

TO THE
Gospel Mission Baptists.

By
J. B. MOODY.



1. 1909.

TO THE GOSPEL MISSION BAPTISTS.

Dear Brethren:—Engagements prevented my attendance on your General Association except parts of two days. I earnestly desired to speak to you words from my heart, but did not, because I could not. So I address you this way. I hesitated about going to your meeting, not because I did not want to, but feared you did not want me to; that is some of you. It is already told over some sections that I tried to “nose in.” So my motive is already impugned. Romans 16:17 came into my mind. It reads: “Mark them that cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine you have learned, and avoid them.” Did I violate that rule? Let us look closely at it. That you have a division was boldly and repeatedly asserted; that is, by “those who have the RULE over you.” I don’t think your churches have so declared. If so, you certainly know what the result will be. This will come up later. As to “Offenses,” no one can be mistaken. Certainly more of that than when the two divisions took place three score and ten years ago. Not only are you more offended than they, but you have caused more offense to the denomination you are leaving. I need not say to you that the bitterness of these offenses is a disgrace to Christianity and especially that part represented by our

orthodox faith. But orthodoxy that does not make us better in heart and life is rotten in the core. The eighteenth verse kept in my mind as I watched the conduct of your leaders. The substance is this: For those who cause the division and offenses are not in subjection to our Anointed Lord but to their own desires, and by complimentary words they deceive the hearts of the unsuspecting. The next verse says, "I would have you wise with respect to that which is good and harm less to that which is evil." As you seem disposed to follow those who proclaim the division, I suppose your churches will finally endorse it. But I am not ready to give you up, and so beg a little attention to the next feature. Is the "Division and Offenses" contrary to the doctrine we have learned? Then I violated the "Beseeching" injunction to "avoid you." I beg you now to give heed to the DOCTRINE. If your division like all others, is based on Doctrine, then we must bid you Good-bye. But take one more look. Are you Baptists? So are we. Are you landmark Baptists? So are we with a small. Shall we like others divide over a lower and upper case letter? Is that doctrine? But as Landmarkism includes so much, we will divide it into smaller items, so as to find the trouble. Let us take it in detail. Are you preservation Baptists?

So are we. Are you final ~~perseverance~~ ⁱⁿ perseverance Baptists? So are we in faith. That is we believe Baptists ought to persevere, though many seem not to be working at it, but rather the opposite.

Are you perpetuity and continuity Baptists? So are we. See my book, "My Church," which has been so highly commended by those on our side, though by none on yours. But when you go out, you will have neither perpetuity or continuity. Your origin will be 1900 years too late. Both sides of a division can't claim the perpetuity. Those that cut themselves off lose it. We had perpetuity before your Division, but you will cut yourselves from the perpetuity we had before yours was conceived, and I hope it is not yet born. The Hardshells saw this and called themselves Primitives.

Again, are you separate Baptists? So are we. That is we believe in separating ourselves from the world and all those divisions that cannot fellowship us, because of false doctrine. Those who would exclude us, and those we would exclude, must be reckoned as separate from us. What false doctrine separates us? Are you close communion and close baptism Baptists? I more. But I am not disposed to make that a divisive doctrine. I have some toleration for non vital doctrines, or rather for those

holding them. Let us contend but not divide.

Again, are you Hardshell Baptists? We are both alike on that. Both have the "Ringed, Streaked, Striped and Strayed" on that. If you accuse me of being more on this, I answer not more than your honored and chosen President; that is your former President, and C. R. Powell said that Bogard would not be there, that is in the moderators chair, if J. K. P. Williams were here. Not more than G. P. Bostic, who was admitted to fellowship. If you are dividing on this doctrine, then you must subdivide, and this of course you will do as soon as you get time and opportunity, as all would-be leaders must lead, and you can't furnish offices and honors for all.

But this difference is greatly magnified. We are all poor worms of the dust and we need a hard shell for protection. The snail out of his shell is in great danger. What is more tempting to the "birds of the air," which represent the messengers of Satan according to Matt. 13:4-19. The snail and oyster, etc., are safe in the shell, but not safe out of it. Dry shells are dead and don't protect anything. What is the helmet but a hard shell for the head, and the shield for the body, and the shoes but a shield for the feet? They may be a little heavy to carry. and may impede our speed,

but better go protected from the fiery darts of the wicked. If Satan can shoot an arrow of suspicion into your heart and mind, and that is his favorite weapon, then your feet will not feel like walking in the commands of Christ, but will suffer with the head and heart? Nor will they walk in the fellowship of the brethren. If you carry no helmet, and no shield, you will need no shoes for your active feet. When you cease to walk in the fellowship of the brethren, you will also cease to walk in the stewardship of the faith. Get your head or heart sick and your feet will be sick also. This and correlative doctrines are believed by both of us with varying shades and degrees, and as we all have to grow stronger and stronger in these strong doctrines, let us give time for growth and bear with each other while growing. I don't believe there is any cause for any division in doctrine, and this is the cause of all other divisions. So we all believe alike, that the Commission was given to the churches, and that associations and conventions are the ways the churches choose to co operate. Are you Missionary Baptists? So are we. Are you gospel mission Baptists? So are we—if you spell the adjectives with small letters. Capitals denote a distinct proper name, different from other Missionary Baptists. Do you believe that each Baptist and each Baptist

church has the inalienable right to send their mission money the way they choose. We more. You say, only through your gateway; we sav through either, or neither, but direct if they choose. This you deny. Our Dr. J. B. Gambrell is, and has been, the greatest pleader for these rights of any man living or dead.

We don't find fault so much with your methods as with your Methodism, as we will see. If you convert methods into doctrines, and then spell with a big "M," then you are Methodists with a big "M," and I would not that you should be that bad kind of methodists. Of course some methods are better than others, and the wisdom of the methods will soon be seen in the fruits they bear. We thus judge the methods of teaching, farming, merchandising, etc. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Show us the fruits of your methods which you have magnified into a sufficient cause for separation, and "division and offenses," such as disgrace christianity, and of which it is a shame to speak.

But let us come back to the comparison. Do you believe in associations? So do we. Do you believe in State associations? So do we. Do you believe in a general association? So do we. Do you believe in these bodies having clerks or secretaries to

record the business? So do we. And you will have as many as we if your work should ever grow so as to require them. Do you believe in a general secretary? So do we. Do you believe that if it requires all of his time, that he is worthy of his hire and that he should be supported? So do we. Do you believe in having a board, or general committee, to attend to the business in the interim of the associations? So do we. Do you believe in sending the gospel into all the world, and preaching it to every creature? We more, judging by our works. Then what is the cause of your division? There is no doctrine involved. Will you convert mission methods into doctrine? Then we will have to call you not gospel mission Baptists, but anti gospel Methodist Baptists, for that is what you will be. Missions constitute doctrine, for we are taught by precept and example to give and to go. But it does not tell us how to go. Christ and the apostles mostly walked. Shall we make that a method? No, for they sometimes rode, both on sea and land. As they did not have steam locomotion, must we therefore discard it? This proves that the HOW of going is not a doctrine, or something taught. We are taught to disciple. That is a doctrine, but we are not taught the method. Baptism is a doctrine, but we

are nowhere taught the HOW as a method. It may be done in a natural or artificial pool or river; it may be done face up or down, standing or kneeling. There are many ways of burying the dead, but no one way is given as a doctrine. There are many ways of teaching the "all things whatsoever." but the ways are not taught. Preaching, teaching, evangelizing, talking, writing are some of the ways, but no method given as a method. There are many ways of giving, and if there is a method suggested, it is in 1 Cor. 16:1 4, where everyone is taught on every first day of the week to lay by in store as God has prospered him. Giving is a part of missions, and right here you might make an argument on methods, but I believe you shun or are at least are shy of this method. Are you withdrawing from us because we do not practice with you this plain method of giving, every one on every first day of the week. Judging from returns, your method seems to be to lay by in bank every day in the week, so that no collections can be taken for the poor saints at Jerusalem, or elsewhere, nor for poor sinners.

I eagerly watch for the fruits of your methods of raising mission money. Now, if you have no distinct doctrines to divide on and no distinct superior mission methods, then what will your division be built on?

Not sand, for that is something and may do till the storm comes. As I see it, you are building on an airy nothing, on a misunderstanding, a misapprehension, a misinterpretation, a misbelief, a mistake, a mistrust, which is sure to prove a misadventure, and misfortune, and also a miserable, misdirected, misuse of mission money and methods. Those who magnify untaught mission methods into doctrines vital and fatal to fellowship and partnership with their brethren, of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one body," will thus also condemn their fathers who walked with God, and in his favor. If you will thus magnify untaught mission methods, then you can't deny that you are Methodists of the Methodists, for they never broke away for matters so trifling. On that you propose to build a division, or schism or sect. You can't build a church, for no schism can be a church if it cuts loose from a church or churches. You can't rise above your source. If you go out from churches, you can't begin churches. Such a division of churches were not in the world before Bogard, Barker, etc. There will be no recognition of each other's churches, baptisms, letters, ministers, ordinations, etc. We will no more sit down to the same table of the Lord, because we will no longer be "one body." We are landmark Baptists; and we warn you now that we will treat you as we do

all other schisms and sects.

But you claim you have other grievances. Your leaders, or rather mis-leaders, have told their too-confiding followers that the conventionites are not sound in doctrine. But I, and thousands of others are as sound in what you call Lanemarkism as you are, and you refuse us even counsel with you in your meetings. I heard one of you say that all of our secretaries were rotten in doctrine. Was J. G. Bow rotten? Is W. D. Powell, W. C. Golden? J. B. Gambrell? He is stronger on the very points you contend for than any or all of you together. Individual liberty and church independency have never had such a pleader.

Is J. M. Frost rotten in doctrine? Read his "Pedobaptism—of Heaven or of Men." Read his recent books on Baptism and the Supper. Who printed J. F. Love's "Baptist Position and Position for a Baptist?" Did he leave a "t" to cross, an "i" to dot, or a letter to scratch? I bought 500 of them. The soundest and safest of all books of its size ever written in defense and propogation of Baptist doctrine. J. F. Love was a secretary, and J. M. Frost, with the endorsement of the Southern Baptist Convention that, and many more of the soundest Baptist books to be found in all the world. Conventionites give a hundred dollars to your one and they make one hundred Bap-

tists to your one, and who knows but they are one hundred times better Baptists than those who are raised on wolf's milk, and who are taught to growl and bark and bite. Read 1 John 2:9-11; 3:11-16; 4:7-8, 20, 21; 5:1-2.

Some of our secretaries, as Willingham and Gray, have come in contact with the nations and religions of the earth, and they are compelled to use policy and diplomacy that are not required of us. If one of you go to a town where everybody is anything but a Baptist, and who are opposed to Baptists, would you not have to use a little more common sense? Could you by abuse, force them to open their houses to you, or come to hear you, and to believe what you say? Would you not have to use a little policy sugar-coated? Does not principle require policy? The man is not as wise as Solomon who can see no place for policy. Are not these the places that Willingham and Gray have to do with? When a place becomes self-sustaining, these wise secretaries turn it loose to fight the fight of faith as soon as they are able. You think they use too much sugar, they think we use too much salt. Which is right? Their policy gives the Baptists a name and fame, while the other policy would defame the same. They believe in baiting the hook, and in feeding the babes with milk and sugar instead of stuff-

ing strong meat down their throats whether or no. I was told the other day that a Baptist paper was so largely circulated in a town and that its spirit was so offensive that the Baptists, once strong, were on the wane. That public sentiment was enraged at its ugly spirit, and that they needed no other weapon to kill us out than that paper. Is that wise?

But you say that if the truth kills the cause, let it die. This is the same as saying if strong meat kills the babes, let them die. If milk is for babes, and babes have to grow to be men so they can endure strong meat, is it not wise to follow the common sense rule? For sound doctrine and wisdom in handling it, I would greatly prefer the convention side. They don't believe in sticking pins in people just to make them fret and fume and fuss and fight. Secretaries who are not wise enough to keep principle from conflicting with policy ought to step down and out, and if not, they would be put out.

But you say again that the convention is a failure. Or rather, your leaders said it, and you seem to endorse it. Is it your rule to swallow everything they give you? Was there ever such success for the truth and our cause as has crowned the efforts of the Southern Baptist Convention? The figures are almost incredible. Baptists have in-

creased in numbers about three times as fast as the population of the country. And did a country ever so increase? I can remember when only about one-tenth of the churches co-operated. Now more than one-half, and that in the face of all the opposition you and others could give. If you had worked for, instead of against them, they might now have two-thirds in co-operation. A great number of our churches can't co-operate because they are not able to keep house for themselves, and thousands have no house to keep. Every year there is wonderful growth. But how is it with you? I think last year you reported 123 churches co-operated with you by letter and messenger, mostly, I understand, by letter. This year I hear only 55, mostly by letter, and the letters not read. Your General Association of the United States of America was smaller than any of our district associations that I ever attended. The Lord is clearly not on your side, if success is a sign, and you always claim that as a measure of success. The Lord CAN'T be on your side, because there is no justification for your division and schism. It must fail because it "has no depth of earth." You have nothing to build on or with, and certainly you have no wise master-builders. You are bound for the ditch and I beg you not to go on in. This is why I now address you. Don't

divide our landmark forces and thus bring us into ridicule and our doctrine into scorn.

But you say again that the Texas Ninth Article is an offense to you. It may have been, as all of these other things were, but you have come to adopt all of them, and especially the Ninth Article. You have that bad. I told you in open meeting that I was a landmark Baptist, and that I was not in full accord with the Southern Baptist Convention; and I asked if I would be allowed to meet with you in Little Rock next March to counsel with you as to the wisdom of the landmark Baptists separating themselves. Instead of taking me into counsel, I was virtually denounced as a hypocrite for not coming out from that I was not in full accord with. But I don't propose to jump out of the frying pan into the fire. Your boss told it out that no one was wanted in counsel who was not in favor of the division. Should a sovereign Baptist church send messengers to your association with "instructions" to vote against further division, you would not let them in. Even visitors were plainly and repeatedly told they could make announcements, but their counsel would be called for when needed. Did you hear it? Texas never treated a visitor that way. The next Flag called us Pharisees. Visitors are always invited to counsel in

Baptist bodies. The Southern Baptist Convention gives me as much recognition as you, if not more. When it meets west I am at home; when it meets east I don't have to attend. The leaders on both sides are not in fellowship with me, but I will neither shun or run. Like J. N. Hall, I propose to attend the Southern Baptist Convention as long as I can, though only as a visitor. So I propose to treat you. They both may count me out or put me out, and I may pout, but I am not going to blaze another route. I was counted out at Hot Springs, though entertaining the body, and had two claims to membership, but I did not even pout. I think proscriptions will soon come to an end in the Southern Baptist Convention, and I trust also with you. I despise such littleness, and especially would I despise it in myself. The Southern Baptist Convention was for a time dominated by Whitsittism—that was my objection to it. They showed contempt for landmark Baptists, but this has improved.

Again you say you object to the money basis. There is no such thing as the money basis. It is only a plank in the platform. It has also the numerical plank for any association can send, regardless of money. The Bible condemns numbers or the multitude as well as money. Ex. 23:2. Kentucky and Tennessee have no money basis

and Illinois Association has. Then why leave these and go to that? Is that sincere or consistent? Your prejudice against a money basis is greater than that of others against close communion. Indeed I had rather reason with the latter than with you on that. When the S. B. C. met in Nashville, I was living there in the capacity of an editor. A brother wrote to me from another state to use my influence to have the money basis abolished.

I took up my pen to do so. I began "to breathe out threatening and slaughter." I looked for the vital point to aim my thirteen inch gun at. I failed to see my game clear. So I went to enquire about the thing I wanted to demolish. I learned something and so would you if you should go in search of knowledge. Did you know that all the religious prejudice in the world is based on ignorance? Anti-missionary like, I thought it should be condemned because there was money in it. I would not like to see church membership on a money basis, yet it takes money to run a church, and the Lord God has everlastingly predestinated that no church shall live without it. I believe that members having money and refusing to give it for church necessities should be turned out. I would not baptize one who told me that he was opposed to the use of money in religion. There is

some sort of money basis in church membership. See 1 Cor. 16: 1-4. When the Lord "ordained that they that preach the gospel, should live of the gospel," he put the ministry on a money basis. All the business that I know of is on the money basis, and missions is pre-eminently business, and can't be run without money. God has put missions on a money basis and who will reply against Him and say "What doest Thou?"

The great business of the associations and conventions is to get and properly dispose of the money, where, when and on whom it will bring forth the best results. Doctrine and sentiment are good, but both no good in missions where there is no money. How can they preach except they be sent, and how can you send them without the money? You are pulling the same string the Anti-mission Baptists pulled. As A. Campbell got out an American edition of Sandamanianism, adopting all of Sandaman's pet ideas, words and phrases, so your leaders have gone to the literature of seventy-five years ago and adopted the ideas, words and phrases of the Anti-missionary Baptists and A. Campbell both. They were not Anti-missionary at first, but soon ran into it, as you are sure to do. Indeed your giving is nearly over now. The only changes you have made have been in

changing "Order" and "Plan" to another "Method."

READ THE FOLLOWING FROM THE ADDRESS
IN 1832.

The First Hardshell Convention.

This body met at Black Rock, Maryland, in 1832, to counsel over the advisability of a separation from the Missionary Baptists. It was decided by those present to advise the separation. And they issued an "Address" to those like minded, and to those undecided, urging them to go with them.

In the light of the current controversy on missions that "Address" has peculiar interest, the remarkable thing about it is, that they were opposing, not missions, but mission methods. To show that this is true I want to give some quotations.

"Previous to stating our objections to the mission plans, we will meet some of the false charges brought against us relative to this subject, by a simple and unequivocal declaration, that we do regard as of the first importance, the command given of Christ, primarily in every age to "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," and do feel an earnest desire to be found acting in obedience thereunto, as the providence of God directs our way, and opens a door of utterance for us. We also believe it to be the duty of individ-

uals and churches to contribute according to their abilities, for the support, not only of their pastors, but also or those who go preaching the gospel among the destitute. But we at the same time contend that we have no right to depart from the order which the Master himself has seen fit to lay down, relative to the ministration of His word. We therefore cannot fellowship the plans for spreading the gospel, generally adopted at this day, under the name of missions; because we consider those plans throughout a subversion of the order worked out in the New Testament. * * The Lord has manifestly established the order, that His ministers should be sent forth by the churches. But the mission plan is to send them out by a Mission Society. The gospel society or church is to be composed of baptized believers; the poor is placed on an equal footing with the rich, and money is of no consideration, with regard to membership or church privileges. Not so with the Mission Societies; they are so organized that money is the principal consideration: a certain sum entitles to membership. * * * The mission administration is all lodged in the hands of a few, who are distinguished from the rest, by great swelling titles, as Presidents, Vice-Presidents, etc. Again, each gospel church acts as the independent, kingdom of Christ in calling and sending

forth its members into the ministry. Very different from this in the mission order. The mission order being so arranged that from the little Mite Society, on to the State Conventions, and General Board there is formed a general amalgamation and a concentration of power in the hands of a dozen dignitaries, who with some exceptions have the control of all the funds designed for supporting the ministers among the destitute at home and abroad, and the sovereign authority to designate who from among the professed ministers of Christ, shall be supported from these funds, and also to assign them the fields of their labor. * * The Mission Boards exclude all from a participation in the benefits of their funds, who do not come under their direction, and own their authority, however regularly they may have been set apart according to gospel order, to the work of the ministry and however zealously they may be laboring to preach the gospel among the destitute."

* * * *

Now brethren: don't you see yourselves in that Hardshell mirror? That is where your leaders got their ideas and pet phrases. The Campbellite opposition was just the same. The love of money is the string you all pull on the poor people who don't want to give, and they follow to save money. Like every new religion or infidel creed, it is but

some old worn out theory revived by some one who thought himself the only one acquainted with the old carcass of a creed.

Teach your people to fuss about methods in giving, and they will soon quit giving at home or abroad. The next step is to oppose education, because it would be unfavorable to ignorant prejudices, and that is what nine tenths of the so called christian world is fed on. Like the Catholics you favor education only your own way. I see on first page of Flag of Dec. 31, middle of second column, that "no conventionite or boardite can claim to be a landmark." That is what you are being fed on, and you know whether there is any truth in it. Your literature is full of such.

But you say again that the Seminary is rotten in doctrine. Which doctrines? Not missions, and that is the first and foremost of all doctrines. Not education. Not culture. Not zeal. Not the doctrines of Grace which are worth more than all doctrines pertaining to the outer life and practice. They say they do not believe in alien immersion, only they would not make it a matter of christian and church fellowship. The man you praised the highest in your meeting is as far from being a Landmark Baptist as Dr. Whitsett. I am a Landmark Baptist and you called me a pharisee and hypocrite. May it not be possible that we misjudge

them and they us. This is what I know to be true. It may be that our salty ugly contentions have disgusted them, and driven them to the other extreme. I look for this to improve on their side, indeed has already improved. I think that if we were to mix with them, that we might exchange some of our salt for their sugar, and I am sure that both of us would be improved. The Seminary invited me to address them, and I tried to stuff all of the doctrines into missions, as at the first, and they gave me an ovation. I said to them then, that if they endorsed that address they were greatly misunderstood. Let us be reasonable and try to understand each other, and thus be gentlemen if not Christians. We have argued, and agitated, and agravated, and grieved, and been so aggressively against each other, that we are not agreeable to each other. Won't you confess that you hate the Baptist more than you do anybody, even the Catholics? Everybody sees this, if you don't.

Now I don't want to be separated from you or them. They treat me a thousand times more courteously than you do. I agree with them on missions, grace, zeal, culture and common politeness, and I agree with you on the church and ordinances, and I don't want to let either of you go. I want to heal the breach. Like J. N. Hall I don't

propose to go out until they put me out, and then I may draw as nigh as I can. The Seminary is much sounder than you represent, and is it not bad, and mean to misrepresent? Yea it is sinful, and violative of the Ten Commandments, so you are guilty of all. The tide is turning in favor of sound doctrines. If it were not for the ultra ugly orthodox, goring ox, it would turn faster. There is such a thing as holding the truth in unrighteousness. "The Baptist World" has ordered and paid for 128 of "My Church," and not one of your papers have noticed it. I offered it at your convention at less than cost, and not one was taken. Do you know why? Your leaders say you must not patronize any school but the Division schools, and that you must not read any papers or books but theirs. They know the power of Rome. The Hardshells don't want their people to read my books because they have represented the Missionary Baptists as Arminians, and my book would catch them. So you have represented the conventionites as anti landmark, and they know that if you read my books that they would also be caught. See?

When the questions of missions was up, your moderator said, that you were not engaged so much in sustaining foreign missionaries, as missionaries to the churches,

to convert them to your ways. That means that your evangelists are out to divide the churches of Christ, and to make them pay for doing it. You are to engage, not in making converts of sinners, but perverts of saints. Then you complain because the pastors don't open their houses and invite the dividers in. Do you really think that the shepherds ought to invite the wolves to come in and scatter their flocks? You don't want your children to be educated at all, if it must be done in schools that have not your mark. The most contemptible college in the world would be one having Mission Methods as the sign. Would you have all the little children pulling hair over mission methods? What have they to do with mission methods? I don't even teach mission methods in my department, because I teach Bible doctrines, and methods are not doctrines. The matter would never have come up if your side had not thrust it in, and then I declared that methods were not doctrines, that is they are not taught as methods.

This division is a schism, and schism are of perdition. Don't be fooled by anyone about its not being a division. That has been abundantly announced by your leaders. Lets stay together and work together and allow each other liberty as to mission methods and the schisms will soon pass off and we will be brethren as heretofore, then God ^{head} will bruise Satan under our feet. I had much more to say but sickness prevents. May God guide into the best service we can render Him.