

DIARY OF AN UNBORN CHILD

- October 5:** Today my life began. My parents do not know it yet; I am as small as a seed of an apple, but it is I already. And I am to be a girl. I shall have blond hair and blue eyes. Just about everything is settled though, even the fact that I shall love flowers.
- October 10:** Some say that I am not a real person yet, that only my mother exists. But I am a real person, just as a small crumb of bread is truly bread. My mother is, and I am.
- October 2:** My mouth is just beginning to open now. Just think, in a year or so I shall be laughing, and later talking. I know what my first word will be: MaMa.
- October 25: My heart began to beat today all by itself. From now on it shall gently beat for the rest of my life without ever stopping to rest! And after many years it will tire. It will stop, and then I shall die.
- November 2: I am growing a bit every day. My arms and legs are beginning to take shape. But I have to wait a long time yet before those little legs will raise me to my mother's arms, before these little arms will be able to gather flowers and embrace my father.
- November 12: Tiny fingers are beginning to form on my hands. Funny how small they are! I'll be able to stroke my mother's hair with them.
- November 20: It wasn't until today that the doctor told Mom that I am living here under her heart. Oh, how happy she must be! Are you happy, Mom?
- November 25: My mom and dad are probably thinking about a name for me. But they don't even know that I am a girl. I want to be called Kathy. I am getting so big already.
- December 10: My hair is growing. It is smooth and bright and shiny. I wonder what kind of hair Mom has.
- December 13: I am just about able to see. It is dark around me. When Mom brings me into the world it will be full of sunshine and flowers. But what I want more than anything is to see my mom. How do you look, Mom?
- December 24: I wonder if Mom hears the whispering of my heart? Some children come into the world a little sick. But my heart is strong and healthy. It beats so evenly: tup-tup, tup-tup. You'll have a healthy little daughter, Mom!
- December 28: Today my mom killed me!

***“If thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law”
James 2:11.***

Via Church Bulletin, Jacksonville Church of Christ, Jacksonville, AL 36265

BULLETIN BRIEFS

Volume 11

November 2008

No. 11

DAVID LIPSCOMB UNIVERSITY AND THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS CONFERENCE

Wayne Jackson

The Christian Scholars Conference (CSC) convened in June, 2008 on the campus of David Lipscomb University in Nashville, Tennessee. With support from several sister schools, e.g., Pepperdine University, Abilene Christian University, Oklahoma Christian University, and Harding University, it was the twenty-eighth annual gathering of some of the most radically liberal, self-designated “scholars” on the planet. There were dozens of presentations (all of which were characterized as “high quality” productions), delivered by both men and women, representing sixty-eight colleges and universities, along with twenty-four additional institutions.

The conference was a heterogeneous blend of sectarian personalities (all of whom were identified as “Christian”), combined with a conglomerate of digressives who have surrendered virtually every vestige of interest in the restoration of New Testament religion. “Restorationism” is not merely ignored, it is **repudiated** emphatically.

The CSC platform affirms that it “is dedicated to the virtue of diversity which expands world-views, fosters collegiality, demonstrates the highest quality of scholarship, and provides opportunity for all Christian scholars.”

The sacred Scriptures enjoin unity; the emerging anti-restorationists applaud diversity. The lineup demonstrated how very far from New Testament teaching this aggregation of “elitists” has strayed.

One of the most startling participants was former Abilene Christian University student, Jared Cramer. Cramer is currently affiliated with the Anglican (Episcopal) movement (working toward priesthood). On his blog the “Reverend Cramer” (as he likes to designate himself) emphatically declares he has abandoned the ideal of “restorationism.”

(Continued next page)

Feel free to use articles
from *Bulletin Briefs*
for your
own bulletin or make
copies of the whole for
distribution.
www.waldronmissions.org

“I don’t believe in Restorationism or Primitivism. I just don’t. It’s not Biblical, there’s no call to it. I don’t care two bits if today’s church looks like the first century church, and I don’t think God does” ([Becoming Quicksand](#)).

The most stunning thing, however, was the topic for which Mr. Cramer contended, with the obvious tolerance of the CSC screening committee and/or those affiliated with this program. According to an abstract that appeared on the Lipscomb University website, the author’s presentation was titled “One New Humanity: Reconsidering Homosexuality in Light of the Ecclesiology of Ephesians.” The abstract states:

“Paul’s letter to the Ephesians presents an ecclesiology founded on unity in Christ rooted in the fullness of God. Ephesians builds on the fundamental truth that in Christ, God has broken down the dividing wall between Jews and Gentiles and is creating one new humanity in place of the two. After examining the ecclesiology of Ephesians, this paper engages in a case study on the place of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered (GLBT) Christians in the Episcopal Church. Perhaps a deeper understanding of Paul’s message in Ephesians can lead to a renewed perspective on the issues facing Christians today.”

This may represent an all-time historical low as an approach to Paul’s Ephesian letter.

The material submitted to the CSC (with only a slight alteration to accommodate a transition to the newer CSC format) is a regurgitation of Cramer’s previously published views. His position was set forth in an article titled [Homosexuality: But Why?](#)

It was submitted in a more extensive format as a thesis written while at Abilene Christian University and presented to Dr. James W. Thompson, November 28, 2006 (see the thesis [*on line*] [here](#)). The CSC submission (June 27, 2008) is virtually a carbon copy of his ACU thesis. It can hardly be claimed, therefore, that his position caught CSC officials by surprise.

Cramer contends that his defense of homosexuality is a response to an increasing number of questions he has received regarding his position on this subject. Incredibly, the author asserts that any discussion of homosexuality “is shallow until a person actually engages in an actual relationship with a person of a different sexual orientation.”

The main proposition the author attempts to argue is that there is nothing “wrong about a faithful, loving, monogamous same-sex relationship.” He says, “I fail to see what it is about homosexuality that declares it as inherently evil” (“Homosexuality: But Why?”). He contends that Paul’s “oneness ecclesiology” in the Ephesian epistle applies to gays and straights just as it did to Jews and Gentiles! If this is so, the apostle contradicted his earlier instruction in both 1 Cor. (6:9), Rom. (1:26-27), and his later letter to Timothy (1 Tim. 1:10).

This brief review is not designed as a comprehensive rebuttal of the author’s superficial treatment of the Scripture texts that condemn homosexual conduct. He dismisses the biblical data with a cavalier wave of the hand and his personal assertion that some of the scriptural condemnations are “conditioned by time and culture”; thus they are not relevant to today’s gay-lesbian-bisexual-transgendered phenomenon. Other texts, he maintains, address “abuses” rather than loving homosexual liaisons.

The following questions are appropriate: How does a “scholar” determine it is “wrong” if: (a) a homosexual relationship is breached by “unfaithfulness”; (b) is flawed when lacking “love” and is solely a matter of lust; or, (c) is unwarranted if it is polygamous instead of monogamous? How does one deduce that fidelity, lovingness, and monogamy are to be preferred over their opposites?

Might someone not contend that Bible teaching about faithfulness, love, and monogamy likewise are culturally flexible, and thus promiscuity, lust, and multiple sex-partners are permissible? These sexually inclusive attitudes and actions are common in numerous “cultures” within certain segments of the modern world.

One of Cramer’s arguments in defense of homosexual relationships (as he ideally depicts them) is that gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and the transgendered frequently bear “all the fruits of the Spirit” (cf. Galatians 5:22-23), hence such must be evidence of their approval by God. He contends that “the holiness seen in the lives of these Christians has stood in ‘stark contrast with many sinful patterns of sexuality’ (e.g., promiscuity, prostitution, incest, pornography, pedophilia, predatory sexual behavior, etc.)” (“One New Humanity”). The “logic” is unbelievable.

What is to be said regarding the atheist who loves his wife, is joyful in his occupational employment, and is peaceable with his next-door neighbor? Do these qualities demonstrate that he enjoys the approval of the very God **he denies**?

What possible justification could David Lipscomb University and its affiliates have for arranging and/or supporting a program that embraces a defense of this debauched level of moral irresponsibility?

What a disservice to the godly memory of the founder of this school! If this does not awaken a somewhat lethargic brotherhood to the gross level of corruption within a number of our universities, could **anything** bring us to a state of reality?

www.christiancourier.com/article/1437

~~~~~

**URGENT**

~~~~~

As the above article by brother Wayne Jackson illustrates, universities David Lipscomb, Abilene Christian, Oklahoma Christian, Pepperdine and Harding are supporting the sectarian and immoral agenda of the so-called Christian Scholars Conference. About the

only way to influence the administrators and boards of these bodies is to hit them in the pocketbook.

Preachers need to have the intestinal fortitude to publicly expose such rank support of these anti-Christ practices and elders need to call on their members to reject these schools when they come with their hands out.

REJOICE AND AGAIN REJOICE!!!

Note by J. Waldron, Taking news from Donald Wildman of the American Family Association in the October Bulletin Brief we carried an article urging a boycott of McDonald’s because of their support of the so-called “gay rights” agenda for “same sex marriage”. As the article below states, McDonald’s has heard the call by concerned Americans and has reversed its policy. It is a time to be thankful to God that there are still “ten righteous souls” in this land and they can be heard. We appreciate very much the work of Mr. Wildman in this effort. His web site is: contact@afa.net.

AFA Ends Boycott of McDonald’s

Donald E. Wildman
P.O. Drawer 2440, Tupelo, MS 38803

October 9, 2008: **Great news!** Because of AFA supporters like you, McDonald’s has told AFA they will remain neutral in the culture war regarding homosexual marriage. **AFA is ending the boycott of McDonald’s.** As you know, AFA called for the boycott in May after McDonald’s joined the National Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce (NGLCC).

McDonald’s said McDonald’s Vice President Richard Ellis has resigned his position on the board of NGLCC and that his seat on the board will not be replaced. McDonald’s also said that the company has no plans to renew their membership in NGLCC when it expires in December.

In an e-mail to McDonald’s franchised owners the company said, “It is our policy to not be involved in political and social issues. McDonald’s remains neutral on same sex marriage or any ‘homosexual agenda’ as defined by the American Family Association.”

We appreciate the decision by McDonald’s to no longer support political activity by homosexual activist organizations. You might want to thank your local McDonald’s manager.