John Kozlowski

From: John Kozlowski <John@Kozlowski.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2017 4:23 PM
To: 'Jim Cross'; 'Dorothy-Jane Kozlowski'; Dorothy-Jane Kozlowski (Outlook)
Cc: 'Isaac Owen Williams'; 'Julia Williams'; 'Jack Cross'
Subject: RE: Is Dorothy-Jane my wife, and adulteress, or dead?

Mr. Cross,

I have watched the videos you referred to and you have got to be kidding to think this is a solid exposition of Scripture. Having a physical copy of Codex Vaticanus does not make your argument stronger. Using Talmudic interpretations makes the arguments all the weaker, see Mark 7:7.

You don't keep a record, but don't worry about that. As you see, more and more are going online for you to review.

Please note that you are offering innuendo again, without specifics. BE SPECIFIC! Don't just write that I am bad.

I agree with interpreting Scripture with Scripture. It is a wise and often used expression. However, the videos you linked interpret Scripture with the Talmud, the traditions of men. Why don't we do what you wrote and use the Scripture itself to interpret the Scripture?

While he mentions the Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, and the Talmud, he fails to mention another very important point. What we see in English form the Hebrew or Greek as "divorce" comes from multiple words. In general they are the idea of putting or sending your spouse away, which is very different from releasing yourself from the bond. Do NOT apply a state issued divorce as the equivalent of "shâlach", "kerîythûth", "apostasion", or "apoluō". The differences are striking. Are you willing to take a serious look at that?

You can see this applied when he talks about history and reads in additional meaning, such as an assumed concept that divorce allows for remarriage. There is no such concept in Scripture (Mark 10, Romans 7, etc.).

Also remember another fundamental. Just as we see so many who distort the Scripture with "name it and claim it" or faith healing, don't you think there is a very large crowd that does the same for their sexual desires and therefore distort the meaning of marriage? You can see this clearly in the rise in popularity of both Islam and Mormonism, both of which grew due to their embrace of polygamy. I would be happy to review that with you. As for me, I want to know and follow the real Lord Jesus Christ, and not mold Him into my image to meet my needs. Do you agree on that?

You pointed to a man that I suggest can be easily refuted, point by point. Are you willing?

I gave you a direct reference that neither you nor him addressed. ADDRESS IT!

Mark 10 "[11]*And he said to them, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her,* [12]*and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.""*

Again I will ask that you be specific. You use generalities ("I just remember numerous times") which might make you feel good, but it is just an illusion. Name calling, referring to the videos of others is not offering any evidence contradicting what I have claimed in Scripture. Try arguing from Scripture!

Dorothy-Jane is NOT a free woman according to Mark 10 and others. She is commanded by the Lord to reconcile with her husband (1Co7:11). She is commanded not to separate (1Co7:10). She is commanded to respect her husband (Eph 5:33). Not talking with me is not respecting her husband.

You write so much about my provision for my family, but refuse to address the "Holding Jobs" video (http://family.kozlowski.org/2017-07-02+1). You make me out to be the bad person here who could be written off. Please consider that unlike anyone else in this discussion, I have repeatedly stated that I am committed to my wife and will not turn from her. I contend this is what a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ is called to do. Can I trust Dorothy-Jane anymore? Of course not! However, I can fully trust the Lord and His command to me is to love my wife, not because of her, but because of Him. I love my wife, because of the Lord, and I still think she is cute.

Dialog, not innuendo, is necessary for reconciliation. Drop the walls between us. Get on the phone with me! As I pointed out in http://family.kozlowski.org/2017-07-06, "we will not let this go!"

Again remember, I'm not trying to win the argument with you, I'm trying to reconcile with you. I desire to share life and family with you as brothers. Are you willing?

Respectfully,

John Kozlowski

Email: **John@Kozlowski.org** ● Phone: **(423) 716-6432**
Kozlowski.org ● **Distinctivist.com** ● **ShofarNexus.com**
Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.
Ecclesiastes 12:13

This email can be found at: http://family.kozlowski.org/Email-2017-09-05+1

From: jimcross45@gmail.com [mailto:jimcross45@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Jim Cross
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2017 2:37 PM
To: John Kozlowski
Subject: Re: Is Dorothy-Jane my wife, and adulteress, or dead?

She is not your wife nor an adulteress, and she is very much alive. I think you do need to look at the link I sent you. She is a free woman, plain and simple - according to the Scripture. You actually do need help in understanding Jesus' answer to the Pharisees. Your actions while she was in your care gave clear grounds not only for divorce, but also for remarriage if she so chooses.

I had no doubt when I agreed to let her marry you that you would live up to your vows the best you could. None of does that perfectly, but I was sure you would demonstrate the love and faithfulness of God, our Father. It never crossed my mind that we would ever find ourselves in this situation. Yet, here we are.

All the chest beating that you do will not change the outcome of your action/inaction when you were responsible for her care and that of your children. She tried and tried - I tried and tried - to get you to be a man and take your responsibilities seriously and you refused time after time.

Do whatever you think you must, but unless you take responsibility for the outcome of your own actions, we're not listening.

I have tried to be your friend and help you see the truth. But you lie to yourself, and you have from time to time written lies about both your ex-wife and me. I don't keep a record of those, so don't ask me to substantiate that claim. I just remember numerous times reading what you have written to me and even to others and said out loud, "That's a lie."

Look at the link I sent and you will see that we aren't basing our thoughts on our own logic, but on the Scripture itself. All my years growing up and since I have been told to interpret Scripture by other Scripture and to read Scripture from the viewpoint of those to whom it was originally written, so now I'm asking you to do the same.

I hope you will.

On Mon, Sep 4, 2017 at 7:44 PM, John Kozlowski <John@kozlowski.org> wrote:

> Mr. Cross,
>
> I'm obviously troubled at the link, but will review it. The implication is not encouraging, but it is consistent with your previous "white knight" suggestion. I have repeatedly asked a simple question that you ignore. It was made clear in "Are you my wife, an adulteress, or dead?" (http://family.kozlowski.b:280/2017-08-13+1). We don't need a third party to look with us at Mark 10.
>
> Mark 10 "*[11]And he said to them, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her, [12]and if she divorces her husband and marries another, **she commits adultery**.""*
>
> So I ask again and request an unambiguous answer: Is Dorothy-Jane my wife, and adulteress, or dead? Your tone suggests the second answer. Please make it clear as there is no other option.
>
> Please remember when you read the English word "divorce" in Scripture, it is in no way referring to at state issued divorce. Mark 10 is clear, remarriage, which is the act of sex, is adultery. Is Dorothy-Jane an adulteress? **Be a man! Answer the question**!
>
> Assuming you will do as you have for years and walk away from this dialog, please remember this email is public at: http://family.kozlowski.org/Email-2017-09-04+1

I was in the process of writing "Salvo 2" when this came. Remember, I'm not giving up. You have used 1st Timothy often. **Remember verse 20. This is direct to you**.

Respectfully,

John Kozlowski

Email: **John@Kozlowski.org** ● Phone: **(423) 716-6432**
Kozlowski.org ● **Distinctivist.com** ● **ShofarNexus.com**
Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.
Ecclesiastes 12:13

From: jimcross45@gmail.com [mailto:jimcross45@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Jim Cross
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2017 6:45 PM
To: John Kozlowski
Subject: Re: George, Susanna, Gloria-Jane, Walter, and Zadok: Reconcile Salvo 1 Summary

John,

The link I'm sending you will give an answer as to why you and I disagree on the specific verses that you repeat in reference to divorce (and remarriage). I know that your M.O. is to dismiss an argument that doesn't agree with you (we all tend to do that), but at least you will see why I am supportive of and was instrumental in removing my precious daughter from you.

It is likely that even if you respond to this that I will not reply. I have found that to be futile.

I will close with this. I pray for you almost every day. I purpose to continue that practice until there is complete and undeniable repentance on your part. May that day come!

Jim

http://walkworthy.org/2014/01/divorce-remarriage-by-david-instone-brewer-rightly-dividing-the-word-100/

On Sun, Sep 3, 2017 at 7:52 PM, John Kozlowski <John@kozlowski.org> wrote:

> Mr. Cross,
>
> Let's be clear at the outset, as I have described often, such as in the two recent videos linked in this morning's email, that the Biblical definition of contention is the mutual seeking of the truth and not a battle of opposites trying to be right. My effort to be open, bold, and clear with you is not an effort to defeat you, but to seek the truth with you as we together follow the Lord Jesus Christ.
>
> In the last many years the Lord and I have done some serious wrestling (Gen 32) and while He wins all the time, He has opened my eyes to my misunderstandings, my desire for the things of this world, and obviously my sin. He has done so with compassion and I am grateful. During this time I have learned how contention, as defined by Scripture, is love. I have also learned that "the institution is not your friend" and see that now in Scripture, and in history.
>
> The clumsy fellow that attempted to proclaim a pro-life message in the 80s is now a clumsy fellow that is proclaiming a trust in the Lord alone, and the magnificence of His grace. It has been remarkable to me that once I became willing and even desirous, I do now literally meet people walking down the street and get into serious dialog about the Lord, or am able to proclaim the joy of obedience and the vastness of His grace. However, my own family, and extended family, including you, don't seem to be part of that group. I grieve this.
>
> Some time back the Galatians 2:11 passage started to hit home. After dwelling on that for some time 2:14 "*in the presence of all*" became a focus. In dialog the same was echoed in 1Tim5:20 and it was clear to me what I must do. The result has been http://Family.Kozlowski.org. It continues to grow and mature. It was commented on today that this has been a lot of work. Yes it has, but I contend that this is obedience to the Lord and an act of love. I am not trying to win and argument or destroy, but to reconcile. Perhaps you would join me on this. Don't you think our reconciliation is the best way to love Dorothy-Jane and our kids?
>
> One of the areas that my maturing has occurred is in my source of income. While that requires a lot of detail, I did a video "Holding Jobs" (http://family.kozlowski.org/2017-07-02+1) that I really think needs to be addressed, especially by my wife. Perhaps you would consider it?
>
> I will answer your specific responses below. Please remember, it is not a point-by-point discussion to win an argument that I'm after. I want to win a brother.

Respectfully,

John Kozlowski

Email: **John@Kozlowski.org** ● Phone: **(423) 716-6432**
Kozlowski.org ● **Distinctivist.com** ● **ShofarNexus.com**

Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.
Ecclesiastes 12:13

From: jimcross45@gmail.com [mailto:jimcross45@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Jim Cross
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2017 2:30 PM
To: John Kozlowski
Subject: Re: George, Susanna, Gloria-Jane, Walter, and Zadok: Reconcile Salvo 1 Summary

Please again refer to the multiple times I have pointed out that going to the state is not in obedience to the Lord as described in 1Co6. Would you address that specifically please?

> *After we had gone to our churches with our concerns and received their counsel (bear in mind they had already heard and/or experienced your side), we then went to the state as the civil authority who could speak on behalf of the state. It was not the other way around. If the church sided with you, we would not have gone to the state. As you know the church as a whole supported us in our effort to separate your children and their mother from you.*
>
> *I hope this addresses this issue that you mistakenly bring up from time to time.*
>
> You claim "heard and/or experienced your side". Are you referring to a single meeting with the elders at Covenant Presbyterian? I suggest that was more of an inquisition rather than a dialog or experiencing my side.
>
> Or are you referring to the institutional church leadership that would not address PCA doctrine when presented to them that was contrary to their deeds?
>
> Or are you referring to the lack of response to the Scripture presented to the institutional church leadership? Do you think that I must have clearly be wrong or they would have responded?

Or are you stating that this vague esteemed but nondescript body has somehow superseded 1Co6?

I "bring this up from time to time" since no one, including your statement, has addressed why 1Co6 can be ignored? It was ignored. Do you deny that?

Do you deny that in supporting my wife, they have gone contrary to PCA doctrine, as well as the Scripture? When 1Co 7:10 states "*To the married I give this charge (not I, but the Lord): the wife should not separate from her husband*". **Where does the institutional church or the state supersede "*not I, but the Lord*"? Please focus on this question!**

Consider that financially I have been providing the required funds each month for years. The amount is in excess of what it should be since Julia is no longer a dependent, but I do not pursue adjustment with the state because I actually believe in 1Co6.

This line of reasoning is interesting. Now, you are submitting to the mandate of the state while ignoring the mandate of God (which is certainly greater than the mandate of the state) that you are responsible to meet the needs of your family. You were actually doing nothing until the state got involved.

Please don't misunderstand this as you did in a recent email conversation with me. I'm not at all asking you to send more money. I'm just stating a fact of life that you, for several years before your family left you and now after several years of separation have not met their needs. That's perfectly fine with me, personally, but I'm quite sure it is not fine with the Lord.

First you should be quiet aware that for about a year or more post my wife's exit I went through some difficulty. I offer no excuse for being behind in the state mandated amount during that time.

However, you should also remember that I have stated that the idea of loving my wife is not to provide for her to live contrary to the Lord's command. Funding sin is not something that I can do so willingly, and as stated previously, as the amount the state requires is reduced, I will reduce what I send. I cannot, as a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, fund my wife's sin, even though I remain in love with her and committed to her.

I wholeheartedly disagree with your statement *"I'm quite sure it is not fine with the Lord."* No matter how you twist meanings, it is clear that I was abandoned. It is clear that this should not be (1Co7:10). It is clear that reconciliation between Dorothy-Jane and myself should take place (1Co7:11). Appealing to the authority of the institutional church does not outweigh the unambiguous statements in Scripture. Can you give me one verse that contradicts that?

The state stipulates that I am to be part of my kids' educational and medical concerns. What communications has occurred on this in years? Why was a father's written refusal of consent for surgery ignored? Isn't this a violation of the state law you bow to?

Since I don't have the parenting plan with me I can't really respond to all of this with facts. I do know that DJ has the plan and has assured me that she is in compliance with it. I am confident that she can be trusted in this. I will add that if she isn't in total compliance with the state it is because she is responsible to our Father first and not the state.

Obviously we have a problem here when you state that my wife is responsible to our Father first, but she still ignores 1Co6, 1Co7, and the others verses often mentioned. I am concerned that, with your assistance, Dorothy-Jane is part of 2Ti3:6.

I'm sure you would agree that had the state been involved in this decision it would have broken the stalemate between DJ and you in favor of allowing the surgery. And, for your further consideration, the surgery has done wonders for George's cognitive thinking and physical well being. Would you really have wanted to deny him that?

Do you really want to get onto health issues with me? I am a vivid example of what getting off of factory food and the industrial medical complex can do. From skin issues to heart failure symptoms, it is clear that medical care is not our friend. Evidence abound that issues, including what George and Jack have experienced have greater chance of full recovery in diet alone than medical intervention. You should first do some study of the history of Rockefeller medicine before you go down this trail. I will stomp you on this. Let's stick with the Scriptural issues instead. At least I hope we have the same source on that.

Let me repeat my request. Get on the phone with me. Let's take man-to-man. Even better, let's talk brother-to-brother. Are you willing?

No. I'm not willing. I need time to consider your words before responding, and that isn't possible in a phone conversation. It appears to me that you process - correctly or incorrectly - information faster than I do, so a phone conversation isn't productive to either of us.

Thank you for finally answering this question. I contend your answer is fearful and unloving. Why does "brother-to-brother" concern you?

Is it perhaps that I have taken 1Peter3:15 seriously and am ready to give an answer? But the verse doesn't end there. There is the admonition for gentleness and reverence or respect or fear. This is something that has become part of me. Specifically the willingness and, to a degree, ability to contend gently and I hope far more clearly than ever before.

The point of a phone dialog, which is not as good as face-to-face, but better than email, is that we have the ability in conversation to ask for clarification of what was not clear. I spent many hours in direct dialog today which included much time spent on asking for clarification, reviewing points from a different angle, and taking the time to look at the Scripture directly to gain a clearer understanding of the Lord's perspective. That is what brothers do. We should do the same!

The joy of establishing a relationship, through repeated dialog, is the ability to question and re-question each other to gain a mutual understanding in our contending for the truth. It is my contention that this is what love does. I ask again for you and me to do it.

- - -

This email can be found at: http://family.kozlowski.org/Email-2017-09-03+2