

William E. Mallon  
11327 SW 172 Street  
Miami, FL 33157

December 16, 1987

My dear Brother Lee,

I am both grateful to you and appreciative of your telephone call on Wednesday, December 9. After much consideration, I felt led, being greatly indebted to you, to respond to you in writing, giving you the more detailed explanation you searched for over the phone. I do this out of faithfulness to the Lord and you. Please understand that I respect you very highly, my heart is compassionate toward you, and my sympathies are fully with you during this hour of frustration.

Please permit me to fellowship in all honesty and candor. Knowing that honesty risks arrogance just as humility risks hypocrisy, yet if honesty and humility become tainted, we must "choose the difference between honest arrogance and hypocritical humility." In other words, we should do nothing at the expense of truth and reality.

To write the following is extremely embarrassing, and to touch certain matters is very loathesome. In order to disassociate myself from any hint of self-interest, self-serving ambition, self-righteousness, and self-vindication, I feel inwardly pressed to reiterate the removal of myself from the work; otherwise, I could never feel the liberty to delineate the facts, which I will try to do as accurately as I can. Let us now come immediately to these facts, each of which I will summarize briefly and add a few comments.

1. In the Spring of 1986, the office purchased a house near Davison campus, just north of Charlotte. Their fellowship with the brothers was not only withheld, but the brothers were also censured as being unfit for coordination and too slow for cooperation. Roger Fiero was selected by the office to take charge as a full-time worker, a brother of whom everyone in the South was extremely reluctant. I suggested that we should go slow with this brother, but upon hearing this, the office deliberately and hastily purchased the house and installed this brother into position, flagrantly declaring that when the Lord moves, He moves quickly, that time is important and the door is now open to North Carolina, and that we have only a little time to be faithful. They utilized this brother and went on a promotional campaign to push this project by means of video tape.

Later, at an Irving training, the office called on the carpet Brothers who represented the churches in the South. With video cameras trained on them, the office reprimanded them for not financially supporting Roger, berated them for not being one with the ministry, and pressured them for monthly pledges under a cloud of intimidation. In fact, the brothers were asked to write out checks totaling \$6,000 right on the spot for his personal debts, and then to pay monthly amounts for his pledged support.

But before this time, not once was the opportunity for fellowship given to the brothers, for they were not aware of this matter. Afterwards, when Tom Cesar asked Ray Graver for an explanation for the seriousness of the meeting, Ray sharply answered, "we do what we are told!" This incident is contrary to your fellowship with the churches in that the full-timers should be approved by the churches. (Recently, it was discovered that Roger had received double, overlapping support for a few months after this training from both the office and the churches--what a bungled mess!)

Several months later, Roger Fiero was manifested to be the wrong brother, because of such weaknesses as fabricating stories and practicing opportunism. Once Tom Cesar and John Little called the office about problems he was causing; they were accused of an impure heart, being not supportive of the work on Davison campus. Later, Tom was told that the ministry never makes a mistake!

Although the brothers in the South are not perfect, having many weaknesses, they nevertheless attempt to run backwards in order to be in one accord, but the office fails to give them the opportunity of fellowship to demonstrate their oneness. The principals from the office who are involved in these affairs are Phillip, Benson, and Ray (I hesitate to mention these dear ones by name, but please allow me this liberty for the sake of honesty). Much embarrassment, confusion, harassment, and demoralization resulted from their attitude and behavior. On June 11, 1986, during the time in your home when you fellowshiped with me, you Identified the problem in every region as having the deficiency of the intrinsic fellowship of the one accord, but in this case, it is not the region, but the office who violates this principle and practice. It takes both the giving and receiving sides to release the intrinsic flow of mutual fellowship.

2. The office received a fabricated report that the brothers of the church in Atlanta had made the decision not to be one with the ministry and did not show the video tapes about "The One Accord" training of the elders (Feb. 1986). Moreover, Leo Garrett (one of the elders in Atlanta) had attended the last meeting of those elders' training, when you gave some instructive fellowship to the brothers from the churches in San Jose and Anaheim, which was about rearranging the elders. When Leo Garrett heard this, he was burdened to step aside because of his age and allow younger brothers to replace him. Apparently, Jim Barry (a brother in Atlanta; more will be said about him later) had called the office that Leo Garrett was forced out by the elders and that the elders do not want to play the video tapes mentioned above. Then Benson and Ray called Leo commending him for standing in oneness with the ministry, while censuring the other elders for not cooperating with the ministry; extolling Leo for being pro-ministry, while berating the other elders for being anti-ministry. They then urged Leo to remain in the eldership so as to defend the ministry. Then Leo told them they were badly mistaken, after which time Benson asked Leo to have Jim Barry to give him a phone call.

However, the church in Atlanta was in fact one with the ministry, and was in fact showing the video tapes on the elders' training about "The One Accord"! A lie was fabricated, action was impulsively taken against the church, and a tale-bearer was believed. How ironic that such a situation could exist over the video tapes that is about the one accord! Furthermore, I had

served the church in Atlanta for 12 years and had fellowshiped with you over the appointments of the elders in Atlanta, but Benson and Ray never once contacted me about these matters.

Again, permit me the freedom of honesty to ask the following: Why is it so easy for the office to believe a lie? Does the office have the auspicious inclination to quarrel with those who have the appearance of not being one with the ministry, jumping to conclusion that they are doing their own work? Why has the office made advances into the local churches around the country on the pretext of watching over the interests of the ministry? Is the reason for Benson and Ray failing to contact me about matters familiar to me is that of the lack of trust and confidence?

3. A few months ago, after Bob Ellis returned from Taipei, he gave this admonition to the elders at a meeting of elders from the South: Turn everything over to the office and the ministry; Phillip and Brother Lee have big plans for this area; it is imperative for us to give our coordination to Phillip and the office, and they need evidences that we will do anything they want; we have to coordinate with Phillip, and if Phillip beats us to the ground, we have to learn to get up and come back to him, for he has seen Benson and Ray beaten to the ground and they have gotten up and come back.

Is it too much for me to make this honest assumption: Is the one accord which the office promotes the one accord of fellowship, or is it the one accord of lining up with the office? Let me strongly declare that the brothers in the South are committed to do anything and everything in their power to cooperate with any burden you, Brother Lee, may have, but why this harangue?

4. While I have demonstrated the grace to rectified any issue with the office, nonetheless, the office has made a quarrelsome issue over my personal notes on "the-one accord" training which were simply copied for the situation as it existed in Miami, but were unfortunately circulated more widespread than I had expected. Why was the matter of these harmless notes inflamed with such furious indignation that this became like a major court case requiring overbearing action? Did anyone consider how delicate and tenuous the Miami situation was, and that to withdraw my notes might be erosive and repercussive? Was this incident taken presumptuously as rivalry and considered to be competitively embarrassing to the office? If so, how ridiculously absurd! Also, was this little instance utilized to make me a public example so as to undermine my service in the South (I heard that Ray Graver's secret motive for telling Phillip was "to do me in". Please know that I am willing to bend over backwards to comply with the requirements of the Living Stream, but Phillip's second letter seemed unduly warranted, insisting on demands that were oppressive to my mind and spirit as well as chilling to my function and my service.

5. Another illustration of the deficient fellowship of the one accord concerns the gospel team a few years ago. The gospel team gave the distinct impression that the churches were not one with the ministry and that only they carried out the ministry. Although we brothers were very happy for them to come to Knoxville, yet their fellowship with us was evasive, the churches

were belittled, and the saints generally were given a poor attitude about the churches, then the churches were saddled for their support.

For example, Howard Higashi, Jake Jacobson, and Bill Dudley thrust Jim Barry into full-time gospel work, a brother with whom we all have a long, turbulent history and have grave reservations about his approvedness. It was impulsively imposed upon the church in Atlanta to accept and support him. Subsequently, he arrogantly adopted the same attitude that he is the unique brother of the church in Atlanta who is one with the ministry and with Witness Lee's burden. He demoralized many of the saints, became very independent, and opposed the elders and the church. Some members of the church told the elders that they could no longer in good conscience give money to the church since the church supports him. In conclusion, he is now no longer serving and no longer in the church, steps which he himself took. I wish I could mitigate these words, but here is another example showing that outward conformity is imposed in violation to the mutually intrinsic flow of fellowship among the workers.-4

6. The young trainers (Minoru Chan, Howard Higashi, Paul Hon, Jake Jacobson, Benson Phillips, Dan Towle, Andrew Yu) during the 1986 summer training in Irving had sessions of so-called fellowship with the elders, grouped according to the different sections of the country, held in Benson's house. Some of these were overheard while eating lunch, analyzing the brothers in order to categorize them, identifying the brothers who presumably control in order to isolate them, and plotting to force the brothers into a mass resignation in order to manipulate them.

Then in the afternoon meeting, these trainers intimidated the brothers with statements like: "You have an incurable disease," "the only cure is amputation," "you are a babylonian protestant, because you do not preach that Witness Lee is a one-man show," "we preach that Witness Lee is a one-man show. and you brothers have a problem with this," "everyone must go to Taipei to show your oneness", and "asking what to do is the old way... just present yourself, and don't ask questions."

Don Rutledge tried to speak, but the thick intimidating atmosphere suppressed him. He was later branded with being in the old way. Afterwards, these young trainers said, "We have to be better prepared so no one can speak up like Don did." What kind of attitude is this when brothers should be practicing the inner anointing and the mutual fellowship? You cannot imagine how threatening the atmosphere was, being full of ultimatum and denouncements.

The following was said before that training, at the elders' meeting, which you could not attend due to illness: "We will take your young people... we will train them ... we will never send them back to you, because you control them," "Witness Lee was sick in Taipei, the full timers prayed, and He was healed; I doubt the Lord will even hear your prayers...."

In summary, there was no sense of their identification with the Body, speaking from a mutuality as being members one of another, sharing from the intrinsic flowing out of the divine fellowship. Instead, it tends to tear down, not build up.

7. Another example of glaring violations of this essential fellowship is when the office scheduled an itinerary sending

teams into the South to give video-tape machines and video tapes to isolated saints (Spring 1986). I was happy about this except that little

fellowship was shared with the brothers in the South. Then the office suddenly scheduled a meeting in Nashville, but never invited me. On the day of the meeting, while catching a plane at the airport in Raleigh, Tom Cesar called me while I was in a dentist's chair in Miami. Immediately, I rushed to the airport and flew to Nashville so that my appearance might cover the situation and prevent deeper reactions, for others were raising questions about why I was being isolated from the activities of the office. You do not know how many times I calmed them down or shielded them from things that tend to unsettle the saints.

After these teams from the office returned to Irving, a report was video-taped and sent to all the churches. On tape, Benson and Ray used terms such as "inconsistent care" and "the depravity of care," implicating the churches in the South with negligence. The derogatory way Benson and Ray portrayed the South was grossly exaggerated, which became unsettling and upsetting to the brothers and sisters who served and sacrificed much for the Lord's recovery. Moreover, brothers throughout the country who saw this video tape said that they had a very poor impression about the churches in the southeast. The office told other brothers that they suspected that the reason why these isolated saints were scattered and not in the church was because the elders had problems with them. This is unfair and dishonest. The fact of the matter is that many of them came from other parts of the country, and some from the area of the office! How could the office have the license to incriminate the churches in the South with such blatant and lying insinuations!

Here again is an independent breach of fellowship, the effect of which was extremely undermining and demoralizing to many of the saints. The overall intent, it would seem to me, was to put the poorest construction on the churches in the South, making the brothers with the saints appear as having a careless attitude and an indifferent heart, with callous concerns for the Lord's move. Also, they easily listened to the disparaging talk of unstable and disgruntled people, such as Roger Fiero and Jim Barry and others. No fellowship was attempted to learn of the situation, but it seems as if the office was presumptuously clearer than the ones who live and labor here.

I do not have any more heart to go on into more points. Enough is enough. This letter sounds too arrogant, but to mitigate or soften its tone will both obscure my honesty and incur the risk of hypocritical humility.

Brother Lee, I sympathize with you because the situation appears to be similar to the Iran-Contra affair, when responsible men around President Reagan broke the law of Congress and carried on covert activities which were illegal and yet at the same time never informed the President, though many in Congress and the news media questioned the President's involvement. Likewise, it appears to me that responsible brothers nearest to you have carried on underhanded activities and gave undermining fellowship without your knowledge. Yet, as the President was willing to accept responsibility and took action accordingly, I trust it will be incumbent upon you to do likewise, according to the wisdom and understanding the Lord gives you.

Although this letter is much too lengthy, I believe the serious nature of the problem merits my continuation with some of the points covered in our telephone conversation on December 9.

1. I can understand why you urged me several times to "forget," but this letter should indicate that the problem is not trivial, but seriously reaching to an acute condition and a critical stage. The tendency is to procrastinate, hoping the problem will go away; or, to ignore it, pretending it does not exist. But this is not responsible action. As someone said, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem." In order to confront the problem and accept my responsibility, I wrote you a letter, and I cannot now forget about it and leave it alone until it is resolved. If our body is sick, we do not forget about it, but seek a diagnosis and a treatment.

2. I appreciate the word that I should forget the circumstances and stand with the basic. This is a good word. But the circumstantial things were mentioned so as to point out to you the symptoms of a very serious root. I wrote the letter to give out signals that are symptomatic of a very fundamental problem, and the way I see it, it is using the power of politics, which is to impose the will of one upon the will of another so as to either overtly or covertly coerce him. There has been the political abuse of the oneness and of the fellowship so as to centralize a power base in order to control others. This is what we call an hierarchy. Hence, it is not a matter of circumstances, personalities, trials, or feelings of discouragement, for these are but symptoms. For example, Benson and Ray, as well as others, promoted Phillip Lee, proclaiming everywhere that Phillip is Witness Lee's closest co-worker, that Brother Lee has no one with as much wisdom, energy, and insight as Phillip Lee, that Phillip is Witness Lee's choice regardless of his anger and abuse of the saints, that everyone must submit and contact Phillip Lee and/or the office--such audacious promotions are obviously symptoms of a disease.

3. The source of the problem is not Roger Fiero or Jim Barry. How could these two novices be trusted more than the more experienced brothers? The problem in the South is not due to these two brothers, but with brothers outside of the South who have broken the most fundamental principles of the recovery and utilized these two brothers to invade and control the South. We thoroughly know these two brothers, but others, by neglecting the intrinsic fellowship, have thrust these brothers into a position that can be used to tear down what has been built up.

4. I know that this is a big recovery, and I feel very happy that we are trying to return to the scriptural way, and God forbid that I should try to hinder what has been gained already. For me to take the attitude and action that I have taken, however, indicates that I am desperately concerned, lest something so very good as the mustard herb grows into an hierarchical tree, with high-handed tactics exercised by the branches to control. I am desperately concerned lest the subtle enemy sneaks some leavening corruption into the fine flour. We must be warned of certain danger-signs and beware of our vulnerability for being baited into a snare.

5. You asked, who discredited me: The source is not the trainees, but the young trainers who surround you. I know you have charged the trainees not to touch any person or any church, but the problem is that these trainees have been utilized through some subliminal fellowship, and another element was injected into them beneath the threshold of their consciousness. The effect of this upon the trainees when they arrived home is that they have been either very depressed or very fanatical. These trainees enjoyed your fellowship about the new way of practice for all the churches to follow when they were in Taipei, but once you left the meeting, the young trainers, I am sorry to say, injected another subliminal element into them. For example, a brother here in Miami who finally got cleared up, wrote inadvertently, "Bill Mallon" in his notes in those places such as, "We have 200 churches and one office; churches have reputations with the office!" Immediately, he considered what kind of reputations the office holds about different churches and various brothers. This gives the ground to the enemy to interject many corrupting and disrupting thoughts.

6. You mentioned about what Watchman Nee saw in 1937 and 1949, how he saw the new way of practice for the church life, and now is the time for us to fulfill his vision. I truly want to be a part of this also and give my absolute and overwhelming support. It is all together a different and insidious problem. Your mentioning of Watchman Nee reminded me of what I read in THE NORMAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH LIFE, especially chapter 7 about Among The Workers" in the Liv. Str. Edition, pages 144-164, which brings to the surface this hidden problem. Here he speaks about spiritual authority vs. official authority, about proper fellowship vs. central control, and about local churches and branch churches. Spiritual authority and the proper fellowship produce local churches, but official authority and central control issue in branch churches. While we need to fulfill Watchman Nee and your burden, yet at the same time we must also beware of another side element subtly creeping in. Brother Lee, I have drunk of your spirit, and I absolutely followed spiritual authority and the intrinsic fellowship in the flow of the river, which brought in the mutual life and love of the local churches. But I fear that another thing is coming in with official authority and central control which will invade the local churches and transmute them into branch churches. We need to identify and isolate where the enemy is attacking and what channels he is using. The real snare is to compromise and sell out in the name of oneness. May it be exposed before there is a total collapse.

7. Brother Lee, although I have written this letter, it does not take away one iota from the deepest appreciation I have for the concern and care both you and Sister Lee have shown for me, my health, and my family over the 24 years that I have been in the recovery. Yes, I do remember how we have worked together -- first, shoulder to shoulder for 10 years in Los Angeles, and then from a distance in New York, Atlanta, and Miami for 14 years--and how we have fought many battles together for the Lord and His recovery. Yes, we can testify that we never had any personal trouble between us for these 24 years. Notwithstanding, and I

know we both mutually agree, the problem both you and I should face together is beyond the personal and beyond personalities. The very first step in having love, care, and concern for others is to l-i-s-t-e-n! I earnestly hope you will not take this letter and misapply it to mean that a problem exist between us. A thousand times "no"! But the situation as defined in this letter demonstrates a much deeper and broader problem. Both of my letters reveal the insidious pressures of a menacing hierarchy in all of its ramifications, coming in to subdue, control, and take over the very recovery of the Testimony of Jesus for which we have labored and fought, and in the process, trampling under foot the essential, intrinsic flow of mutual fellowship among the brothers.

Comparatively speaking, it is easy for me to bear my daughter's illness and financial burdens, but I no longer can stomach the evil of playing politics by using and abusing oneness with the ministry and with the office. This absolutely has nothing to do with flesh and blood, but with the spiritual dark forces behind the scene who are working in deception.

Now I wish to conclude this long letter. You will never know of the intensity of my consternation. I have suffered a great dilemma over this matter of speaking with you about the affairs surrounding the office. You probably do not realize how much of a promotional campaign that went on for the office, which would correspond to a political campaign. What compounded the problem and prevented me from coming to you is that Phillip, being your very own son, was positioned into a very prominent place of the work. A message you gave in Anaheim, on April 18, 1983, entitled PRACTICAL TALKS TO THE ELDERS # 6 --- "Avoiding Family Entanglements": Here you testified that Watchman Nee never brought his relatives into the church leadership or into the work. I can now see the wisdom of this, because in your case, I say this kindly, to have Phillip established into such a prominent place of the work has frustrated and hindered transparent fellowship between you and the workers as well as between you and the churches. In my case I agonized long as to what to do. Finally, I decided to withdraw from the work, thus giving me the basis for writing a letter to you indicating some signals, hoping you could see that these signals are symptomatic of a more fundamental root, as I have attempted to explain above.

You may ask, Why did I not do anything before now? First, for three years I stood against my concerns because they seemed to be founded without supporting evidences. There were a number of insinuations and innuendoes, but I felt to wait until these were more manifested. Second, the principle is that it always takes time. Time is the best means to manifest things. Even today, I expect I know only the tip of the iceberg, which means that much more is submerged beneath the surface. And finally, the third reason, Because of your son, Phillip, who was so conspicuously involved, I was in an agonizing dilemma. To me, it meant that if I touched your son, I would touch you. Please understand that I do not interpret this situation as being related to personalities or circumstances, but the enemy's attack to corrupt and destroy the recovery of the Testimony of Jesus, which we love and treasure so much. Since Phillip was now so intricately involved with the work, I eventually worked through my dilemma and decided to resign from the work. By divorcing



myself from the work, I then had the ground and the liberty to be open, transparent, and honest with you.

Finally, I believe that a kind of blind loyalty has been promoted, which issues into a propensity to obstruct truthfulness and single-hearted faithfulness. Blind loyalty is very much of the soulish, natural life. It blinds us to honesty and reality, leads us down a narrow and false pathway, and protects our self-serving ambitions from challenge and criticism. Honesty opens ourselves to grow in wisdom and effectiveness. May we lay ourselves open to the deepest challenge that is called upon us in this hour until we transcend and transform the natural.

I apologize for the lengthiness of this letter and its frankness. This letter is not meant to be judgmental or cruel. My motivation for writing it is to extend myself to you, for the purpose of nurturing you for our spiritual growth, just as you have always done so in the past. May His prevailing blood cover us, and His sufficient grace supply us.

Always respectfully yours as a faithful brother in Christ,

William E. Mallon