

## John Kozlowski

---

**From:** Chris Bitterman <[cbitterman@meadowviewpca.org](mailto:cbitterman@meadowviewpca.org)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 6, 2014 3:08 PM  
**To:** John Kozlowski  
**Subject:** Re: Got your letter

John,

Time is not short because this is not a problem which suddenly sprung up and requires an immediate-drop-everything-go-intervene response. This is a problem which only repentance will remedy. I cannot fix this, and an urgent response to Dorothy Jane would only serve to reinforce the idea that the remedy is outside of your power.

Regretfully,

Chris

On Tue, Aug 5, 2014 at 8:18 AM, John Kozlowski <[John@kozlowski.org](mailto:John@kozlowski.org)> wrote:

Chris,

You have stated that my wife and children are frequently at Meadowview but not members. I am asking you as a brother in Christ to stand in my stead as I believe a great offense is occurring. Communications has been refused by my wife and what I receive from Jim Cross, I contend, is destructive to my family, an abomination in the Lord's eyes, and needs to be addressed

I'm not there. I'm asking you please to step in and step in now. My reason is below.

---

Mr. Cross,

You use generalize terms, such as "You can repent and live a changed life". Let me try to make this more specific. You have judged that I live in sin. Specifically how? What must I do in your eyes to be seen as repentance?

## 1<sup>st</sup> Timothy 5:8

What you throw at me is 1Tim 5:8, while ignoring both facts and casually passing off my question on Matthew 19:6.

Let's first assume that I am spending my days sitting in front of a TV watching football, smoking cigarettes, drinking beer, and living off of government welfare. A good argument could be made that I am in violation of 1Tim 5:8. However, there is no place in Scripture that gives one person license to violate Scripture because of the deeds of others. If I am guilty of violating 1Tim 5:8 that does not grant you or my wife a license to violate Matt 19:6, which I address below.

It is easy to throw off the stereotypes I have set forth. In the well over a year that I have lived here at Daybreak I have yet to turn on the TV. I have never had a cigarette, or drank a beer. I do confess that the six figure salary that I received from Westar as a government contractor was government welfare. I have remorse for that and repent of it. I know you take that as snide, but I think Dorothy-Jane will know that I mean that with all sincerity. I was a thief (the word I used then) and it was wrong. I acknowledge very few agree with me on that.

Now let's look at the reality. I fully admit there were difficulties for many months in the last two years. However, since October of 2013 I started a contract with RapidRMS (<http://RapidRMS.com>). It was good for a short while but then there was over a month of nothing as they waiting on funding for the project. Since January funding has been in from multiple providers and what I do has been separated as an independent product: Rapid On-Site. I agreed to work at a minimal rate in order to see the project to a point where funding would increase. We started at \$500 per week in January and recently went up to \$600 a week. For this I work 80+ hours a week. Six figures are on the table when the project is established, but this is not my drive.

Granted that is a far cry from what I have and can make. Weekly I receive multiple easy jobs that would bring in six figures now, and at least one of those per week is over \$200K. I discard them immediately. It leads to an obvious question as to why I don't. The short answer is James 4:17 *"So whoever knows the right thing to do and fails to do it, for him it is sin."*

One of the simpler reasons that I do not give up on the project for a higher paying job is I made a commitment and I intend to see it through. The second is that Rapid On-Site is based on ShofarNexus and there are other issues involved because of that. I wrote a long discourse on that but in reality it is irrelevant to the divorce issue, so I will set that aside except for one important concept. Dorothy-Jane has stated that one of the initial attractions to me was of my determination in pro-life ministry in the 80s for which I had passion but not skill. Today I have the skill and growing connections to "put a spoke in the wheel" of the American Auschwitz (Bluffdale, UT), dim the Five Eyes, remove a pillar of the UN takeover of the web, and allow former Moslems to safely bring an Arabic Bible to the Kaaba. It is no longer a pipe dream as last December I sent the first Matryoshka Cryptogram on a 30,000+ mile journey. It would be so much sweeter to make this journey with my wife at my side.

# Matthew 19:6

In my query of you on this matter on Thursday, May 15, 2014 you responded with: “DJ has not divorced you. I aided her in setting up a separate living environment where she and her children would be cared for. **She nor I have violated Matthew 19:6.** (emphasis mine)” May I quote you the pertinent part: “*What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate.*” The word “*separate*” is the Greek chorizo, which is defined as: 1) to separate, divide, part, put asunder, to separate one's self from, to depart 1a) to leave a husband or wife 1a) of divorce 1b) to depart, go away. This includes divorce, which clearly involves physical separation, but fundamentally means “to separate, divide, part, put asunder, to separate one's self from, to depart”. You must either redefine Matthew 19:6 to mean divorce only, or statement that “She nor I have violated Matthew 19:6” is incorrect or subterfuge.

As a PCA Elder you should be able to discern these things. The PCA has. You might remember I have quoted PCA resolutions in 2012:

The PCA discussed at length the issue of marriage and divorce in 1992 and approved numerous statements on the issue. I assert that to what degree PCA members or leadership have been involved, they are **contrary to the PCA’s position.**

The PCA stands against separation in marriage. Therefore I assert that this separation is in violation of the PCA General Assembly’s guidance. The following is from page 228 with my emphasis added.

*Indeed, separation of any kind as a means of dealing with marital difficulty and preventing divorce not only is **neither recommended nor mentioned in Scripture**, but seems to be contrary to a fundamental principle of Biblical spirituality, viz. that what **ought not to be done, ought not to be approached.***

There is also no hint of physical abuse. The most that can be argued is that my response our situation caused emotional stress. This is the only remotely related issue to abuse. However, even *abuse* is not a cause for separation. Page 229 continues with the following with my emphasis added.

*The fact remains that Scripture does not address the circumstance of an abusive husband. As is the case in any other area of Biblical ethics, one cannot extract from Scripture a comprehensive statement of all possible applications of a divine law. Rather, it is left to the church to apply Biblical norms, with the direction provided by the casuistry Scripture does supply, to the untold number of situations which must be faced. It is important to acknowledge that the view that —desertion‖ in 1 Corinthians 7 cannot be made to refer to anything but actual departure from house and home and the view we have stated*

*above are both extrapolations from the Scriptural statements. No one can appeal to a Biblical statement concerning the duty or the liberty of a battered spouse.*

I contend that the actions taken, both the physical separation and the legal separation are in violation of the counsel of the PCA. I implore all who are leadership or members of the PCA to heed the General Assembly's statements, cease and desist in facilitating this separation, and actively work to restore our family.

I contend that your statements such as: "I have annulled Dottie Jane's vows to you", and your deeds are in violation of the PCA position, contrary to scripture, and an attempt to stand in the place of God. Church is not a power play for those with connections. When that is done, all you have is a cult.

## **What is the requirement?**

Since January I have steadily provided the state mandated funds. Dorothy-Jane has often expressed appreciation for the steady flow. Around May she finally wrote again that she loves me and used the word reconciliation. She also appreciated the increase of funds several weeks ago. Why now is divorce pursued? Is \$600 a week insufficient, especially in a single household, for our family to live? Does that not meet the requirements of 1Tim 5:8. Or is it that if I don't bring in six figures now that I am unqualified?

Income has been steady. Relationships seemed to be improving. What happened? What kind of repentance are you looking for? Is it a dollar figure? How much money do I need to love to gain your approval?

## **Adultery**

I sent you an email referencing Leviticus 19. Let me also quote verse 29 "*Do not profane your daughter by making her a prostitute, lest the land fall into prostitution and the land become full of depravity.*" This is exactly what you are violating in word and deed.

Let's be very clear on this most significant subject. Dorothy-Jane may divorce me in the eyes of the state, but not the eyes of the Lord. Scripture is clear that she does not have license to do so. If she were to marry another she become an adulteress. Mr. Cross, as a PCA Elder you should know this. To convince your daughter that she can do this, to claim that you have the right to annul the marriage, is at best the acts of a cult leader or at worst someone trying to play God. Beyond everything else this is the greatest offense and I contend is spitting in the face of the Lord. It is disgusting.

You are suggesting that my wife can find a "white knight". In doing so you should have the name John and not I since you are acting no different than the man who runs a house of prostitution. I hope that is clear.

Perhaps I still am too much of a coward. It seems a righteous man, when another man tries to rationalize his wife into adultery, would put him in the grave. Phineas may be a good role model here.

In 1990 I contended with you on the issue on putting Dorothy-Jane on birth control pills to alleviate menstrual pain she was experiencing. You gained my respect for backing down when I presented my arguments. Otherwise ErikaLeigh either might not have been or could have been killed. This time it is not medical and Scriptural arguments, but the Scripture alone. Please, in love for the Lord and your daughter, back down again.

## **My Love and Commitment remains**

I have made many blunders. Many of them were motivated by sin, especially greed. I offer no excuse for them, they were wrong. However even in my blunders, my love for my wife has always been there. Even when the horror came of her walking out of my life, nothing was diminished. Within hours I made a foolish commitment to end my life. Granted part of the motivation was to ease my own pain, however, and I offer the card I wrote to her that day as evidence, I also wanted to give her the freedom to start fresh with another man without sin. I was willing to commit a vile sin to prevent her from doing so. I confess I was wrong in my attempt, but I do not back down from the motivation. Suggesting that she can had another man via divorce and not my death is cowardly and vile.

I appeal to you, I appeal to those around you, I especially appeal to my wife, and I set my appeal before the Lord. DO NOT go through with the divorce. Dorothy-Jane has had steady income from me. There has never been any threat from me. There is no adultery. There is no license for divorce. Stop the shame of going to the state.

May the Lord's mercy show to us all.

---

Dorothy-Jane,

You have seen me as your protector. Please see me as that now. I am the only "white knight" for you. All others are impostors.

I wore your wedding ring on my finger for several hours today. It just doesn't fit. Please allow me to put it back on your hand.

I love you,

I love you,

I love you,

*John Kozlowski*

---

Email: [John@Kozlowski.org](mailto:John@Kozlowski.org) • Phone: [\(423\) 716-6432](tel:4237166432)

PO Box 551, Cleveland, TN 37364-0551



[Kozlowski.org](http://Kozlowski.org) • [Distinctivist.com](http://Distinctivist.com) • [ShofarNexus.com](http://ShofarNexus.com) • [ShofarPortfolio.com](http://ShofarPortfolio.com)

*Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.*

Ecclesiastes 12:13

---

**From:** Jim Cross [mailto:[jjmccross45@gmail.com](mailto:jjmccross45@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 8:36 PM

**To:** John Kozlowski

**Subject:** Re: Got your letter

I think I can help you with this, John. And, I can see how it could be confusing.

DJ wrote that letter to you intending to use it as a cover letter for the divorce proceedings, but after considering the cost of sending it that way she decided to send it to you immediately after you were served. She thought that you would be served much earlier, and was prepared to send it on a moment's notice.

The letter wasn't meant to offer you hope that she might return to the same man she left.

The intent was to make a couple of things clear to you. First, she is not pursuing another man. Secondly, once the divorce is final, she will have cleared the way for the Lord to bring a godly man along to whom she would have the freedom to respond. Again, she is not seeking for that to happen. She's just opening the door for that possibility. She is doing this in response to the email you sent her in which you said she is condemning her children to a fatherless home. A divorce puts her in a place where she is not responsible for a fatherless home,

because she would be free to accept the overtures from what I would call a “white knight” should the Lord provide that one.

Clearly, you are the one who put her in a position where she needed to take her children away from you for their own protection. You know that there were times that they were in danger of the state removing them from your home. So, once this divorce is final, the ball is in your court, John. You can repent and live a changed life that would give her reason to consider re-marrying you. In the absence of that, the Lord could bring another. Either way, she would not be assigning them to live in that “fatherless” home you described.

To put it succinctly, she is putting that burden on your shoulders, where I believe it belongs. If you want to be sure that there is no chance that another man will be responsible for raising your children, you can man up and do it yourself. But, man, you’re a long, long way from there in your present condition.

To tell you the truth, I’m surprised that DJ would ever consider trusting you again!

Jim

---

**From:** [John Kozlowski](#)

**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 4:34 PM

**To:** ['Dorothy-Jane Kozlowski'](#)

**Cc:** [jimcross45@gmail.com](mailto:jimcross45@gmail.com) ; [dr.terrycassell@yahoo.com](mailto:dr.terrycassell@yahoo.com)

**Subject:** Got your letter

---

DJ,

I just received your letter and your wedding ring. I don’t understand. This is dated July 5 and sent Aug 1. The letter holds out hope, but your actions between those dates were to file for divorce. Please help me understand. Please let me know your intentions.

I love you,

*John Kozlowski*

---

Email: [John@Kozlowski.org](mailto:John@Kozlowski.org) • Phone: [\(423\) 716-6432](tel:(423)716-6432)

PO Box 551, Cleveland, TN 37364-0551



[Kozlowski.org](http://Kozlowski.org) • [Distinctivist.com](http://Distinctivist.com) • [ShofarNexus.com](http://ShofarNexus.com) • [ShofarPortfolio.com](http://ShofarPortfolio.com)

*Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.*

Ecclesiastes 12:13

--

**Chris Bitterman**

**Senior Pastor**

**Meadowview Reformed Presbyterian Church**

[cbitterman@meadowviewpca.org](mailto:cbitterman@meadowviewpca.org)

[www.meadowviewpca.org](http://www.meadowviewpca.org)