



Joy Harris <[REDACTED]>

Mutual Heartbreaks

Pastor Kevin Harris <[REDACTED]>

17 March 2017 at 14:45

To: Joy Harris <[REDACTED]>

Dear Mom,

Your answer is found in the rest of Matthew chapter 18. That parable teaches that if there is any sin you won't forgive, then you don't understand how forgiving the Lord was to you. God forgave you of far more than Dad ever did to you. Yet you are unwilling to forgive.

Explain the absurdity of the second paragraph. Your moral compass must be pointed to true north -- which is the Scriptures. Just because this world calls something absurd doesn't mean you or I should.

You continue to seek to suggest that the Bible does not have the answers with statements like: 'Obviously Matthew 18 doesn't apply then.' Of course it does. Mom, the Bible is sufficient. If a wolf gets in among the sheep, the church gets first crack at the case. That's God's command. To resist that is to resist Him. You should be red in the face about fighting what God makes extremely clear. Mom, we Christians need to saturate our minds in the Bible so that we think like God thinks (Psalm 50:21), respond to mistreatment like Christ responds (1 Peter 2:23), and serve humbly like He did (Philippians 2:1-11). This is the crucified life that brings true joy (Galatians 2:20). The Apostle Paul exemplified a daily death to self when he wrote, *'And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved'* (2 Corinthians 12:15). That you were driven to despair and suicidal thoughts (though it saddens me greatly) shows not that you needed to leave your husband but needed to die to self. Joh 12:24 *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.* This is not what your church at the time taught much about, nor was it being exemplified by your husband, so I understand why you struggled. I just want you to know that there are answers which God's Word shares.

Side note about the third paragraph: However, most immorality in churches is consensual. Both are guilty and both must be confronted and restored. I give you the case of Jack Schaap. His 'under-age' (worldly perspective) paramour agreed to multiplied sexual meetings, making her as guilty as he. You and I should abhor the sin every bit as much whether it is one person wanting to fornicate or two people wanting to fornicate.

But back to you. Extreme cases and exceptional circumstances are what you are referring to, but in your case, you sinned against your husband, provoking him to temptation exactly as God predicted would happen in 1 Corinthians 7:5. You stopped loving your husband as you had appeared to Debby and me to do year after year after year. *'Ye did run well... Who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?'* Galatians 5:7.

I can understand if you failed to catch 1 Corinthians 7's import when you did your daily Bible readings over the years, and you might have missed preaching/teaching/examples on this subject. But those first 5 verses show God's way to Adultery-Proof a marriage. Let me be clear - sex is not a gift you give to your spouse. It is his right

(like a landlord). It is your duty (like a tenant). And visa versa. You owed him, and wronged him deeply when you said 'no.' Until you recognise that, and admit it, and broadcast your repentance like you have his wrongdoing, you remain in grave jeopardy. Embedded in that text about the Lord's Supper are these words: *'But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. 29 For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. 30 For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. 31 For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. 32 But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world'* (1 Corinthians 11:28-32).

Also to clarify, I do not hate Jason. I stand ready to forgive him as soon as he repents. You incorrectly judge my motives, and using your line of reasoning, would say the Lord Jesus was wrong to denounce the Pharisees so strongly as He did in Matthew 23. Yet He did not hate them; He was here to die for their sins! John the Baptist, Micaiah, Noah and the Apostle Paul denounced sin strongly. That does not imply hatred. Jason has a lot of people he has wronged. If we are supposed to just 'move on' then God is wrong to consign the wicked to hell whose sins were committed a lot further back in history than were Jason's. Should God just 'move on'? No, the Great White Throne is where the damned will be judged. Time has no effect on the appropriateness of justice being served. Jason has one hope, and that is to get the blood of Christ covering (atoning for) his sins against multiple churches, and then he won't be judged for them.



Your last sentence shows me that you are a dishonest woman. Mom, you know better than to equate the usual use of the word 'rape' with what happened to you. You were 'forced against your will' perhaps, but by continuing to use the word 'rape' you paint a deceitful picture.

Rape is a stranger grabbing a girl in the dark and often ends with murder. There's blood everywhere. There's bruising. There's kidnapping. There's severe trauma and it's awful. She's a prisoner forced to humiliation with a man who has no right to steal from her.

But you entered a marriage covenant with your husband, a covenant that every Bible student knows includes God's condoning of sexual relations. Sex is a huge incentive for a man to marry and put up with working long days to feed others, clothe others, shelter others besides himself. He gets up early, goes to work, labours all day, and arrives home at night tired -- all in service to his wife and family (I realise I am giving God's ideal which is often ignored, but allow me to paint the picture as God intended it to be). He could look forward to intimacy as a 'reward' so to speak at the end of the day. Excluding all others, Dad could turn to you in this increasingly sexualised world to find satisfaction in you alone. God calls it holy and honourable in Hebrews 13, and commands husbands in Proverbs 5 in very strong language to be satisfied only with their wives' bodies. Yet when your husband did that, you refused him. Sure, being a loving husband should have stopped him from forcing you to do your duty (no one is going to disagree that Dad was living carnally), but don't equate that with rape. Just because there is no state law that forces you to pay your debt to your husband doesn't take

away from the fact that you are guilty of stealing what is his. You vowed before a Justice of the Peace on 12 May 1972 to give it to him. Surely you are able to see the vast distinction.

Stop calling it 'rape.' You debase yourself to the level of this vile world when you let their terms become yours, beliefs become yours, and unjust laws to become your hope for justice.

With such deceitful use of terms, do you see why I don't trust you with my children?

Let' also put to rest this thing about how I should honour you. You tire of having 'submit to your husband' repeated by a man who won't love you as Christ loved the church or as he loves his own body. I think that would be quite difficult to take. So it is with the woman with a plank in the eye who has failed to obey God to tell others to obey God. You left your husband, Mom. That is what the ungodly do. However, the word 'honour' means 'weighty' as in 'you hold a lot of weight with me. You are valuable to me.' Mom, when your son has not been able to contact you from the day he found out you had left your husband until even this very second, but has phone calls unanswered, how can you suggest he has not tried to show you honour? Your emails have been vitriolic and abusive toward me. You assume the worst about me at every turn -- as seen in this week's correspondence many times. It is time that you lived Philippians 2:3. I do consider you very precious. I have often hoped someday you would come live with us and let us care for you if you ever stop being so youthful and healthy (who knows, you'll probably outlive your pain-ridden son). However, that must be balanced against the duty I also have to protect my children. When you took in [REDACTED] and would not listen to my sharing of my research about how she was deceiving you, I came to the conclusion that you would do to my family what you did to [REDACTED], if you could. Show your change of heart and I'll give you access to your grandchildren, Mom.

Controlling regarding my 19 year old? Let me tell you, if someone wants to hurt my favourite 65 year old mother, I will be just as protective (if she ever gives me access to her).

I truly want to do that.

Love you,

Kevin

From: Joy Harris [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, 17 March 2017 1:49 PM
To: Pastor Kevin Harris
Subject: Re: [SPAM] Re: [SPAM] Re: [SPAM] Re: Mutual Heartbreaks

Kevin,

Wait, you're saying that if a person is raped, they should not call the police, they should call the pastor? What if it was murder? Should they call the pastor still? And what if the person repents? Do you let a rapist move forward with no justice just because he repented?

And what if it's a child? Is a child supposed to go to her pastor if she gets raped? That's absurd.

I think you misunderstood my scenario. I was saying if a girl gets raped by another man in the church, not her husband. Obviously Matthew 18 doesn't apply then.

I'm using the word rape because that's what rape is - non-consensual sex.

On Fri, 17 Mar 2017 at 05:38 Pastor Kevin Harris <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Mom,

That's easily solved: Matthew 18:15-17 comes first, leaving the perpetrator to be treated as an heathen man and a publican, as the text clearly states. Then 1 Corinthians 6 is no longer violated.

I am afraid that you have made a very, very, very serious blunder. Scriptures are sufficient. 2Pe 1:3 *According as his divine power hath given unto us **all** things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue:* 2Ti 3:16, 17 *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.* There is no such distinction between civil and criminal matters, and I don't know a Bible student in history or contemporarily who would. In fact, we had already discussed the Bible's solution on the one occasion that we had a talk in the past 5 years. This is what comes of cutting yourself off and not seeking Biblical counsel. As a result, God's name and Christianity that takes the Bible literally would not have been reproached, both in the courtroom and in the comments made by readers in that newspaper report. God would be glorified if a Queensland court had been told that a church body had found his behaviour so intolerable and wrong that it had rebuked him, denounced his behaviour as unfitting a Christian, and released him from membership. What a contrast to the cover-ups which Roman Catholicism is known for! The unsaved, who, by the way, are far more unjust and unrighteous than the man they committed to prison for two non-consensual sex episodes, would sit up and admire a Christianity like that. Do you see what you have caused instead?

As to your second paragraph,

1) you are still using that super-charged word that makes his act look equal to the serial rapist who grabs girls in the night and lives a life totally reprehensible and ignorant of God's desires. Your husband, on the other hand, gave years of his life seeking to honour God with his life. He did provide for his family, turned away from opportunities to be unfaithful to you, did pour himself into family times, family devotions, and trying to do right. Yes, we all know his flaws, but ignoring his good points is to be unthankful, which is sin. You painted him before the court as a man with no good points, and led them to believe he was different than he was. Is that why you did not inform them that I was here and could bring some balance to the ugly picture you painted. Remember, to leave out relevant facts in a story is to deceive. Dad is not that kind of a rapist, and we all know it.

2) let me turn it around: you agreed to sex most of the time and only denied him 100s of times (5 with success), yet that still makes you guilty on 100s of counts. He did not force you on 1000s of occasions throughout your married life, but agrees that he did twice (I acknowledge that you claim it was more often, but don't miss this next point). That is thrown out of a just court just like the man who says, 'Your Honour, I didn't murder my wife for 3000 days. You're going to punish me for one day's act and ignore all the days I did right?

3) So you were equally wrong in saying 'no' (an act of force) as he was in saying 'yes' and forcing it. The difference is that you forced your will (100s plus 5) more than he forced his (100s). Both wrong, both guilty, the blood of Jesus Christ can cover both of your sins.

Dad has repented. You haven't.

1Jo 1:9 *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*

Love you,

Kevin

From: Joy Harris [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, 17 March 2017 12:46 AM
To: Pastor Kevin Harris
Subject: [SPAM] Re: [SPAM] Re: [SPAM] Re: Mutual Heartbreaks

Kevin,

Alright, I'm happy to revise my statement to say that I *successfully* denied sex on fewer than 5 occasions.

You would honestly compare my denying sex even after giving sex multiple times as "equal" to rape? How could that possibly be so?

I Cor 6 addresses civil matters. The context clearly excludes criminal matters, which Romans clearly tells us are to be addressed by him who bears the sword: government. If a 17 year old girl is raped by a man in the church, what is she supposed to do? Take it to the pastor? That's absurd. And if she does, what is the pastor supposed to do? How does he bring the man to justice? Scripture does not address how a church is supposed to handle such a situation because Scripture never contemplates such a situation arising. If you cannot offer Scripture for this position, you cannot ask me to believe or obey it.

On Thu, 16 Mar 2017 at 21:26 Pastor Kevin Harris <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Mom,

Let's take a breath and think through your words. *'Prove all things...hold fast that which is good.'*

Let me start with an inconsistency in your statements. You said, 'I denied him on fewer than 5 occasions in our entire marriage.' But you began the conversation saying, 'I don't trust *you* because it doesn't bother you that a man raped your own mum hundreds of times.' Mom, you can't have it both ways. For a rape to occur, you had to say 'no.' You need to add in the 100s of 'rapes' you claim were occurring because before he allegedly forced you, you said, 'no.' So did you deny him 5 times or hundreds of times?

Furthermore, you are using a super emotionally-charged word when you refer to it as 'rape.' Surely you can see a difference between the man you were intimate with consensually 100s or 1000s of times over nearly 40 years and a stranger grabbing a girl in a dark alley. The latter is a sex offender and deserves to be on a list of perpetrators. I think we need to acknowledge that the two are not the same thing. To be honest, you must see the difference. No thinker takes you seriously if you equate the two. Yet that is what the Queensland government did at your request.

Next, you say, 'If he requires sex 100's of times a day causing injury, inability to eat and sleep and to meet other God-given responsibilities, clearly he has gone beyond what is "due benevolence".' Mom, to create a scientifically/physically impossible scenario and then hang your argument on it is not wise.

You say, 'there clearly *is* a limit to the obligation of due benevolence' -- There is no limit given so therefore there is no limit. You don't get to make up the rules, Mom. That is the right of our Sovereign alone. His rules forbid a spouse to refuse a spouse...full stop.

Who explicitly told David not to number the people? It is not stated, yet God killed thousands for David's error. He was supposed to deduce it. Where does the Bible state that we can't abort? It doesn't, yet you and I deduce it. That's what principles are -- time-honoured truths that apply in all times at all places. We don't need God to cover off on every little possibility. He doesn't have to have a rule, 'Thou shalt not necklines two finger's widths below your collarbone or skirts to the bottom of your knee.' We easily deduce those things.

What God says you are not to do to your spouse, you have now admitted to disobeying on 5 occasions, and in a roundabout way, you admit to 100s of other times too.

I repeat then: Will you back down from your statement? Will you bow to the authority of Scripture? Will you recognise that withholding what God commands you not to withhold is a crime against both God and your husband? The issue I asked you about is not his response to your sin. Does that passage allow you to unilaterally say 'no' to your husband? If you are not permitted to say 'no,' and so you obey your God, does that not remove the possibility that 'marital rape' will ever occur? In other words, if you had obeyed, would he have raped you?

You wanted his 'crimes' to be punished, but you have yet to plead guilty to yours. Mom, this is classic judging someone with a plank in your eye. You are as guilty as Dad. You admit to 5 (or 100s?) of sins; provoking him to sin. Yet you are a victim and he's not? He is in prison but you're not? Please repent and admit your guilt.

You say, 'it doesn't say anything like what you're saying it says' -- of course it does. God says that you must not unilaterally deny him. If God gives no limit, you mustn't. That's not hard to grasp. Mom, and no amount of blustering, threatening and belittling will change the facts. Verbal abuse is not befitting a child of God, and is every bit as bad as what you say Dad did to you physically. You seem to see his faults, my faults, [REDACTED]'s faults, but will not admit to even one yourself. If you truly want to win an argument, you have to use truth. I said exactly what the text says and no more, which makes me a true prophet instead of a false prophet as you say. You are labelling a truth-speaker as a deceiver. You are adding to your guilt with each passing opportunity to admit your sin and seek the Lord's forgiveness.

Isa 5:20 Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

As long as you twist facts and make up rules and judge others by your rules, you are not in submission to the Lord. You know it. I know it. It doesn't matter how many people you get to agree with you. It's only the Lord's approval that any of us need.

If your reality does not line up with God's reality, then your reality is wrong.

Because you speak this way, telling me things that are not true and right by God's standard, that I have had a hard time knowing what to believe for these past few years, as far as you and Dad are concerned. That will not change if you are speaking with the unChristian tone that is in today's emails.

You have spent the last decade condemning me and suffering the consequences. I don't trust you with my children (I don't care how old they are, they are still not 'fair game' for you to hurt). I wish you would humble yourself and talk with civility so that things might change.

The other question it would be good to look at some time comes from 1Co 6:1 *Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? 2 Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? 3 Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life? 4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church. 5 I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? 6 But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. 7 Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?* My question is, 'Again, God's Word is crystal clear. In addition to not admitting your own equal crimes against your husband, why did you not bow to the Lord's directives here in this passage?'

Why did the prosecutor not speak to me? I would have told a different story. He only received selective facts. But God knows all of the story.

If the judge had all of the facts, he may not have come to the verdict he did and God's name might not have been so smeared in the newspaper as it was. For instance, there's an obvious flaw in the argument that Dad is a domestic violent offender. If that's so, why did Jason intentionally send [REDACTED] to the home of such an 'evil' person who had allegedly been responsible for Jason's own mental health issues? The case should have been thrown out right there.

You were created to be Dad's helper. Whatever he wanted to do, you were there to help him. 'Submit' is *hupatasso* which speaks of ranking under a commander. It is to subordinate yourself under him. If the general says to march for 8 hours, you must do it. Mom, you were to do it just as the church submits to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Yes, we live in a fallen world. Eve was deceived and led her husband into disobedience. She lost her

perfect husband, and all Eves since then have had to bear that burden. But God gives clear principles in His Word about how to have a good marriage in a fallen world. There were times when I watched you being a good helper to him, but I also saw other times where you belittled him, made him feel his inadequacies keenly, and did not cooperate with his wishes. There is plenty of forgiveness available for you for these sins. You ought to seek it with a contrite heart, so that your bitterness is released, the Lord gets the glory, and your marriage can be restored. Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. You need it just as much as Dad does, Mom.

Well, you got your way. I let this turn into an email discussion. It turned out exactly as I feared. You and I are not singing off the same song sheet. The same Spirit does not have 'absolute sway' in us both. Do you see any reason to continue on with this discussion? It seems to me that I will have to once again commit you to the Lord to deal with as He sees fit and wait until the Judgment Seat of Christ for the final verdict. That's what you are forcing me to conclude. I hoped so badly that this would not be the result.

I love you, Mom. My desire is to be there for you if ever you are in need. My great desire is that someday you will see the hurt you have caused, admit it so that I and others might forgive you. Then I would like to open up a place on our property for you to live in, should the need arise.

It's up to you, Mom.

Love you,

Kevin

From: Joy Harris [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, 16 March 2017 6:16 PM
To: Pastor Kevin Harris
Subject: [SPAM] Re: [SPAM] Re: Mutual Heartbreaks

The word "due" in verse 3 clearly has a limit. If he requires sex 100's of times a day causing injury, inability to eat and sleep and to meet other God-given responsibilities, clearly he has gone beyond what is "due benevolence". You may differ with me in where that limit is, but there clearly *is* a limit to the obligation of due benevolence. Therefore, your statement that "God says otherwise" is not true. What God says is clear. How that should be applied in the details is not stated in Scripture and requires interpretation. You may think 10 times a day is the limit, or 100, or 1000, but the point is, you have a limit and so do I. And neither is clearly, explicitly stated in the text of Scripture. You have therefore, because of your careless and sloppy approach to Scripture, put words in God's mouth. You said "GOD says" and God does not say. That is the mark of a false prophet. And when you're defending an evil such as rape, it is blasphemy.

Exactly where I draw the line in interpreting the line is between me and God and in the extreme case, my local church. But let us assume for a moment, that any denial, IF any denial existed (I denied him on fewer than 5 occasions in our entire marriage), is sin. You want to make that the issue, but it is not the issue. The issue is that if he takes what he has a right to by *force*, it is rape. Whether or not I should say no doesn't change the fact that it is rape. Because rape is not defined by whether I *should* say 'yes' or 'no', but by what I *do* say, and if I do say 'no', then it is rape. It is that simple. Even if I've sinned, marital rape DOES exist. You may justify that rape on the basis of my sin, but it does not change the fact that it *is* rape.

I gave a careful set of arguments directly from the text. If you had read my email with any care whatsoever, you would understand that I already addressed these points. If you're too busy to respond in a way that actually addresses what Scripture says, then don't respond. Take a week or two if you need it. But if you're going to condemn me based on Scripture, I expect you to actually show me in Scripture what you're saying it

says, because I've clearly looked at this passage more carefully than you have and it doesn't say anything like what you're saying it says. If ever there was a time to think carefully, this is it, so stop being lazy, stop being sloppy, and study your Bible.

On Thu, 16 Mar 2017 at 14:11 Pastor Kevin Harris <kdharris@speedlink.com.au> wrote:

You write, ' But for a wife to decline sex for the 3rd time in a given day because she has an appointment is not a violation of this passage.' God says otherwise: *3 Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.*

4 The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

5 Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.

Will you back down from your statement? Will you bow to the authority of Scripture? Will you recognise that withholding what God commands you not to withhold is a crime against both God and your husband? The issue I asked you about is not his response to your sin. Does that passage allow you to unilaterally say 'no' to your husband? If you are not permitted to say 'no,' and so you obey your God, does that not remove the possibility that 'marital rape' will ever occur? In other words, if you had obeyed, would he have raped you?

From: Joy Harris [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, 16 March 2017 2:59 PM
To: Pastor Kevin Harris
Subject: [SPAM] Re: Mutual Heartbreaks

Kevin,

You say you are "but a simple servant of the Lord who wants to be like Jesus Christ". This false humility is betrayed by your life. Everything about the way you interact with people in ministry says it's really about power. You use the Bible to pressure people. I understand that you don't see yourself this way, but that's why you're in the position you're in.

You seem to think that I think little of myself. I don't. I know who I am before God. I don't need your assurance or anyone else's. That why I protect myself from people like you.

You are correct to believe that Scripture is our authority. You are correct to believe that the Holy Spirit teaches us from Scripture. You're horribly mistaken to think that simple Bible study must lead 2 people to the same conclusion. Such a notion is childish, simplistic and unbiblical. For instance, the very next chapter, 1 Cor 8, speaks about meat offered to idols - a matter in which Christians disagreed. Paul urges love, not Bible study.

You talk about the authority of Scripture, then cut and paste a bunch of commentaries. Surely your conscience signalled the inconsistency. I won't engage with the commentators except to say that none of