

---

**DR. GAMBRELL'S**  
**AFTER CAMPAIGN**  
**MESSAGE**  
**TO SOUTHERN BAPTISTS**

---

**A Warning Against Entangling Alliances**



**DR. J. B. GAMBRELL**  
**President Southern Baptist Convention**

---

# To Southern Baptists Scattered Abroad

---

BY J. B. GAMBRELL.

---

The Atlanta Convention was a marvel of unity, vision and lofty purpose. From the Convention which met in Nashville, 1914, this way there has been a marked tendency to unity among Southern Baptists; and this culminated in the Atlanta Convention. That Convention was the largest and the most representative Baptist body which ever met on this continent. Every section of the territory was represented, and all callings and classes.

The Convention did two significant things. After hearing an eminent representative of the Inter-Church World Movement, showing him every courtesy and consideration, the Convention adopted a report, prepared by a very strong committee, which report set forth that the Baptists have a distinct message and mission; that they cannot subject themselves to overhead control; that they can do their own work cheaper and better than it can be done for them by any outside body, and that they

must be busy about their work. This report, which definitely set the policy of the Convention, was framed in considerate language; and, after discussion, was adopted by the great Convention with only two dissenting votes. That the Convention represented in that vote the overwhelming sentiment of Southern Baptists is beyond question.

Following that report, the Convention set in motion the forces for the 75 Million Campaign. The vote inaugurating the campaign for the 75 million objective was unanimous and most hearty. We have just concluded the campaign and the results abundantly justify the wisdom of the Convention in assuming responsibility for its own work. The campaign has been one of the most educating, inspiring and successful ever conducted for any religious purpose in the world. It has been a Baptist campaign. The Baptist people have been asked to give this large sum of money on Baptist principles. It has been most educating, both for Baptists and others. If it had been a part of a campaign by other denominations under an inter-denominational leadership, it could not have been so distinctly a Baptist campaign. The amazing success of the campaign is a wonderful vindication of the wis-



dom of the Convention. We nowhere have the weakness of compromise. We everywhere have the strength of conviction and consistency.

We have come now to a new stage of the great Baptist forward movement. To get the 75 millions subscribed was a worthy undertaking; but that is not the culmination of the purpose of the Convention, but the beginning. We must now conserve the results of the victory. Many a victory has been lost because the results were not taken care of.

The years coming will be momentous. Any slack will give opportunity for disintegration. We have laid the foundation, now for a great forward movement; but we must move forward or lose the results of our noble victory.

It was reasonable to suppose that the leaders of the Inter-Church Movement, after the very courteous treatment received by their representative, would respect the findings of the Convention and not attempt to create divisions among Southern Baptists. But this reasonable expectation has not been realized. Immediately following the Convention, agents of the Inter-Church Movement, which is just one of many movements, going in the same direction, were sent into the South and direct ef-

forts were made to disintegrate Baptist opinion in the South and to switch Baptist activities into a channel alien to the purposes of the Convention; and this effort is continuing. We have no reason to expect it will not continue, as long as there is the faintest prospect of succeeding. Men are going all through the South, some of them giving out extremely hurtful and untrue statements, such as that the Baptist 75 Million Campaign is a part of the general movement, and that a certain per cent of it is to go to the support of the Inter-Church Movement.

We confront a situation of tremendous importance to the integrity of Baptist faith and work. Nothing short of plain speech now will serve the purposes of truth. We have this situation: A group of men with headquarters in New York, of which group Dr. John R. Mott is the most conspicuous leader, seconded by Dr. Robert Speer—the first a Methodist, the second a Presbyterian—with almost unthinkable assumption are seeking to lead what is miscalled “The Christian Church of America.” In plain English, they have assumed the role of super-church leaders. They are putting on a world-program definitely set to break down the existing

Christian order, and especially calculated to destroy the faith and order of Baptist churches. That they show no courtesy to the great organized bodies of Christianity is proven by the fact above cited. In the face of the findings of the Southern Baptist Convention, they are afield now to disintegrate the forces of Southern Baptists. Director General Scarborough had to meet this all through his great Campaign.

To understand the situation it must be remembered that there is a group of inter-organizations, such as the Federal Council of Churches, the Edinburgh Continuation Committee, the Y. M. C. A., and not a few others, all practically under the same leadership, and all moving in the same general direction. It has been affirmed above that this New York group have assumed an overhead leadership and that their plans are such as to break down the existing order. An assertion like that ought to be proven. I cite the now well-known fact that the Committee of Six, which functioned in war work, composed of Dr. John R. Mott; Mr. Burke, a Catholic priest; Col. Cutler, a Jew; Robt. Speer, and two others, was originally a self-constituted committee. This small group of men, not a Bap-

tist on the committee, in concert with the War Department, took over the religious work in the camps. The Catholics were given a distinct place, the Jews were. Dr. Mott, Secretary of the Y. M. C. A., assumed to represent Baptists and others and entered into a covenant with the government of such nature that the Y. M. C. A. *“could not keep faith with the Government and encourage any denominationalism in the camps.”* It is perfectly safe to say that if any six Baptists had assumed to control the denomination in any of its activities, they would be peremptorily repudiated as usurpers. Overhead control is obnoxious to the very genius of the Baptists. And when pedo-Baptists, Jews, Catholics, and others assume control over Baptist affairs it is unbearable. And that is just exactly what Dr. Mott and his associates did. They had such a strangle-hold on the Baptists (other denominations can speak for themselves) that whereas Pastor Truett was sent by the First Church, Dallas, overseas, his salary paid, and more than \$1,000 paid for his expenses, he could not go over except in a Y. M. C. A. uniform and under the direction of the Y. M. C. A., though he earnestly desired to go out as a Baptist preacher. The Convention at Atlanta gave a strong pronouncement upon

the conduct of the Government in this matter. The conduct of these six men in assuming to represent people who did not ask them to represent them, is quite as much to be repudiated. The Union Movement, of which there are so many branches, is the most revolutionary and destructive movement, so far as Baptist faith and practice are concerned, that was ever set a going. I am persuaded if Baptists know the truth that will be sufficient. Here is further proof:

The Edinburg Conference, as one of its very great admirers asserts, marked a new era in missions. Dr. Mott, so vitally related to these many different organizations, was made Chairman of the Continuation Committee. He went abroad on many mission fields. He did not confer with our Foreign Mission Board. But he proceeded to organize missionary activities on foreign fields on new lines, all of them converging to a single point. It was recommended that territory be delimited, that church letters be exchanged between all the denominations, that there be union publishing houses, union Bible training schools, union colleges, and "whether in union or denominational schools no undue emphasis should be laid on those doctrines that distinguish one denomination from an-

other," and finally "in order to do all that is possible to manifest unity, the Conference suggested as the most suitable name for this purpose "*The Christian Church in China.*" It was further agreed in the Chinese Conference "that in respect of former organizations they (the churches) should have freedom to develop in accord with the most natural expression of the spiritual instincts of Chinese Christians." A so-called "indigenous church" was proposed and here is what is said about that: "*Each indigenous church in the mission field will gradually, out of these elements, build up that body of Christian doctrine and that form of polity which is best adapted to its life.*" The Bible is entirely ignored in all these matters. What becomes of Baptist doctrine and churches?

Practically the same ideas were in all the conferences at different places. "The formation of a type of Christian churches" was recommended, "in which each would recognize the ministry, ordinances and discipline of the others and members might be freely transferred from one to the other;" and then it is added: "Only by this plan is it in any way possible to secure the unity that is desired." In the face of these findings, how can it be said that there is no intention to

destroy the Baptist faith and order?

In the Panama Conference, where Drs. Mott and Speer were the leading spirits, the same trend was followed. In the Chilean Conference it was said: "The conviction grows clearer to the workers in this Conference that the aim of our Christian work in this country is the creation of the *united Chilean Church*, undivided by denominational distinctions which obtain in other parts of Christendom. As intermediate steps in achieving this end, we approve all practicable measures of co-operation among the recognized bodies." These methods of co-operation are set down as the division of territory, the use of a common name for evangelical churches, the use of a common hymn book, the organization of a committee on co-operation and agreement for the transfer of members between all recognized bodies, with union education, etc. There are some who insist that this movement, in its wide swing, does not mean the destruction of Baptist churches. They are not informed or do not think.

All these measures are put on among our missionaries abroad with no conference whatever with our Foreign Mission Board. We have self-appointed, super-denominational

leadership which will co-operate under them; but they feel bound by nothing that even the most representative Baptist body in America says.

The Inter-Church Movement is now at the front. It is just one of a good many movements, all interlocked and co-operating. Before me is a folder which says: "Co-operation, not Union." And yet the very breath of it is "union," and the language of it. They speak of "The Christian Church of America," "Protestant Church of America," embracing all non-Catholic bodies presumably. There is no such church. It is abuse of scriptural language and carries a fundamentally incorrect concept and is utterly opposed to the New Testament view of churches. The leaders of this movement talk of groups meeting here and there, praying and agreeing, as undoubted evidence that God is moving them. There was very much prayer at Atlanta; and yet these same brethren seem utterly unable to believe that God might have been in the Atlanta Convention. Super-leaders ought to have super-privileges in prayer, if there are such leaders in God's sight.

One very favorite illustration put forward by the Inter-Church World Movement is this: "Victory came to the allied armies when the

way was found to co-operate under a common plan. Since it was possible for these many allied nations to fight together effectively without destroying their individuality or surrendering their sovereignty, leaders of the evangelical denominational churches believe that it is possible for Christian bodies to work together in the same spirit with great benefit to each other and with highly multiplied power in their appeals and efforts." Whether these very able brethren cannot think under the bark or think nobody else can, I do not know. The illustration does not fit the case at all. The allied armies were absolutely agreed in what they wanted to do. The different denominations are not at all agreed. The Episcopalians will preach their doctrines—rationalist salvation and all. Others will preach their doctrine. The Atlanta Convention declared the Baptists have a distinct message and mission. Our message is different from the message of others. We discard all proxy religion. Others hold to it. We discard baptismal regeneration. Many others hold to it. We discard all overhead authority in religion. Others hold to it. The very root principles that govern Baptists are different from others; and the other denominations do not agree as to what they want to do.

Baptists are committed irrevokably to the propagation and confirmation of the Gospel throughout all the world; and real Baptists will not, cannot, talk down on the great doctrines of the New Testament in order to keep in with others; and we would necessarily have to do that in any such movement as is proposed.

And, furthermore, the allied nations in the full exercise of their authority could and did put their armies under one generalissimo; but Baptists cannot do that. We have but one Generalissimo—the Lord Jesus Christ. We can follow no man any further than he follows Christ. So the very taking illustration carries in it deadly errors.

There is a principle in law and it stands good in reason, that intelligent men intend the natural results of their conduct. Does any sane Baptist believe that our churches can adopt the policy of limiting territory, of receiving members from other churches on their rantism, of putting the soft pedal on the great distinctive principles of the New Testament for which we stand—does any Baptist believe that we can put on the program suggested by Dr. Mott and his associates in China and South America without committing denominational suicide? And, further,

does any real Baptist believe that we can become a part of an organization controlled by men who believe differently from ourselves and continue to exist? The question answers itself. Let it be kept in mind now that the Inter-Church Movement is just one of a number of movements led by the same men; and then I ask, my fellow Baptists, if those who acknowledge the supreme authority of Jesus Christ in religion can show the least favor toward a movement lead by men who boldly propose that churches in China and elsewhere shall grow up, not under the teaching of the New Testament, but to take such form as may be given them by their own wisdom. That is exactly the way the Roman Catholic hierarchy developed. They broke away first from the supreme authority of Jesus Christ and then fell gradually into the iron mold of the Roman Empire. My fellow Baptists, we are confronting the greatest battle that has been fought since the Reformation. It is a battle for the supreme authority of Jesus Christ and for the churches as revealed in the New Testament. Yielding to the present trend has played the Baptists down in England and now there is a movement started for reorganization in England on old line principles. Dr. A. C. Dixon says: "The crisis in England is graver than at the Reformation." I say it out of a deep conviction that Baptists cannot live in the atmosphere that the super-church leaders are making for them. If it is foolish to ride a horse without a bridle, it is far more

so to ride a horse led by a man who wants to take you to your death. I appeal to my fellow Baptists in the words of the Apostle Paul: "Be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord for as much as you know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

In Nashville, 1914, the Convention passed the following, which is commended to the faithful consideration of our great brotherhood:

"We believe that the highest efficiency of the Southern Baptist Convention in the propagation and confirmation of the Gospel can be attained:

"1. By the observance of strict loyalty to Christ as the head of the church, in a spirit of candor and Christian courtesy toward all who profess to be his disciples.

"2. By preserving a complete autonomy at home and abroad, unembarrassed by entangling alliances with other bodies holding to different standards of doctrines and different views of church life and church order.

"3. By devoting our energies and resources with singleness of heart to fostering and multiplying denominational schools and other agencies at home and abroad in full denominational control and in full harmony with the spirit and doctrine of the churches contributing funds to our Boards.

"4. By a complete alignment of all our denominational forces, churches, schools, hos-

pitals, papers, Sunday schools, women's and young people's societies, in purpose, spirit and practice with the program of Christ as set out in the Great Commission, avoiding the weakness of vagueness and the diffusion of denominational strength into channels leading away from the churches.'”

As I come to the close, I would insist in reason that Baptists cannot have two policies, one for China and one for America. If on any foreign field we can take pedo-baptists on their infant rantism, we ought to do it at home; and that is not all, we will do it at home finally, because the decay of doctrinal soundness will get down into the very roots of our denominational life. This has been started already in England and in the North.

We have made a great campaign. Southern Baptists stand on the highest and best ground they have ever occupied. Let us go on to serve the Lord according to His Word; but, at the same time, see to it that none of the numerous paid agents of the numerous overhead bodies penetrate and disintegrate our working forces. To this end we must inform, educate, strengthen. Never have we been in such good condition. But if we relax and allow ourselves to fall under these distracting influences, we will follow the natural trend and our testimony and our strength will be destroyed.

*Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,  
Fort Worth, Texas.*