

## TORONTO'S DISCIPLINE OF 'BROTHER X' vs. LSM'S QUARANTINE OF TITUS — A Response to LSM's Attempt to Discredit Toronto's Eldership

### SUMMARY

A document on A Faithful Word.org seems designed to discredit the Toronto eldership.

The LSM-brothers charge the Toronto elders with inconsistency and reversing their stand because in 1992-3 they quarantined "Brother X," while they now reject the call to quarantine Titus Chu. They claim "*The parallels between [the two cases] are striking*" and argue that both Brother X and Titus Chu should be quarantined.

However, this argument involves logical fallacies—

- That "striking parallels" mean the situations are equivalent
- That "striking parallels" necessitate identical judgments.

In fact superficial resemblance does not imply equivalence.

The cases of Brother X and Titus Chu are significantly different. They are in different spheres:

- Brother X was disciplined by the Toronto elders for his activities in that locality.
- The blended co-workers' quarantine of Titus was initiated in the context of 'the work.'
- There are elders in the local church—it's scriptural for Toronto elders to discipline Bro. X.
- But in the Bible there are no "global elders" overseeing one world-wide work
- Are the "blended brothers" acting as "global elders" in quarantining Titus? If so, this is unscriptural.
- It is the elders' jurisdiction to determine whether a brother should be quarantined in the local church they oversee.

The LSM-brothers contend that Brother X was disciplined for doing his own publication work, violating the 'one publication' principle in the recovery. However,

- LSM's 'one publication' policy was not promulgated until 2005.
- Brother X's writings were "local publications for local needs."
- As "local publications" they wouldn't have violated the 'one publication' edict
- Therefore this argument is bogus.
- 'One publication' is not in the Bible. It's not a valid basis for scriptural discipline, including Titus' quarantine.
- Brother X's writings attacked the local church, the elders, the recovery and its ministers.
- In contrast, Titus' publications have not denigrated any scriptural elements in the recovery.

The LSM-brothers allege the Toronto elders are treating Titus Chu differently than they treated Joseph Fung (from Hong Kong) and John So (from Germany) in the early 1990's. However,

- In each case the elders exercised their responsibility to determine which ministries are beneficial to the church here.
- They are currently exercised whether to receive the ministries of the many "blended co-workers" visiting the Toronto area.
- Brother Titus Chu was not "quarantined by the Body." 63 co-workers are not "the Body"
- Many churches have endorsed the "blended co-workers'" quarantine.
- However, others have rejected it.
- Thousands of local churches (in S. America, Africa & mainland China) have remained silent
- As a genuine local church, the elders in Toronto reserve the right to arrive at their own judgment on this issue (with due consideration of other churches' views).

[Full Text Follows-Next page]

## TORONTO'S DISCIPLINE OF 'BROTHER X' vs. LSM'S QUARANTINE OF TITUS — A Response to LSM's Attempt to Discredit Toronto's Eldership

### **LSM's Campaign to Discredit Toronto's Eldership**

LSM's "blended co-workers" issued a document which appears designed to discredit the eldership of the Church in Toronto. The article entitled,<sup>1</sup> "***Has the Truth Changed or Have Some of the Metro Toronto Elders?***" is curious. The question posed by the LSM-brothers' title offers readers only two options—either the truth has changed or the Metro-Toronto elders. Since "the truth" is unchanging, the obvious implication is that "some of the Metro Toronto elders" have changed. Hence the authors appear to charge the Toronto eldership with inconsistent and contradictory actions. This seems to be a thinly-veiled attempt to discredit Toronto's eldership.

The article begins by comparing events that transpired in Vancouver during the early 1990's with current happenings in Toronto.<sup>2</sup> However, it soon becomes clear that the Vancouver-Toronto comparison is not the real issue. Rather the essay's focus is a comparison between two cases of discipline—the Toronto elders' discipline in the early 1990's of a mysterious brother— identified only as 'Brother X'—and the "blended co-workers'" current quarantine of Titus Chu.

The LSM-brothers charge the Toronto elders with inconsistency and reversing their stand because in 1992-3 they quarantined this mysterious brother, "Brother X," while they now reject the call to quarantine Titus Chu. The writers assert that it is<sup>3</sup> "*impossible to reconcile...the position taken by some of the Toronto elders today [with] the strong stand the Metro Toronto elders took in 1992 and 1993.*" Hence, the LSM-brothers deduce that<sup>4</sup> "*a striking change has taken place in the stand taken by the [Toronto elders in 1992-3] and the stand some of them are taking today.*" They charge that<sup>4</sup> "*Today, [the Toronto elders'] public stand is 180 degrees removed from the public stand they took then [in 1992-3].*" Based on this alleged "180°-change," the writers pose the rhetorical question<sup>5</sup>—"*Were they wrong...then, or are they off the mark today?*" This leading question assumes the Toronto elders have erred—either previously or presently. Other obvious alternatives aren't suggested. The possibility the Toronto leadership made a proper decision in both cases is never mentioned. Clearly this option is not considered a viable alternative by the LSM-writers. From the arguments presented, the LSM-brothers' evaluation is clear—the Toronto elders are "*off the mark today.*" But are they?

### **LSM's Device—Equating Cases which Differ**

The LSM-brothers reach their conclusions based on a comparison between a case of quarantine in Toronto in 1992-3 with current efforts to quarantine Titus Chu by the "blended co-workers." They claim,<sup>6</sup> "*The parallels between [the two cases] are striking.*" However, closer investigation reveals that the two cases' similarities are merely superficial. The resemblance exists chiefly in the minds of the LSM-authors. By juxtaposing the two cases the LSM-authors try to concoct an equivalence which masks the underlying divergence between the two instances. Moreover superficial resemblance does not imply equivalence. This is true in spiritual matters. That's why the Apostle Paul prayed for the believers' discernment to "prove by testing the things which differ" (Phil. 1:10).

In July 1992 the Toronto elders quarantined "Brother X" due to his divisive activities. The LSM-brothers allege that<sup>6</sup> "*the parallels between [the Toronto elders'] reasons for quarantining Brother X and the reasons behind the co-workers' [quarantine of] Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers are striking.*" They then proceed to present their side-by-side comparison.

### **LSM's Logical Fallacy—"striking parallels" require identical Judgments**

Before reviewing their assessment, an important point should be made. Every disciplinary case should be evaluated on its own merit. This is true in both secular society and in the Church. Suppose, in the legal sphere, 'Person A' faces three charges and is found guilty. In an unrelated case, 'Person B' faces the same three charges. Are we to assume that, because the charges are identical, 'Person B' is also guilty? If the jury finds 'Person A' guilty and 'Person B' innocent, has a travesty of justice occurred? Obviously not; the supposition that justice requires the same verdict involves a logical fallacy. Even with "*striking parallels*" between the two cases, we still cannot presume that impartial justice requires identical verdicts. Yet, this implicit assumption by the LSM-

brothers underlies this entire piece! Arguing from "**striking parallels**" to equivalence is a logical fallacy. The "**striking parallels**"-argument won't hold up in a court of law. Each individual case has to be examined on its own merit. To do otherwise is to pervert justice. The AFW.org website is maintained by DCP, led by Brother Dan Towle, which handles LSM's litigation. One would expect, after years of interactions with lawyers, the DCP-brothers would know these principles—that "striking parallels" don't establish proof; each case should be judged on its own merit. The LSM-brothers' central thesis is undermined by neglect of these basic principles. In the present context, closer examination reveals that in fact these two cases are distinctly different. That makes the LSM-writers' argument even more tenuous.

In 1992 the Toronto elders sent a letter<sup>7</sup> to "Brother X" telling him that due to his divisive activities he would no longer be received in the fellowship. The elders in Toronto gave three reasons for their action. The LSM-brothers examine these reasons one-by-one and try to establish the equivalence between Brother X's case and that of Titus Chu.

### **1. Brother X's Divisive Meetings & Work**

The Toronto elders told Brother X: "*You have your own weekly meetings without any proper fellowship and coordination with the elders. You are using these meetings to carry out your divisive work.*" (June 24, 1992)

The LSM-brothers comment: "*If in 1992 the Toronto elders quarantined a brother for carrying out his own meetings in rivalry with the meetings of the church in Toronto, why do they now seek to justify the divisive activities of Titus Chu? He now conducts his own trainings, conferences, and other works in rivalry with those carried out by the [blended] co-workers...*"

An important difference exists between in the sphere of Brother X's activities and those of Titus Chu. Brother X was a full-time brother serving the Chinese-speaking saints in Metro-Toronto. Financially he was being supported by the saints in Toronto. This brother was serving locally under the oversight of the Toronto elders. Brother X's gatherings referred to as "your own weekly meetings...to carry out your divisive work," were meetings in Toronto. The elders were dealing with a local problem—divisive activities within their locality—Toronto. As such the elders were overseeing church affairs in their own locality, as they should. The elders were within the bounds of their responsibility and authority in requiring Brother X (a Toronto full-timer) to have "proper fellowship and coordination with the elders." This also explains why the Toronto elders expressed concern that "*since October 1991 [Brother X] abruptly ceased to attend the regular weekly fellowship meetings of the elders and co-workers.*" That was a coordination meeting for Toronto.

### **"If you don't know the difference between the church and the work, there will be problems"—Ron Kangas**

Indeed the case of Titus Chu is distinctly different from that of Brother X. The "blended co-workers'" action, calling for Titus Chu's quarantine, arose within the sphere of 'the work' (in the first instance). Titus Chu's case was not initiated within the realm of a particular local church. It began with the "blended co-workers'" public declaration at LSM's elders' training in Whistler, BC. In claiming the two instances are equivalent, the LSM-brothers ignore the important distinction between the local church and the work.<sup>8</sup> As Brother Ron Kangas stated,<sup>8</sup> "*If you do not know the difference between the church and the work, there will be problems.*" The Toronto elders disciplined Brother X for his divisive activities in Toronto, the sphere of their oversight. As elders they have a clear scriptural mandate to do so (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2-3). In contrast Titus Chu's case falls within the sphere of the work, not a particular local church. The LSM-brothers' neglect of this important distinction means there are "*problems*" (Ron Kangas' term) with their analysis. It has led them to erroneously equate these two cases. However the Bible charges us to discern "*between things which differ*" (Phil. 1:9-10.)

### **"Global Elders" vs. local elders in Toronto**

In contrast to Brother X, the call to quarantine Titus Chu was initiated by 63 "blended co-workers" against their fellow-worker. Surely that is in the sphere of 'the work.' This raises the question—Is there a "global oversight" which oversees all the workers? Should the "blended co-workers" function as "global elders," overseeing the whole recovery, including all the workers? At

times it seems they assume such a position. A year ago some "blended co-workers" declared:<sup>9</sup> *"we are also cognizant of our responsibility to keep watch over the interest of God's allotment to us (Acts 20:31; 1 Pet 5:2-3)."* It is important to note here that both the biblical phrase, *"watch over...God's allotment"* and the Scripture references (*Acts 20:31; 1 Pet. 5:2-3*) refer to local-church elders. However, these blended co-workers clearly applied these Scriptures to themselves in the context of the whole recovery. Evidently, they regard themselves as "global elders" with the responsibility and authority to oversee the entire recovery. Yet is this concept Biblical? Is this what Brothers Nee and Lee taught? Watchman Nee said clearly, *"Let us note carefully that there are no elders in the Universal Church."* (Vol. 30, p. 46.) To establish a "global eldership" overseeing the recovery world-wide is unscriptural. Yet the two cases (Brother X and Titus Chu) are equivalent only if there is a "global eldership" with the responsibility and authority to deal with Titus Chu in the sphere of 'the work' which corresponds to the Toronto elders' responsibility and authority to deal with Brother X in the sphere of the local church.

### **One Centralized Global Company of Workers?**

The "blended co-workers'" view of 'the work' leads them to conclude that<sup>10</sup> *"we must serve in one company...under the proper leadership in the Lord's move."* In their paradigm, *"the proper leadership"* means all the workers world-wide should submit to the oversight of the "blended co-workers." However, Watchman Nee warned against the temptation<sup>11</sup> *"to attain the position of director over all of God's servants,"* because *"regardless of how man seeks after God's will, the Holy Spirit is always the unique Executor. He never needs man to be His manager."* Along the same lines, Brother Lee taught that,<sup>12</sup> *"No one should exercise any control over the work for the Lord..."* He elaborated, asking *"who can direct the acts of so many co-workers and serving ones? We do not have a board or a mission to direct the acts of the co-workers. No one is in a position to direct the ministers' acts."* It is ironic that while Witness Lee talked about not controlling the co-workers' acts, the LSM-brothers explicitly target the **"activities of Titus Chu."** They complain that Titus *"now conducts his own trainings, conferences, and other works in rivalry with...the [blended] co-workers..."* This exposes their own narrowness of heart in contrast to the broadness of Brothers Nee and Lee.

In Watchman Nee's view 'the work' is carried out by multiple companies of workers, (without any centralized human control) operating in their respective spheres under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, yet extending the "right hand of fellowship" to one another. Viewed from this biblical perspective, the fact that Titus Chu *"conducts his own trainings, conferences, and other works"* does not imply any *"rivalry with...the [blended] co-workers"* (contrary to the LSM-brothers allegation.) Titus Chu's case differs from that of Brother X because the former is in the sphere of the work, while the latter was in the church. The two are not equivalent. Moreover, the Toronto elders' rejected the "blended co-workers'" quarantine of Titus (in part) because it violates the principle that one worker company ought not to subjugate other workers in the guise of upholding 'one organic work.' As Brother Lee warned,<sup>13</sup> *"Today many [workers] overreach themselves and interfere with the jurisdiction of others. This overreaching and interference causes trouble."*

### **2. Brother X's Publications**

The Toronto elders wrote Brother X saying: *"You are involved in the writing and distribution of weekly publications which both openly and through innuendo attack the church, the Lord's recovery, the elders, and the ministry. These materials do not build up but rather undermine many of the truths and practices which we have followed for decades."* (June 24, 1992)

The LSM-brothers then comment: *"If in 1992 the Toronto elders quarantined a brother for carrying out his own publication work, why do they now condemn the co-workers' affirmation ...concerning being restricted in one publication work...? Why do they now stand with those, including both Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes, who have "openly and through innuendo attacked" both this [one publication] principle...and the co-workers...?"*

Here the LSM-brothers construct an unwarranted parallel. They contend the Toronto elders quarantined Brother X for doing *"his own publication work"* in violation of the 'one publication' principle, suggesting the Toronto elders accepted a 'one publication' policy in the 1990's. The LSM-brothers imply that the Toronto elders have since changed their stand by asking, Why then don't

the elders also condemn Titus Chu on the same grounds? The answer is simple. The discipline of Brother X in the early 1990's had nothing to do with LSM's 'one publication' policy. Two relevant facts are: first, LSM's 'one publication' policy was not promulgated until 2005 with the issue of *"Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery."* The LSM-writers are rewriting history by claiming their 'one publication' edict applied retroactively to the 1990's. In fact the 'one publication' policy never entered the elders' consideration in dealing with Brother X. Second, Brother X's publications were a local matter. His writings were<sup>14</sup> "local publications for local needs." As such Brother X's writings do **not** violate LSM's 'one publication' principle, even if it were in effect in the 1990's! The LSM-brothers are fully aware of this exception in their own 'one publication' policy which OK's "local publications for local needs." Yet they seek to mislead others. This argument is bogus. Hence any supposed "parallel" between the two cases based upon the 'one publication' policy is totally without factual foundation. The Toronto elders have not changed their stand on publications.

The issue raised by the Toronto elders was not Brother X's own publication work *per se*. Rather, the problem was the nature and content of his publications which the Toronto elders' charged, *"attack the church, the Lord's recovery, the elders, and the ministry [and] undermine many of the truths and practices which we have followed for decades."* Again as shepherds of the flock in Toronto, the elders were guarding the local saints against material they regarded as damaging, by disciplining Brother X. In today's situation the elders are exercising similar care in evaluating the nature and content of the ministries and publications to be received by the local church. In particular, since they see no Scriptural ground for LSM's 'one publication' policy, the elders don't agree with the wholesale distribution of that document in Toronto. Moreover, since 'one publication' isn't scriptural, what are the grounds for quarantining Titus Chu and others based upon their disagreement with this 'one publication' declaration? Surely this is non-scriptural discipline based upon a non-scriptural (and supposed) offense! There is no contradiction here. The Toronto elders have been consistent all along.

### **3. Toronto's Treatment of John So, Joseph Fung & Titus Chu—the Same or Different?**

The Toronto elders told Brother X, *"Recently you had close contact with John So and also conducted a meeting where Joseph Fung spoke to some of the local saints. These two have been quarantined by many churches in the Lord's recovery because they caused divisions..."* (June 24, 1992)

The LSM-brothers comment: *"If in 1992 the Toronto elders disciplined a brother because of 'his close contact and open involvement with...brothers who have been quarantined by many churches in the Lord's recovery because they caused divisions,' why do they now practice the same thing themselves?"* I understand the LSM-brothers' point to be—Brother X was disciplined (in part) because of his "close contact and open involvement" with John So and Joseph Fung, brothers under quarantine by many churches. Brother Titus Chu and others are currently being quarantined by many churches. Why then aren't the Toronto elders disciplining these brothers (i.e. Titus & co) and those who contact them?

The answer isn't that difficult. It's not rocket science! In their capacity as overseers, the elders decide which ministries are beneficial to the local church. In the early 1990's, based upon their understanding of the situation at the time, the Toronto elders felt the ministries of Joseph Fung (a worker from Hong Kong) and John So (from Germany) were not beneficial to Toronto. That's part of the elders' oversight. When a local full-timer, Brother X, provided a platform in Toronto for Joseph Fung to minister—that was a problem. The elders took appropriate measures with regard to both Joseph Fung and Brother X.

The Toronto elders are exercising the same kind of oversight now concerning which ministries (within the one New Testament ministry) are beneficial to the saints in Toronto. There's no contradiction here. There's consistency!

### **63 "Blended Brothers" are NOT 'The Body'**

Concerning Titus Chu, the LSM-brothers ask why the Toronto elders *"defend and maintain fellowship with a brother, Titus Chu, who has been quarantined by the Body for divisive activities."* First, let us unequivocally state that Titus Chu has not *"been quarantined by the Body."* Second,

the validity of the (alleged) "divisive activities" of which Brother Titus is accused, has not been established.

According to the Bible, Christ's Body includes all the genuine believers in every place throughout the age of grace. The Toronto elders reject as unscriptural and dangerously exclusive the concept that "*the recovery equals the Body.*" The "Warning Letter" calling for the quarantine of Titus Chu was signed by 63 "blended co-workers." Those 63 brothers are not "the Body." Neither do the various federations of churches which endorsed the "blended co-workers'" quarantine equal "the Body." Hence, the LSM-brothers' outrageous assertion that "*Titus Chu...has been quarantined by the Body*" is invalid. The elders likewise repudiate Brother Ron Kangas' contention that<sup>15</sup> "*This [quarantine] is NOT an action of LSM, it is the Body of Christ.*"

### **Toronto Eldership's Stand on Titus' Quarantine**

When the "Warning Letter" of quarantine was issued by the "blended co-workers," the Toronto elders, realizing the potential repercussions here, moved quickly to thoroughly examine this case. Based upon that review, it was determined<sup>16</sup> that the "evidence did not warrant the verdict," the case against Titus Chu was not proven. Hence, the Church in Toronto will continue to receive Brother Chu's ministry as long as it is deemed profitable. The Toronto elders are aware that many local churches have federated together to issue documents endorsing LSM's quarantine. Yet these "many churches" do not in aggregate constitute the Body, neither does their "feeling" necessarily represent the "feeling of the Body." Some of these churches admit in their endorsements that they have never heard Titus, nor read any of his writings. Their agreements appear to be "knee jerk reactions" to LSM's quarantine campaign. Other local churches, especially those familiar with Titus' ministry, have (after careful consideration) rejected the Warning Letter. Thousands of other local churches world-wide have simply remained silent. This latter category includes a vast number of churches in South America, Africa and mainland China. Beyond this there are millions of genuine believers, *bone fide* members of Christ's Body, who know nothing of the LSM-brothers' quarantine measure. In the midst of this complex situation, as a genuine local church, the elders in Toronto reserve the right to arrive at their own judgment on this issue<sup>17</sup> (with due consideration of other churches' views).

Nigel Tomes  
Toronto elder & co-worker

January, 2007

### **NOTES:**

1. The initial articles (the first in a series) were posted on "AFaithfulWord.org" (AFW.org) January 22, 2007. [This has also been posted on the Toronto site: "lastadam.com".] We are told the series consists of Introduction plus 3 parts. This article addresses the "Introduction" and "Part 1." The AFW.org website is maintained by LSM-affiliate, DCP headed by Brother Dan Towle, one of the "Blended Co-workers." We assume that this article has passed through LSM's "discerning check" and reflects the views of LSM's "blended co-workers." For simplicity, we refer to the authors as "LSM-brothers."
2. The "anonymous E-mail" comparing Vancouver and Toronto seems related to the piece entitled, "VANCOUVER 1992-3, TORONTO 2006-7—REPEATING HISTORY?" posted on concernedbrothers.com. We don't wish to address those issues here, except to note the following: The LSM-writers make the (unsubstantiated) claim that "*the brothers most vocal in criticizing the actions of the former leading ones in Vancouver were...elders and workers in the churches in Metro Toronto.*" They base this on correspondence between the Toronto elders and Vancouver's leading brothers. However, the goal of that correspondence was not to criticize Vancouver, but to solve the "spill-over effects" of a Toronto-brother's actions in that locality.
3. Introduction. The LSM-brothers inform the readers, "What you will find impossible to reconcile with the position taken by some of the Toronto elders today is the strong stand the Metro Toronto elders took in 1992 and 1993 against divisive activities and the case they made for honoring the feeling of other churches in the Body regarding the quarantine of a divisive brother [Brother X]."
4. Introduction.

5. The LSM-brothers' Introduction ends with the words: "So we ask: Has the truth changed, or have they changed? Were they wrong in their dealings with Vancouver then, or are they off the mark today?"
6. Part 1. The phrase in context reads: "**The parallels** between their [Toronto elders'] reasons for quarantining Brother X and the reasons behind the co-workers' letter of warning concerning Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers **are striking.**"
7. Dated June 24, 1992. "Brother X" left the Church in Toronto in 1992, taking with him a group of approx. 100 Chinese-speaking saints. A number of these launched a frivolous law-suit against the Church which was subsequently dismissed (but not before considerable legal expenses were incurred by the Church.) There was further dissent among the group which left, resulting in Brother X's departure from among them. Subsequently, he served as a "free-lance preacher" among Chinese-speaking congregations in the Toronto area, before being appointed to a pastoral position in a Mandarin Church in Mississauga, ON. Brother X's history of dissention, subsequent to departing from the Church in Toronto, casts some light on whether the elders' discipline in 1992-3 was justified. It is also relevant to the LSM-brothers' attempt to portray the cases of Brother X and Titus Chu as equivalent. Titus Chu & co have not left the recovery and have no intention of doing so.
8. As Watchman Nee noted, "*So the ministry, the work, and the churches are **quite different in function and sphere**, but they are really coordinated and interrelated.*" (W. Nee, Collected Works, vol. 30, p. 186.) Along these lines, Brother Ron Kangas has said, "The churches, the ministry and the work are quite different in function and sphere, but they are coordinated and interrelated....They are distinct. **If you do not know the difference between the church and the work, there will be problems** in your church life." [RK, *The Ministry*, vol. 9, No.6, (June 2005) p. 12]
9. Quote from DCP's article "**Why do LSM and the local churches...continue their legal efforts...**" [contendingforthefait.com](http://contendingforthefait.com) Feb. 27, 2006]
10. Quote from Bob Danker: "On the Minister of the Age and the Wise Master Builder" on AFW.org. According to the "blended co-workers' new paradigm," "*the situation in the first century was not satisfactory according to God's way in His economy...God's way is to have all His people serving Him under one vision to build up His unique divine building according to His unique design under the [human] supervision of one master builder.*" (Bob Danker)
11. Watchman Nee articulated his view to the Exclusive Brethren as follows: "**Some**, seeing the vast land of China, **are tempted to attain the position of director over all of God's servants.** How good this seems from a human point of view, because workers would then be distributed evenly, no one area having either too many or too few. We would say, however, that **regardless of how man seeks after God's will, the Holy Spirit is always the unique Executor. He never needs man to be His manager.**  
We need to exercise such faith in the lordship of the Holy Spirit that we will never form an economic center for the work. Man delights to divide money equally with all of God's servants so that no one will gain too much or too little. However, if we do this, where is the lordship of the Holy Spirit? During the past ten years we have endeavored to the best of our ability to give the Holy Spirit the complete lordship in this matter, letting Him direct the saints themselves or the local meeting. The result has been: "He who gathered much had no excess, and he who gathered little had no lack." **We must allow the Holy Spirit to exercise His lordship in everything. No matter how we have sought after His mind, we are never His assistants.** We must allow the Holy Spirit to do everything according to His will. We must also be clear whether the Holy Spirit is now exercising His authority or if we have **set ourselves up as a guard over the fellowship.**" [W Nee, Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 425, emphasis added.]
12. From W. Lee, [Leadership in the New Testament](#) p 15. The quote in context reads: "Furthermore, this leadership is not the leadership in the ministers' acts, but in their teaching, to restrict them from being divisive. Sometimes in the New Testament Paul told some of his co-workers to go to certain places (1 Cor. 4:17) or to remain other places (Titus 1:5). But basically speaking, **the leadership is not exercised over the ministers' acts. No one should exercise any control over the work for the Lord.** If one has the burden to go to Alaska, he must be clear that this going is of the Lord. No one controls his going or not going, but he need to be clear that his decision is of the Lord through fellowship with the Lord and the Body. There is **no restriction exercised in the movements of the workers**, but if someone rises up to teach something beyond the teaching of the apostles, the leadership may rise up to tell this one not to teach differently. The leadership which is shown in the New Testament is mainly in the teachings of the ministers, not in the acts of co-workers. As the Lord's recovery is spreading throughout the entire world, **who can direct the acts of so many co-workers and serving ones? We do not have a board or a mission to direct the acts of the co-workers.** No one is in a position to direct the ministers' acts." (Emphasis added)
13. Witness Lee, [Life Study of Second Corinthians](#), 1984, p. 452

14. The "One Publication" document explicitly says: "But being restricted in the **one publication does not mean, and has never meant, that individual churches are not free to produce and distribute materials for their local needs.** We have always had publications like this among us, and there have generally been no problems related to these. Songbooks, local tracts, church meeting outlines, testimonies, etc., have long been produced among us without controversy. **These are actually not part of the one publication** among us in that they do not involve all the churches. These are **publications that address local needs.**" (Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery, June 2005, emphasis added)
15. Message 1, LSM's US Thanksgiving Conference, Washington DC, Nov. 2006
16. See "The Determination & Recommendation" of the Toronto Review Committee
17. This position is consistent with Watchman Nee's view, after "reconsidering the churches' mission," in The Normal Christian Church Life. W. Nee says: "The local church is the supreme court. There is no organization to whose control it must submit, nor is there any organization over which it exercises control. It has neither superiors nor subordinates. If any one is received or refused by a local church, its judgment in the matter must be regarded as absolutely decisive. Even should the decision be wrong, all that can be done is to appeal for a reconsideration of the case. The local church is the highest church authority. If other churches object to its decisions, all they can do is resort to persuasion and exhortation. There is no alternative course, because the relationship which exists between the churches is purely spiritual, not official." He then gives an illustration:  
"If a brother who has been disciplined in Nanking moves to Soochow, and there proves himself to be innocent of the charge brought against him, then Soochow has full authority to receive him, despite the judgment of Nanking. Soochow is responsible for its actions to God, not to Nanking. Soochow is an independent church, and has therefore full authority to act as it thinks best. But because there is a spiritual relationship with Nanking, it is well for the brother in question not to be received before Nanking's mistake in judgment is pointed out to Nanking. If Nanking's relationship with the Lord is right, then it will pay attention to what Soochow has to say. But if it refuses to do so, Soochow cannot press anything against Nanking, because Nanking as a local church is directly responsible to the Lord alone, and has full authority to decide and act independently of Soochow. If the churches are spiritual, there will be no difficulty in their relationship one with the other. But if they are not, and difficulties should arise, we must not seek to solve them by interfering in any way with their independence, for it is ordained by an all-wise God." (W. Nee, Vol. 30, pp. 64-5)  
The Toronto elders recently applied these principles in communicating with the nearby Church in Brampton, according to W. Nee's advice that "Nanking's mistake in judgment [should be] pointed out to Nanking"