

Concerning Bro. Lee's ministry

1. What is the distinction between the **“riches of Bro. Lee's ministry”** (which is a matter of constitution as a crucial aspect and should be received, enjoyed, preserved, propagated continuously and indefinitely) and his **“personal active ministry”** (which is a matter of leadership in the work as a major aspect and practically has ended due to his physical death)? (See Acts 20:24 and 2 Tim. 4:6~8 referring to the anticipated end of the apostle Paul's course and ministry)
2. Should we not honor Bro. Lee's concern for the Lord's recovery by focusing on the matter of encouraging all the saints to be constituted with the **“riches of Bro. Lee's ministry”** (cf. Eph. 3:8) that he has bequeathed (in the form of printed & electronic publications and recorded audio & video tapes of his messages) to the churches in the Lord's recovery, and propagating these riches in various ways continuously and indefinitely for the building up of the Body?
3. What does Bro. Lee mean when he said that, **“Nothing else on this earth is upon my heart at the end of my course. I must treasure the end of my course”** (Witness Lee, *A Word of Love*, p. 46, 1996), and that **“he treasured the end of his ministry very much”**, referring to the last three and a half years of his life (LSM, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 7, No. 6, p. 16, August 2003)? Does this not indicate that Bro. Lee foresaw the approaching end of his personal active ministry, due to the thorn that the Lord has given him (Witness Lee, *A Word of Love*, p. 46, 1996), in the same manner as the apostles Paul and Peter expected the imminent end of their course and ministries (Acts 20:29; 2 Pet. 1:14; 2 Tim. 4:6-8)?
4. When Bro. Lee said that Bro. Nee was forced to **“discontinue his ministry for six years”** (Witness Lee, *WATCHMAN NEE A Seer of the Divine Revelation*, p. 180, 1991) and that **“his ministry was terminated for six years”** (*ibid.*, p. 181), does this not show that a person's active ministry is confined by the element of time and restricted under the specific circumstances in which he operates? In other words, should this not indicate that a person's operative ministry on the earth cannot continue indefinitely?
5. What does Bro. Benson Phillips mean when he spoke, together with Bros. Andrew Yu and Albert Lim, in a series of meetings at a Full Time Training in the Far East in March 2003, saying that **“Watchman Nee's ministry was terminated due to his imprisonment.”** (Literature Center, *The New Man*, Vol. 18, Issue No. 2, p. 7, April 2003)? If Watchman Nee's ministry can be terminated because of imprisonment, should not the matter of physical death be more of an impediment to the carrying on of anyone's personal ministry (cf. Heb. 7:23-24)?
6. Aside from the Lord Jesus Christ, whose ministry is unique, eternal, and unalterable due to His death, resurrection, ascension, and exaltation (Mar. 1:14 fn. 1; Acts 1:11 fn. 2; 2 Cor. 1:4 fn. 1 paragraph 2; 2 Cor. 1:22 fn. 3; 2 Cor. 4:1 fn. 2; Eph. 4:12 fn. 3; 1 Tim. 1:12 fn. 1; Heb. 7:1 fn.1; 7:17, 24; 13:20 fn. 2), is there any other New Testament minister who was able to resurrect from the dead in order to continue his personal ministry in perpetuity?

Concerning the so-called “blended co-workers”

7. What does the speaker (in a series of gospel meetings in Moscow 1992) mean when he said, **“When an ordinary human being dies, it is the end of his career, no matter how great a person is. Once he leaves the world, his work [the issue of a person's ministry] is over. But the death of Christ was not the end of Christ; rather, it was the capstone to His work. Death signaled not the termination of His career but the very culmination of His achievements.”** (LSM, *Christ is God*, p. 18, Moscow 1992)? In spite of this clear statement, why do the so-called “blended co-workers” continue to mislead so many dear saints in the Lord's recovery into acknowledging that Bro. Lee's personal active ministry, with its accompanying leadership in the work, now has been carried over and succeeded by the so-called

“blended co-workers” as his “extension” (See page 5 of LSM’s policy declaration dated June 30, 2005, entitled “*Publication Work in the Lord’s Recovery*”)? Is this not the doctrine of apostolic succession as practiced by the Roman Catholic Church and the major protestant denominations?

8. Did not Bro. Lee clearly say that **“I definitely do not mean that my ministry is the unique [New Testament] ministry”** (Witness Lee, *Life-Study of 2 Corinthians*, Message 27, pp.235-236); also that **“The ministry among us is not the ministry of a single person, but the unique New Testament ministry”** (Witness Lee, *The God-ordained Way to Practice the New Testament Economy*, p. 172, 1987); and Bro. Lee said that **“I made it clear repeatedly by my writings that when we say ‘the ministry’, we are referring to the New Testament ministry, not just my ministry. If my ministry is a part of that ministry, thank God for this”** (Witness Lee, *The Problems Causing the Turmoils in the Church Life*, p. 16, 1993)? Why then did Bro. Benson Phillips insist on contradicting Bro. Lee by saying that **“we declare strongly that his [Bro. Lee’s] ministry could never be over because his ministry is the New Testament ministry”** (Benson Phillips, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 275, Jan. 2006)? Also, why does Bro. Benson insist on contradicting Bro. Lee’s speaking by saying that **“his ministry could never be over”** (*Ibid.*, p.275), when Bro. Lee himself said that **he treasured the end of his course** (Ref. Witness Lee, *A Word of Love*, p. 46, 1996) and that **“he treasured the end of his ministry very much”**, referring to the last three and a half years of his life (Ed Marks, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 7, No. 6, p. 16, August 2003)? How can the so-called “blended co-workers” be so whimsical and capricious in contradicting Bro. Lee’s word, while professing to be constituted with the riches of his ministry, by saying that **“all of the things that have been presented in these gatherings [seven feasts] are directly from his [Bro. Lee’s] ministry”** (Benson Phillips, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 276, Jan. 2006)? Do the so-called “blended co-workers” really know Bro. Lee’s ministry?
9. Since Bro. Lee himself already said that **“he treasured the end of his ministry very much”**, referring to the last three and a half years of his life (Ed Marks, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 7, No. 6, p. 16, August 2003), why then do the so-called “blended brothers” insist on the perpetuating of Bro. Lee’s personal ministry through institutionalization and organization (by quoting from alleged unpublished notes of a purported LSM meeting in page 5 of the policy declaration entitled “*Publication Work in the Lord’s Recovery*” dated June 30, 2005), with the intention of assuming the present leadership in the work, the ministry, and the churches in the Lord’s recovery? Is this not the explicit warning of Bro. Lee against “organization” in deformed and degraded Christianity (Ref. Witness Lee, *The God-ordained Way to Practice the New Testament Economy*, p. 28-29 & 169, 1987)? Should they not focus, emphasize, and perpetuate instead the riches of Bro. Lee’s ministry that is constituted with the unsearchable riches of Christ, which he has bequeathed (in the form of printed & electronic publications and recorded audio & video tapes of his messages) to the churches for the organic building up of the Body?
10. Who and what are the names of the present so-called “blended brothers”? How are they appointed according to the Scriptures? What is the scriptural basis of their assuming the present leadership in the work, the ministry, and the churches in the Lord’s recovery? Can the mere quoting of a few sentences from Bro. Lee’s letter dated March 24, 1997 with the subject “*A Letter of Fellowship with Thanks*”, be a sufficient basis for claiming the apostolic authority and leadership in the work by the so-called “blended co-workers” (See page 54 of a publication compiled by the so-called “blended co-workers” in December 2004, which they arbitrarily entitled as “*Remaining in the Unique New Testament Ministry of God’s Economy under the Proper Leadership in His move*”, and placing Bro. Lee’s name on the book cover, implying to be the author, without Bro. Lee’s knowledge or approval)?
11. What is the scriptural basis and spiritual authority for the so-called “blended co-workers” to call the twice yearly **“international elders’ trainings”**, when the majority of the churches in the Lord’s recovery were not directly or indirectly established by them and the respective elders of these local

churches were not directly or indirectly appointed by them? Was it not Bro. Lee, as the acknowledged spiritual father of all of the present leading co-workers in the Lord's recovery (see document referred to as *The Phoenix Accord Among Leading Co-workers in the Lord's Recovery*, point 7 under 'Principles', February 2003), who has the spiritual authority to call such international elders' trainings starting in February of 1984 (Witness Lee, *Elders' Training – Book 1*, Foreword by Bro. Benson Phillips, Nov. 1985)? Can the so-called "blended co-workers" claim the apostolic authority of Bro. Lee to justify the calling of the twice yearly "international elders' training"? In what meeting or in which book did Bro. Lee explicitly confer his apostolic authority upon the so-called "blended co-workers", in order for them to have the spiritual authority to call and conduct a twice yearly "international elders' training"? What is the scriptural basis for such a practice of "**apostolic succession**" in the Lord's recovery today?

12. It remains a question whether Bro. Lee himself would appreciate to be referred to as the "acting God" by the saints in the Lord's recovery. When Bro. Lee called the prophet Samuel as the acting God during his time (Ref. Witness Lee, *Life-Study of 1 & 2 Samuel*, p. 43, Dec. 1993), he used the past tense "**was**" in saying that "**As God's representative, Samuel was the acting God**" (*Ibid.*, p. 43), realizing that Samuel was a normal human being subject to the limitation of his physical existence on the earth, no matter how high a position he has attained (Ref. *Ibid.*, p. 43). Why then did Bro. Ron Kangas use the present tense "**is**" when referring to Bro. Lee as the acting God by saying that "**we must be one with the wise master builder, who is the acting God**" (Ron Kangas, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 212, Jan. 2006)? With all due respect to our dear Bro. Lee, but is Bro. Ron Kangas implying that Bro. Lee can be 'present with us in name only', but not in reality? What kind of teaching is this and what is the scriptural basis for saying that a New Testament minister can exist in name only, but not in reality, after his death? Did not Bro. Lee clearly say that the prophet Samuel's ministry on the earth also ended, although he had reached the highest position at the time when Saul was raised up to be king in Israel (Ref. Witness Lee, *Life-Study of 1 & 2 Samuel*, p. 43, Dec. 1993)? If the ministry of the prophet Samuel as the acting God during his time came to an end, should it not also apply to any other ministers of the Old and New Testament?
13. When presenting his thesis that referred to Bro. Lee and the apostle Paul as acting Gods [sic], why did Bro. Ron Kangas use the original Greek text (*architekton*, S.753) for the phrase "master builder" in 1 Cor. 3:10 on the one hand, while arbitrarily applying and comparing it to the RCV's English translation "Architect" (same English translation as NIV and NASB, but different from ASV and KJV) on the other hand for Heb. 11:10 in support of his argument? Should he not also use the original Greek text (*technites*, S.5079) for Heb 11:10 when referring to the English translation of the word "Architect" for comparison with the Greek word for "master builder" in 1 Cor. 3:10, which then would clearly show that they are actually two different words and meaning in the original Greek text, and therefore unequivocally contrary to his own conclusion of the subject (Ref. Ron Kangas, *Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 213, Jan. 2006)? Is this how the Bible is interpreted? Is this not what Bro. Lee expressly warned us against the "twisting and deforming of the truth" (Ref. Witness Lee, *A Word of Love*, p. 60, Sept. 1996)?
14. Did not Bro. Lee clearly say that we should "**hold the complete revelation of the entire holy Scriptures properly and without any twisting and deforming**" (Witness Lee, *A Word of Love*, p. 60, September 1996) and that "**the very great particular characteristic in the Lord's recovery is to do everything according to the Bible**" (Witness Lee, *Elders' Training – Book 7*, p. 107)? Also, did not Bro. Nee say that "**the Bible is our only standard...if it is not the Word of the Bible, we could never agree even if everyone approved of it**" (*Collected Works of Watchman Nee*, Vol. 7, p.1231) and that "**whatever the Bible does not have, the church must by all means reject**" (Watchman Nee, *Further Talks on the Church Life*, p. 64, 1951)? Why then did one of the so-called "blended co-workers", during the Winter Training of 2004 when referring to the matter of "one publication", totally disregarded Bro.

Nee's and Bro. Lee's clear and emphatic word by saying that **“it is not a matter of right or wrong, biblical or non-biblical. It is a matter of whether there is one sound or more than one sound.”** (Minoru Chen, *The Ministry Magazine*, Vol. 9, Issue 1, p. 186, Jan. 2005)? Is this not again a blatant contradiction to what Bro. Lee said as the very great particular characteristic in the Lord's recovery, which is to do everything according to the Bible (Ref. Witness Lee, *Elders' Training – Book 7*, p. 107)?