that He has different bodies and different testimonies. This does not mean that the ministry or the work under Peter's leadership in the Jewish land was for one kind of testimony, and then the work and the ministry under the leadership of Paul in the Gentile world was for another kind of testimony. The Lord has, in the New Testament age, one unique ministry for one move to produce one unique Body as one unique testimony. (*Elders' Training, Book 4: Other Crucial Matters Concerning the Practice of the Lord's Recovery*, p. 28)

No doubt there were various groups of workers in the New Testament. In the physical realm, limitations of time and space make this a necessity. The problem is what conclusion a person draws from that necessity. If a group of workers carries out the common ministry with the same teaching in all of the churches in fellowship and coordination with the other workers under a common leadership, that is a work that matches the governing principle of the ministry—the principle of the Body. If, on the other hand, a work advances different teachings without fellowship or coordination and without accepting the leadership of those whom the Lord has raised up to function in that capacity, that work violates God's government in the Body and is divisive.

2. Accusing the Co-workers of Trying to Centralize Control

The dissenting ones claim that the co-workers are trying to centralize control of the work. They deny that there should be one coordinated leadership in the work, claiming that the groups of workers are independent. In his July 22, 2006, letter, Titus Chu wrote:

> 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.

He states that , "…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…" In that letter he attacked Brother Benson Phillips' speaking in an elders' training in which Benson exhorted the churches to receive one another in the fellowship of the Body of Christ.

> We must receive all the believers. But the burden here [this morning] is that we might receive all the local churches and all the saints in the local churches. They must be received by us, and they must be received according to Romans 14:3 and 15:7. God has received us, Christ has received us; this is one receiving by the Triune God. 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. Every church receives every brother and sister. (*The Ministry Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 2, Feb. 2005, p. 108) [The words in brackets were in Benson's spoken message but omitted in the version printed in *The Ministry Magazine*. They are included here because they clarify the context of his comments.]

Titus Chu turned Benson's word on its head, asking:

> 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)?

Brother Lee responded to the same accusation in the 1980s.

> In the Lord's recovery there is no such practice of a "centralization of the churches" and a "centralization of the work." We do emphasize that all the churches should be one in the Body of Christ, not by the way of forming a federation but in the way of adequate fellowship in the Spirit in the organic union of the divine life. We also stress that the co-workers should not work independently but corporately under one leadership. (*Elders' Training, Book 10: The Eldership and the God-Ordained Way*, p. 98)

The dissenters equate fellowship and blending with control. They cast aside Brother Lee's fellowship concerning the necessity of blending in every aspect of the Body life, including among the co-workers.

> All of these points mean that we should fellowship. When a co-worker does anything, he should fellowship with the other co-workers. An elder should fellowship with the other elders. Fellowship tempers us; fellowship adjusts us; fellowship harmonizes us; and fellowship mingles us. We should forget about whether we are slow or quick and just fellowship with others. We should not do anything without fellowshipping with the other saints who are coordinating with us. Fellowship requires us to stop when we are about to do something. In our coordination in the church life, in the Lord's work, we all have to learn not to do anything without fellowship.
>
> Among us we should have the blending of all the individual members of the Body of Christ, the blending of all the churches in certain districts, the blending of all the co-workers, and the blending of all the elders. (*The Divine and Mystical Realm*, p. 87)

The co-workers pointed this out to Titus in their first letter of June 2005:

> We cannot understand how any brother can presume to affect the Lord's move in the complicated and delicate situation of China without fellowship. Fellowship means to stop your own work and be limited by others. This you have not done. (Letter to Titus Chu from 21 co-workers, June 4, 2005)

What these twenty-one co-workers sought was not personal control, but a blending fellowship presented by Brother Lee as the way to serve together as co-workers in the one ministry in the Lord's recovery.

3. Seeking to Undermine the Present Leadership in the Lord's Ministry

The dissenters say that Brother Lee's ministry ended with his death and should therefore not be continued. In a recent letter, Titus Chu asked the blending co-workers:

> 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? (Titus Chu, letter to 21 co-workers, July 22, 2006)

As late as 1986 Brother Lee referred to Watchman Nee as "our senior co-worker" (*Elders' Training, Book 9: The Eldership and the God-ordained Way (1)*, pp. 99, 112). Although Brother Lee has departed, it is fitting for the blending brothers to refer to themselves as Brother Lee's co-workers. Such a reference indicates that the blending brothers are endeavoring to be one with Brother Lee in his ministry, his teaching, his conduct, his burden, and his practice of the Lord's recovery. Their desire is to be his continuation, as Timothy was to Paul (2 Tim. 3:10-11a, 14).

Brother Lee often referred to his ministry as the continuation of Brother Nee's. He never said Brother Nee's ministry was over.

> …Although Brother Nee passed away over twenty years ago, today we still see his ministry remaining here to minister to the churches for their going on. (*The Governing and Controlling Vision in the Bible*, p. 33)

Brother Nee sent Brother Lee to Taiwan with the express intent that there could be a continuation of what the Lord had begun in mainland China.

> Brother Nee told me and all the other co-workers that, no matter how I felt, I must leave the Mainland. When I asked why, he said I must go out, that one day the work there would be wiped out. If I went out, there would still be something left on the earth. (*The World Situation and God's Move*, pp. 33-34)

At the end of his life Brother Lee similarly expressed a desire that the co-workers would continue his ministry.

> The Lord has shown me that He has prepared many brothers who will serve as fellow slaves with me in a blended way. I feel that this is the Lord's sovereign provision for His Body and the up-to-date way to fulfill His ministry. (Witness Lee, A Letter of Fellowship with Thanks, 03/24/97)

In particular, he asked some of these brothers to continue to oversee the labors of Living Stream Ministry to publish his ministry:

> My burden is for the recovery based on the interpretation of Brother Nee and me. I am the continuation of Brother Nee; I would like to have a continuation of me, and this needs a corporation...The Living Stream corporation will continue this ministry. (*Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*, p. 5)

This is consistent with Paul's word in 2 Timothy 3:14: "But you, continue in the things which you have learned and have been assured of, knowing from which ones you have learned them." The dissenters equate the co-workers' commitment to continuing Brother Lee's ministry with papal succession.

> A "blended co-worker" recently said, "There is no successor to Brother Lee, but there is an open group of the 'being-blended brothers' who are continuing Brother Lee's ministry." Can we say this "strongly refutes the assertion of Catholicism" concerning apostolic succession? Doesn't this rehabilitate it under the guise of "one wise Master builder"? Are we returning to Rome? (Nigel Tomes, "Is the Recovery on the Road to Rome?")

The real test is not succession in any sense, but who is actually continuing the ministry raised up by the Lord, that is, who is speaking the same thing with the same emphasis and burden as that of our brother in the last stage of his ministry.

The dissenters especially attempt to discredit those co-workers whose portion is to speak at the international gatherings, by twisting their statements after quoting them out of context. Some of these twistings are documented on http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/Twisting.html. These are enumerated in the appendix to this document.

C. Concerning the Church Life

1. Accusing the Co-workers of Changing the Lord's Recovery into a Global Organization, Not the Organic Body of Christ

The dissenters accuse the co-workers of replacing the organism of the Body of Christ with a global organization. They base this on Minoru Chen's statement that "practically speaking the Body equals the recovery" (*The Ministry Magazine*, vol. 7, no. 6, August 2003, pp. 196-197) and Ron Kangas' statement that "the seven times a year that we come together are for the universal Body, for the speaking to the entire Body and for the Lord's leading to the whole Body" (*The Ministry Magazine*, vol. 7, no. 9, p. 169). Titus Chu makes this accusation in his July 2006 letter:

> 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"? (Titus Chu, letter to 21 co-workers, July 22, 2006)

Nigel Tomes concludes a similar criticism of Brother Minoru's speaking by saying:

> We fear this exclusive definition of Christ's Body will produce a "virtual body," an entity which is in fact nothing more than a global organization. (Nigel Tomes, "'The Body Equals the Recovery' – Going Beyond what has been Written?", *Fellowship Journal*, vol. 5, no. 4, July 2006, p. 48)

Brother Minoru's speaking was based on a portion from Brother Lee's ministry that he was reading. The key to rightly interpreting Minoru's word is the qualifier "practically speaking." In context his speaking was concerning the practical way for the churches to know and honor of the feeling of the Body. His speaking was a respeaking of Brother Lee's fellowship.

> We are here for the Body. Without the backing of the Body, without the backing of the recovery, we have no way to practice the local churches. If we practice the local church life and neglect the view of the Body, our local church becomes a local sect.
>
> The recovery is for the Body, not for any individual or merely for any individual local church. If we are going to do something, we have to consider how the Body, the recovery, will react. The problems are all due to the lack of seeing the Body and of caring for the Body…. (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 35)

Brother Ron's speaking accurately reflects Watchman Nee's teaching on the matter of the ministry of the Word being for the entire Body:

> …The Head is one with the members, and the members are one with each other. Paul learned these two lessons from the beginning. He saw the life of the Body from the first day. This is why he was able to drop his self and accept the commission of the work, and why he was later able to commission

> others in the work. This shows us that God's speaking is not directed toward individuals, but toward the whole Body. (*The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, vol. 57, p. 108)

It also matches Brother Lee's fellowship:

> Whatever one church receives is for the whole Body. Therefore, we should not try to confine any experience of Christ to our locality. We should realize that whatever we receive of Christ is to be transfused into the rest of the Body. (*Life-study of Ephesians*, p. 733)

The real issue is that Titus Chu lacks a clear view of the ministry in God's economy and of the Body of Christ in its reality and practicality. As a result, he rejects the need to be restricted in his teaching and practice by the feeling and fellowship of the brothers taking the lead in the Lord's ministry in His recovery or by the other churches in the recovery.

2. Claiming Those Churches That Restrict Themselves in One Publication Are "Ministry Churches"

The dissenters claim that those churches that receive only LSM publications are no longer local churches, but "ministry churches". In his attack on *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*, Nigel Tomes wrote:

> If a local church adopts the "one publication" policy is it still a genuine local church? Or has it become a "ministry church"? (Nigel Tomes, Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery— "Analysis & Response")

He then argues that those churches that are restricted in one publication are no longer local churches, but ministry churches. In the same way Titus Chu asks:

> Aren't you brothers misleading all the local churches, making them ministry churches just for your purpose? (Titus Chu, letter to 21 co-workers, July 22, 2006)

Brother Lee faced the same accusation in the 1980s, and his response to those accusations is instructive:

> In 1987 some dissenting ones among us began to create divisions. They claim that my ministry has become a system that has subjected under the ministry all the churches built up by the ministry, making them "ministry churches" and no longer genuine local churches. They also say that the emphasis of my ministry has changed, and that this has changed the nature of the Lord's recovery. These dissenters have taken this as an excuse to separate themselves to form a number of divisions. Although I strongly deny these allegations concerning my ministry, even if they were true, it would not justify any division. (*The Practice of the Church Life according to the God-ordained Way*, p. 15-16)

> I have never built up any "ministry church." I have been in the recovery for sixty years, laboring continually. I was also with Brother Nee for twenty years. Neither Brother Nee nor I ever built up a church to ourselves. The churches built up through the Lord's ministry are not "ministry churches." Although Paul's ministry built up a number of churches, it is not right to call any of these churches "Pauline churches." Some of the Corinthians said, "I am of Paul," others said, "I of Apollos," and others, "I of Cephas" (1 Cor. 1:12); but eventually Paul said that he, Apollos, and Cephas were of the Corinthians, for all were theirs (3:21-22). The missionaries went to China and built up their mission churches, but our ministry has built up not "ministry churches" but local churches. Today it is difficult to find any local church on this earth that has not been built up by our ministry. Therefore,

> their accusing of me is not fair. (*The Practice of the Church Life according to the God-ordained Way*, p. 28-29)
>
> I have the full assurance that when I brought the recovery to the United States, I did not carry out a denominational ministry, nor did I raise up denominational churches. What I brought to America was "the ministry." Through this ministry the Lord brought the work of His recovery to America and has raised up the churches, built up the churches, and nourished and perfected the saints for more than thirty years. The very work that raised up the local churches in America is surely "the ministry." This being the case, the churches raised up through my ministry are the churches of the ministry and should be one with the ministry. (*The Ministry of the New Testament and the Teaching and Fellowship of the Apostles*, pp. 13-14).

3. Accusing the Co-workers of Promoting Conformity and Uniformity

The dissenters accuse the co-workers of promoting conformity and uniformity. In a message printed in *Fellowship Journal*, Titus Chu said:

> To cause the local churches to be brought into uniformity under the banner of Living Stream Ministry is to frustrate the work of the Spirit. (Titus Chu, "The Lord's Recovery and The Ministry")

Similarly, Nigel Tomes wrote:

> Perhaps, in the 30 years since that declaration was made, the distinction between oneness and uniformity has been blurred. For some, the call for the saints to be in one accord leads them to expect uniformity in outward expression among believers and among churches. (Nigel Tomes, "The Beauty of Variety" *Fellowship Journal*, vol. 2, no. 6, June 2003, p. 27)

What the co-workers have been ministering has nothing to do with outward conformity or uniformity, but with intrinsic matters such as the one Body, the one flow of the Spirit, the one work, the one ministry, and the one fellowship of the Body of Christ. It was Brother Lee's expectation that all of the churches would be one in teaching, practice, thinking, speaking, essence, appearance, and expression (see *Elders' Training, Book 7: One Accord for the Lord's Move*, chapter 3).

> …If you believe the Bible, you have to admit that we should be one in teaching, practice, thinking, speaking, essence, appearance, and expression. There is not a verse in the Bible that even gives us a small hint that allows the churches to have different appearances. (*Elders' Training, Book 7: One Accord for the Lord's Move*, p. 39)

4. Promoting Isolation in the Name of Local Autonomy

Titus Chu says that knowing "the feeling of the Body" by "fellowship with the Body" can only be applied locally and that no one represents the Body to him outside his own locality.

> Therefore we must be very careful when we use the term "the feeling of the Body". I have heard it said, "Why don't you fellowship with the Body?" Be careful, for this can only be applied locally, because who can practically be recognized as representing "the Body" once you go beyond the level of the locality?...
>
> Thus I am troubled when I hear some brothers say, "Why don't you fellowship with the Body?" If some claim to represent the Body, they replace Christ! The Body has one Head and one person—the

> exalted, pneumatic Christ. (Titus Chu, "What a Prophet Must See," *Fellowship Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 27)

Titus also teaches that the elders should only take into account the profit of the saints in their own locality when doing things.

> …Every decision that the elders make in their locality should have the profit of the saints of that locality in view, rather than something else. (Titus Chu, *The Oneness and the One Accord*, pp. 92-93)

This allows the leading ones in the churches under Titus' ministry to effectively cut off fellowship with and ignore the feeling of the churches outside their area and of the other co-workers. It nullifies the fellowship of both Brother Nee and Brother Lee concerning the universal fellowship of the churches as the practicality of the Body of Christ and the need to care for the feeling of the Body as expressed in all of the local churches throughout the earth.

> Turmoil after turmoil has transpired because of our not knowing the Body. The only remedy that can cure us of this kind of illness is the seeing of the Body. When Brother Nee taught about the Body he said that with whatever we do, we have to consider how the churches would feel about it. When we do something, we must not forget that we are members of the Body, and the Body is not only a local church. The local church is not a "local body"; if it is, it becomes a local sect…. (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, pp. 28-29)

Titus' present standing is a complete deviation from the stand he took in 1989 with several other co-workers throughout the Lord's recovery in the United States. A letter signed by Titus Chu closes with the following plea:

> Please deal with this matter thoroughly, as befits those who serve the Lord, caring not only for your own feeling but also for the feeling of the Body. For the Body's sake, brothers, we appeal to you, imploring you to hear us and to consider before the Lord all that we have presented to you in this letter. (An Open Letter to the Speakers in the Meeting of the Church in Anaheim on August 28, 1988, signed by Francis Ball, Titus Chu, Les Cites, Eugene C. Gruhler, Joel W. Kennon, David Lutz, Benson Phillips, and James Reetzke, Sr. on April 10, 1989)

5. Distorting Brother Lee's Speaking about Repenting for Past Failures in Receiving Believers to Justify Embracing Christianity

The dissenting brothers distort a statement that Brother Lee made in the last message of the 1997 Chinese-speaking conference. In that message Brother Lee spoke about repenting for mistakes that had been made in the past in receiving all believers. Brother Lee's fellowship did not represent any change in the teaching in his ministry regarding receiving the believers according to God and according to Christ. It acknowledged that we in the Lord's recovery have not always lived up to that standard and called upon the saints to get into the subject thoroughly and prayerfully to be adjusted by the Lord. The dissenting ones, however, have used Brother Lee's word as a "carte blanche" to justify deviating from Brother Lee's teaching, fellowship and leading on many points, claiming that they are offensive to other Christians. According to one account:

> It is time for the church leaders and the saints to learn the facts and realize that -- first, as Brother Lee confessed, we, Brother Lee included, indeed have made many mistakes and offended the Body of Christ under Brother Lee's leadership; also Brother Lee assumed responsibility for those mistakes as he took the last opportunity of his life to make a public repentance. (Anonymous, "Brother Lee's

> Spirit of Painful Repentance and Solemn Charge in His Final Public Message – Why did we totally miss the mark?")

The anonymous writer then calls for a re-evaluation of "the teachings" of Brother Lee which, he claims, caused "many mistakes." Titus Chu claims that the co-workers have completely ignored Brother Lee's word:

> 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? (Titus Chu, letter to 21 co-workers, July 22, 2006)

He attacks the following speaking of Brother Benson Phillips from a recent elders' training

> We must receive all the believers. But the burden here [this morning] is that we might receive all the local churches and all the saints in the local churches. They must be received by us, and they must be received according to Romans 14:3 and 15:7. God has received us, Christ has received us; this is one receiving by the Triune God. 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. Every church receives every brother and sister. (*The Ministry Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 2, Feb. 2005, p. 108) [The words in brackets were in Benson's spoken message but omitted in the version printed in *The Ministry Magazine*. They are included here because they clarify the context of his comments.]

Titus claims that Benson was saying that we must first receive all the churches and only after that can we 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)? (Titus Chu, letter to 21 co-workers, July 22, 2006)

The dissenters apply Brother Lee's "repentance" broadly, taking it as a basis for attacking almost any action with which they disagree. For example, they use it to attack the present litigation over the *Encyclopedia of Cults and New Religions*:

> If we take Brother Lee's final speaking seriously, we cannot assume that today he would do things exactly as he did during his life-time. Shouldn't we ask, what would he do differently, especially related to the entire Body of Christ? Isn't it conceivable that Brother Lee would handle litigation differently, that he would not proceed with the present legal case? (Anonymous, "The God-Men Case & The Encyclopedia of Cults Case – the Same or Different?")

The dissenters' application of Brother Lee's "repentance" to offending some Christians by filing a libel lawsuit is a purely speculative and baseless extrapolation from what he actually said. In fact, the context of that portion of the message was receiving people according to God and according to His Son. In his later ministry he also expressed regret that the riches the Lord had given to His ministry in His recovery had not been adequately propagated to Christians generally and he made several arrangements to do that. He never "repented" for condemning the denominational system of deformed and degraded Christianity or its worldly practices. In fact, in the very passage the dissenters quote from Brother Lee strongly says,

"sectarianism in the denominations is wrong." He never "repented" for the libel litigations of the 1980s. In fact, he specifically requested that the lawyers involved in that case be invited to his funeral.

Titus Chu rejects Brother Lee's clear word from that Chinese-speaking conference that all the churches need to be blended together in the fellowship of the one Body of Christ. This was the subject of the message in which Brother Lee spoke of his regret for mistakes made in receiving the believers.

6. Encouraging Ambition

Titus Chu encourages ambition among the young people "to be manifested" and "held in high regard" by others. He also counsels them to "fight to make your mark before the Lord," even if their aspiration is something of the soul-life.

> David was surely a person held in high regard and appreciated by everyone. If we experience such things, we should treasure them. When you are young, you should labor to be manifested. (Titus Chu, *David: A Person Who Served His Generation by Struggling After God's Heart*, p. 71)

> Do not be too concerned about whether or not desiring it is something of your soul-life. Fight to make your mark before the Lord, and then let the Lord work on you!... You should not be content to simply be a good, functioning brother in the church life. No! (Titus Chu, *David: A Person Who Served His Generation by Struggling After God's Heart*, p. 79)

Such encouragement of ambition is contrary to the teaching of the Lord's ministry and leads to division and rebellion:

> I want to say something for the sake of the young brothers. The ambition of the brothers is a problem in the church. It is a shame to say this, but it is a fact.... The ambitious ones would never admit that they were ambitious. When they caused a division, they did it with a certain excuse. They put on a "cloak" of a certain doctrine. They would say that the church was wrong in this certain doctrine, and because they were clear about this they had to leave. This was altogether a pretense, an excuse, and a cloak for their ambition. (*The History of the Church and the Local Churches*, p. 88)

> To some extent this may also be the situation in some places in the recovery today. Certain ones take the proper ground and keep the fundamental faith, yet they live in the flesh, in the self, and in the natural man. They may be selfish and pursue their own interest, seeking glory and exaltation. Even worse, they may have ambition, something that is hateful and abominable in the sight of God. The root of every rebellion that took place among us in the past seventy-two years has been this ugly and evil matter of ambition. (*Life-study of 1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 80)

Appendix – Examples of Attacks on the Co-workers

The following are examples of attacks made by Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes against the blended co-workers serving in the ministry of the Word in the international conferences and trainings and a brief summary of the answers, details of which can be found on http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/Twisting.html:

- Nigel Tomes attacked James Lee for supposedly saying that "one publication" should be added to the seven "ones" in Ephesians 4. James Lee did not say anything remotely close to this (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/SevenOnes.html).

- Nigel Tomes attacked Minoru Chen for supposedly saying that it does not matter whether "one publication" is biblical or non-biblical. In fact, what Minoru said was that it does not matter whether teachings that divide the Body of Christ are biblical or not; as long as they divide the Body, they are indefensible (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/NotAMatter.html).

- Nigel Tomes accused Ron Kangas of saying "Witness Lee was the acting God." Both he and Titus Chu attack the use of the term "the acting God" as extra-biblical. Nigel takes exception to applying that term to Brother Lee. In fact, Ron's speaking affirmed Brother Lee's definition and application of the term to someone who is one with God and represents Him in carrying out His interest on the earth (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/ActingGod.html).

- Nigel Tomes quoted half of one sentence from Brother Lee's ministry to argue that Brother Lee's mention of a writers' conference gives brothers the ground to carry out their own publication work. Actually, the context of Brother Lee's speaking was the need to be restricted in one publication; quoting the entire sentence would have made it clear that what Nigel is promoting is what Brother Lee called "doing things lawlessly" (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/WritersConf.html).

- Nigel Tomes claimed Brother Nee's action in setting up the Hong Kong and Taiwan Gospel Bookrooms established a precedent for multiple publication works in the Lord's recovery? In fact, in his fellowship with Brother Lee, Watchman Nee clearly indicated his intention that the Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Shanghai Gospel Bookrooms would function as one (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/HongKongBkrm.html).

- Titus Chu attacks Ron Kangas, saying he contradicts the Bible by saying there is no local Body, ignoring that what Ron spoke was Brother Lee's teaching. A local church is the manifestation of the universal Body of Christ in time and space and derives its existence from the universal Body. Thus, to say a church is a local Body as something independent of the universal Body is wrong (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/LocChurchChristsBody.html).

- Titus Chu accuses the co-workers of belittling the local churches as merely a procedure, ignoring that this was Brother Lee's word and his emphasis in his late ministry and that the co-workers clearly taught the need for the local churches as the procedure to accomplish the goal of God's economy, the building up of the Body of Christ (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/CoworkDeemph.html).

- Titus Chu attacks Ron Kangas for saying that a local church may not be in the Body, ignoring that this was also Brother Lee's word. Titus neglects the distinction made between the position of a local church in standing and the condition of a local church in reality (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/LocChurchBody.html)..

- Titus Chu accuses Benson Phillips of distorting Brother Lee's teaching on receiving the believers by misconstruing the context of Benson's fellowship and inserting the thought of time dependency between the parts of Benson's fellowship that was not in Benson's speaking (in progress – will be http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/ReceivingChurches.html).

- Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes accuse Minoru Chen of serious error regarding the truth by saying "the recovery equals the Body," ignoring the fact that Minoru was commenting on a passage of Brother Lee's ministry that he was reading and that its clear context is the practicality of caring for the feeling of the Body by caring for the feeling of the other local churches (http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/RecoveryBody.html).

- Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes accuse Ron Kangas of serious error when he said the speaking in the seven international conferences and trainings is for the speaking to the entire Body of Christ. In

fact, Ron's word reflects both Brother Nee's and Brother Lee's teaching that God's speaking is for the whole Body and whatever one church receives is for the whole Body (in progress – will be http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/SpeakingToTheBody.html).

---

[1] Some of those publicly defending Titus Chu try to create the impression that the rejection of their different teachings and dissenting views is a rejection of "the Great Lakes brothers" and of all churches in that area. This is not true. The cause of DCP's involvement in these issues is the very public and discordant criticisms of the co-workers made by a very small number of brothers, not with the brothers who may privately hold or who have privately communicated different views. In addition, some of those publicly defending Titus Chu give the impression that their writing is supported by all the churches, elders and workers where they are. That also is misleading and false.

[2] One brother who has written extensively to publicly defend Titus Chu and criticize the co-workers feigns innocence when called to account, claiming he and others are only raising questions and propounding "concerns". Any fair reader of his writing, however, recognizes its acerbic tone and should be able to readily identify the multitude of rhetorical questions, of challenges to the co-workers, and of false insinuations and innuendos as reckless railing. As the Appendix to this document demonstrates, he has repeatedly attributed to faithful co-workers statements that they did not make. In doing so, the he has maligned their words, meanings and motives in an avalanche of baseless charges.

[3] Some of Titus Chu's defenders seem to have taken great offense that 21 senior co-workers in the Lord's recovery would write to Titus Chu pleading with him to stop his independent and divisive works and to shepherd the churches and workers under his influence into the one work of the Lord's unique recovery, to build up the Body of Christ. Their indignation is misaimed. The co-workers' action was not taken lightly, nor was it taken hastily. It was taken only after a number of situations manifested an increasing trend toward discord in the Lord's recovery due in part to different teachings and differing views concerning such fundamental matters as oneness and one accord, the New Testament ministry, the work, and the practice of the church life. The public responses of Titus Chu and his defenders only confirms the conclusion that they are determined to pursue an independent and divisive course.

[4] An early draft of this document (clearly marked "Draft") was obtained without our permission and posted on a third party Internet site along with an inaccurate summary of the outline points included in the draft. The summary used language that was more inflammatory than the draft. That language was not and never had been part of the draft. We discovered that this had happened when "Concerned Brothers" used that posting to justify their putting up on their Web site a number of letters along with a cover letter which attacked the words in the summary as though we had written them ,which we did not. As is typical of this dissenting writer, he went to great pains to identify DCP as belonging to LSM, another falsehood.

