

A FAITHFUL WORD

S E R I E S S I X

"By the mouth of two or three witnesses"

**HAS THE TRUTH
CHANGED OR
HAVE SOME OF
THE METRO
TORONTO
ELDERS?**

Book

1

DEFENSE & CONFIRMATION PROJECT

© 2007 Defense and Confirmation Project

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval systems—without permission from DCP.

1st printing, May 2007

2nd printing, June 2007

Electronic printing, July 2007

Published by

Defense and Confirmation Project (DCP)

P. O. Box 3217

Fullerton, CA 92834

DCP is a project to defend and confirm the New Testament ministry of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee and the practice of the local churches.

Phil. 1:7 – Even as it is right for me to think this concerning you all because you have me in your heart, since both in my bonds and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel you are all fellow partakers with me of grace.

All verses and footnotes are from the Holy Bible Recovery Version, published by Living Stream Ministry. All books cited are publications of Living Stream Ministry and are from either *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee* or the published ministry of Witness Lee unless otherwise noted. Excerpts from the Recovery Version and the ministry of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee are copyrighted by Living Stream Ministry and are used by permission.

Unless otherwise indicated, the articles in this book are co-authored by Bill Buntain and Jeff Runkel with Dan Sady and John Metz.

Boldface type has been used for emphasis in quoted passages and is not in the original quoted material unless otherwise noted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	5
Introduction.....	7
Part 1 – The Metro Toronto Elders’ Basis for Quarantining a Brother In 1992	9
Part 2 – The Metro Toronto Elders Address a Church’s Refusal to Honor Their Quarantine in 1992-1993.....	17
Part 3 – Witness Lee’s Affirmation to Leading Brothers in Canada in 1993.....	25
Corrections to Statements Made by the Toronto Elders and Nigel Tomes.....	33

PREFACE

Deut. 19:15 – One witness only shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity or for any sin which he has committed; at the word of two witnesses or at the word of three witnesses shall a matter be established.

Matt. 18:16b – ...that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

1 Tim. 5:19 – Against an elder do not receive an accusation, except based upon two or three witnesses.

The warning letter quarantining Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers (see *“Mark Those Who Cause Division”*, book 1 of series 1 of *A Faithful Word*) was issued only after the co-workers had received numerous reports from many parts of the earth about the problems that have been and still are being caused by the work of Titus Chu and those working closely with him. This series of books includes reports from various places regarding the divisive activities and speaking of Titus Chu and his close co-workers.

Shortly after the co-workers’ letter of warning was issued, some of the elders in the church in Toronto announced that they would perform their own investigation to arrive at their own determination whether the quarantine of Titus Chu was justified. Some of the leading ones in the church in Toronto have long been associated with Titus Chu and were appointed to their leadership roles by him. Therefore it was not surprising that their “investigation” was a mere display and led to a public pronouncement that the quarantine was not justified and would not be honored.

The behavior of these Toronto elders was entirely contrary to the handling of a parallel situation by the leading ones in the Metro Toronto area in the early 1990s. At that time a brother was quarantined by the churches in Metro Toronto for carrying out an independent work, putting out his own publications, and associating with those who had been quarantined by the churches for divisiveness. They understood that quarantining a

brother in one church was quarantining him from the fellowship of all of the churches. When some leading ones in Vancouver (who have since left the churches) refused to honor their quarantine, the brothers in Metro Toronto wrote to them repeatedly telling them that their actions were “an offense to the Body.” In 1993 brothers from across Canada met with Brother Lee to review this situation. At that time he told them:

Should we listen to the churches or take care of our own personal observation of the situation? If we put the notification of so many churches aside and go to investigate the situation for ourselves, this is an offending to the Body. Do we respect the Body or do we respect ourselves? (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 32)

The articles in this book take a detailed look at this incident and how the handling of the present quarantine of Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers (including Nigel Tomes, one of the leading ones in Toronto) deviates from both the common practice of the churches in the Lord’s recovery and the earlier practice of the churches in the Metro Toronto area. They show that, contrary to their claims, the controlling elders radically changed their standing. (See the second book in this series—*Concerning Sectarianism and Abuse of Authority in Toronto*—to read the response of those who have stood faithfully for the oneness of the Body.)

The last article in this book is a set of answers to misrepresentations posted on the Internet by the opposing leaders in Toronto in response to the posting of our articles on afaithfulword.org.

INTRODUCTION

...[R]eceiving a person who has made trouble in the recovery and who is still making trouble involves the Body very much. If we behave ourselves properly, we are okay in the Body. But if we commit something that is condemned by the New Testament, the Body has the right to say something. The Body surely will check with a local church if there is a division-maker among them whom they have not disciplined. If they do not discipline such a one, they are wrong and are offending the Body. (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 31, from Witness Lee's speaking in a meeting with the elders of the churches in Canada on August 14, 1993)

A recent anonymous email attempts to draw comparisons between events that took place in the church in Vancouver in the early 1990's and events currently playing out in the church in Toronto. There are many parallels, but the author of this email does not have the facts straight. This email accuses the "soon to be blended brothers" of somehow mistreating those then in the lead in Vancouver. It overlooks the fact that the brothers most vocal in criticizing the actions of the former leading ones in Vancouver were not the existing co-workers ("soon to be blended brothers"¹) but elders and workers in the churches in Metro Toronto.² Included among these were Nigel

¹ This expression is not used by the co-workers, but comes from the dissenting anonymous e-mail.

² Saints began to meet as the church in Toronto in the 1960s. At that time a number of municipalities were federated into a regional government known as Metropolitan Toronto. In 1967 a number of municipalities were merged into a six-city configuration that included the City of Toronto, North York, and Scarborough, among others. The meeting hall of the saints was in North York, but the church in 1974 was incorporated as the church of the Torontonians. Subsequently, saints began to meet as the church in Toronto and the church in Scarborough. In 1998 the provincial government consolidated all six cities into the

Tomes and other strident critics of the co-workers and of the recent quarantine of Titus Chu. The author(s) of the anonymous email was either ignorant of or chose to disregard the large body of letters³ sent from the Metro Toronto brothers to the leading ones in the church in Vancouver. Some of the brothers who signed these letters are the same ones who reject the quarantine of Titus Chu today.

These letters demonstrate that a striking change has taken place in the stand taken by the authors of these early letters and the stand some of them⁴ are taking today. In this series of articles, we will examine the correspondence between the brothers in Metro Toronto and those in the church in Vancouver. The letters referenced in these articles can be seen at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/TorontoCorrList.html>. We encourage you to read them carefully. You will recognize many of the signers of these early letters as current or former elders in the church in Toronto. 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. Today, their public stand is 180 degrees removed from the public stand they took then. 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?

City of Toronto. Based on that decision, the three churches all became the church in Toronto with three halls corresponding to the meeting halls of the three churches. The correspondence referred to in these articles occurred when there were still three churches. Since all three acted in concert, we refer collectively to the brothers who signed the letters as the Metro Toronto brothers.

³ Most of the letters discussed in these articles were assembled in a packet distributed by the Metro Toronto brothers to all the churches in Canada on February 5, 1993.

⁴ Not all of the signers of the letters in 1992 and 1993 have endorsed the action some the Toronto elders have taken in rejecting the quarantine of Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers.

PART 1 – THE METRO TORONTO ELDERS’ BASIS FOR QUARANTINING A BROTHER IN 1992

Since certain ones are trying to make divisions among us and trying to cause others to stumble, what shall we do? We should, according to the apostles’ teaching, turn away from them and not tolerate them... (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 18, from Witness Lee’s speaking in a meeting with the elders of the churches in Canada on August 14, 1993)

Quarantining a Brother for Divisive Activities

On July 24, 1992, elders in the churches in Metro Toronto sent a letter to Brother X¹ telling him that due to his divisive activities he would no longer be received in the fellowship of the Lord’s recovery. The parallels between their 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. The elders in Toronto gave three reasons for their action:

- (1) 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.**

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 co-workers in the Lord’s recovery outside of “any proper fellowship and coordination” with them and, in fact, in defiance

¹ The identity of Brother X and of other brothers participating in his divisive activities are protected in these articles and in the correspondence posted at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/TorontoCorrList.html>.

of their admonitions and contrary to his prior agreements with them.

- (2) 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.**"

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 of Brother Lee's fellowship concerning being restricted in one publication work in carrying out the ministry in the Lord's recovery? Why do they now stand with those, including both Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes, who have "openly and through innuendo attacked" both this principle which has preserved the oneness of the churches in the Lord's recovery for decades and the co-workers who labor in the ministry in the Lord's recovery according to that principle? Why do they now defend the writings of Titus Chu and of those such as Nigel Tomes? Do they not acknowledge that these writings "undermine many of the truths and practices which we have followed for decades," including the ones articulated in their own correspondence with Vancouver?

- (3) 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**. The apostle Paul in **Romans 16:17** **exhorts us to mark those who make divisions and to turn away from them**.

The fact that Brother X had contact with quarantined brothers gave the Metro Toronto brothers grave concern. Although the activities of Brother X were, for the most part, carried out in one small area, the brothers from the Metro Toronto churches saw him as "...making division in the Body of Christ." 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? Furthermore, in the recent “Determination and Recommendation” of the church in Toronto, it was asserted that there was no scriptural basis for quarantining Titus Chu because he had not denied any essential item of the faith. However, here the Toronto elders themselves did not cite any essential of the faith that Brother X had denied; they only stated that his activities were divisive and therefore damaging to the church.²

The elders in Toronto stated that this action was necessary because:

Within the past year, on many occasions, collectively and individually, we have brought to your attention our serious concerns regarding your divisive activities among us. Ever since October 1991 when you abruptly **ceased to attend the** regular weekly **fellowship meetings of the elders and co-workers**, we have been seeking continuously to have face to face fellowship with you in order to address our serious concerns so that the oneness of the Body of Christ could be maintained.

In their dealings with Titus Chu, the co-workers tried through face-to-face fellowship to address the problems caused by his ministry for years. When he and those who work with him stopped participating in the co-workers’ times of prayer and fellowship and his defiant rejection of the co-workers’ fellowship became apparent, the co-workers wrote to him expressing their serious concerns concerning his ministry on three occasions—June 4, 2005; August 25, 2005; and June 27,

² The co-workers’ warning letter includes references to 15 portions of Scripture, as compared to only one in this letter. When the Metro Toronto brothers wrote to all of the churches in Canada on December 14, 1992, explaining their quarantine of Brother X, the two verses they cited as justification were Romans 16:17 and Titus 3:10, both of which deal with a divisive or sectarian person and both of which were quoted at the very beginning of the co-workers’ warning statement concerning Titus Chu and those who promote and disseminate his divisive teachings, publications, practices, and views. Thus, the claim by some brothers in the Metro Toronto churches that there is no scriptural basis for quarantining Titus Chu for his divisive activities is absolutely without merit by their own standard.

2006. In each case, he continued to spurn their pleas that he adjust his course.

Nigel Tomes first wrote to the co-workers raising concerns about the publication of the co-workers' affirmation of Brother Lee's fellowship concerning being restricted in one publication work. He received multiple responses, which he himself called "helpful." Nevertheless, when *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery* was released, he launched a public attack on the principle it articulated and eventually on many of the co-workers themselves. His rhetoric has been consistently strident and divisive. He has tried through twisting both the co-workers' statements and those of Brother Nee and Brother Lee to heap scorn on those seeking to continue in the same line of ministry established by Brother Nee and Brother Lee. He likewise has refused all correction and been unrepentant.

"Repent and Stop Divisive Activities"

The elders in Toronto concluded their letter to Brother X as follows:

Therefore, for the sake of keeping the genuine oneness of the Body, you force us to make the decision that **until you repent of and stop** your involvement in these divisive activities, **we can no longer receive you in the fellowship of the Lord's recovery.** As such a brother, you are no longer allowed to attend any church meetings. This decision will be made known to the saints in the three churches in Metro Toronto.

On June 27, 2006, the co-workers wrote a private letter to Titus, calling on him to repent. His response was to publicly post a broad attack on the co-workers on the Internet that was full of self-vindication and boastful pride concerning his work. In his response Titus twisted many of the co-workers' statements and assailed many understandings of the truth that have preserved the Lord's recovery in oneness for decades. If the Toronto elders were justified in quarantining a brother who refused to "repent of and stop" his involvement in divisive activities that were limited to the Metro Toronto area, how much more are the co-workers and the churches justified in quarantining brothers who

have publicly posted attacks on the leading ones in the ministry in the Lord's recovery for worldwide dissemination.

A World-Wide Quarantine

It is also significant to note that the elders in Toronto did not quarantine Brother X merely from the fellowship of the church in Toronto or the churches in the Metro Toronto area, but from "the fellowship of the Lord's recovery," meaning all of the churches in the Lord's recovery over the entire earth. In their view at that time a quarantine exercised toward a brother in one church was a quarantine of that brother in all of the churches.

Explaining to the Churches the Reasons for Quarantining a Brother

In a letter dated August 5, 1992, the elders and co-workers in the Metro Toronto churches informed the elders in all of the churches in Canada of their quarantine of Brother X. Their letter listed the same three reasons for quarantining him:

1. "Organizing his own weekly meetings ... outside of any proper fellowship and coordination with the local elders, in order to carry out his divisive work."
2. "His involvement in the writing and distribution of weekly publications which both openly and through innuendo attack the church, the Lord's recovery, the local elders and the ministry."
3. "His close contact and open involvement with ... brothers who have been quarantined by many churches in the Lord's recovery because they caused divisions."

The Metro Toronto brothers stated that they "fellowshipped with [Brother X] in private with the demand that he stop his working and learn to be a brother among us." But Brother X did not heed the demand. Instead he "...continued his involvement in the divisive meetings and publications." Similarly, the co-workers exhorted Titus Chu to abandon his independent work and bring it into the blending fellowship of all of the co-workers. Titus rejected that fellowship. In the opening of their letter to the churches in Canada, the Metro Toronto brothers stated:

Over the last few years, there have been indications of [Brother X]'s intention to set up his own work and by that lead the saints into division. We, as the elders tolerated many of his activities, hoping that through fellowship and time our brother could repent and be restored to the practical oneness which we enjoy in the Lord's recovery. The churches here have been going through a great turmoil, especially over the past two years, mainly due to [Brother X]'s working among the saints.

By all appearances, the elders in Toronto took the proper approach in trying to rescue this brother. They endured Brother X's activities for a period of time, hoping that the brother could be rescued through shepherding. Only when the brother's unwillingness to repent became openly manifest and the turmoil in the church caused by his divisive activities rose to the level that it demanded action did the elders act to discipline him. This matches the steps taken by the co-workers in their attempt to rescue Titus Chu from becoming a factor of division in the Lord's recovery. For many years they tried to shepherd him both one-on-one and through the blending fellowship of the co-workers. Because of the confusion caused in the recovery by his dissemination of his own publications and by their content, the co-workers were compelled to clarify their standing concerning publication work in *Publication Work in the Lord's Recovery*. Only after the opposition of Titus Chu and those who aggressively supported him became very public and after the divisive effect of his work among the churches became increasingly manifest did the co-workers take the serious step of issuing the warning statement concerning him.

As you read this August 5, 1992 letter please consider what you have read and heard from the dissenting elders in Toronto and others who have rejected the quarantine of Titus Chu. It is ironic that the three things carried out locally by a brother fourteen years ago caused the Metro Toronto brothers to say, "... we can no longer receive him as a brother" while today they defend Titus Chu for doing the same things on a far more global scale.

Expecting the Churches to Heed Their Quarantine

Near the end of this letter they asked the elders to whom they were writing to “refuse this brother in fellowship in the church where you bear responsibility and to watchfully oversee and advise your local saints who may have contact with [Brother X].” They did not ask the church there to establish a “Review Committee” or to issue a “Determination and Recommendation” concerning whether or not the quarantine exercised by the Metro Toronto churches was justified. They bluntly said “refuse this brother.”

The Scriptural Basis for Quarantine

In their letter to the other churches, the Metro Toronto brothers offered no scriptural basis for their quarantine of Brother X. This may have been because they knew that it was understood among those who bear responsibility in the churches that divisiveness is a scriptural ground for quarantine. Today, some cite an alleged lack of scriptural basis as a reason that the church in Toronto and other churches would not honor the blending co-workers’ letter of warning regarding Titus Chu. Some have argued that since, in their view, Titus has not deviated into heresy regarding any essential item of the faith, there is no ground to quarantine him. Yet, the Metro Toronto brothers cited no essential items of the faith that Brother X had repudiated; they only cited his divisiveness as sufficient ground for quarantine. They demonstrated a clear understanding of both Romans 16:17 and Titus 3:10 that is sorely lacking in the dissenters’ writings now.

Conclusion

In 1992-93 the brothers from the Metro Toronto quarantined a brother for participating in divisive activities. That quarantine was based on three factors concerning the brother’s actions:

1. Carrying out his own meetings,
2. Producing and disseminating his own divisive publications, and
3. Associating with brothers who had been quarantined by the Body.

Today many of the same brothers in Metro Toronto defend and maintain fellowship with a brother, Titus Chu, who has been quarantined by the Body for divisive activities. This brother has his own publication work and carries out his own trainings, conferences, and other work outside of fellowship in the Body and in rivalry with the general ministry in the Lord's recovery. Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes attack the co-workers and the churches in the Lord's recovery both directly and through innuendo. Just as in 1992, the result has been division.

In the conclusion of "Determination and Recommendation," a number of brothers in Toronto, all but one of whom signed the 1992-93 letters, state that the quarantine of Titus Chu is improper because he has not denied the essentials of the faith. We ask these brothers in Toronto, Did Brother X deny the essentials of the faith? If divisiveness in the local situation in the Metro Toronto churches was grounds to quarantine this brother from fellowship with all of the churches in the Body, is it not more justifiable to quarantine a brother whose work has caused turmoil and division among the churches around the globe?

**PART 2 – THE METRO TORONTO ELDERS
ADDRESS A CHURCH’S REFUSAL
TO HONOR THEIR QUARANTINE IN 1992-1993**

Should we listen to the churches or take care of our own personal observation of the situation? If we put the notification of so many churches aside and go to investigate the situation for ourselves, this is an offending to the Body. Do we respect the Body or do we respect ourselves? (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 32, from Witness Lee’s speaking in a meeting with the elders of the churches in Canada on August 14, 1993)

Addressing a Church’s Refusal to Honor Their Quarantine

Some of the elders and directors of the church in Toronto have falsely accused the co-workers of applying pressure to the church there to go along with the quarantine of Titus Chu. They challenge the authority of the co-workers in issuing their warning. If we turn back the clock to 1992 we find the Metro Toronto brothers being far more assertive in calling upon all of the churches in Canada to honor their quarantine of Brother X than the blending co-workers have been thus far concerning the quarantine of Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers. The Metro Toronto brothers wrote multiple letters on this subject when the church in Vancouver refused to go along with the Metro Toronto brothers’ quarantine of Brother X.

On August 13, 1992 the leading brothers in Vancouver responded to the quarantine letter from Toronto, stating that they had “...received the other side of the picture from different sources.” They declared further that until they had a clearer picture, they could not and would not heed the request of the brothers in Metro Toronto. The essence of their refusal to heed the demand of the Metro Toronto brothers was their contention that a brother quarantined in one locality was not necessarily quarantined in all localities. Their response caused the brothers

in Metro Toronto to respond on September 4, 1992 with a four-page letter to the brothers in Vancouver. In this letter they recapped their time of fellowship with a dissenting leading one from Vancouver. They expressed their disappointment that the issues raised were not fully addressed and explained that they wrote to air their concerns and make their stand clear. The Metro Toronto brothers reminded the brothers from Vancouver that:

In Romans chapter 14, Paul exhorted us to receive those brothers who differ from us in practice and doctrine. However, in the same book, Paul also charges us to turn away from division makers. Brothers, while we endeavor to practice the receiving of the believers, should we not also practice Paul's word here in chapter 16? The goal of both charges is to preserve the oneness of the Body of Christ.

They quoted the stand of the brothers in Vancouver, "So long as a brother has not caused trouble (division) here in Vancouver, we will receive him (regardless of the trouble he has caused in other local churches)." The brothers from Metro Toronto responded as follows:

If our understanding is correct, your policy is radically different from the established practice of the local churches.

Near the end of this letter the Metro Toronto brothers criticized the Vancouver brothers for continuing to receive and welcome this divisive brother "regardless of the damages he has wrought in other churches." They then ask:

Brothers, what is your view of the Body of Christ? Since we are one body, is not damage to other localities damage to you? Brothers, where do you stand in relation to the oneness of the Body of Christ?

If these questions were asked of the dissenting elders in Toronto today, what would their response be? In rejecting the quarantine of Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers, they are rejecting the testimonies of elders and co-workers from Korea, Taiwan, China, Singapore, Malaysia, Ghana, and the United States. Do they assert that they have certain knowledge that these reports from the churches and the co-workers throughout the earth are false? On what basis do they set themselves up as

authorities above the testimonies of so many churches and the warning of the co-workers? Has the truth changed, or have they?

Appealing to the Ministry of Brother Nee

On December 14, 1992 the brothers in Metro Toronto sent a five-page letter to the elders in the churches in Canada that consisted of excerpts from the ministry of Watchman Nee arranged by topic. According to the Metro Toronto brothers, “These writings clarify the stand of the Lord’s Recovery and the practice of the local churches these many years.” They pointed out from Brother Nee’s ministry that no church should act independently of the other churches in deciding whether to receive a brother and that a brother disciplined in one locality should be considered under discipline of all of the churches. They then expounded on Romans 16:17 and Titus 3:10 concerning turning away from one who causes divisions and refusing a factious person. They concluded by stating that in regard to their decision to quarantine the divisive brother:

It is based upon his [Brother Nee’s] understanding of the scriptures and the established practice of the Lord’s Recovery since the time of Brother Nee, that we wrote informing you of our decision to discipline a certain brother and requesting that this brother not be received into the fellowship of the local churches you oversee.

“Strongly Offended” by Any Church Not Cooperating with Their Quarantine

On December 18, 1992 the brothers from Metro Toronto sent an 11-page letter to the brothers in Vancouver that listed seven points in which the leading brothers from Vancouver had “strongly offended the churches in Metro Toronto.”

The Metro Toronto brothers reminded the brothers in Vancouver of the

...very clear fellowship from Brother Watchman Nee regarding the matter of dealing with division in a local church and the manner in which other local churches should cooperate with such a decision in the principle of the “One Body.”

They further reminded the brothers from Vancouver that there should not be any contention in the churches (1 Cor. 11:16), but that "...what one church does [in disciplining a brother], all the churches should do..." Today a number of the Toronto elders and others have exercised their own preference and feeling in rejecting the decision to quarantining Titus Chu. They have rejected "the principle of the 'One Body'," which they formerly espoused, and now no longer propose that "what one church does, all the churches should do."

The next paragraph in the letter contains a very telling quote, especially taken in light of today's situation. The Metro Toronto brothers said that both Brother Nee and Brother Lee had expounded Romans 16:17-20 and Titus 3:9-11 clearly. They stated that the brothers from Vancouver evidently had an interpretation that was different from both Brother Nee and Brother Lee. In regard to the teaching of both Brother Nee and Brother Lee the Metro Toronto brothers said, "Their practical teaching preserves the health and oneness of the Body of Christ. Why do you refuse to accept their fellowship regarding these scriptures?" The same question could be asked today of the brothers who reject the quarantine of Titus Chu. What has changed to cause the brothers from Toronto to abandon their previous burden to maintain and preserve the health and oneness of the Body of Christ?

In the following paragraph the Metro Toronto brothers stated that the leading brothers in Vancouver were "taking a different direction" and "straying from the path" because they refused to follow Toronto in the matter of quarantining Brother X and Brother Joseph Fung. What the Metro Toronto brothers are doing in rejecting the quarantine of Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers is exactly the same in principle as what they so strongly accused the brothers in Vancouver of doing. To use their own words, these dissenting elders are "taking a different direction" and "straying from the path," that is, they are deviating from the practice in the Lord's recovery built up through the ministry of Brother Nee and Brother Lee, a practice they championed fourteen years ago.

The Metro Toronto brothers concluded this portion of their letter with the following:

Frankly, you three brothers [in Vancouver] have caused a serious offense against the Body! By your habit of receiving brothers, being disciplined by the Body, i.e. Brother X and Joseph Fung, you are offending the local churches and therefore damaging the oneness of the Body of Christ.

How we wish all the Metro Toronto brothers would heed these words today!

Near the end of the letter the Metro Toronto brothers tell the Vancouver brothers:

You brothers have believed the “few” dissenting saints without confirming the facts with the elders here and then you have acted presumptuously on unconfirmed facts by sympathizing with them...

The same is true today of the decision of some to reject the quarantine of Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers. The dissenting elders made no attempt to confirm the facts that were presented in the meeting in Whistler in which the co-workers’ letter of warning was presented. How could they then have the assurance to reject that warning?

In their conclusion to this letter the Metro Toronto brothers again brought the topic back to maintaining the practical oneness in the Lord’s Body:

However, when it comes to the practical oneness of the Lord’s Body it would be irresponsible for us to ignore Romans 16. We testify that, it was because of the vision of the One Body, that the Lord Jesus led us out of the denominations, Brethrenism and the free groups! To now tolerate the things we experienced in Babylon annuls our treasured vision and glorious experience these many years.

It seems many of these same brothers no longer treasure this vision today. When they wrote this letter, their vision was of the practical oneness of the Body of Christ, and at that time they refused to tolerate anything that would annul this vision. The vision has not changed; they have.

Protesting Damage to the Oneness of the Body

In a letter dated January 25, 1993¹ the Metro Toronto brothers wrote again to the leading ones in Vancouver. The letter was yet another attempt to persuade the leading ones in Vancouver to clear up their offense. Again the Metro Toronto brothers asked the brothers in Vancouver what their views of the truth and the one Body were:

While you stress that the saints should follow the teachings of Watchman Nee, it seems you have ignored one of the most crucial commitments of his ministry—the oneness of the Body of Christ. You have given the saints under your care the feeling that you are one with the churches in the Lord's Recovery. Yet, at the same time it seems that you have ignored the fact that some brothers are divisive. Their activities are damaging the oneness of the Body. Dear brothers, according to our observation, your receiving brothers is according to your own taste and preference, rather than upholding the principles of the one Body.

Near the end of the same letter the brothers from the Metro Toronto churches gave their own testimony regarding openness to all the brothers in the Lord's Recovery:

We in the churches in Metro Toronto are happy that we have received help from, are still being supplied by, and remain open to brothers in the Lord's Recovery outside of our localities. This is how we are in fellowship with all the other churches in the Lord's Recovery.

Today, some of the leading brothers in the church in Toronto seem to be cutting themselves off from the fellowship of all of the churches. This will surely be a great loss to the church under their care.

Conclusion

In 1992-93 the brothers from the Metro Toronto churches were very strong in their expectation that all the other churches in

¹ This letter is dated January 25, 1992, but in the opening paragraph the authors say they are responding to a January 9, 1993 letter from the brothers in Vancouver; an obvious mistake was made in dating the letter. It should have been dated January 25, 1993.

the Lord’s recovery should follow them in their quarantine of Brother X. They demonstrated an understanding of the requirement in Romans 16:17 and Titus 3:10 to deal with division-makers and factious persons. They appealed to Brother Nee’s ministry to show that the discipline exercised by one local church should be respected and applied by all local churches. They stated that by refusing to honor the quarantine exercised by the churches in the Metro Toronto area, the leading ones in Vancouver had “strongly offended the churches in Metro Toronto” and were not upholding the principle of the one Body.

Today some of the elders in Toronto claim that those who uphold the quarantine of Titus Chu are somehow interfering with the “local administration” of the church in Toronto. Such a sectarian position cannot be reconciled with their earlier strong rebuke of the church in Vancouver and their subsequent correspondence with all of the churches in Canada. That case involved damage on a much smaller scale to the Lord’s Body than is occurring today through the divisive activities of certain brothers.

PART 3 – WITNESS LEE’S AFFIRMATION TO LEADING BROTHERS IN CANADA IN 1993

...The churches in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan also sent out an open letter to quarantine these ones. In this matter we are touching a great truth, the truth of the Body. Do we honor the Body? The churches in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan are parts of the Body. Should we not honor them and respect their feeling? (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, pp. 18-19, from Witness Lee’s speaking in a meeting with the elders of the churches in Canada on August 14, 1993)

Standing with the Churches’ Quarantine of Divisive Ones

On February 1, 1993, the elders of the churches in Metro Toronto wrote to the leading ones in Vancouver criticizing their receiving of brothers who had been quarantined by other churches. The Metro Toronto brothers’ letter cited the reasons that four brothers had been quarantined by the churches. They said:

These four brothers:

- 1) have denied the standing of the churches in the Lord’s recovery;
- 2) have produced divisive meetings;
- 3) have attempted to draw saints away from the local churches to follow after themselves; and
- 4) have made unfounded and malicious attacks upon some leading brothers in the recovery and especially upon Brother Lee and his ministry.

Today, Titus Chu and those divisive workers standing with him have likewise denied the standing of all of those local churches who acknowledge the leadership of the co-workers in the ministry, calling them “ministry churches.” This was the same

accusation made by the divisive ones quarantined in the 1980s toward those churches that acknowledged Brother Lee's leadership in the ministry (see *The Practice of the Church Life according to the God-ordained Way*, pp. 15-16 and pp. 28-29; and *The Ministry of the New Testament and the Teaching and Fellowship of the Apostles*, pp. 13-14). The divisive nature of Titus Chu's work is being increasingly manifested as elders appointed by him have taken action to cut their churches off from the fellowship of the Body and to consolidate their control, in some cases through mass ex-communication of longstanding members of the churches in their localities. Furthermore, no one can deny the malicious tone of the unfounded attacks by Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes on the leading co-workers in the Lord's recovery who are laboring to continue in the line of the ministry of Watchman Nee and Witness Lee.

The elders in the Metro Toronto churches declared:

The open letter from the churches is **not only indicative of the stand of those churches, but also of the stand of the Body of Christ**, which includes the churches in Canada, and the stand of many saints in the Church in Vancouver. Why brothers, would you oppose the stand that is for the maintaining of the oneness of the Body and the furtherance of the Lord's Recovery? We earnestly plead with you to reconsider your position in this matter for the sake of the Lord's recovery and the oneness of the Body of Christ. Why should we not quarantine those who have spiritually torn down many dear saints and have brought in confusion and serious harm to many churches? Isn't this a grave offence to the Lord and a tremendous damage to His Body and His churches?

With respect to Joseph Fung and [Brother X], you have clearly violated the teaching of the scriptures in Romans 16:17 and Titus 3:10. These verses are crucial for the Body of Christ to protect itself from the germs spread by division makers. However, in order to justify your position, you have taught differently from the New Testament and both brother Watchman Nee and brother Witness Lee regarding the meaning and use of these verses.

Here the elders in the Metro Toronto churches equated the stand of the churches in California with the stand of the Body of

Christ. They recognized that to not stand with the quarantine of ones who had been quarantined by a group of churches because they “have spiritually torn down many dear saints and have brought in confusion and serious harm to many churches” was “a grave offence to the Lord and a tremendous damage to His Body and His churches.” It seems the elders in Metro Toronto who oppose the quarantining of Titus Chu today have completely lost such a realization of the Body.

The Churches’ Serious Concern Regarding the Elders’ Standing

On February 5, 1993, three brothers wrote on behalf of the elders in Metro Toronto to all of the churches in Canada about their mutual concern regarding the standing of the leading ones in Vancouver: “... we, like you, are very concerned regarding the standing of the elders of the church in Vancouver.” With their letter they included copies of all of the correspondence between themselves and the leading ones in Vancouver since April 1992.¹ In their letter the Metro Toronto brothers said that the leading ones in Vancouver:

...have, based upon rumour, drawn improper conclusions regarding the situation in Metro Toronto and have participated in activities which have undermined the oneness of the Body of Christ. We do not state this lightly.

By effectively separating the churches receiving his ministry from full and open fellowship with all of the other local churches, Titus Chu and those working with him have created an environment in which the saints in those churches do not really know the situation of the Lord’s recovery as a whole. In this isolated condition, even the elders can easily draw improper conclusions based on rumors and false reports spread by Titus Chu, Nigel Tomes, and others. As in 1993, those who spread rumors and false reports have led many to participate “in

¹ Most of the letters referenced in these articles are from this packet. Copies are posted at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/TorontoCorrList.html>.

activities which have undermined the oneness of the Body of Christ.” As then, this should not be taken lightly.

Brother Lee’s Fellowship with the Leading Ones from Canada

In the summer of 1993 some brothers from Canada asked for a time of fellowship with Brother Lee to review what had transpired in Vancouver and to seek a way for the churches in Canada to go on in one accord. On August 13-15 about 30 brothers from across Canada, including brothers from Metro Toronto, met with Brother Lee in his home. Brother Lee’s fellowship from that time became *The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*. We encourage all of the saints to read this book in its entirety as it is very applicable to the present situation in the Lord’s recovery. Here are a few excerpts (emphasis added):

The fifth problem is that we do not care for the discipline. The discipline is to turn away from the troublemakers. Besides the opposition outside of us, there has been turmoil within. **Since certain ones are trying to make divisions among us and trying to cause others to stumble, what shall we do? We should, according to the apostles’ teaching, turn away from them and not tolerate them...** (p. 18)

...I mentioned only four names of ones who should be quarantined. **The churches** in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan **also sent out an open letter to quarantine these ones**. In this matter we are touching a great truth, the truth of the Body. Do we honor the Body? The churches in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan are parts of the Body. **Should we not honor them and respect their feeling?** But some were not clear and strong to keep the truth to maintain the feeling of the Body, which comprises all the churches. (pp. 18-19)

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 Body is the Body of Christ, constituted by the Triune God with all the believers on this earth, with all the local churches.

Both the ministry and many churches in the recovery made a decision to quarantine certain divisive ones. Some did not accept this decision and have even joined these divisive ones. They have disregarded the feeling of the Body. How we behave ourselves depends upon the degree of our seeing of the Body. (pp. 28-29)

...[R]eceiving a person who has made trouble in the recovery and who is still making trouble involves the Body very much. If we behave ourselves properly, we are okay in the Body. But if we commit something that is condemned by the New Testament, the Body has the right to say something. **The Body surely will check with a local church if there is a division-maker among them whom they have not disciplined. If they do not discipline such a one, they are wrong and are offending the Body.** (p. 31)

Regardless of how much help we have received from a certain one in the past, if he does something that offends the Body, we must practice the truth. We must know the Body and trust in the Body. The churches in California wrote an open letter because they felt burdened and were held responsible to let the churches on this globe know the damage certain ones did in California and the loss which they had suffered. In this open letter they said that they had made the decision to quarantine these ones. Should we listen to the churches or take care of our own personal observation of the situation? **If we put the notification of so many churches aside and go to investigate the situation for ourselves, this is an offending to the Body. Do we respect the Body or do we respect ourselves?** (p. 32)

Sadly, some of the brothers in Metro Toronto have departed from Brother Lee’s fellowship and from such a proper realization of the Body. Through their rejection of the co-workers’ warning letter quarantining Titus Chu and certain of his workers and of the affirmations of that action by so many churches, they are offending the Body, just as the leading ones in Vancouver did when they rejected Toronto’s quarantine of Brother X and the churches’ quarantine of Joseph Fung.

“Their Stand Is Our Stand!”

After meeting with Brother Lee, the elders representing the churches in Canada, including the elders and workers in Metro Toronto, wrote an open letter to the ones causing divisions in Vancouver and in Toronto on August 23, 1993. (On August 30, 1993, they attached this letter to an open letter to all of the churches in the Lord’s recovery.) In it they said:

This letter is to make known our objection to your sectarianism. You have separated yourselves from the fellowship of the universal body of Christ and specifically from the fellowship of the local churches, the expression of the one body! As brothers representing the churches in Canada, we declare that we cannot sanction your way of divisiveness.

You all have demonstrated your separation from the fellowship by rejecting the discipline by so many churches, of Joseph Fung and brothers like him, and have carelessly ignored the damage which these brothers caused to the Body of Christ. As the churches in Canada, **we stand in oneness with the decision of the other churches on the earth! Their stand is our stand!**

It is impossible to reconcile these statements with the current standing of those in the church in Toronto who publicly reject “the discipline by so many churches.” In a recent article posted on the Internet, Nigel Tomes dismisses the churches’ letters of affirmation of the co-workers’ action in quarantining Titus Chu by saying, “Federations of local churches through their leaders are pledging allegiance to the ‘blended co-workers.’” Such a twisting of the churches’ letters cannot be reconciled with the joint statement of the churches in Canada which Nigel himself signed standing in oneness with the decision of the other churches on the earth. It appears that Nigel’s standard of truth is that such affirmations are proper when they support his position and improper when they do not.

Conclusion

After a careful reading of this article and all the letters on which it is based, it is evident that a number of the leading ones in Toronto today have abandoned their previous standing for the practice of the oneness of the Body of Christ in the Lord’s

recovery. These brothers both continue to receive and defend Titus Chu and Nigel Tomes. In doing so, they are acting contrary to Brother Lee’s personal fellowship with the elders in Canada in 1993, in which he warned them that not being faithful to deal with “a division-maker among them” is an offense against and a damage to the Body (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 31). They are also acting contrary to their own stand of just 14 years ago.

Sadly, the dissenting ones in Toronto can no longer declare, “We stand in oneness with the decision of the other churches on the earth!” No longer is the stand of the churches their stand. Their current stand is actually the same as the one they criticized the leading ones in Vancouver for taking in those days. They have separated themselves “from the fellowship of the universal body of Christ and specifically from the fellowship of the local churches, the expression of the one body!” The truth does not change; the brothers in Toronto have. What a tragic loss to them and to the saints in Toronto who would follow them!

CORRECTIONS TO STATEMENTS MADE BY THE TORONTO ELDERS AND NIGEL TOMES

We had intended to write only three articles regarding the deviations of some of the Toronto elders from their realization of the practicality of the Body life in their correspondence with the leading ones in Vancouver in the early 1990s. However, because of the responses posted on the church in Toronto's Web site, we feel we must clarify a few points. On their Web site they have posted both brief announcements and more detailed responses written by Nigel Tomes. Since there is considerable overlap and both were posted as representing the Toronto elders (which is itself a falsehood¹), we will address the inaccuracies in both of them together.

1. The title of Nigel's article—"Toronto's Discipline of 'Brother X' vs. LSM's Quarantine of Titus—A Response to LSM's Attempt to Discredit Toronto's Eldership"—is deceptive. Living Stream Ministry did not quarantine Titus Chu. The decision to quarantine him was the outcome of much fellowship and prayer over months and years among the co-workers who care for the work and the churches across the entire globe. In addition, the article posted on DCP's Web site was not written by LSM, nor does LSM sponsor www.afaithfulword.org, as Nigel alleges. Nigel has consistently made LSM a target of his attacks by grossly distorting its role.
2. The statements representing the Toronto elders and Nigel Tomes' second article claim that the authors of the article in our site are anonymous. This is also false. The home page of

¹ As the elders in Toronto know very well, not all of the elders there agree with the actions being taken in the name of the church and of the eldership. At least two of the elders have been marginalized and excluded from many decisions recently because they do not agree with the direction the other elders are taking.

www.afaithfulword.org plainly states, “Unless otherwise indicated, the articles on this site are co-authored by Bill Buntain with Dan Sady and staff.” Nigel (who is one of the elders in Toronto) knows this, because he has referred to us as the authors of the articles on the site in at least seven articles of his own. Even though it is factually wrong, Nigel’s position seems hypocritical since he has never expressed the slightest concern over the numerous anonymous articles posted on an anonymously operated Web site to which he has submitted his own dissenting articles for publication.

3. The second article by Nigel Tomes faults us for basing our articles on “private correspondence between the elders of the churches in Vancouver and Toronto,” saying, “several of these letters were clearly marked ‘Confidential’.” Actually, it was the leading ones in Metro Toronto who thrust this correspondence into the public arena in 1993. In a letter to all of the churches in Canada dated February 5, 1993, brothers representing the churches in Metro Toronto released the once “confidential” letters:

Since the elders in Vancouver have deferred fellowshipping regarding these important outstanding matters which relate to the truth concerning our stand in the Lord’s recovery, we believe it would be helpful to all the leading brothers in Canada, to have a copy of all the correspondence between Metro Toronto and Vancouver since April, 1992.

This was clearly pointed out in the introduction to this series of articles, where we said:

Most of the letters discussed in this article were assembled in a packet distributed by the Metro Toronto brothers to all the churches in Canada on February 5, 1993.

Further, we believe we have taken care of any confidentiality issues by hiding the names of Brother X and the others who were being disciplined by the church.

4. Nigel Tomes says:

The LSM-writers [again a false designation] 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.

The facts on which this “unsubstantiated” claim is made are these: There are 21 pieces of correspondence which the leading brothers from the churches in Metro Toronto either sent or received. There is no evidence that any other church came close to that volume of correspondence with Vancouver in that time period. We agree that the “goal of the correspondence was not to criticize Vancouver,” and we did not criticize the leading brothers in Toronto for what they wrote to the leading ones in Vancouver. But as the chain of correspondence shows, the brothers in Metro Toronto did become increasingly strong in criticizing the actions of the brothers in Vancouver in ignoring the Body’s quarantine of divisive members.

5. The Toronto elders’ statement and Nigel’s article argue that the quarantine was improper because it was announced in a statement by co-workers. They make the unbiblical claim that only the elders of a local church can quarantine someone. In this they have plainly changed their position from what it was in the early 1990s. The quarantine of Joseph Fung and three other brothers was first spoken by Brother Lee in a meeting with the elders following the 1989 Winter Training (*The Fermentation of the Present Rebellion*, p. 7). In that meeting Brother Lee followed Paul’s example in the New Testament to issue a warning. In his epistles, Paul exhorted the saints in Rome to quarantine certain division-makers (Rom. 16:17), and he charged his fellow worker, Titus, to refuse factious men (Titus 3:10). Brother Lee’s warning was subsequently confirmed by letters from a number of churches.

In *The Fermentation of the Present Rebellion*, I mentioned only four names of ones who should be quarantined. The churches in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan also sent out an open letter to quarantine these ones. In this matter we are touching a great truth, the truth of the

Body. Do we honor the Body? The churches in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan are parts of the Body. Should we not honor them and respect their feeling? But some were not clear and strong to keep the truth to maintain the feeling of the Body, which comprises all the churches. (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, pp. 18-19, from Witness Lee's speaking in a meeting with the elders of the churches in Canada on August 14, 1993)

When Brother Lee said that four brothers should be quarantined, he was speaking as a worker. He was not an elder in any church. His statement came out of his fellowship with many co-workers concerning the problems being caused by these four brothers among the churches. The confirming letters from the churches in California, West Malaysia, and Taiwan were written in the following months. Thus, in his later review of the history of this quarantine with the leadings ones from the churches in Canada, he said:

Both the ministry and many churches in the recovery made a decision to quarantine certain divisive ones. (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 29)

The sequence in the quarantine of these four brothers exactly matches what was done in the quarantining of Titus Chu and others—it was first spoken as a warning and an exhortation by brothers representing the ministry and the work in the Lord's recovery and subsequently confirmed by the churches. The churches in Metro Toronto did not object to the quarantine of the divisive ones in the 1990s, but rather supported it. Thus, the stand of the elders in Toronto regarding who can exercise quarantine has clearly changed.

6. Nigel's article consistently asserts the autonomy of local administration in the exercise of quarantine. For example, he says:

It is the elders' jurisdiction to determine whether a brother should be quarantined in the local church they oversee.

As a genuine local church, the elders in Toronto reserve the right to arrive at their own judgment on this issues (with due consideration of other churches' views).

In their capacity as overseers, the elders decide which ministries are beneficial to the local church.

The clear position of the Toronto elders today is that a local church need not respect a quarantine of divisive members by other churches or by the leading co-workers, that quarantine is purely a local matter, and that each local church can receive whoever they choose without regard to the damage those ones have caused elsewhere. This is in stark contrast to the following statements in the letters written by the leading ones in Metro Toronto in the 1990s to the leading ones in Vancouver:

Brothers, what is your view of the Body of Christ? Since we are one body, is not damage to other localities damage to you? (Letter from the Metro Toronto brothers to the leading ones in Vancouver—August 13, 1992)

It is based upon his [Brother Nee's] understanding of the scriptures and the established practice of the Lord's Recovery since the time of Brother Nee, that we wrote informing you of our decision to discipline a certain brother and requesting that this brother not be received into the fellowship of the local churches you oversee. (Letter from the elders and co-workers in North York, Toronto, and Scarborough to the elders of the churches—December 14, 1992)

...very clear fellowship from Brother Watchman Nee regarding the matter of dealing with division in a local church and the manner in which other local churches should cooperate with such a decision in the principle of the "One Body." (Letter from the elders and co-workers in North York, Toronto, and Scarborough to the leading ones in Vancouver—December 18, 1992)

Frankly, you three brothers [in Vancouver] have caused a serious offense against the Body! By your habit of receiving brothers, being disciplined by the Body, i.e. Brother X and Joseph Fung, you are offending the local churches and therefore damaging the oneness of the Body of Christ. (Letter from the elders and co-workers in North York, Toronto, and Scarborough to the leading ones in Vancouver—December 18, 1992)

Clearly the leading ones in Vancouver felt the ministry of the ones quarantined by Toronto and those quarantined

through Brother Lee's fellowship and the affirmation of the churches in California, Malaysia, and Taiwan were beneficial to the church in Vancouver. Nevertheless, the brothers in Metro Toronto saw Vancouver's receiving of these brothers as a violation of the principle of the "One Body," an offense to the Body, and a damage to the oneness of the Body.

Furthermore, the position of the Toronto elders today is diametrically opposed to Brother Lee's fellowship in the elders' trainings in the 1980s:

If you exclude one from your local church, you exclude one from the Body. If you are not receiving one into your local church, you are not receiving one into the Body. This aspect is above the regions and also above the churches. It is a Body matter and not just a local church matter. (*Elders' Training, Book 4: Other Crucial Matters Concerning the Practice of the Lord's Recovery*, p. 32)

Brother Lee's fellowship with the leading ones in the churches in Canada in 1993, fellowship in which brothers from Metro Toronto participated, confirmed this point. Following that fellowship all of the leading ones from Metro Toronto, including Nigel Tomes, joined the other churches in Canada to issue a joint statement in which they sharply criticized the leadings ones in Vancouver for rejecting the discipline exercised over divisive brothers by other churches.

7. Both the Toronto elders' statement and Nigel's article accuse the rest of the Lord's recovery of adhering to a concept of "a centralized global company of workers with a co-ordinated administration ('global elders') over all the local churches." This false accusation was carefully answered in the article "Concerning Regions of the Work and Companies of Workers."²
8. Both the Toronto elders' statement and Nigel's article state that our article entitled "Has the Truth Changed or Have Some of the Metro Toronto Elders?—Part 1" attempted to apply the "one publication" principle retroactively to the

² *Regions of the Work and Companies of Workers*; also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/RegionsCompanies.html>.

1990s. Actually, Brother Lee had presented the need to be restricted in one publication in 1986 (*Elders' Training, Book 8: The Life-pulse of the Lord's Present Move*, pp. 161-165), and this principle had long been practiced by those taking the lead in the ministry in the Lord's recovery. However, our intention was not to apply the "one publication principle" (as Nigel calls it) to the publication work of Brother X; it was to point out the inconsistency in the stance of the current Toronto elders. In 1992 they recognized that a separate publication work that was critical of the leadership and the ministry was damaging to the oneness of the local church. Nevertheless, today they defend a separate publication work that is critical of the leadership and the ministry in the Lord's recovery and which has damaged many saints and churches. Whether one accepts the "one publication principle" or not, the fact is that Titus Chu's publication work specifically and his work generally have produced contention and division among the churches in the Lord's recovery.

9. Both the Toronto elders' statement and Nigel's article imply that the quarantine of Titus Chu was based solely on his refusal to be restricted in one publication. That is not true. Titus' insistence on carrying out a separate publication work to disseminate his own teachings was only one of the factors in the decision to quarantine him. It was only one symptom of his persistence in carrying out a divisive work without regard to the damage it was causing in and among the churches.
10. Both the Toronto elders' statement and Nigel's writings claim that the evidence presented at Whistler did not justify a "verdict" of quarantine and justifies their rejection of the co-workers' statement on that basis. This claim misrepresents the nature of the co-workers' fellowship in Whistler. It assumes that the goal of the Whistler was to present a "case" to the standard of a court of law. It was not. It was to inform the elders and the churches represented at Whistler of a decision reached through the co-workers' prayerful fellowship and to provide a general sketch of some of the factors on which that decision was based. The imposition of a court paradigm with a requisite standard of

evidence is merely an artifice to allow Titus' partisans to reject the co-workers' fellowship.

11. Both the Toronto elders' statement and Nigel's article claim that the church there performed its own investigation into the facts behind the quarantine in the statement of warning. There are several problems with this claim. The quarantine was based on numerous reports of problems that have been caused by Titus Chu's ministry throughout the earth. Do the Toronto elders seriously mean that they investigated these reports? For example, did they talk to:
 - a. The sixty-three co-workers and elders who signed the letter of warning, to clarify any of the issues behind the quarantining of Titus Chu?
 - b. The co-workers in Taiwan who reported that Titus Chu's work there had resulted in divisions?
 - c. Any of the co-workers who spoke about Titus Chu's divisive activities in mainland China?
 - d. The leading brothers in the churches in Ghana who reported divisions caused by Titus Chu's work there?
 - e. The leading brothers in the church in Kampala, Uganda, or the workers who raised up the church there and who subsequently withdrew from the work because of misrepresentations made to them and because the divisive activities of workers sent there by Titus Chu (see "An Account of Events in Kampala by Tim Knoppe" in *Concerning Titus Chu's Divisive Work in Uganda*)?
 - f. The leading brothers in the church in Milwaukee, a church that was split by the divisive activities of workers sent by Titus Chu (see "A Letter from the Church in Milwaukee"³)?
 - g. The leading brothers in the churches in Maryland and northern Virginia, where a divisive split was initiated by a brother associated with Titus Chu?

These are just a few of the many instances that informed the co-workers' decision before the Lord to take the serious step of quarantining Titus Chu and certain of his co-workers. Nigel quotes the following passage to defend the Toronto

³ [http://www.afaithfulword.org/corresp/Letter from the Church in Milwaukee.pdf](http://www.afaithfulword.org/corresp/Letter%20from%20the%20Church%20in%20Milwaukee.pdf).

elders' decision not to honor the quarantine carried out by the co-workers and so many churches:

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. (*The Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, vol. 30, pp. 64-65)

We would ask: In what way has Titus proved "himself to be innocent of the charge brought against him" as it relates to his divisive activities in the Far East, in Africa, in the U.S., and elsewhere? Rather it seems that the elders in Toronto have fallen into the same trap they warned the brothers in Vancouver of in 1993:

Yet, at the same time it seems that you have ignored the fact that some brothers are divisive. Their activities are damaging the oneness of the Body. Dear brothers, according to our observation, your receiving brothers is according to your own taste and preference, rather than upholding the principles of the one Body. (Letter from brothers representing the churches in North York, Scarborough, and Toronto to the leading ones in Vancouver—January 25, 1993)

What was carried out by certain ones in the church in Toronto was unmistakably an attempt to vindicate Titus Chu and not a "thorough investigation" into the facts behind the co-workers' letter of warning. Furthermore, we would ask these elders in Toronto: When Brother Lee spoke of the need to quarantine certain ones, did the elders in Toronto perform their own investigation? From their own words in writing to the church in Vancouver it does not appear so:

You all have demonstrated your separation from the fellowship by rejecting the discipline by so many churches, of Joseph Fung and brothers like him, and have carelessly ignored the damage which these brothers caused to the

Body of Christ. As the churches in Canada, we stand in oneness with the decision of the other churches on the earth! Their stand is our stand! (An open letter from the churches in Canada to divisive brothers in Vancouver and Toronto—August 23, 1993; subsequently attached to a letter sent to all of the churches in the Lord's recovery on August 30, 1993)

This letter (as are some of the others mentioned in these articles) was signed by Nigel Tomes. Can he really say he has not changed, that he has not abandoned his former commitment to the practicality of the oneness of the Body of Christ?

12. The very fact that the elders in Toronto performed their own "investigation" is contrary to the fellowship Brother Lee had in 1993 with the leading ones in the churches in Canada following the incident in Vancouver. Witness Lee's fellowship vindicated the stand taken 14 years ago and reproves their stand taken today:

If we put the notification of so many churches aside and go to investigate the situation for ourselves, this is an offending to the Body. Do we respect the Body or do we respect ourselves? (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 32)

Both the ministry and many churches in the recovery made a decision to quarantine certain divisive ones. Some did not accept this decision and have even joined these divisive ones. They have disregarded the feeling of the Body. (*The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 29)

13. Both the Toronto elders' statement and Nigel's article ridicule the idea that the warning statement of the co-workers and the affirmation of so many churches is an expression of the feeling of the Body. The Toronto elders' statement says:

The AFW article makes the false claim that "Titus Chu has been quarantined by the Body." The article is wrong in assuming that 63 "blended brothers" are "the "Body" [sic] or that the affirming churches are "the "Body" [sic]. At most, they are only a very tiny fraction of the Body. Thousands of local churches (in S. America, Africa,

Europe & mainland China) have remained silent on this matter, not to mention the hundreds of millions of other believers in the Body who were unaware they were involved in such an action of ‘quarantine’.

It should be obvious to any thoughtful reader that such a statement makes the practice of the Body life, particularly in dealing with divisive members, a practical impossibility. The elders in Toronto seem to be asserting that no action can be considered something “by the Body” or representing the feeling of the Body unless it is endorsed by every local church and by every believer on the earth. This also is a deviation from their former realization, as their letters to the leadings ones in Vancouver testify:

The open letter from the churches is not only indicative of the stand of those churches, but also of the stand of the Body of Christ, which includes the churches in Canada, and the stand of many saints in the Church in Vancouver. Why brothers, would you oppose the stand that is for the maintaining of the oneness of the Body and the furtherance of the Lord’s Recovery? (Letter from the elders of the churches in Metro Toronto to the leadings ones in Vancouver—February 1, 1993)

Furthermore, Nigel’s absurd assertion that this demonstrates that we “do not consider all believers to be members of the Body” has already been fully answered in our article entitled, “Practically Speaking, for Us the Body Today is Just the Lord’s Recovery”—Did Minoru Chen ‘Go Beyond What Has Been Written?’”⁴

14. Nigel’s second article asserts that we are wrong in saying the Toronto brothers “seem to be cutting themselves off from the fellowship of all of the churches.” Perhaps we should have said they seem to be cutting themselves off from the *common* fellowship of all of the churches. They consider visiting saints, elders, and co-workers as a hostile force “attacking” the church! One elder even demanded that a brother who used to live in Toronto get permission before

⁴ “‘Practically Speaking, for Us the Body Today is Just the Lord’s Recovery’—Did Minoru Chen ‘Go Beyond What Has Been Written?’”, also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/RecoveryBody.html>.

visiting with family members still in the church there. The common fellowship of the churches is the fellowship of the one Body of Christ that includes all of the local churches. Notably all of the visiting workers are brothers with long associations with Titus Chu and all of the churches mentioned have had strong historical ties with Titus Chu's work. The point is that the church in Toronto and some of the other churches that have cut off fellowship with the churches and brothers that are not under Titus Chu's work are in danger of being local sects because they no longer participate in the common fellowship among all of the churches. Rather, fellowship with them is contingent upon accepting the ministry of Titus Chu, and those who receive the ministry of the co-workers are threatened with the elders' "discipline."

If only the group of churches in your district are blended together, that is not the unique blending. That is a "sect blending." (*The Ten Great Critical "Ones" for the Building Up of the Body of Christ*, p. 60)

The local churches should fellowship with all the genuine local churches on the whole earth to keep the universal fellowship of the Body of Christ. Any local church that does not keep this universal fellowship of the Body of Christ is divisive and becomes a local sect. (*A Brief Presentation of the Lord's Recovery*, p. 44)

15. The Toronto elders' statement says, "We are appalled at the ferocity of this attack." We believe the articles we wrote are fair (if frank), accurate, and thoroughly documented. Our articles merely challenge the Toronto elders to live according to the standard they set for others based on their former realization of the oneness of the Body of Christ.

We would further ask: Why are these brothers not appalled at the ferocity of the attack upon Living Stream Ministry and the co-workers in the Lord's recovery carried out by Titus Chu in his open letter of July 22, 2006, or by Nigel Tomes in many articles spread out over the past year and a half? Do the brothers feel that Nigel is justified in attacking Benson Phillips, Ron Kangas, Ed Marks, James Lee, Minoru Chen, Andrew Yu, Living Stream Ministry, the Taiwan Gospel Book Room, the church in Hong Kong, and all of the

churches he accuses of “knee-jerk” reactions in affirming the co-workers’ letter of warning? Do they justify the accusation by Titus, Nigel, and others that the co-workers were lying about LSM’s involvement in the attempt to take Recovery Versions of the New Testament into mainland China, even though LSM’s version has been fully affirmed by the testimony of the brother who was at the center of this incident (see “An Introduction to the Open Letter of Kwong Keung Lai” and “An Open Letter of Clarification Concerning an Inaccurate Account of Events Concerning Me in Titus Chu’s Public Response in a Letter to the Blending Co-workers” in *Concerning Attacks on Living Stream Ministry*)? Do they feel that Titus Chu, Nigel Tomes, and those who agree with them are due a “free pass” to malign the reputations of the co-workers and that no one is allowed to call them to righteous account?

The Toronto elders recently decided to have an early business meeting to ask for a mandate that would cement their control over the church’s affairs. Yet they accuse LSM of seeking to control the church in Toronto. Actually, it is the Toronto elders who have exercised unseemly control in Toronto. It is the Toronto elders who branded 77 of their own members as “LSM-aligned” because they wrote the elders expressing concern over the direction the church was taking. It is the Toronto elders who set up a video camera in one of the meeting halls to monitor what the saints are speaking. It is the Toronto elders who have tried to intimidate members who participate in certain home meetings.

Conclusion

Nigel Tomes’ writings exhibit a disturbing theme. When he is caught in a lie or distortion, he makes no attempt to correct it.⁵

⁵ There are many examples of this. For example:

1. Nigel’s accusation that James Lee said “one publication” should be added to the seven ones in Ephesus 4 was false (see “Adding ‘One Publication’ to the Seven ‘Ones’ in Ephesians 4—What Did James Lee Really Say?” in *A Pattern of Twisting(1)*; also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/SevenOnes.html>).

When his unfounded assertions are carefully answered, he simply repeats his imaginations without acknowledging that the answers have already been given. As we have noted, his entire line of argument on a “global company of workers” and his claim that we do not consider other Christians as members of the Body of Christ have been carefully and thoroughly answered

2. Nigel’s misrepresentation of Brother Lee’s speaking by quoting half of one sentence to argue that Brother Lee wanted multiple publication works when in fact the context of his speaking was the need to be restricted in one publication work (see “My Intention... Was to Encourage You to Write’—What Did Witness Lee Really Say?” in *A Pattern of Twisting (1)*; also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/WritersConf.html>).
3. Nigel’s claim that the Hong Kong Book Room was a separate publisher, ignoring Brother Lee’s clear testimony of Brother Nee’s arrangement of the publication work (see “Was the Hong Kong Book Room a Separate Publisher? — What Did Watchman Nee Really Say?” in *A Pattern of Twisting (1)*; also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/HongKongBkrm.html>).

Although neither Titus nor Nigel have ever retracted falsehoods published on the Internet or in print, the issues on which Nigel’s lies had been exposed were dropped from Titus’ letter of July 22, 2006. Only those points that we had not yet answered were included. Will they now withdraw their false accusations against LSM and the co-workers regarding the arrest of Brother Kwong Keung Lai (Li Guangqiang) in mainland China in light of Brother Lai’s own statement that their allegations were false (see “An Introduction to the Open Letter of Kwong Keung Lai” and “An Open Letter of Clarification Concerning an Inaccurate Account of Events Concerning Me in Titus Chu’s Public Response in a Letter to the Blending Co-Workers” in *Concerning Attacks on Living Stream Ministry*; also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/reports/KwongKeungLai.html>)? Will they now renounce their twisting of Brother Benson Phillips’ speaking regarding the need for fellow-ship among the churches (see “Receive All the Churches and Then All the Believers—What Did Benson Phillips Really Say?”, in *A Pattern of Twisting (2)*; also available at <http://www.afaithfulword.org/articles/ReceivingChurches.html>). These are just a few examples among many that could be cited showing the lack of commitment to even the lowest standard of the truth.

already. Rather than deal with those answers in a straightforward manner, Nigel merely repeats his accusations as if no answer had been given. This is not the work of one who is concerned for truth; rather, it follows a well-known principle of propaganda—if you repeat a lie often enough, people will begin to believe it.

The saints should all understand that Nigel Tomes himself was specifically mentioned in the co-workers' fellowship at Whistler as one of the divisive co-workers of Titus Chu from whom, according to the co-workers' warning statement and based on Romans 16:17, we should turn away. It is a shame that the elders controlling the church in Toronto have not only failed to deal with Nigel Tomes as a divisive brother, but they have given him a platform to carry on his divisive activities with the approval of and even representing the leadership of the church.

