

# ALIAS "CAMPBELLISM."

---

## CHAPTER I.

Under the title, "Blood Before Water and Christ Before the Church," Mr. J. H. Grime, Missionary Baptist, of Lebanon, Tenn., publishes a small booklet or pamphlet in violent opposition to what he is pleased to nickname "Campbellism." While to all thoughtful people it carries its own refutation upon its face, it presents an opportunity to point out some things that ought to be impressed upon the public mind.

The very title of this pamphlet is ambiguous and is an absolute misrepresentation of the teaching of those against whom Mr. Grime wages such a violent war. Does he mean to insinuate that Christian people who preach nothing they cannot read word for word in the Bible, and who tell sinners exactly what inspired men command them to do to be saved as it reads in the Bible, in so doing are putting water before the blood of Christ, and that people are saved by the church rather than by Christ? 'Blood before water', Why this bitter attack, this subtle misrepresentation? Because Christians teach in the language of Jesus, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16: 16), why misrepresent them as teaching that sinners can be saved without the blood of Jesus? Is this fair, and is it honest? The apostles, as they preached "as the Spirit gave them utterance," commanded: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." (Acts 2: 38.) Does Mr. Grime charge them with putting repentance and baptism before the blood of Jesus? The Lord Jesus, as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1: 29), shed his atoning blood in his death; and when those who obey, his command to be baptized are thus "buried therefore with him through

baptism into death" (Rom. 6: 4), they come into contact with his atoning blood, and, " ° being then made free from sin " (verse 18), they are raised to " walk in newness of life " and go on their way rejoicing. Is this putting the water before the blood? And can a man be saved by the blood of Jesus who refuses to obey his command to be baptized?

And because we thus point out the Scripture teaching that the Lord "adds to the church daily" (Acts 2:47) those who obey the command of Christ to believe and be baptized, can any fair-minded man represent us as teaching that people are saved by the church rather than by Christ? All who are saved are members of the church of which Christ is the Head, because God " adds " them to it. There are no saved people outside of the church that God r adds " those that were rare] saved " to. This church that God adds people to is the body of Christ. "And he is the lead of tie body, the church." (Col. 1: 18.)

0 0 0

In the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of April 9, 1925, I published, at advertising rates, an article entitled, "Sprinkling Not Baptism," in which the only reference I made to the Baptist Church is contained in the following extract:

From the Scriptures above quoted it may easily be seen that penitent believers, upon being baptized into Christ, enjoy the remission of their sins and all the blessings attendant upon being admitted into that holy and apostolic church that Christ founded upon the rock. All Christians, all children of God, are members of " ° the church, which is his body," outside of which no man can please God or be acceptable in his sight. The same thing that makes a man a Christian makes him a member of the church; or, to put it in other terms, the same thing that makes a man a child of God makes him a member of the family of God. All of God's children are in God's family, or church. We submit, in the uttermost kindness, that, when a man becomes a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, etc., he becomes something more or less than a Christian, as he can be a Christian without being either, and as the church of Christ was established many centuries before the establishment of either of these human denominations. A man must accept something that was not preached by the apostles, and that, therefore, is not Christianity, or any part of it, before he can be a member of

any other church than the church Jesus built on the rock, or wear any other name than the name that was worn by that body of people who "were called Christians first in Antioch."

Mr. Grime wrote, challenging me for a discussion to be published in the Banner, but saying nothing about who was going to pay for it. As the publication of such a discussion at advertising rates would soon run into a considerable figure, I thought it impractical. The church of Christ at Grant, Tenn., in which town Mr. Grime preaches and which town is also near his home at Lebanon, wanted a discussion, in which I readily agreed to participate. But Mr. Grime, under date of October 4, 1926, wrote

My Dear Brother Allen: It seems that nothing short of a discussion will quiet the waters at Grant, Tenn. I am not able to hold an oral discussion, but I can write.

I do not believe in your church and its doctrines a little bit, and I presume that you feel the same way toward mine. Now, one of us, if not both, is wrong.

I will soon stand before the Judge, and you may; so why can't you and I discuss this matter?

You remember that in your last you proposed the " general church question " for discussion. Therefore, I submit to you an accompanying agreement.

Hoping for a favorable reply, I am as ever, Truly,  
J. H. GRIME.

To which I replied, under date of October 29, 1926:

Dear Brother Grime: I regret the delay in replying to your letters, and hope you will pardon me, on account of the great amount of other things demanding my attention.

I regret to note that you say you do not believe in the church of Christ and its doctrine " a little bit." You are aware, no doubt, that the church of Christ teaches no doctrine that it cannot read word for word in the Bible, and it is on this account that I regret exceedingly your repugnance toward the church. I would regret to know that you will appear before God in opposition to his word.

I do not see how a written discussion between you and me, with little or no circulation, can still the troubled waters at Grant, Tenn. I understand that Grant, Tenn., wants an oral discussion. I think they ought to have it; and I am sure that if the Baptists will agree, our brethren at Grant will heartily come into it.

As to a written discussion, I beg to say that this office is handling the discussion between Dr. E. E. Folk and

Brother J. C. McQuiddy; it also handles the discussion between Dr. G. A. Lofton and Elder F. W. Smith; and I do not believe that you would claim you could do better than did either Dr. Folk or Dr. Lofton. I am sure that I could not do better than did Brother McQuiddy and Brother Smith.

I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to our Brother Joe Pendleton, of Alexandria, Tenn., and I am sure that if you will arrange for some one to hold an oral discussion at Grant, Brother Pendleton will be glad to serve you.

Accept my best wishes for your health and happiness, and that you may yet see the danger in fighting a body of people who teach nothing except what they can read word for word in the Bible. Truly, JAMES A. ALLEN.

Though there was a great demand for an oral discussion, Mr. Grime continued to insist on having a written one, for which there was no demand. I did not agree to the written discussion for this reason, and also for the reason that, in writing a book or pamphlet, I could not feel justified in calling upon Mr. Grime to publish it for me. I would gladly have entered a partnership with him in publishing such a book or pamphlet if I had thought there was a demand for it.

Mr. Grime manifests the right spirit when he says, " I told them also that I wanted the Baptist cause put to the severest test, and if it would not stand the light let it go down," though he does state all the facts when he says, "but no persuasion or goading would induce them to take hold." The intelligent reader knows that the church of Christ, preaching and teaching " the Bible alone," is the only church in existence to-day, or, that has ever been in existence, that does not have to be " persuaded " or " goaded " into an investigation of what it teaches. Neither the Baptist Church nor any one of its sister human denominations is ready for such investigation or examination. Occasionally a man of such an aggressive nature as Mr. Grime gets one of them into a discussion, though, generally, one such discussion cures them of all desire for investigation for many a long year. Self-preservation, being the first law of human nature, and experience, have taught them that the only way they can keep from losing their members and keep their human

denominations intact is to keep them from hearing a discussion of what they teach. We have just had a most notable exhibition of this stratagem here in Nashville, presented in the Freed (Christian) and Bogard (Baptist) debate. Out of an audience of twelve hundred people, the Baptist debater himself did not claim over fifty or seventy-five Baptists in attendance. Baptist preachers designedly, deliberately, and industriously did their utmost to keep the Baptist people away. They did this because they were conscious that the Baptist denomination would lose many of them if they did otherwise.

But we greatly commend Mr. Grime for rising above the ordinary run of Baptist preachers and wanting "the Baptist cause put to the severest test, and if it would not stand the light, let it go down." No sensible person wants to cling to anything that is to finally "go down" and that will take him down with it. Every cause in which is involved the usefulness and happiness of men and women in this world and their eternal destiny in the world to come ought to be "put to the severest test." Paul says "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. 5: 21.) Peter says: "But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord: being ready always to give answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you, yet with meekness and fear." (1 Pet. 3: 15.) Jesus says: "And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, lest his works should be reprov'd. But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they have been wrought in God." (John 3: 19-21.)

We are happy to reciprocate the kindly feeling of Mr. Grime. People should be ashamed to feel otherwise toward their fellow beings. No man who allows himself to be so one-sided and prejudiced as to say bitter things, indulge in innuendo, or slyly say uncomplimentary things behind a man's back, as all overly "sweet" people do, has any chance of heaven unless he repents. No man who "does not believe in discussion," and in the most rigid

and severe investigation of things in which is involved the eternal destiny of the soul, can lay any claim to being a disciple of Him who commands that all things be brought to the light.

But Mr. Grime is mistaken in thinking many of his friends "live above their doctrines." The doctrine a man holds is what makes him what he is. His actions and life are but the expression of what he believes in his heart. "For as he thinketh within himself, so is he." (Prov. 23: 7.) If Mr. Grime will notice a little more closely, he will find that these friends he likes are such good people because of their doctrine and not in spite of it.

#### "ORIGIN OF THEIR CHURCH."

What does Mr. Grime mean? The "origin of their church!" Will he allow that we are honest, and that we tell the truth, when we stand up before heaven and earth and unequivocally say that we have no church, and want no church, except the church of which a full record is given in the Bible? He seems determined, perfectly regardless of the plainest facts to the contrary, to charge upon us that Brother Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Va., is the founder of the church of which we are members.

We humbly and kindly call attention to the motive that causes the Baptist and other human denominations to make such a charge. All of them were founded by men, uninspired and fallible men, and were founded upon human creeds, upon "the precepts and commandments of men," all of which explains why none of these denominations, nor their doctrines, are even once mentioned or taught in the Bible. On their principles it is perfectly right to belong to a church founded by a man. And yet, when we honestly and most sincerely tell them that we want to pass by all these man-made churches, with their man-made doctrines, and be identified simply with the church we read about in the Bible, they charge us with "Campbellism," and with belonging to a church that was founded by Brother Alexander Campbell! Is it not true that Jesus Christ founded a church upon the rock many centuries before Brother Campbell was born and before

John Smyth founded the Baptist Church A.D. 1607 by baptizing himself?

The Bible gives a full record of the church that Christ founded and clearly and plainly records how inspired men, as they spoke " as the Spirit gave them utterance," taught people to become members of it. Suppose, then, that we forget all about John Smyth -and Alexander Campbell, and every other uninspired man, and go back simply to the Bible. If we do exactly what the apostles commanded people to do to be saved, will not we be saved, and will not God, being " no respecter of persons," add us to the same church to which ;he added "those that were saved " in New Testament times? Will God add those who do exactly what the apostles commanded to either the Baptist Church or the Campbellite Church? And if we preach exactly what the apostles preached, neither more nor less, but word for word as it is recorded in the Bible, can any man be clear of the sin of bearing false witness against his neighbor who charges us with preaching " Campbellism " and that Brother Alexander Campbell is the founder of our church?