



The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.

NUMBER ONE IRON OAKS DRIVE • PARIS, ARKANSAS 72855

**THE BAPTIST HISTORY COLLECTION**  
**DENOMINATIONAL HISTORIES**

**The Southern Baptist Convention**  
**1845-1953**

*by William Wright Barnes*

*Research Professor in Baptist History*  
*Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary*

*Thou hast given a standard to them that fear thee;*  
*that it may be displayed because of the truth*

— ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 60:4

**The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.**

**Version 1.0 © 2005**

# THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

1845-1953

**BY**

**WILLIAM WRIGHT BARNES**

*Research Professor in Baptist History  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary*

*Barnes, William W. –  
The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1953.  
Original Copyright © 1954 Broadman Press, Nashville, TN  
Reprinted By Permission*

# CONTENTS

PREFACE

**1. INTRODUCTION**

**2. THE CONVENTION FORMED**

**3. TAKING A STRIDE, 1845-1860**

**4. THE WAR PERIOD, 1860-1865**

**5. RECONSTRUCTION ERA, 1865-1879**

**6. THE WILL TO GO ON, 1879-1899**

**7. BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD**

**8. THE CONVENTION AND INTERNAL CONFLICTS**

**9. THEOLOGICAL TRAINING IN THE LIFE OF THE CONVENTION**

**10. THE WOMEN'S WORK**

**11. EXPANDING HORIZONS, 1899-1919**

**12. ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING**

**13. WIDENING AREAS OF CHRISTIAN TRAINING AND SERVICE**

**14. GROWTH IN CO-OPERATION, ORGANIZATION, STEWARDSHIP, AND  
EVANGELISM**

**15. THE LAYMEN**

**16. THE CONVENTION AND PROBLEMS OF SOCIETY**

**17. RELATIONS WITH OTHER BAPTIST BODIES**

**18. RELATIONS WITH NON-BAPTIST BODIES**

**19. A PERIOD OF EXPANSION, 1946-1953 by PORTER ROUTH**

EPILOGUE

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PREFACE

No institution in human experience may be fully understood unless it be known historically — known in its origins and its development in time. This is true whether the institution, the custom, the organization, or whatever it be called, is within the so-called secular or religious realm. A historical study of the past is valuable to the present and future, both positively and negatively. The Roman historian Tacitus put this twofold value succinctly:

“I consider the chief reward of history to be, that good deeds be not forgotten and that reprobation by posterity be a restraint to bad words and deeds.”

The Southern Baptist Convention is such a subject of study — an institution in the religious life of America that deserves and receives the willing, devoted loyalty of millions of church members in the homeland and, through its labors of love and patience and hope, receives the love and gratitude of thousands in lands beyond the seas. The following pages endeavor to tell the story of this Convention in its origins and development through one hundred years. This story cannot be understood, even in part, without some knowledge of current American history and world conditions. No institution, any more than an individual, can live unto itself. The Latin writer Terence (second century B.C.) states this fact clearly: “I am a man, and I count nothing human foreign to me.” Philip Schaff, distinguished American theological teacher and writer, adapted the words of Terence: “I am a Christian, and I count nothing Christian foreign to me.” The antecedents of organized Baptist life in the South, transplanted from Europe, were rooted in the beginnings of Christianity in the American colonies. Likewise, the activities and influence of this organized life reach out to the ends of the earth.

In striving to tell the story of the Convention very few printed volumes have been consulted, for the reason that very few have been published which relate to this field. The minutes of the Southern and state conventions, of associations and other Baptist organizations, biographies of leaders, official and private correspondence, periodicals and magazines have supplied the historical data that have gone into the picture of a century. So many have contributed their time and have assisted in making available valuable source material that lack of space forbids enumeration.

Among the institutions to whose librarians I am deeply indebted I am pleased to name: the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary; the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary (formerly the Baptist Bible Institute); the University of Richmond and the Virginia Baptist Historical Society’s collection on the campus; Wake Forest

College; Furman University; Mercer University; Howard College; Mississippi College; Clarke Memorial College; Baylor University; William Jewell College and the Missouri Baptist Historical Society's collection on the campus; Duke University; State Archives of Alabama; State Library of Mississippi; the University of Texas; Shurtleff College Collection (now in the headquarters of the Baptist State Convention of Illinois, Springfield); the Library of the Mercantile Association, St. Louis; and the Library of Congress. The records of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention are copious, with many letters to and from missionaries and other friends of missions. Unfortunately, the records of the Home Mission Board are relatively few. Likewise, the files of the Woman's Missionary Union have not been preserved; I was told that no correspondence was kept beyond three years. In the statistical office of the Sunday School Board much valuable material has been gathered. The collection of the Southern Baptist Historical Society in that center will make that library an increasingly important place of study.

The Andover-Harvard Library graciously sent me a photostatic copy of a page out of one of the *Letters* of the German scholar Alberti (see Appendix D), which has important bearing on the historical question which divided Southern Baptists more than half a century ago. So far as my reading goes, Alberti's *Letters* were not known by either side in that controversy. Dr. R.E. E. Harkness of Crozer Seminary has put me in his debt by sending material, in photostatic or other form, from the collection of the American Baptist Historical Society. Dr. Garnett Ryland of the Virginia Baptist Historical Society, Dr. L.T. Crismon of the Kentucky Baptist Historical Society (librarian of the Southern Baptist Seminary), Dr. H.I. Hester of the Missouri Baptist Historical Society have all given their time without limit for consultation and for assistance in finding material. In my own institution, Dr. L.R. Elliott, librarian, and Dr. Charles P. Johnson, assistant librarian, have been at my call throughout the period of this study. I thank all of these who have been named and many others who have lent assistance.

For more detail in the period covered in chapters V and VI the reader is referred to *Relations Between Northern and Southern Baptists* by my friend and colleague, Professor Robert A. Baker, Th.D., Ph.D. This is a timely presentation of the facts of a century of American Baptist history.

When this volume was first projected, a history commission was elected to make plans and to advise in an editorial capacity. Dr. W.O. Carver has served as chairman, the other members being Dr. R.W. Weaver, Dr. J.M. Dawson, Dr. T.L. Holcomb, and Dr. J.L. Hill. Upon the lamented death of Dr. R.W. Weaver, Dr. G.W. Paschal was elected to supply that vacancy. The members of the commission have been sympathetically patient during the long delay, due to providential circumstances over which none of us had any control. Their

counsel and constructive suggestions have been gratefully accepted and appreciated.

The editorial committee requested Dr. E.C. Routh to do the editorial revision for them. A better selection could not have been made. Dr. Routh's wide experience as an editor, his familiarity with the course of Baptist history and its developments, and his intimate acquaintance with Southern Baptist life and leaders for many years eminently qualified him to perform the task requested of him by the committee. I am grateful to him for relieving me of a heavy responsibility — a responsibility made the heavier by the fact that editorial revision on my part, because of the daily, and at times hourly, interruptions of school work, was next to impossible. The excellence of his work may be seen in the manuscript.

My task, the completion of which was delayed unduly by circumstances to which reference is made above, was to close the story of the first century with 1945. Dr. Porter Routh was asked to bring the story up to date from 1945 to 1953. His experience as editor, as the head of the Department of Survey, Statistics and In-formation of the Sunday School Board, and now his position as executive secretary of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention qualify him to tell the story of the progress and development during the past decade perhaps better than any man among us. I am grateful to him for the task he has so well performed.

The story of the Southern Baptist Convention, that enrolled two hundred ninety-three Baptists in its first meeting and in its latest annual meeting more than ten thousand, must be interesting and enlightening. In tracing the activities and achievements of South-ern Baptists, we discern the hand of God at every turn. Southern Baptists may thank him and take courage.

WILLIAM W. BARNES

## 1. — INTRODUCTION

From Colonial times there were rivalries and jealousies between the Northern and Southern colonies. The big problem of the revolutionary leaders was to secure co-operation among the colonies, the allegiance of each of which had been directly to the Crown of England. After Yorktown and the achievement of political independence, the problem was to hold the thirteen independent states together. The great distances, the poor roads, the lack of facilities of travel and other means of communication hindered unity of thinking and acting. In formulating the Constitution for the basis of federal union, the jealousies between the Northern and Southern sections, between the large and small states, almost wrecked the effort. The Constitution, which was finally adopted, was a congeries of compromises that laid the basis for later political conflicts involving the issues of nationalism and states' rights. These struggles culminated in the War Between the States.

The same conditions that hindered unity of thinking and acting in secular life affected the Baptist groups in different parts of the land. In addition, varying emphases in doctrine, in ecclesiology, in church polity were brought from Europe, and comparable differences developed among the various groups in this country. Some of these differences entered into the separation between Baptists of the South and the North in 1845.

The first half of the nineteenth century saw tremendous struggles throughout the world. Politically, socially, intellectually, and religiously the world was in ferment. All of these elements of strife were current in the United States. Westward expansion and the development of new conditions and new political units intensified these conflicts. Religion is never wholly free from secular influences, and the first half of the century witnessed tremendous religious conflicts. Old religious bodies divided, and new ones arose. Presbyterians separated over doctrinal questions; Methodists divided over organization. The Oxford Movement in England gave the impetus that put high churchism in control of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. All phases of Protestantism feared the increase of Romanism. In Baptist life, the movements identified with Campbellism, hardshellism, and freewillism separated Baptists in three directions.

### **BAPTIST ASSOCIATIONS**

Among American Baptists there had been a growing denominational consciousness and a striving after national union since the middle of the eighteenth century. The Philadelphia Association, the Charleston, the Sandy

Creek, the Warren, and the increasing number of other associations gave momentum to the movement. The French and Indian War, 1756-1763, suggested to some of the colonial political leaders the thought of a closer political affiliation among the thirteen colonies. The Stamp Act of 1765 intensified that feeling. This developing sense of political nationalism reacted on Baptists. Upon the occasion of the formation of the Warren Association, Dr. Samuel Jones, moderator of the Philadelphia Association, wrote to James Manning of Warren, Rhode Island, September 8, 1767:

For, as particular members are collected together and united in one body, which we call a particular Church, to answer those ends and purposes which could not be accomplished by any single member, so a collection and union of churches into one associational body may easily be conceived capable of answering those still greater purposes which any particular Church could not be equal to. And, by the same reason, a union of associations will still increase the body in weight and strength, and make it good that a three-fold cord is not easily broken.<sup>f1</sup>

The meeting of the colonies in the Continental Congress to carry on the struggle for political independence suggested a comparable meeting of Baptist associations. Morgan Edwards pro-posed, in 1771, that the Philadelphia Association be incorporated and a delegate from each of the other associations be admitted to the corporation. In 1775, the Warren Association issued a call for “a general meeting of delegates from our societies in every colony” in the interest of religious liberty. A meeting of Baptists was called to convene in Virginia, October 17, 1776, to form a “Continental Association.” (Note the name of the proposed body.) The troublous times prevented the meeting, but the two groups, Regulars and Separates, gradually coalesced in New England. In Virginia, in the struggle for separation of church and state and for religious liberty, the two groups definitely united in 1787.

In 1799, the Philadelphia Association issued a call for a national meeting. Rippon’s *Register*<sup>f2</sup> reports as follows:

Apprehensive of the advantages likely to result from a GENERAL CONFERENCE composed of one member, or more, from each Association, to be held every *one, two, or three* years, as might seem most subservient to the general interests of Christ’s kingdom, this Association, in 1799, respectfully invited the different Associations in the United States to favor them with their views on the subject. At this meeting (that is, 1800), having received approving resolutions from three of their sister Associations, they recommended that next year a committee be appointed to digest a plan, which may tend to accelerate this *beneficial design*.<sup>f3</sup>

This Association think also, that it would be adviseable to invite the general committee of Virginia, and different associations on the Continent, to unite

with their own body, in forming a Missionary Society, and for employing Missionaries among the natives on the American Continent.

In the first decade of the nineteenth century, Dr. Richard Furman, of Charleston, corresponded with Dr. Thomas Baldwin, of Boston, and Rev. John Gano, of New York, concerning a national union of Baptists.<sup>f4</sup> The national union, in the thought of the early leaders and of those in later decades, was to be composed of Baptist bodies such as associations and state conventions — comparable to the Presbyterian General Assembly and the Methodist General Conference. In the midst of these stirrings and reachings out after a compact denominational organization, the conversion of Luther Rice and Adoniram Judson to Baptist views necessitated immediate action. Rice had in mind a semi-connectionalism brought over from his Congregational training. During a journey from Boston to Savannah, 1813-1814, in the stagecoach between Richmond and Petersburg, a plan came to him. Later he wrote to Judson:

The plan which suggested itself to my mind, that of forming one principal society in each state, bearing the name of the state, and others in the same state, auxiliary to that; and by these large, or state societies, delegates to be appointed to form one general society. ... Several state conventions have been formed already, and more will probably be originated. To these, it is calculated, auxiliaries will be formed, and that associations will also become constituents; and that from there delegates, perhaps, ultimately, *the* delegates will be appointed to the general convention.<sup>f5</sup>

The urgency was so great that the leaders did not have time to perfect the national denominational organization contemplated in the sequence suggested by Rice. Judson was in Burma, and Rice wished to return and join him. Their support must be assured at once. Then, too, not all American Baptists favored such highly articulated denominationalism. Furthermore, many Baptists were opposed to the very principle of missions. It was impossible to lead some churches and associations into a denominational organization, because they were afraid of a rigid ecclesiasticism, and others because they were opposed to missions, the main objective of the new organization. In most cases, these two grounds of op-position combined.

The situation called for immediate action. The New England leaders, with the exception of Dr. Baldwin of the Second Baptist Church, Boston, favored the “society” ideology as over against the “denominational.” The Rev. Daniel Sharp insisted that a Boston society should be formed at once to support Rice and Judson, but Dr. Baldwin, having in view a national organization, advised de-lay until others could be consulted.

The result was that before we did anything we came to the conclusion that he (Baldwin) should write to certain individuals, and that I (Sharp) should write to others, proposing to them, that if they thought it best to form a Missionary

Society in either of their cities, we would become auxiliary or enter into any arrangement that might meet their views, so that the Societies of Boston, Philadelphia and New York might become one.

A local society was formed in Boston at once to support Rice, at home temporarily, and Judson in India, until Dr. Baldwin's national plans might be perfected. But Sharp and others still thought in terms of local societies, limited to the Northeastern part of the country.

Brother Rice was employed by the new society formed in Boston, to visit and stir up the churches and try to excite a missionary spirit among them. He started from Massachusetts to Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania, and met with so much success that the brethren in Pennsylvania encouraged him to go South where he produced a strong impression in favor of missions. It was at this juncture that proposals were made and received through the medium of the agent <sup>f6</sup> to meet in Convention for the purpose of taking into consideration what ought to be done in regard to foreign missions. <sup>f7</sup>

Even after the national body for foreign missions was formed, the Boston leaders were not national in their thinking, as reflected in the address which Dr. Sharp delivered upon retiring as a member of the Boston Board for thirty-two years and as its president for many years: <sup>f8</sup>

Although it was not indeed so expressed in the Constitution, I always understood it to be, the connection of a comparatively inactive with an active partner. The former contributing funds; the latter doing the work. The former having a share of the honors, and a voice in appointing the board who should do the business: — the latter devising plans of operation, selecting stations, appointing missionaries, and then calling on the denomination to aid them by their pecuniary contributions. This was the relation. It never entered into the expectations of those who started the foreign missionary enterprise that they should obtain missionaries from the South, but simply monies from the South to aid them in the noble object of sending the gospel to the heathen.

## **ORGANIZATION OF BAPTIST MISSIONARY CONVENTION**

The suggestion of Dr. Johnson to Luther Rice was accepted and carried into execution in May, 1814, at Philadelphia. The "General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions" was formed. This Convention was a foreign mission society, composed of individuals interested in missions or sent by bodies interested in missions. These bodies might be churches, associations, or state conventions. But if such Baptist bodies could not be enlisted for missions, then societies, composed of interested individuals, were formed within a church or an

association. From these local societies, messengers were sent to the General Convention on the basis of contributions to the treasury of the Convention.

But the denominational consciousness was still prominent. It was more pronounced from Philadelphia southward and especially in Virginia and the Carolinas. There were certain ideas embodied in the ecclesiology of the Baptists in those states that determined the thinking then and has continued to the present to determine trends in Southern Baptist life. The centralized thinking in ecclesiology in those areas derived from three sources, viz.:

**1.** *The Philadelphia Confession of Faith, used widely among the churches of the South, carries the conception of the general, invisible church (a conception brought over from the Westminster Confession, to which the Philadelphia one goes back in origin), as well as of the particular church.*

#### ARTICLE 26

“**1.** The catholick or universal church, which ... may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the Elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one under Christ, the head thereof, and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

“**2.** All persons, throughout the world, professing the faith of the gospel and obedience unto God by Christ ... are and may be called visible saints; and of such ought all particular congregations to be constituted.

“**5.** ... Those thus called he commandeth to walk together in particular societies or churches, for their mutual edification. ...”<sup>19</sup>

**2.** *The original Baptist life, finding expression in Virginia and North Carolina, came from the General Baptists in England. Although the General Baptists were Arminian in theology, in opposition to the Calvinism of the Philadelphia Confession, they held to a centralized ecclesiology in agreement with the fundamental spiritual idea of the Philadelphia. Their General Assembly exemplified externally the invisible church idea of the Philadelphia Confession.*

The General Baptist Creed of 1678 (England) states:

#### ARTICLE 39

“General councils, or assemblies, consisting of Bishops, Elders, and Brethren, of the several churches of Christ, and being legally convened, and met together out of all the churches and the churches appearing there by their representatives, make but one church, and have lawful right, and suffrage in this general meeting, or assembly, to act in the best means under heaven to preserve unity, to prevent heresy, and superintendency among, or in any congregation whatsoever within its own limits or jurisdiction. And to such a

meeting, or assembly, appeals ought to be made, in case any injustice be done, or heresy, and schism countenanced, in any particular congregation of Christ, ... and such general assemblies have lawful power to hear, and determine, as also to excommunicate.”<sup>f10</sup>

**3.** *The great Baptist progress south of the Potomac began after 1750 with the coming of the Separate Baptists from New England.* These were converts from Congregationalism and Presbyterianism during the Great Awakening. Shubael Stearns and Daniel Marshall, the principal leaders, were never wholly freed from the ideas of ecclesiology they inherited from the past. The Sandy Creek Association was the large body that included all Separate Baptists until 1771. That association functioned as an ecclesiastical body, examining and baptizing candidates, examining and ordaining ministers, observing the Lord’s Supper, and exercising control over the churches.<sup>f11</sup> In 1774, the General Association, the Separate Baptist association in Virginia, elected Samuel Harriss an apostle and ordained him. His duties were “to pervade the churches, for the purpose of performing, or at least, superintending the work of ordination, and to set in order the things that are wanting.” John Waller and Elijah Craig also were elected to the apostleship. Was this an inheritance from the General Baptists of England?

As a result of these three inheritances, Baptist leaders south of Philadelphia, as a rule, favored a national denominational organization more than did the leaders north of Philadelphia.<sup>f12</sup>

As already indicated, the General Convention was composed of individuals, not of state conventions or of associations. But leaders of the thinking of Luther Rice, Richard Furman, William B. Johnson, and others had the hope and expectation of transforming the Convention into a truly representative denominational body. In 1817 changes in the constitution enlarged the scope of the Convention to include home missions and education, but a reaction set in by 1820. In that year, the ardent friends of foreign missions and those opposed to the plan of making the Convention into a denominational body succeeded in holding the General Convention to foreign missions only.<sup>f13</sup>

However, the agitation continued. William Staughton, a Philadelphia pastor active in the General Convention, had written in 1813:

The plan of a general Association is a good one. I wish it success. Such an Association is practiced by seven of the individual Associations in Virginia, called a General Conference; but it has extended no farther through our American Union.<sup>f14</sup>

Morgan Edwards, also a pastor in Philadelphia, had written earlier, in 1770, concerning the Philadelphia Association:

But what I deem the chief advantage of this Association is, that it introduces into the visible church what are called joints and bands whereby the whole body is knit together and compacted for increase by that which every part supplieth. And therefore it is that I am so anxious to render the said combination of Baptist Churches universal upon this Continent. <sup>f15</sup>

His ideas were evident after the formation of the General Convention. A writer in the *American Baptist Magazine* <sup>f16</sup> suggested a national program for Baptists — churches combined into associations, associations into state conventions, and state conventions into a national body. He even suggested an international program; “thus the Baptists on both sides of the Atlantic would be united together in a solid phalanx.” In the 1820’s, associations began to call for a national representative body. Even from Boston, where there was little sympathy with a centralized denominationalism, an editorial in the *Christian Watchman*, June 27, 1827, commented:

When these Conventions (that is, state conventions) began to be organized it was contemplated ... that the whole would meet at some central point by their delegates in a General Convention. Such a meeting would have many advantages. It would not be among the least, that a large number of brethren from different States, united in the doctrine of Christ, and in their views of gospel ordinances, would see each other on the most friendly terms, and for mutual consultation on the best means of concentrating their energies in promoting the common interest of the Redeemer’s Kingdom. ... To diffuse a conviction of this duty, let us have the wisdom and strength of the whole denomination in a phalanx.

The year 1826 saw decentralization. The General Convention disassociated itself from education and moved its headquarters to Boston. Its seminary had already closed in Washington and another opened in Newton Center. The Baptist General Tract Society moved to Philadelphia. The plan for a true denominational body seemed to be dead. But the agitation *pro* and *con* in reference to an all-inclusive body continued for two more decades. Even as late as February, 1844, Dr. W.C. Buck, editor of the *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, proposed that the General Convention be transformed into a denominationally all-inclusive body: <sup>f17</sup>

Let the Convention be regarded as a great national Association of the States ... a grand council fire, around which every chieftain of the host, elect, and every soldier of the Cross may be invited to rally. ... Here we might display our national motto *e pluribus unum*. ... Should such a mode of action be adopted, it will supersede the necessity of a Western organization, and will bind the union in fetters of love.

On March 28, 1844, Dr. Buck published a proposed constitution for a new general convention of the Baptists of the United States. This convention was to

be composed of delegates from the state conventions and general associations, the number from each to be determined by the Baptist membership in each state. Baptists in the North moved in their thinking toward decentralization. Associations in the North ceased to observe the Lord's Supper in their meetings. The Board of the Baptist State Convention of New Hampshire had issued a new confession of faith in 1833 with no reference, direct or indirect, to the general church idea, limiting the article dealing with ecclesiology to a definition of a particular church.

In the South, it will be seen, the trend continued in the direction of centralized thinking and action. But the accepted method of conducting denominational work on a national scale was based on the Northern ideas of ecclesiology — a separate and distinct organization for each particular phase of work. <sup>f18</sup> Contributions were made by individuals and Baptist bodies of any character to each organization according to the interest of the contributors.

The acting board, located in Boston, conducted the work of the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States for Foreign Missions. The Executive Board of the American Baptist Publication Society was located in Philadelphia. The American and Foreign Bible Society, established in 1837, carried on Bible distribution from its New York headquarters. Southerners and Northerners, churches and individuals, made contributions to the work of one or more of these societies according to the information and interest involved.

There continued to be suggestions and calls for a more comprehensive denominational organization from both the North and the South, but the greater number were perhaps from the South. State conventions were organized on a more inclusive basis, which kept alive the desire for a national organization comparable in the national sphere to the state convention in its sphere. The realization of this dream came in the South because of the opportunity presented by the introduction of a wholly new issue. After 1830, into the midst of Baptist life, surcharged with such discussion, came the abolition issue. Geographically, decentralization and abolitionism coalesced while centralization and anti-abolitionism prevailed in the same general area. Perhaps the desire to keep abolitionism out of meetings designed to promote missions and education intensified the centralized thinking. <sup>f19</sup> For the next decade and a half, American Baptist life, as well as all other phases of American life, was rent to its depths.

## 2. — THE CONVENTION FORMED

The formation of the Southern Baptist Convention grew out of the division in the Home Mission Society and in the General Convention (foreign missions) over the question of slavery. But the tendency to division in American Baptist life was in evidence before slavery became an issue. It showed itself first in the sphere of home missions. Pastors and editors in the South, and some state conventions, protested that the Home Mission Society was neglecting the Southern area and called for new organizations to meet the need.

During and immediately after the War of Independence there was a tremendous tide of emigration from the seaboard states into the territory beyond the Allegheny Mountains. Many Baptists were among the multitude; the first to settle in Mississippi fled from Tories in South Carolina. Baptist work in Tennessee began from South and North Carolina and Virginia during and after the Revolution.<sup>f20</sup> By the opening decade of the nineteenth century one fourth of the Baptist church members of Virginia had emigrated to Kentucky. From New England, New York, and the Middle states, the human tide was moving westward into the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. When the United States Government bought Louisiana from France, 1803, thus opening the mouth of the river to traffic between the valley and the outer world, the emigration increased tremendously.

### HOME MISSIONS

When the General Convention was formed in 1814 to support Rice and Judson on the foreign field, there was a call for home mission activity also. Those who favored a general denominational organization joined with the promoters of home missions and, at the next meeting of the General Convention in 1817, changed the constitution to provide for home missions and education. In that year, J.M. Peck and J.E. Welch were sent to the West as home missionaries. But there came a reaction, and three years later, the General Convention resolved to hold itself to foreign missions only and let home missions and education be cared for otherwise. To that extent, the opponents of a general denominational organization triumphed and the formation of separate societies for each phase of the work became the accepted method.

The Massachusetts Domestic Missionary Society, under the leadership of its secretary, Dr. Jonathan Going, supported Mr. Peck until permanent plans could be evolved. In April, 1832, the American Baptist Home Mission Society was formed. Its motto has always been "North America for Christ." The Society was located in New York, and, from the beginning, most of its missionaries

came from New England and New York and were sent to the upper Mississippi Valley, north of the Ohio.

Within three years after the formation of the Society, there were complaints in the South and West and calls for a Southern organization to meet the needs south of the Ohio and, later, in the Republic of Texas. The *Christian Index*, March 24, 1835, reviewed the report of the Society and said that little attention was given to the Mississippi Valley, south of Tennessee. In the issue of July 28, an appeal from Nashville, Tennessee, was published, addressed to Dr. Going. A correspondent in the *Baptist* (Nashville) was more specific:

It appears from the "last report of the Executive Committee of the American Baptist Home Mission Society" that they have not a single missionary in all Kentucky, Alabama, Louisiana and Florida, and that they partially or entirely sustain one missionary in Mississippi, three in Tennessee and three in Arkansas, making in all seven missionaries for these six states and one Territory ... only one missionary to every 428,581 souls, while in the state of Michigan, ... they have sixteen missionaries ... one missionary to every 4,000 souls. ... Why are these states (Illinois and Indiana) so liberally supplied? Are they more needy? Are they more destitute? They are more liberally supplied be-cause of Northern contributions, and because Northern preachers re-fuse to come to the south. ... It is, therefore, apparent, that the only way to produce effort in the south must be brought about by the formation of a Southern Baptist Home Mission Society.<sup>f21</sup>

The question of a Southern home mission organization was pro-posed in the auxiliary convention of Tennessee for the Western district, held at Paris, in 1837. It was freely discussed and was referred to the annual meeting of the state convention, at Mill Creek, the same year:

The expediency of the measure was argued on the ground that the American Baptist Home Mission Society ... had treated the south and southwest with almost total neglect; that the distance of our region from New York ... was so great that they obtained but little information of our circumstances, and consequently did not, as was believed, feel so deep an interest in our affairs as they otherwise would; that they, being personally acquainted to no great extent with any ministers besides those residing in the north, seldom engaged the services of southern men; and northern men, with but very few exceptions, were unwilling to live amongst us. ... The brethren, however, were reluctant to act on the subject; not because they regarded the measure as unimportant, but from a fear that their motives and feelings would be misunderstood by our northern brethren, and their efforts to help themselves be attributed rather to what really did not, and does not now exist toward the north, than pure zeal for the advancement of the common cause of our blessed Redeemer. After considerable deliberation and discussion ... brethren agreed to suspend any action for *the present*.<sup>f22</sup>

In November of the same year a Macedonian call from the Re-public of Texas was addressed by a committee, appointed by the recently organized Washington church, to the “Baptist Board of Foreign Missions in the U.S.” and to the American Baptist Home Mission Society. A copy of the appeal to the Foreign Board was received by the Rev. S.G. Jenkins of Mississippi, brother of a member of the committee. He sent it to the *Christian Index* in which it was published February 22, 1838. <sup>f23</sup> The editor, Dr. Jesse Mercer wrote: <sup>f24</sup> “Will not the American Baptist Home Mission Society take this subject under immediate consideration, and as soon as practicable send some qualified brother or brethren into the spacious field?”

The call to the Home Mission Society from the church at Washington, in the Republic of Texas, reached the board of the Society at its regular meeting December 18, 1837. Several efforts were made to heed the call. After nearly two years, Rev. James Huckins of Vermont, agent of the Society in South Carolina and Georgia, agreed to go. He had become popular among the Baptists in those two states and was recommended for the Texas mission, probably by Dr. W.B. Johnson. <sup>f25</sup>

Complaints against the American Baptist Home Mission Society continued, with accumulating momentum from the several Southern states, until the final separation in 1845. The July 19, 1844, issue of the *Christian Index* quoted the *Religious Herald* as follows:

Hitherto our contributions have been generally expended in the free States of the West, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and the territories of Iowa and Wisconsin. A few missionaries have been sent to Missouri, a still smaller number to Arkansas and Texas. Florida and Louisiana have been overlooked ... equally destitute with Iowa and Wisconsin, and where probably a greater amount of good could be effected, with the same expense and labour. ... The American Home Mission Society have made it (Mississippi Valley) the chief scene of their operation. ... Meanwhile the South and Southwestern new states, equally destitute, have been measurably overlooked.

The emigrants to the West have been chiefly from the New England and Middle States. ... In Florida, in Louisiana, in Arkansas, is an extensive field, more destitute, as far as Baptists are concerned, than any other in the United States. Indiana has an equal number of ministers with Alabama, Illinois and Mississippi, yet scores of missionaries have been sent to those two western states, and none to the latter. ...

This feeling (of hostility to the south) is the strongest in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Michigan; yet these states, while supplying thousands of emigrants to the West, have never collectively given half as much in one year to the Home Mission Society, as has been contributed by Virginia in the same space of time. <sup>f26</sup>

*The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*<sup>f27</sup> justified separation on the basis of this neglect of the South. In an editorial review of the thirteenth annual report of the Home Mission Society — nine Southern states reporting — it says:

The South is sustaining missions in the Eastern and Northern States instead of the contrary, as many of our Eastern friends suppose. ... Those nine southern states have not only supported all the domestic missions of this Board in the entire south, but those of Canada and Texas also, and furnished the liberal sum of \$554.973 to support domestic missions in northern states. ... The south will not only lose nothing by being thrust out from the Northern Society; but it also proves that the domestic missions of the south can be better sustained in our separate existence. ... We once before (about two years ago) made a similar expose from a monthly report.

These complaints, voiced by Baptists in the South, were honestly made but were based on inadequate information. The records of the monthly meetings of the board of the Home Mission Society show clearly that the board was endeavoring to meet the calls for mission work in the southern states. The board had difficulty in finding qualified men who were ready to work in needy places in the South. Efforts were made to find capable men for Nashville, Natchez, New Orleans, and other places. The board agreed to pay Dr. W.B. Johnson the large salary (for that time) of one thousand dollars per year to labor in New Orleans. The high salary was agreed to because of the need and opportunity there and because of the abilities and high standing of Dr. Johnson. He agreed to go, but circumstances seem to have arisen that prevented him.

However little foundation there was for the complaints of Baptists in the South that the Society was neglecting that area, those who were registering the complaints were sincere. They did not know how greatly the board was endeavoring to secure the men needed for the work. The effect on Southern minds was the same as if the charges of neglect had been true.

## **CALLS FOR A SEPARATE CONVENTION**

As early as 1835 there were calls for a Southern convention. The *Biblical Recorder*, December 2, 1835, did not think it wise. However, in 1837, its editor, Mr. Meredith, proposed such a convention, but Editor Sands of the *Religious Herald*<sup>f28</sup> thought that the difficulty and expense, due to lack of communication, were too great. He proposed that each state convention send eight or ten delegates to consult in the interests of the denomination.<sup>f29</sup> The tendency to separation was greater in the West because of the apparent need of mission work. The Rev. Robert T. Daniel, a North Carolina leader who had gone to the West and preached through Tennessee and Northern Mississippi, issued a call for those interested to meet at Columbus, Mississippi, to form a

Southern Baptist Home Mission Society. Some of the leaders in Kentucky and Tennessee thought the movement was hasty and favored delaying action until all the state conventions and general associations in the states south of the Potomac and Ohio rivers could be en-listed,<sup>f30</sup> but the meeting convened and the society was formed May 16, 1839. It functioned for nearly three years; after the death of Elder Daniel, it lapsed.

The West was developing a consciousness of its own. In 1828, Andrew Jackson was elected President of the United States, the first one to come from west of the Alleghenies. Many of the national leaders were thinking in terms of the East against the West. Some of the Baptist leaders in the West were thinking likewise. Baptist anniversaries were always held in the East and usually north of the Potomac. Some of the Western leaders resented the attitude of superiority assumed by Easterners.<sup>f31</sup> There developed strong sentiment for a Western denominational organization. Rev. J.M. Peck, of Illinois, Rev. W.C. Buck, of Kentucky, and Rev. R.B. C. Howell, of Tennessee, were greatly interested in evangelizing the Mississippi Valley. On May 11, 1839, in the home of Dr. Buck, in Louisville, a group met to consult upon the advisability of forming a Western Baptist home mission society, having the valley as its particular field. But Editor Buck's views enlarged. He conceived a Western denominational organization to embrace all phases of religious activity. A Western Baptist convention had convened in 1833, mainly in the interest of education. It was a "convention without power of action, without funds or any means to obtain them; or by which the sphere of its influence could be enlarged."

At the meeting of this convention in Louisville, June 3, 1840, Dr. Buck proposed a reorganization, forming a general convention of Western Baptists, composed of "delegates from the General Associations and State Conventions in each Western State and Territory that contributes funds." This plan of reorganization was submitted to the several state bodies and their answers considered in the meeting of the Western Baptist convention in Louisville, June, 1841. The majority favored reorganization, but upon the earnest request of the advocates of the Western Publication Society the question was deferred.<sup>f32</sup>

Division was in the air during the second half of the thirties, due to the natural desire of each section to realize its own needs and objectives. Should the division be East against West or North against South? If the need for domestic missions in the valley had remained the major issue, a Western denominational organization might have developed. But the question of slavery arose to divide the West as well as the East.

## THE ISSUE OF SLAVERY

The principle and practice of slavery were not divisive issues when the national government was established on the basis of the federal Constitution. There was opposition to slavery in the South and in the North. It had not become a sectional issue. In the 1787 convention that framed the Constitution, it was proposed to give Congress the authority to limit the trade in slaves. A committee, the majority of which were from the free states, reported adversely, denying Congress the power at any period to prohibit the African slave trade. Later, another committee, the majority of which were from the slave states, reported a new section giving Congress the authority to prohibit the trade after 1800. The commercial interests of New England especially hindered leaders in the Southern and Middle states from including provisions in the federal Constitution that would curtail the traffic both in time and extent.<sup>133</sup> A manumission society was formed in Tennessee in the second decade of the century, and in 1817 it presented a memorial on slavery to the legislature. The leader of the society, Elihu Embree, published in Jonesborough, Tennessee, in 1820, *The Emancipator*, the first antislavery paper in the United States.

Baptists in the Southern states contributed their part of the opposition to slavery. They gained their first supporters among the population within the lower economic brackets. Hence, most of their members were found among the nonslaveholding majority of the population of the South. In the upper South, where plantation life was not on a scale so extensive, this was especially true. In Virginia, Kentucky, and other states, associations passed resolutions against slavery. In 1828, the Cherokee church sent a re-monstrance to the Holston Association, Tennessee, against the traffic in slaves. The association unanimously approved the re-monstrance. In Kentucky, Baptist churches and associations, known as the "Friends of Humanity," passed resolutions of non-fellowship with slaveowners. Many of these Baptists left Kentucky for Missouri, thus strengthening the antislavery sentiment in that state. Many Baptist families, among them that of Thomas Lincoln, father of Abraham Lincoln, left Kentucky for Indiana and Illinois, because of opposition to slavery south of the Ohio.

Of all the divisive issues in American life in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, slavery cut the deepest because it was at once a political, economic, social, moral, and religious issue. But not until the opposition took the form of abolitionism in the 1830's did the issue begin to portend those divisions in the religious and political spheres realized in the following decades. Throughout the fourth decade there was no break of fellowship over the issue among American Baptists. In December, 1833, the Board of the General Convention for foreign missions, located in Boston, the hub of

abolitionism, received a communication from the Baptist ministers in and near London on the question of slavery. During the previous year, under the leadership of English Baptist missionaries in Jamaica, emancipation of slaves had just been accomplished in that island. Out of the enthusiasm of victory, the London ministers wrote to American Baptists. The Boston Board replied, September 1, 1834:

*Resolved*, That the Board earnestly desire a closer intimacy with their Baptist brethren in England, believing that the cause of truth in both countries, and throughout the world, would be promoted by a more cordial union and cooperation of the two great branches of the Baptist family.

*Resolved*, That while, as they trust, their love of freedom and their desire for the happiness of all men are not less strong and sincere than those of their British brethren they cannot as a board interfere with a subject that is not among the objects for which the Convention and the board were formed.

(signed)

DANIEL SHARP, V. PRES.

LUSIUS BOLLES, COR. SEC.

Dr. Bolles sent with the resolutions, of which these are two, a letter in which he pointed out that the political organization in the United States — a nation composed of sovereign states — made it difficult to handle slavery by Congress as Parliament had done. He called attention to the facts of history: that slavery was introduced into the colonies against the wishes of the colonists; that some states had already freed the slaves, and that Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky would soon follow their example.<sup>f34</sup> Then he continued:

There is now a pleasing degree of union among the multiplying thousands of Baptists throughout the land. ... Our Southern brethren are liberal and zealous in the promotion of every holy enterprise for the extension of the gospel. They are generally, both ministers and people, slave-holders, not because they think slavery right, but because it was firmly rooted long before they were born and because they believe that slavery cannot be instantly abolished. We are confident that a great portion of our brethren at the south would rejoice to see any practicable scheme devised for relieving the country from slavery.

We have the best evidence that our slave-holding brethren are Christians, sincere followers of the Lord Jesus. ... We cannot, therefore, feel that it is right to use language or adopt measures which might tend to break the ties that unite them to us in our General Convention and in numerous other benevolent societies.

We have presented these considerations, dear brethren, as among the reasons which compel us to believe, that it is not the duty of the Baptist General

Convention, or of the Board of Missions, to interfere with the subject of slavery.<sup>f35</sup>

The editor of the *Cross and Journal* expressed the attitude of the vast majority of Baptists, North and South, working together in the General Convention:

Whatever view may be taken of the subject of slavery itself, its evils and its remedy, and we are fully aware that a great variety exists among our readers, we believe all will agree in opinion with the editors of the *American Baptist*, that the “resolutions of the Board in reply are fraternal and kind to our British brethren; and that they, at the same time, evince a wise precaution in respect to subjects irrelevant to the single and grand purpose of the Baptist General Convention, which is the publication of the gospel to the heathen world.”<sup>f36</sup>

If the members of the Board in Boston had continued this attitude, there might have been no break. But abolitionists were active and persistent. Churches and associations were won, first to condemnation of slavery and then to nonfellowship with those who had any sort of connection with slavery. A Northwestern Baptist convention, covering Northern Illinois, Northern Indiana, and Wisconsin, was formed in 1841. These regions had been settled from the East. In a circular issued by the convention, the members refer to their “similarity of origin,” “their modes of thinking and acting,” “their higher degree of affinity for each other.” Dr. J.M. Peck, influential missionary and statesman in the upper Mississippi Valley, whom no one could accuse of being pro-slavery, saw in the constitution and the circular of the convention the dangerous element of abolitionism and sectional strife. He wrote: “We bear our decided testimony against all such narrow sectional arguments and motives as these.”<sup>f37</sup> The next year, after traveling extensively in New York State, Dr. Peck wrote:

Probably a majority of the associations have expressed their views, in the form of resolutions in general terms against slavery. In a few instances they have been so expressed as would imply nonintercourse with the southern churches.

But we are convinced from much enquiry and observation, that a very large majority of northern Baptists regard the declaration of non-fellowship and exclusion of whole bodies, *en masse*, a thousand miles distant, as exceedingly preposterous and subversive of all general discipline upon the New Testament principles.<sup>f38</sup>

In New York and New England, the Free Baptist Foreign Missionary Society was formed in 1840 on abolition principles. No missionaries were immediately appointed, but missionaries of the Boston Board, antislavery in sentiment, were approached. Because of the delay by the American Baptist Free Missionary Society in the appointment of missionaries, the more militant

abolitionists formed the American and Foreign Baptist Missionary Society to begin home and foreign work at once. The constant agitation of these two Societies, both strongly abolitionist in sentiment but disagreeing in method, accomplished the objective of each: to develop abolition sentiments among the rank and file of Baptists and thus force the Boston Board to refuse fellowship with Baptists in the Southern states. The result is well known: The missionaries of the Boston Board were approached; some of them agreed to accept support from the new Society rather than continue under the patronage of the Board of the General Convention. <sup>f39</sup>

Many Baptists in New England preferred to remain with the Boston Board in the hope and expectation of influencing the Board to do some act that would cause a rupture with the South, thus working hand in hand with the Free Baptist Missionary Society. There were slaveholders among the missionaries of the Board. If the Board could be influenced to dismiss these, or to secure their resignations, the issue would be gained. Among these missionaries was the Rev. Jesse Bushyhead, chief justice of the Cherokee Nation, working under the Board among his people. The *Christian Reflector* asserted that Dr. R.E. Pattison, home secretary of the Board, was endeavoring to get Mr. Bushyhead to resign. The missionary died July 17, 1844, apparently before the issue was settled. <sup>f40</sup> Mr. and Mrs. Davenport, missionaries of the Board in Siam, were slaveholders, and Mrs. Henrietta Hall Shuck, missionary in China, would inherit slaves upon the death of her father. <sup>f41</sup>

By the year 1840 the abolition issue was beginning to be felt among Baptists in the South. The Alabama Convention, November 7-9, 1840, took cognizance of the matter and appointed a committee of five — Jesse Hartwell, B.P. Bestor, W.C. Crane, J.H. DeVotie, and M.P. Jewett — to make recommendations. The committee reported:

(1) That abolitionism was unscriptural, was against the national constitution, was against the peace and prosperity of the churches, and dangerous to the permanency of the union;

(2) that money should be withheld from the Board of Foreign Missions and from the American and Foreign Bible Society until Alabama Baptists were assured that these agencies had no connection with antislavery. The following resolution was adopted:

“Resolved, That, if satisfactory information be not obtained upon this subject, we recommend the formation of a Southern Board, through which our funds may be directly transmitted.” <sup>f42</sup>

The Board of Managers of the General Convention issued an address, November 2, 1840, signed by Daniel Sharp, president, and Baron Stow, recording secretary. <sup>f43</sup> This was included in the Board’s report to the

Convention in Baltimore, April, 1841. The primary object of the General Convention was and is foreign missions.

The Board was unable to discover any sufficient reason for the withdrawal of support [on any] considerations wholly extrinsic and irrelevant. ... The Board can have powers and will, only when first it shall have been endued with them by the Convention, from which it emanates. The Board is the executive of the Convention: the Convention alone is legislative. It is the province of the Board simply to carry into effect the will of the Convention. ... These principles clearly defined in the Constitution and laws which the Convention has framed. There is still another subject to which the attention of the Board has been called ... the continuance of Christian fellow-ship between northern and southern churches. ... It does not come under their cognizance in any form; not ... within the scope of the General Convention, with its present constitution.

The Rev. Baron Stow signed this address as recording secretary of the Board, but a letter of his, dated January 11, 1839, to the London Union, declared his sympathy with abolitionism: "It would not be difficult to show that the influence of *the American Church is, at present, the main pillar of American slavery*. But, my dear brother, God is on our side and the cause will prevail." <sup>f44</sup>

The General Convention, in April, adopted the report of the Board, and, notwithstanding the personal attitude of some of the members and officers, the official pronouncement for the time being allayed some Southern fears concerning the Foreign Board. The Alabama Convention authorities seemed to be satisfied with the official attitude of the Board of the General Convention.

The report became current in Georgia that the Home Mission Society would not appoint a slaveholder as a missionary. In 1841, the Board of the Society had issued a circular setting forth its neutrality on the issue. In April, 1844, the Society itself, by a vote of 123 to 61, declared "our co-operation in this does not imply sympathy with slavery or anti-slavery, as to which subjects societies and individuals are left as free and uncommitted as if there were no such co-operation." But, at this meeting, the Society appointed a committee of nine to consider the amicable dissolution of the Society. This left the attitude of the Board of the Society in doubt. To allay the question in Georgia, the executive committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention requested the executive board of the Home Mission Society to appoint the Rev. J.E. Reeve, a slaveholder, a missionary to the Indians. The salary of Mr. Reeve was provided for and his field of labor indicated. The Board needed only to appoint him and allay all doubts. But the Executive Board of the Society, in view of the purpose, declined to appoint him.

The General Convention also, in its meeting in April, 1844, had declared neutrality. But Dr. Pattison, home secretary of the Acting Board in Boston, declared in the summer following, at an association in Massachusetts, that he would not vote to appoint a slave-holder a missionary and that he did not think the Board would appoint one. It was during the summer of 1844 that Dr. Pattison was endeavoring to induce Rev. Jesse Bushyhead to resign. The Boston <sup>f45</sup> and Salem Associations voted resolutions against slavery and slaveholders. The *Christian Reflector* was boasting that the Board was becoming less proslavery. All of these facts and conditions led the Alabama Convention, November, 1844, in a series of resolutions, <sup>f46</sup> to ask the Acting Board in Boston whether a slave-holder would be appointed a missionary. The Board gave a definite, negative answer. Since the General Convention in April had declared neutrality, there were many that considered the Board had transcended its authority.

There was no unanimity in the South or in the North concerning the decision of the Acting Board, but all were agreed that further co-operation was impossible. The *New York Baptist Register* for April, 1845, expressed the attitude of many in the North:

For ourselves we deplore the necessity of division, but when things reach such a crisis as they appear to have done, deplore it as we may, there is no prospect of peace or comfort in the continuance, and weakness rather than wisdom would yield to efforts to effect it. ... Why is it not best that our Southern brethren take their position on one side of the line and we take ours on the other, and engage in the various departments of benevolent effort with renewed zeal and increased liberality? <sup>f47</sup>

At the time, however, it was not certain whether the cleavage would be geographical — North and South — or whether it would be on the principle of slaveholders and nonslaveholders fellow. shipping with one another in opposition to abolitionism. There were nonslaveholders in both the North and the South who were willing to fellowship with slaveholders; and abolitionism was feared and hated in both sections. The situation was comparable to the issue of political secession fifteen years later. Many Southerners were opposed to secession from the Union, and many in the North were opposed to coercing the Southern states.

The Virginia Baptist Foreign Mission Society, following the action of the Boston Board, took the lead and issued a call for a consultative convention: <sup>f48</sup>

*To the Baptist Churches of Virginia and the Baptist Denomination of the United States generally:*

DEAR BRETHREN:

You will perceive by the accompanying resolutions of the Executive Committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention, that they have acceded to our proposal to hold in Augusta, Geo., on Thursday before the 2d Lord's day in May next, a Convention. ...

**1.** We wish not to have a merely *sectional* Convention. From the Boston Board we separate, not because we reside at the South, but because they have adopted an unconstitutional and unscriptural principle to govern their future course. The principle is this — That holding slaves is, under all circumstances, incompatible with the office of the Christian ministry. ... For ourselves we cordially invite all our brethren, North and South, East and West, who “are aggrieved by the re-cent decision of the Board in Boston,” and believe that their usefulness may be increased by cooperating with us, to attend the proposed meeting.

**2.** We are desirous to see a *full* Convention. Let us, brethren, have a meeting concentrating in a good measure, the wisdom, experience, and sentiments of the denomination in the South, and South West, and such portions of our brethren in other places as may deem it best to unite with us. ...

**3.** *Several important subjects*, beside the question of organizing a Foreign Mission Society, will, we presume, come under the consideration of the Convention. We will mention some of them, that our brethren in Virginia, especially, may learn, as far as practicable, the views and wishes of the denomination. Whether it will be better to organize a separate Bible Society, and Publication Society, or to continue our connexion with the existing institutions, are questions which must be discussed. It is quite likely too, that the subject of building up a common Southern Theological Institution will claim a share of attention.

JAMES B. TAYLOR, PRES. <sup>f49</sup>  
C. WALTHALL, SECY.

The call issued from Virginia did not specify the character of the proposed organization, but it is suggested in the statement that other subjects than foreign missions would be considered. Dr. W.B. Johnson, president of the South Carolina Convention, was very specific. He was the only man who had been in the organizational sessions of the General Convention in 1814 and, later, of the Southern Baptist Convention and the only one to serve as president of each body. He was a member of the committee in each convention to propose the constitution. His centralized ecclesiology was well known. In his presidential address to the special session of the South Carolina Convention, in Edgefield, the week preceding the meeting in Augusta, he said:

I invite your attention to the consideration of two plans. The one is, that which has been adopted for years past, viz: Separate and independent bodies for the prosecution of each object. Your familiarity with the plan renders any remark upon it unnecessary. The other proposes one Convention, embodying the

whole Denomination together with separate and distinct Boards for each object of benevolent enterprise, located at different places, and all amenable to the Convention. <sup>f50</sup>

Leaders in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi advised delay. They wished to wait for the action of the General Convention, believing that the Convention would not sustain the decision of the Boston Board. They desired to preserve national union and warned the leaders in the seaboard states against haste.

Let not the churches despair of preserving the union. The mission belongs to them and not to the Boston Board; and that Board has neither the right nor the power to dictate to the churches the terms and conditions upon which the mission is to be conducted or the union of the denomination preserved. Let the churches assume their right and appoint such agents, at such a location, as in their estimation shall be most favorable to secure the interests of the mission and the peace and harmony of the denomination.

We hope our brethren in the South will pause and seek to God for wisdom before they take the step, in this matter, which cannot be retracted. <sup>f51</sup>

As late as the first of May, Editor Buck desired to hold the moderates, North and South, together and force the abolitionists to withdraw and form their own organizations. The *Biblical Re-corder* of North Carolina and the *Baptist* of Tennessee agreed with him. <sup>f52</sup>

The Board of the Tennessee Baptist Foreign Mission Society was very specific in its attitude against immediate withdrawal:

*Whereas*, The dissemination of the word of God in all lands and the conversion to him of the heathen world is an object dear to our hearts, and *Whereas*, the more effectually to prosecute this object, by the Church, collectively, the Baptist Triennial Convention was organized, the duties of which during its recess, are performed by an Acting Board, at present and for some time past, located in Boston; and *Whereas*, that Board was virtually and substantially instructed as to their course in relation to the question of abolitionism, by a resolution passed at the last session of the Convention, repudiating all connection with both slavery and anti-slavery, in all proceedings; therefore. ...

Baptists in the South were almost unanimous for separation. There was difference in opinion concerning the time and the extent of separation. Dr. R.B.C. Howell of Nashville sent to Augusta a letter approved by the quarterly meeting of the Board of the General Association of Tennessee. He asked for delay, since Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, and Kentucky did not have time to appoint representatives. He gave three reasons why Southern Baptists should not secede at the time: It would give too much importance to the decision of the Boston Board; secession now would show disrespect for the

brethren in the North who disapproved the decision of the Board; and it was probable the General Convention would not sustain the Board.

But Dr. Howell recognized that separation from the Board must come for three reasons: The Board had done violence to the Word of God, had violated the constitution of the General Convention, and had reversed the judgment of the whole church as expressed in the last session of the Convention.<sup>f53</sup> There was no question of separation, except as to when and how and how far. Some had suggested a separate convention in 1835. Editor Meredith of the *Biblical Recorder*, December 2, 1835, doubted the wisdom of it at that time, but he suggested it later in 1837. Then, Editor Sands of the *Religious Herald* was the doubter.

Due to the short time and poor communications, there were few representatives from the states west of the Allegheny Mountains. Three hundred and seventy-eight messengers were appointed in response to the Virginia call; three hundred and twenty-seven<sup>f54</sup> from eleven states met at Augusta, May 8, 1845.<sup>f55</sup> Dr. J.L. Burrows of Philadelphia was present, representing the American Baptist Publication Society and the State Convention of Pennsylvania. He was not a member of the Convention but was recognized as a corresponding messenger and participated in the discussions.

A committee, of which Dr. Johnson was chairman, was appointed to draw up a constitution. There was a problem as to the field and the name of the new organization. It was the hope that the Baptists of all the Southern states would join in the new Convention.<sup>f56</sup> With that objective in mind, there was a proposal to call it the “Southern and South Western Convention.” However, after some discussion it was felt that a previous suggestion to entitle it simply the “Southern Baptist Convention” would be comprehensive enough, and it was so adopted. Some preferred the customary plan of operations — forming a foreign mission society at the time and considering home missions and other objects later.

In the discussion, Rev. Richard Fuller, of South Carolina, said that he preferred the term “Society,” because the Baptist Church<sup>f57</sup> could not in this way be divided. Dr. Burrows stated that he loved the Baptist Church, loved it more than ever amid the difficulties which surrounded it. The Church could not be severed, although they might act in different spheres and be governed by different regulations. Mr. Tinsley of Virginia said that, while this subject might trouble and agitate the bosom of the Northern part of the Church, they would keep steadily before them the object for which they were originally associated together. Rev. J. Davis of Georgia deprecated “haste in the discussion of this important question, which is more important than any that has ever before been agitated by the Baptist church.”<sup>f58</sup>

## CONVENTION ORGANIZED

In the end, the plan of Dr. Johnson, <sup>f59</sup> who was elected president, prevailed. The constitution was adopted Saturday, May 10, forming one Convention, authorized to do any sort of denominational work that seemed wise.

Upon the adoption of the constitution, Dr. J.B. Jeter submitted the following:

*Resolved*, That the individuals, churches and other bodies, approving the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention, adopted by this body, be recommended to meet, according to its provisions, for organization, by members or delegates, on ..., in Richmond, Va.: And that this Convention now proceed to the election of Officers and Boards of Managers, to continue in office until said meeting.

The chairman raised a question whether this body had the authority contemplated in the action proposed in the last sentence of Dr. Jeter's resolution. Did this body have authority to organize even a "provisional government?" In the opinion of Dr. Johnson and others, this body, called to consult about the current situation existing between Baptists in the South and in the North, was only empowered to recommend. Hence, it was their duty to refer the recently adopted constitution to "the individuals, churches, and other bodies approving the Constitution ... to meet for organization under the Constitution, by members or delegates, according to its provisions." However, the other view prevailed. "The Convention then proceeded to organize a provisional government under the Constitution." <sup>f60</sup>

There was strong sentiment among those present at Augusta in favor of the "society" ideology rather than the "convention" type. Some of the latter mode of thinking favored the appointment of agencies for publication, Sunday school, and other endeavors. In private conversation the establishment of a general theological school was proposed. The fifth Article of the constitution made provision for such an all-comprehensive program: "The Convention shall elect at each triennial meeting as many Boards of Managers, as in its judgment will be necessary for carrying out the benevolent objects it may determine to promote. ..." In consideration of the general circumstances, the fact that the American Baptist Publication Society had not become involved in the question of slavery, the expense involved in establishing a publishing agency, and special problems connected with establishing and supporting a theological school for the South, only two boards were then formed: Foreign Missions at Richmond, Virginia, and Domestic Missions at Marion, Alabama.

It appears that the result secured at Augusta was a compromise between Dr. Johnson's proposal of a comprehensive body and a society for the propagation of the gospel, with the difference from the current society method that the new

Convention combined home and foreign missions. Article V of the constitution made possible future expansion. However, for the first half century, the Baptist papers, North and South, frequently referred to the “Southern Missionary Convention.”

The Convention adjourned Saturday until Monday. On Sunday, the members and visitors joined with the First church of Augusta in the observance of the Lord’s Supper. <sup>f61</sup> On Monday, other business was transacted, and the Convention adjourned. The constitution provided for triennial meetings. Copies of the proposed constitution were sent to Baptist papers and in other ways brought to the attention of Baptist churches and other Baptist organizations. The time and place for permanent organization under the proposed constitution were set for Richmond, Virginia, June, 1846.

The members of the consultative convention at Augusta re-turned home after having proposed a new sort of convention, an organization the plan of which was more in accord with the ecclesiology prevalent in the South. It was such an organization as Luther Rice and Richard Furman desired in 1814; such a one as Dr. Buck and Dr. Howell desired to form in the West; such a one as many desired in the General Convention in 1823 and 1826; such an organization as had been functioning in the several state conventions. It was truly a denominational convention, comprehending within its scope any phase of work, missions, education, benevolence, etc., that the convention should desire to perform.

Although the action taken under the Jeter resolution on Saturday, May 10 — the formation of a “provisional government,” and the invitation to those interested to meet in person or by delegation in Richmond the following year to perfect a permanent organization — suggests that they considered the transactions at Augusta tentative, plans were made that indicated a sense of permanent action. A charter was secured under the laws of Georgia, December 27, 1845. The newly appointed boards began to function, although their work the first year was largely preparatory. The Foreign Board could not initiate work as soon as the Domestic Board, which had six missionaries in the field the following year. In September, the Foreign Board had appointed Samuel Clopton as a missionary to China, although he was not sent out until the following year. From the beginning, the numbering of the sessions has been reckoned from 1846. <sup>f62</sup>

### 3. — TAKING A STRIDE, 1845-1860

The new convention was not only new in being, but it was also new in character. In the first period, the task was to change from the society method to the denominational method of conducting missions and other benevolences — in a word, to find direction. Before the formation of the General Convention in 1814 there had been organized at least sixty-five, perhaps more, societies, north of Philadelphia, for raising money for both domestic and foreign missions. Much money had been sent to the English Baptist Mission in India. South of Philadelphia, funds had been raised and sent to Carey and his confreres in India. There were some societies, but the preferred method had been through denominational organizations — churches and associations — rather than through societies, membership in which was based on finances. <sup>f63</sup> The General Convention for foreign missions and, later, agencies for varying objectives were formed on the society pattern, membership being voluntary on a financial basis. Churches contributed to their treasuries, but these agencies were not specifically denominationally-based organizations.

#### DENOMINATIONAL BASIS

The new Southern Baptist Convention retained some of the older characteristics, but under the leadership of Dr. Johnson, chairman of the committee that prepared the constitution, the new organization was formed on a broader denominational basis. The compromise between the two methods may be seen in the constitution. Membership in the triennial meetings was based on finances, as heretofore. Article III reads: “A Triennial Convention shall consist of members who contribute funds, or are delegated by religious bodies contributing funds. ...” This indicates continuation of the society method, but Article V reads: “The Convention shall elect at each triennial meeting as many Boards of Managers, as in its judgment will be necessary for carrying out the benevolent objects it may determine to promote. ...” This indicates a combination of all lines of activity under one organization, a method hitherto rejected by American Baptists in all national bodies.

Article IX carries a further suggestion as to the difference in nature of the new organization, reference being made to “the Churches composing this Convention.” Heretofore, the national societies were composed of individuals, but this suggests that the new Convention was based on the churches. Due to the lack of training on the part of the churches and to the influence of the older method, there was not a great difference in the practical administration of the work of the two Boards of the new Convention from that of the older societies. There was, however, a sense of unity in the work and a concentration upon

missions at home and abroad, that excluded extraneous questions. The new leaders were lacking in experience in the larger field; and although this would be a disadvantage in the beginning, it was a disadvantage that time would mitigate.

The Convention, formed as a denominational institution based on the churches, associations and state conventions, did not enter into the full denominational program provided for in its constitution. <sup>f64</sup> During the formative years, as it was finding its direction, the influence of the society method and the possible fear of a centralized, comprehensive organization held the Convention to a program of missions only. In the new organization there was this change from the older method: one convention was to conduct both foreign and home missions, having a separate board for each, instead of the earlier method of an entirely independent society for each phase of work.

The new Convention, arising out of friction in mission work, was formed primarily for missions. There were many difficulties, but encouragement came from friends in the North as well as from supporters in the South. Dr. Francis Wayland, president of the General Convention, had written to Dr. Jeter:

You will separate of course. I could not ask otherwise. Your rights have been infringed. I will take the liberty of offering one or two suggestions. We have shown how Christians *ought not* to act, it remains for you to show us how they *ought* to act. Put away all violence, act with dignity and firmness, and the world will approve your course. <sup>f65</sup>

This was read at Augusta. The New York *Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record*, July, 1845, wrote:

A more intelligent or dignified body have rarely been assembled. The ministers of the gospel are not specified by any designation, so that we only recognise such as were before known to us in this relation; of whom there were a goodly number, probably one half of the whole. Besides these, there were found governors, judges, congressmen, and other functionaries of highest dignity — all moved by a common spirit, and apparently obeying the highest impulse of their natures. Such men may be mistaken; they may sometimes do wrong; but it is impossible not to respect them, and do homage to the sincere, manly ingenuousness, and the christian forbearance which they evinced.

From a secular source came this word of justification: “It ought to be understood and remembered, that the ecclesiastical separation which has taken place, was forced upon the South. ... The necessity was deeply regretted by the South, but could not be avoided.” <sup>f66</sup>

The task of enlisting the Southern churches in a program of missions at home and abroad was tremendous. Many Baptists of the South were so strongly

Calvinistic in theology that they could not enter into missionary activity. The ecclesiology of Southern Baptists, especially west of the mountains where the New Hampshire Confession prevailed, stressed the local church idea to such an extent that they were afraid of the new Convention,<sup>f67</sup> although many Southerners thought and wrote in terms of the generic idea, the Baptist Church.

The geographical conditions intensified the problem of enlistment. There were few churches in large centers of population. Most of them were in the villages and the country. To reach these churches and pastors, agents had to be employed to travel widely, a laborious, expensive method in time and money. But Southern Baptists could not be united in the new work unless they could become acquainted with one another and with the new plans. In this day of rapid and abundant communication, it is difficult to realize the conditions that faced our fathers a century ago.

In the interior, subscribers to Baptist periodicals published east of the mountains complained that their papers failed to reach them. Some of the editors in the seaboard states declined to accept subscriptions from the far interior unless the subscribers agreed to receive their papers in a seaboard city. Editors frequently complained that their exchanges failed to arrive. The Foreign Mission Board of the new Convention was located in Richmond, Virginia, and communication with the lower South was difficult.

The Baptists in Virginia have always had much more of intercourse with the North than with the South. Not twice a year can we send a package of books hence to Charleston, without sending it by the way of Baltimore. And the South western states have had more intercourse with the North than they have had with Virginia. To carry a book-case from Tuscaloosa, in Alabama, to Penfield, in Georgia, you must first send it to Mobile, thence to New York, thence to Savannah, and thence via Augusta or Atlanta. ... We mention these facts to show that it is not wonderful; if Virginia has had more difficulty in severing the ties that attached her to the North, than Georgia or Alabama has had.<sup>f68</sup>

Notwithstanding the problems arising out of inexperience and many and varied difficulties, the Convention went forward, feeling its way and getting its stride. A committee was appointed at Augusta to arrange with the Board of the General Convention an equitable division of funds, forces, and fields. The committee re-ported at the meeting of the Convention in Richmond that the Northern Board declined to transfer to the new Convention any of the funds or mission fields. The final agreement was that the Northern organization should retain the corporate name and all the property and assume all the debts.

## FOREIGN MISSIONS

The missionaries, of course, were left free to choose the board under which they would labor. Rev. J.L. Shuck, who had been working in China for eight years under the old Board, chose service under the new Convention. Rev. I.J. Roberts, who had been working in China under a separate society formed to support him, was accepted by the new Board. At the Richmond Convention, the Foreign Mission Board announced the appointment, during the preceding year, of S.C. Clopton and George Percy as missionaries to China. China thus became the first foreign mission field of the Southern Baptist Convention, and during the ensuing year Matthew T. Yates, one of the great missionaries of the Board, began his career of forty-two years in that field.

Motivated by the deepest desire to do the will of God in witnessing to the whole world, Southern Baptists believed that they could do this work most effectively by organizing a separate convention. Yet their unshaken respect for Adoniram Judson, the first missionary sent by American Baptists to a foreign field was manifested by the reception given Mr. Judson when he visited Richmond, the home of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention February 8, 1846, only a few months after the constitution of the new Board. On that occasion, Dr. Jeremiah B. Jeter welcomed the honored missionary in a significant address in which he said:

Welcome, thrice welcome, are you, my brother, to our city — our churches — our bosoms. I speak as the representative of Southern Baptists. You will soon return to Burmah, the land of your adoption . . . it is as near from Burmah to heaven as from Richmond or any other point on the globe. Angels, oft commissioned to convey to heaven the departing spirits of pious Burmans and Karens, have learned the way to that dark land. <sup>169</sup>

Rev. James B. Taylor, pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Richmond, became the first corresponding secretary of the Board. For twenty-five years, through three trying periods — beginning, war, and reconstruction — he led Southern Baptists and gave tone to their mission outlook. His genuine piety, consecrated devotion, and practical wisdom gave direction to the policies and work of the new Board and placed his name high in the roster of missionary statesmen. In those formative years, the Southern Baptist Convention was fortunate in possessing a group of such great leaders to set the pace for the years ahead.

During the first year, the Foreign Board began the publication of *The Southern Baptist Missionary Journal*. At the Richmond Convention in 1846, the Board's report was necessarily limited in scope. Little had actually been accomplished except the laying of plans and the effort to enlist the Baptists in all of the Southern states. But the Board had large plans in the making. Responsibility

for the whole world was upon them. In the Augusta meeting it had been resolved “That ... it is proper that this Convention at once proceed to organize a Society for the propagation of the Gospel.” And in an address to the public, issued by authority of the newly formed Convention, they declare that the conduct of their Northern brethren would forbid them to speak unto the Gentiles. <sup>f70</sup> As their experience enlarged and their funds increased, their plans expanded.

In the 1846 meeting, Mexico, South America, and Palestine were proposed as possible fields of labor. And from Palestine as a base, the work would expand into Asia Minor, Egypt, Arabia, and Persia. The presence of the Negro in the South called special attention to Africa. The report on the African Mission says:

Twenty-five years ago, a little church of only seven members, with Lott Carey as pastor, was organized in an upper room of a private dwelling in this city (Richmond). That church is now the First Baptist church in Monrovia. It has been the mother of some seven to ten other churches, and also of the Providence Baptist Association in Liberia. Since that period, hundreds of colored Baptists have emigrated from this country and settled permanently in the land of their forefathers. ...

The Board considered, then, that the proper missionaries to be sent to Africa were suitable Negro ministers from this country.

As the first decade advanced, the interest and activity in foreign missions increased among Southern Baptists. Sectional strife had disappeared from the meetings, more frequent <sup>f71</sup> and more accessible meetings brought members of Southern churches together, and unification of different phases of work under one Convention brought consolidation and direct control over the boards. Through this period, the work in China and Africa was enlarged. Japan was opened to Western influence by the United States in 1854. <sup>f72</sup> Six years later the Foreign Mission Board appointed J.Q. A. Rohrer, J.L. Johnson, and C.H. Toy to open mission work in that empire, and J. William Jones to enlarge the work in China. But the ship that carried the Rohrers was never heard of, and Mr. Jones, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Toy never sailed for their fields, for civil strife in the United States delayed the opening of the Southern Baptist mission in Japan. These young men made their mark, however, but in other spheres than missionary activity.

## **DOMESTIC MISSIONS**

The Domestic Mission Board, located in Marion, Alabama, did not begin its tasks as well as did the Foreign, but it had missionaries at work sooner. Rev. J.L. Reynolds, of South Carolina, was elected corresponding secretary in

Augusta but declined. Rev. D.P. Bestor, of Alabama, undertook the task, but in November, 1845, he resigned: "I have learned by visiting many, and by an extensive correspondence, that our brethren prefer carrying on their domestic missionary operations, through their Associations and State Conventions." <sup>f73</sup> Rev. Russell Holman undertook the position in December, 1845.

For ten years there had been criticism of the American Baptist Home Mission Society for neglecting the states of the lower Mississippi Valley and the Republic of Texas. Now, when Southern Baptists had a mission agency, some of the associations and state conventions, having mission programs of their own, saw no place for the Domestic Board. After the rise of Landmarkism (1851), this attitude was intensified in the West but mitigated in the eastern South. Still, during the first year, the Board employed six missionaries — one in Virginia, one in Florida, one in Alabama, one in Louisiana, and two in Texas.

The Home Mission Society, New York, became more interested in the Southwest after 1845. The Society had sent the first missionary to Texas in 1840, nearly two and a half years after the appeal from a small church in the Republic. Before the withdrawal of Southern Baptists from the General Convention, however, the field was abandoned. After the formation of the Southern Convention, the Society again entered the field, and Secretary Holman of the Domestic Board of the Convention registered a gentle protest:

Texas was abandoned by them previous to the division; after the Southern organization it was occupied by this Board. This, together with its geographical position, will furnish an apology for calling it "our field." Yet, if the Northern Board have sufficient funds to "preach the gospel to every creature" in the Northern and Western States, and Territories, and can occasionally send a Missionary to Texas, we will find no fault. <sup>f74</sup>

After a few months, the Society again left the field.

In its first report to the Convention, the Domestic Board recognized its field as covering fourteen states, nearly one million square miles, with a population of about eight million. The responsibility to the widely scattered white population and to the Negroes, free and slave, was recognized. The Board requested the state associations and conventions, the domestic missionary societies, and the district associations to become auxiliary and to make reports to the Board, in order that all domestic missionary work might be reported to the Southern Convention. Southern Baptists were a rural people. In the older states, many of the abler pastors held rural pastorates. In the report for 1857, the Board said: "Cities and towns are important centres of influence. Your Board have deemed it the part of wisdom to bestow a liberal share of their aid upon these

promising fields.” New Orleans was considered a special field of the Board from the beginning.

The Indian Mission Association, with headquarters in Louisville, had been organized in 1842. Its supporters were mainly Southern; its officers were Southern. In 1855, the board of the Association approached the Foreign and the Domestic Boards of the Southern Convention, with a proposal of union. The Convention instructed the Domestic Board to take over the missions of the Association, and the name was changed to the Domestic and Indian Mission Board. In this same decade, work was begun among foreign-speaking peoples — the Chinese in California, the Germans in Missouri and Maryland. The Board continued the program developed in the first decade and a half among the native English-speaking population, white and black, the Indians, and the foreign-speaking immigrants and their descendants.

## SIGNS OF CONFLICT

Near the end of this period there began to appear those fundamental differences in ecclesiology and mission methods, around which so much Southern Baptist history has gathered and which will be discussed in another chapter. But during this decade and a half the Convention was finding itself and getting its direction. Division took place over missions, domestic and foreign. Some desired to bring into the sphere of operations any and every sort of denominational work. The Convention finally settled upon a program of missions as the main task and, in the 1859 session in Richmond, projected that task on such liberal principles and broad methods that any and all Baptists could join together — Landmarkers and non-Landmarkers. Even those Primitive Baptists who professed to believe in missions, but not in “modern institutions,” could have found a working basis had they so desired. <sup>175</sup>

The record of those fifteen years shows that the Southern Baptist Convention was winning its constituency and deepening the missionary interest and activity. The antimissionary elements in Southern Baptist life had been passing out of the churches and associations; the activities of Alexander Campbell and his followers were considered as on the outside; better means of communication among Southern Baptists were bringing a wider acquaintance and a deeper sense of fellowship. Educational interest was increasing. Baptist colleges in the states were training leaders, and interest in a Southwide theological school was deepening. At the end of the period, the school opened its doors. Mission contributions increased over the preceding period by nearly sevenfold.

In 1846, the review exhibited that fact that, during the thirty-three years previous, while the Baptists of the whole country were united in their

missionary work, the South had contributed to Home and Foreign Missions \$250,656.

In 1859, the records indicated that, during the thirteen years existence of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Southern States had contributed for Domestic and Indian Missions \$266,359, and for Foreign Missions \$384,339.07, or making a total of \$650,698.07. Thus the South gave, after the formation of our Convention, an average annual contribution seven times greater than it gave before the organization. <sup>f76</sup>

The new Convention was taking its stride and gaining momentum with each passing year. But a cloud, larger than a man's hand, was rising over the horizon. War just ahead, followed by "reconstruction," would nearly wreck the Convention and lessen its activities, as it would everything else in the South, for a generation. It seemed providential that in the years immediately preceding that conflagration, Southern Baptists should be peculiarly blessed in the person of their leader, Dr. Richard Fuller, who served as president of the Convention from 1857 to 1859.

Dr. W.E. Hatcher, in his *Along the Trail of the Friendly Years*, <sup>f77</sup> tells an interesting story about Dr. Fuller, who was a mighty preacher but a "wretched presiding officer." By way of illustration, Dr. Hatcher tells of a brother who arose in the Convention and stated a point of order in such an involved, equivocal way that the president was helplessly confused. He looked at the brother and said, "My dear brother, will you not, in the interest of the kingdom we love, withdraw that motion?" The brother, after a little re-monstrance, solved the situation by complying.

Another brother offered a resolution to the effect that we must all pray for the Baptist editors. "Dr. Fuller did not know what to do with the motion, and he stood for well-nigh a minute, a very king in his grandeur, and finally said, 'Well, my dear brother, we will think about that matter.' The Convention burst into convulsions, and the brother and his motion went down unwept." So far as we know the editors were not prayed for — at least on that occasion. Dr. Hatcher went on to pay a fitting tribute to the president: "Dr. Fuller's great soul, filled with spiritual mastery, floated the Convention on peaceful seas, guarding against every rising storm and after all brought things to a nobler conclusion than any rigid parliamentarian could possibly have done."

## 4. — THE WAR PERIOD, 1860-1865

Political and economic circumstances which developed affected the future course of the Convention. Before the next meeting of the Convention in Savannah, in 1861, the Southern states began to secede from the federal Union.

As in the case of the Baptists, and Methodists, in 1845, some fundamental differences in interpretation of the organic law led to division. The cause, in each case, was constitutional interpretation. The occasion was a clash around slavery which, though not limited geographically in colonial and early national years, be-came, for various reasons, an “institution peculiar” to the states south of the Mason and Dixon line and its projection, the Ohio River. Amid the clashing of nationalism with states’ rights, the Missouri Compromise determined, in 1850, the extension of the dividing line beyond the Mississippi River.

### **SECESSION AND THE CONFEDERACY**

The Compromise did not settle the question of the interpretation of the Constitution. New England, the first home of secession (Hartford Convention, 1814), had nurtured the outstanding advocate of nationalism, Daniel Webster. The South, the home of the nationalist leaders, George Washington, John Marshall, James Madison, and others, furnished the leaders for states’ rights, J.C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis. The West, the existence and influence of which ultimately saved the Union, gave Henry Clay and Abraham Lincoln. With the passing of Calhoun, Webster, and Clay, a new era with new leadership opened. Upon the election of Lincoln in 1860, the secession of Southern states began.

The several Baptist state conventions and general associations made pronouncements upon the current political and military conditions. The action of the Baptist State Convention of Texas may be taken as typical. In the session at Huntsville, 1861, “the Committee on preaching and devotional exercises announced that special prayer would be offered to the God of battles for our be-loved Confederacy; accordingly fervent prayer was offered in the various places of preaching for the success of our arms, and for a speedy and honorable peace.”

The Southern Convention, meeting in Savannah, 1861, made a strong pronouncement. A Committee on the State of the Country, one member from each state represented, was elected from the floor of the Convention. Dr.

Richard Fuller, of Baltimore, president of the Convention, was chairman. The Committee reported May 13, as follows: <sup>f78</sup>

We hold this truth to be self-evident, that governments are established for the security, prosperity, and happiness of the people. When, therefore, any government is perverted from its proper design, becomes oppressive, and abuses its power, the people have a right to change it.

In vindication of their sacred rights and honor, in self-defence, and for the protection of all which is dear to man, the Southern States have practically asserted the right of seceding from a Union so degenerated from that established by the Constitution, and they have framed for themselves a government based upon the principles of the original compact — adopting a character which secures to each State its sovereign rights and privileges.

This new government, in thus dissolving former political connections, seeks to cultivate relations of amity and good will with its late confederates, and with all the world; and they have thrice sent special commissioners to Washington with overtures for peace, and for a fair, amicable adjustment of all difficulties.

After a long preamble of this kind there follow ten resolutions. Several read as follows:

**2nd. Resolved,** That we most cordially approve of the formation of the Government of the Confederate States of America, and admire and applaud the noble course of that Government up to this present time.

**4th. Resolved,** That we most cordially tender to the President of the Confederate States, to his Cabinet, and the members of the Congress now convened at Montgomery, the assurances of our sympathy and entire confidence. With them are our hearts and our hearty cooperation.

**8th. Resolved,** We do recommend to the churches of the Baptist denomination in the Southern States, to observe the first and second days of June as days of humiliation, fasting and prayer to Almighty God, that He may avert any calamities due to our sins as a people, and may look with mercy and favor upon us.

**10th. Resolved,** That these resolutions be communicated to the Congress of the “Confederate States,” at Montgomery, with the signatures of the President and Secretaries of the Convention. <sup>f79</sup>

In the session of 1863, at Augusta, the Southern Convention again made a pronouncement on the current secular affairs: <sup>f80</sup>

*Resolved, 1st.* That the events of the past two years have only con-firmed the conviction expressed by this Convention at its last session, that the war which has been forced upon us is, on our part, just and necessary, and have only strengthened our opposition to a reunion with the United States on any terms

whatever; and while deploring the dreadful evils of the war, and earnestly desiring peace, we have no thought of ever yielding, but will render a hearty support to the Con-federate Government in all constitutional measures to secure our independence.

*Resolved, 2d.* That we gratefully acknowledge the hand of God in the preservation of our government against the power and rage of our enemies, and in the signal victories with which he has crowned our arms; and encouraged by the experience of the past, and by the present condition of affairs, and humbly relying on the Divine blessing, we confidently anticipate ultimate success.

*Resolved, 3d.* That while we justify ourselves in this conflict with our enemies, we acknowledge that our sins have deserved the terrible calamities that God has sent upon us, and view them as a solemn and imperative call to penitence, humiliation and a hearty turning to God.

*Resolved, 7th.* That we have just heard with unutterable grief of the death of that noble Christian warrior, Lieut. Gen. T.J. Jackson; that we thank God for the good he has achieved, and the glorious example he has left us, and pray that we may all learn to trust, as he trusted, in the Lord alone.

In the beginning of the war, the work of the Southern Baptist Convention, as well as that of the several state bodies, was disrupted, both at home and abroad.

Colleges have suspended, some of them indefinitely. Doctor Talbird, President of Howard College, has raised a company and gone to the wars, and the students of most of our colleges have enlisted in the Confederate army. The Revision Association is prostrate, and we presume the whole work of Revision is indefinitely suspended. Our female schools, in several localities, show signs of distress. Some six or seven Baptist papers have gone down in the past six months, while the Mississippi Baptists and the Texas Baptists issue half sheets, and the Tennessee Baptist is cut down in size to one-third less than the Western Recorder. Added to this gloomy picture, our Foreign Missions are paralyzed, our Home Missions almost suspended, and our State organizations unable to carry on their work. Ministers have been forced through stern necessity to leave their fields of usefulness in order to provide bread for their families. <sup>f81</sup>

## HOME MISSIONS

The work of home missions, more than foreign missions, was disorganized by the outbreak of hostilities between the North and the South. The problem of the Foreign Board was to raise and transmit funds to the mission fields. The Domestic and Indian Mission Board not only had financial difficulties, but the fields of work were disrupted and new mission opportunities and problems

arose in connection with the armed forces of the Confederacy. The Board reported to the Convention, in 1863, that

Most of the Domestic Mission work has been suspended during the war. ... More than 150 men had occupied the field previous to the breaking out of the war. ... The public sympathy and effort were now turned to the moral and spiritual well-being of the army. It would have been fruitless to have attempted its diversion. Hence, the Board in January, 1862, determined to enter at once upon its (Army Missions ).<sup>f82</sup>

Thus the work of the Domestic Board was disrupted just as the Board was beginning to prove its place in the life of Southern Baptists. In its early years, many had not seen a place for it. Each state Baptist body, with the associations, insisted that it could look after the mission needs within its own borders. But by 1861 the Board had proved its right to function. In its report to the Convention that year, the Board had said:<sup>f83</sup>

The progress of our work is the best evidence of its hold upon the confidence and regards of the friends of missions. ... Had not the above causes ( short crops and national agitations) existed, the receipts of the year would probably have exceeded those of the past by not less than ten thousand dollars.

The work among the Negro slaves had been encouraging and was expanding:<sup>f84</sup>

... they are almost entirely dependent upon the white man for the bread they eat, and specially for the instruction that shall make them wise unto eternal life. Our obligations, then, in this regard, are weighty, and address themselves to our most serious consideration. ... Many of them are located at a distance from the sanctuaries frequented by the families to which they are attached; and unless special provision is made for them, they must remain deprived of all wholesome religious Sabbath instruction. It has been the design of the Board to supply this want as far as possible. Several of our missionaries devote all of their time to their benefit; and many, if not all, give a portion directly to their religious training. They are encouraged in this work by the masters of the slaves, and now that we are (as it is to be hoped) removed from those political exciting causes that have had, for years, a tendency to embarrass our evangelical efforts for the good of the black man, we look forward to a brighter day, when no suspicions can be thrown upon devoted, honest labor for the religious instruction of members of our families.

There is no class of people among us that more sincerely appreciate the efforts of our missionaries than the slaves that work our soil. Let us, then, give them the pure Word of Life that has elevated them so far above the conditions of their race in the mother land.

The same report indicates the progress of the mission in California among the whites and the Chinese. The work among the Germans in Louisiana, Missouri,

Kentucky, and Maryland gave evidence of increasing success. But all of these different phases of the work of the Domestic Board — Negroes, Chinese, Germans, English-speaking whites — were disrupted by the outbreak of hostilities.

Perhaps the work among the Indians, in some respects, suffered most, because of outside interference. Rev. J.A. Stover had begun work among the Cherokees in the Indian Territory in 1857. The mission among the Pottawattomies, mainly educational, had to be abandoned because the funds from the United States Government were held back. The Government had appropriated \$75.00 for each pupil, but, when the Board closed its books December 31, 1860, the Government owed on account \$2,546.87. Every phase of the Domestic Board's work was either destroyed or seriously impaired.

The leadership of the newly formed Confederacy looked to the religious leadership of the South to give morale and stamina to the people. Sentiment, duty, and opportunity called the Board to labor among the Confederate armies. Baptists began to make plans to send colporteurs into them. President Davis commented: "I most cordially sympathize with the movement. We have but little to hope for, if we do not realize our dependence upon Heaven's blessing, and seek the guidance of God's revealed Truth."<sup>185</sup> The Baptists as a people, ministers and laymen, entered heartily into the fighting forces.

A few days since a distinguished Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity inquired of the Rev. James B. Taylor, D.D.: "Can you explain to me how it is that there are so many Baptists in the army? I have been chaplain from the beginning of the war, and it seems to me that a large portion of all the religious men with whom I have met were Baptists. Is it that your people are so numerous, or that they are patriotic?" Bro. Taylor replied that "they were both numerous and patriotic." In one regiment from Georgia there were, some time since, six hundred Baptists. In a regiment from Alabama there were thirteen Baptist ministers.<sup>186</sup>

In the several states in which Confederate armies were active or stationed, the Conventions of those states carried on religious work among the soldiers. This was especially true in Virginia where so many of the soldiers were gathered. Perhaps there was never an army in which a greater religious work was done than in the Army of Northern Virginia.<sup>187</sup> The well-known religious character of such military leaders as Generals R.E. Lee, T.J. Jackson, J.B. Gordon, and others set the example and gave encouragement to the movement.

The Domestic Board of the Southern Convention did some of its work direct and some of it through the state organizations. In its report to the Convention in 1863, the Board set forth a general plan of operation:<sup>188</sup>

Missionary operations in the army are diversified, but on this account are not less valuable. Sometimes the missionary is accompanying the regiment or brigade upon their long marches, and preaches as he finds it convenient. Sometimes he moves from camp to camp, conversing with the men, distributing tracts, testaments, religious newspapers and holding meetings for prayer, and exhortation; and sometimes he is found located for a time within the massive walls of the strong and defiant fort, where he has access to its defenders, always anxious to wait upon his ministry.

The printed page — Testaments, tracts, religious newspapers — was very popular with the soldiers. One missionary of the Board reported: <sup>f89</sup>

There is a great thirst for reading among soldiers — even among those who have little taste for it when at home. The reason is simply this, they are now cut off from almost every other source of information; many, when at home, would ride or walk miles to obtain the news of current events by enquiry and conversation, rather than seek it through the medium of the printed sheet. In the army they have no such neighbors to whom they can resort for such information. Hence they will read — read anything.

The Board reported: <sup>f90</sup>

The Board takes pleasure in acknowledging the courtesy of the Col-portage Board of Virginia, under the efficient superintendence of Rev. A.E. Dickinson, to our missionaries, in furnishing them gratuitously with large supplies of their publications for distribution in the army. Bro. D. thinks that not less than 5,000,000 pages of tracts have been given them for this object. Add to this the amount purchased of other publishing houses by the Board, and you have some idea of the volume of truth scattered among our soldiers for their spiritual instruction.

In its report prepared for the biennial session of the Convention in 1865, but which could not be submitted until 1866, the Domestic Board stated: <sup>f91</sup>

This has been a prolific field of ministerial effort. It would be gratifying to all the friends of Jesus to read the many letters we have received from the Chaplains and Missionaries employed among the soldiers of the army. ... The result of these labors can be fully known only in eternity. ... Salaries of eleven chaplains were supplemented, so as to enable them to support their families, and remain at their several posts of duty.

[Religious literature] has been found a valuable auxiliary to the labors of the active ministry; \$9,090.45 have been expended for religious tracts — \$20,522.37 for religious newspapers — \$1,681.20 for Bibles and Testaments. It has been found impossible to secure as large an amount of the latter as desirable. We have endeavored to place a copy of the Scriptures in the hands of every soldier in the Confederate Army. Large numbers have been obtained by other organizations, and distributed in the army, much to their credit. It is pleasant to know that the spirit of cooperation has existed among all the

evangelical ministers and chaplains of the army, and by their united efforts much good has been done, and the truth widely diffused.

The Domestic Board did not forget the field and the armies west of the Mississippi. But as the war progressed, communication was difficult and the raising of funds almost impossible. As the federal armies gained control of the Mississippi, the problem became heavier. Accordingly, a trans-Mississippi department of the Board's work was established. Rev. J.B. Link, who had served as agent of the Board in Mississippi, was sent to Texas. He was authorized to raise funds and pay them to missionaries in the army or to pastors of destitute churches. He was expected to make a quarterly report of his services and of the business of his department to the Board. In Louisiana, the executive committee of the state convention was appointed agent of the Domestic Board and authorized to appoint missionaries and pay out funds for the Board.

In its last report during the war period, the Domestic Board of the Southern Baptist Convention expressed gratitude to God and man for blessing upon abundant labors: <sup>192</sup>

The work of the Board has been increased beyond any year since its organization. The spirit of liberality among our churches was never more manifest. No appeal has been made in vain, and many have been responded to with unusual generosity. The spirit of God has given countenance to our labors, and many have been made to rejoice in hope of a blessed immortality through the instrumentalities sustained by the Board.

## **OCCUPATION BY FEDERAL ARMIES**

As the war advanced and the military resources of the South diminished, the extending military control of the North over the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention vitally affected the life and work of the churches. After the fall of Vicksburg and the Battle of Gettysburg, the fortunes of the South began to wane. The federal armies controlled more and more of Southern territory. The American Baptist Home Mission Society, through its president, U.S. Senator Harris of New York, made application for the authority to take charge of abandoned Baptist meetinghouses in the controlled territory. The Secretary of War granted more than was asked, but the Society did not decline the added privileges.

WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON  
January 14, 1864

TO THE GENERALS COMMANDING THE MILITARY DIVISION OF THE  
MISSISSIPPI, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE GULF, OF THE SOUTH, AND OF  
VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA, AND ALL THE GENERALS AND OFFICERS

COMMANDING ARMIES, DETACHMENTS AND POSTS, AND ALL OFFICERS IN THE SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED DEPARTMENTS:

You are hereby directed to place at the disposal of the American Baptist Home Mission Society all houses of worship belonging to the Baptist Churches South, in which a loyal minister of said church does not now officiate. It is a matter of great importance to the Government, in its efforts to restore tranquility to the community and peace to the nation, that Christian ministers should, by example and precept, support and foster the loyal sentiment of the people. The American Baptist Home Mission Society enjoys the entire confidence of this Department, and no doubt is entertained that all ministers who may be appointed by it will be entirely loyal. You are expected to give it all the aid, countenance, and support practicable in the execution of its important mission.

You are also authorized and directed to furnish their executive officer, or agent, and his clerk, with transportation and subsistence, when it can be done without prejudice to the service, and will afford them courtesy, assistance and protection.<sup>193</sup>

The Home Mission Society was careful to explain why it sought such authority from the War Department and how the authority was exercised:

In almost every city, town and village taken by our army there has been found a deserted Baptist meeting-house. In many places these houses have been stripped of all that was movable, or converted into hospitals, stables, storehouses, or, perhaps, occupied by others than Baptists, who have denied us the privilege of using them as places of worship. Instances are not wanting where colored brethren have been shut out of, or disturbed in the use of, their own houses wherein they had worshipped for years, under the plea that the houses formerly be-longed to their masters, and now to the Government, and not to them. Your Board, satisfied that all this was without the knowledge or consent of the authorities at Washington, informed them of the facts, asked for protection, with privileges and obtained [this military order].

The Board appointed Dr. J.W. Parker, of Boston, its agent for the objectives of the order. He could take possession of Baptist meeting-houses in any territory in the South, held by Northern armies, and appoint pastors.

In all this the Board have to do only with meeting-houses, or Baptist Church property that has been deserted by its former occupants, which property the War Department allows them to hold and use until civil authority can be restored. And their whole object will be accomplished if, by thus occupying the property, they can save it from being destroyed, or passing into other than Baptist hands, and preserve it as an inheritance for future Baptists who may live to own and occupy it.

The report of the Board to the Society goes on to say that “early in the year a missionary was sent to New Orleans. ... He has been able to perpetuate the Coliseum Place Baptist Church, with *modern improvements*, and now has thirty members, fifteen of whom he has baptized, a good congregation, a Sabbath school of three or four hundred children, and, in the basement of the house, a flourishing day and evening school.” <sup>f94</sup>

Since the minutes of the Home Mission Society refer specifically to the Coliseum church, this case may be taken as an example of the methods sometimes used by the Society’s agents in the South.

In the summer of 1863, a Reverend J.W. Horton, a representative of the American Baptist Home Mission Society of New York, visited New Orleans, as he said, “To look after Baptists’ interests.” Finding the church neither desirous of his services, nor willing to surrender the house to him, he obtained a military order from General Bowen, Provost Martial General, and thus forcibly obtained possession.

At the time of the military seizure, there were about sixty-five members of the church in the city; of whom only five, one male (a German) and four females, who continued to worship in the house under the new administration. Quite a number of others attended the First Baptist Church; others became scattered.

... <sup>f95</sup>

Similar pastoral appointments were made by Dr. Parker, as agent of the Home Mission Society in Baton Rouge, Vicksburg, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Nashville, Island Number 10, and Memphis. Other representatives of the Society were in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi.

## FOREIGN MISSIONS

As soon as the war began, the Federal authorities blockaded the South and, with the naval strength available, were able to make the blockade real. The Foreign Mission Board was cut off from communication with the missionaries in China and Africa. Dr. Fuller, of Baltimore, president of the Southern Convention, secured permission from the Secretary of State in Washington for such funds as the Board in Richmond might have to be sent by flag of truce to Baltimore. More than two thousand dollars were sent in this way. Deacon William Crane of Baltimore wrote to Mr. Isaac T. Smith, the financial agent of the Foreign Mission Board living in New York, and learned that he had already made large advances to the missionaries of the Board. The Maryland Baptist Union Association met in November, 1861, and at once took steps to relieve the situation. After consultation and discussion, the following resolutions were passed: <sup>f96</sup>

RESOLVED, That any churches or bodies or individuals having funds for Foreign Missions be requested to pay the same to bro. William Crane, and that bro. Crane be requested to forward said funds to bro. Isaac T. Smith, of New York.

RESOLVED, That we tender our acknowledgments to bro. Smith, of New York, for his Christian conduct and labor of love in behalf of our Missionaries at all times, especially in this hour of trouble when they have been cut off in whole from the Board in Richmond.

RESOLVED, That bro. Crane be requested to act as our Agent in reference to future communications with the Missionaries.

RESOLVED, That the Clerk be requested at once to send a copy of these resolutions to bro. Smith.

During the meeting, Deacon Crane announced that several very liberal contributions and several smaller ones, added to the amount received by flag of truce from Richmond, would cover the advances made to the missionaries by the financial agent of the Board, Mr. Smith, and meet the current needs of the missionaries of the Board.

During the following year, 1862, the leaders in Baltimore, Dr. Fuller and Dr. Williams, together with Dr. Samson, of Washington, and others kept before the people the mission program of the Richmond Board. Contributions came in from members of the churches in Baltimore, from other parts of Maryland and Washington, and from friends in Northern cities. Mr. Hiram Woods, Jr., a young member of Dr. Fuller's church, accepted responsibility for the support of a missionary in China. Efforts were made to secure funds from the Board in Richmond by flag of truce, as in 1861, but the request was denied. In this somewhat inchoate manner the Board's missions in China and Africa were partly supported during 1862.

In the fall of that year, the Board requested the following brethren to act as a provisional board in Baltimore to care for the missions: R. Fuller, J.M. W. Williams, Franklin Wilson, Hiram Woods, Jr., Henry Taylor, A.F. Crane, and A.J. Lowndes. Dr. Williams was elected corresponding secretary by the group. This provisional board made appeals in public meetings and in the Baptist papers. Through the latter means, Kentucky Baptists learned of the provisional organization. Dr. W.M. Pratt, treasurer of the General Association of Kentucky, sent a check for several hundred dollars to William Crane, the treasurer of the provisional board.

During the rest of the war, Baptists in Maryland, the District of Columbia, Kentucky, and Missouri, through the provisional organization, assisted greatly in supporting Southern Baptist foreign missions. Letters from the missionaries

to the leaders in Baltimore and Washington were copied and sent to Kentucky and Missouri. Correspondence between the Board and the missionaries was carried on by flag of truce through Dr. G.W. Samson, president of Columbian College in Washington, and the Baltimore provisional board. Permission was again secured from the military authorities of the South and of the North for the Board in Richmond to send funds — as long as there were any — and letters by flag of truce to the provisional board.

Some of the missionaries — Matthew T. Yates, in China, particularly — secured secular work that assisted them to carry on. The foreign residents in Shanghai and Canton, especially the English, made contributions to the missionaries. The London Missionary Society (Congregational) contributed to the work of Dr. R.H. Graves.<sup>f97</sup>

There was yet another means through which the Foreign Mission Board in Richmond was enabled to finance in part its missions in China and Africa. The Northern navy had isolated the South from the beginning of hostilities. Blockade-running, if successful, was highly remunerative, for the price of cotton on the English market rose to fabulous prices. Although the risk was great, the profits were attractive. The Board invested in long-staple cotton and took a venture. The following reports are interesting:

I learn, also that the running of the blockade has been laid under contribution for the transmission of funds to our missionaries. A vessel, sailing not long since from one of the Confederate ports, carried several bales of sea-island cotton, which the Board purchased for some fifteen hundred dollars, and which, if it reaches England, will net nearly five thousand. When last heard from, it had arrived at a West Indian port, and there was but slight exposure to subsequent capture.<sup>f98</sup>

We are gratified to state that remittances have been made by the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board, which will administer timely relief to our brethren abroad. They were sent ... in the shape of Sea Island Cotton. ... The vessel into which the cotton was admitted by the courtesy and generosity of the gentlemen who own or who chartered it, sailed several weeks since from a Confederate port, and, at the last advices, had reached Nassau in safety.<sup>f99</sup>

When the Foreign Board made its report to the Convention in Augusta, 1863, this reference was made to blockade-running in behalf of foreign missions:

It is also to be mentioned, that the kindness of important shippers, in one of our seaports, has permitted the forwarding of Cotton to Europe, by which relief has been given in our extremity. It is not improbable, though it may be attended with some risk, that in this way we may yet forward a large amount of our funds.<sup>f100</sup>

From Liverpool or some other important English cotton market, the tripled funds could be sent through commercial houses having business connections in China and Africa, directly to the missions of the Board, without danger of confiscation by the ever-watchful Yankees.

The Baltimore committee raised, during 1862-1865, \$12,990.60 and expended \$12,937.60, leaving a balance of \$53.00 at the close of the war. The General Association of Kentucky, through its treasurer, Dr. W.M. Pratt, remitted to the Board and to the missionaries, through the Baltimore committee, during 1863-1865, \$7,608.91. The Board raised in the South, from the close of the Convention year, 1863, to April 1, 1865, \$72,028.90 and expended \$51,351.51, leaving a balance at the close of the war of \$20,677.19. But as this was in Confederate bonds and currency, it was hence-forth worthless. The Board authorized the treasurer to mark it off in order to balance his books. Thus, at the beginning of the Convention year, April, 1865, the Board found its finances depleted. Again, Maryland and Kentucky filled the breach and supplied funds when the other states were prostrate. Dr. James B. Taylor, secretary of the Board, wrote to Dr. W.C. Crane at Baylor University, Independence, Texas, on February 6, 1866:

We are arranging to continue our work in the foreign field, and I cannot but hope a favoring Providence will open the way, not only for the sustentation of the different missions, but for their early reinforcement. The present will be a year of great trial to us. If we can secure the amount necessary for the support of our brethren up to the close of 1866, my impression is, we shall be able to go on ... and be permitted to call for more laborers to enter the fields. ... My hope how-ever is, that Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and Texas will take hold of the work in good concert. <sup>f101</sup>

In March of that year, the Board adopted the following:

*Resolved*, That in view of the Divine care of our missionaries during the last four years of frightful war, we are under renewed obligations to cherish an humble, grateful spirit, and to prosecute our work with renewed diligence.

*Resolved*, That in the prosecution of our foreign missionary enterprise, the Board regards itself as called upon, not only to sustain the missionaries already in the field, but to reinforce our different missions at the earliest practicable period. <sup>f102</sup>

When the Convention met in Russellville, Kentucky, in 1866, thanks were expressed to the provisional board in Baltimore and to the Baptists in Maryland, District of Columbia, and Kentucky for their generous aid during the period of the war. After the Convention, the Board learned that there was a debt of about eight thousand dollars, borrowed by the missionaries, under the authority of the Board. "This amount, though sufficient to embarrass them, was

small in comparison with the expenditure which might have been made by our missionaries had they borrowed funds for the support of the different stations. Instead of this they restricted themselves, in some instances, to the lowest possible supplies of food and raiment ...” <sup>f103</sup>

Within three years, the Board paid this amount at home. The debt on the Yoruba mission in Africa was lifted by contributions from churches and individuals in England and Scotland, made to the Rev. A.D. Phillips, missionary to Africa, during a visit he made to those countries in 1868 en route home. The obligation was overpaid, leaving a balance to the credit of the mission. <sup>f104</sup>

## WAR’S DECISIONS

When General Lee surrendered to General Grant at Appomattox, April 9, 1865, the government of the Confederate States of America fell and that nation ceased to be. It was more than the fall of a nation. It was more than the confirmation of nationalism as over against states’ rights under the Federal Constitution. It marked the end of an era — the passing of the old South and its civilization, and the coming of the new South and the civilization yet to be.

The Convention did not meet in the regular biennial session in 1865, due to the collapse of the Confederacy in April, but it met in Russellville, Kentucky, in 1866. <sup>f105</sup> The South accepted the decision of war as settling the hitherto divisive interpretation of the Federal Constitution on the question of the right of a state to secede. The Convention was not disposed to refer to current political questions. But many ministers of Southern sympathies had been legally forbidden to preach, and they had suffered “fines, imprisonments, and other pains and penalties” rather than obey such prohibition. The Convention was constrained to make a pronouncement on separation of church and state and on religious liberty. Therefore, the Southern Baptist Convention declared:

<sup>f106</sup>

... in the face of the world, and in the fear of God —

that all interference with these functions on the part of civil rulers transcends their legitimate authority, and is a usurpation of the rights of conscience; and that when the claims of civil rulers come in conflict with those of Christ, it is our duty to “obey God rather than men,” and endure the consequences.

That in adopting these resolutions, the Convention expressly disavow any disposition to interfere with political affairs, and have regard solely to the question of religious liberty.

## 5. — RECONSTRUCTION ERA, 1865-1879

At the close of the four years of internecine strife the structural life of the South, as built up from colonial days, was shattered. The reconstruction committee of the United States Congress, which took the administration of the Southern affairs out of the hands of President Johnson, determined to eliminate the former states and ultimately form new political divisions, bearing other names. For the time being, the South was divided into military districts, each one under the control of a Federal general. The former economic structure, with investments counted in hundreds of millions, was destroyed, and the material loss, resulting from the battles and the armies marching through the South, was immeasurable. Especially was this true in the Eastern half of the South, which had been the main support of the work of the Southern Baptist Convention.

In the first year or two following the war, there was actual want of the necessities of life among all classes of Southern people, including many who had been wealthy and were among the upper social group. Dr. J.B. Taylor of the Foreign Mission Board, in a letter to Dr. Crane, president of Baylor University, Texas, and a native of Virginia, wrote February 6, 1866:

“You have no idea of the total prostration of everything in Virginia. Our people are the subjects of great suffering. I am glad to say, however, that they are patient and cheerful — ready to endure and labor.” <sup>f107</sup>

The whole social structure, founded upon slavery, was destroyed, and confusion, as great as that evolving from the economic conditions, reigned. Educational institutions had closed their doors during the war; some of them were burned by Federal soldiers, never to reopen. The turmoil within the religious realm was just as serious. Many houses of worship had been destroyed; others, Baptist and Methodist, had been taken by ministers from the North, under authority from the Secretary of War. In his *History of Missouri Baptists* R.S. Douglas points out a constitutional provision forbade a minister to conduct public worship unless he took an oath that he had neither assisted nor sympathized with the Confederacy. In other states, an oath was required by the military.

The Negroes had been members in the same churches with the whites. Religious instruction had been given them by the families of their masters, by pastors of white churches, and by Negro ministers directed by churches, associations, and state conventions. In several instances, since state laws forbade freeing slaves and permitting them to remain within the state, associations had bought Negro preachers in order that some preachers might

have the opportunity to minister constantly to the slaves. <sup>f108</sup> Many white pastors had given considerable time to the religious interest of the slaves.

A letter from Dr. J.H. DeVotie, secretary of the Georgia Convention, to Dr. S.S. Cutting, secretary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, dated July 15, 1877, states:

In connection with all my charges before freedom came, I had a large number of colored people to whom for 35 years I gave about 1/3 of my preaching. I say, gave, for I would never receive one dollar compensation from them. It paid me gloriously. In connection with those labors I had the indescribable pleasure of baptizing about 800 of these Ethiopian believers. ... Before the war, a number of our pastors preached to them and their ministrations were of a high order. Since then they have been mainly under the teaching of men of their own color, a large portion of whom are untaught and utterly unfit for the work. That preaching of our pastors ... is the cause under God of the vast numbers of baptized believers among them, but there is a fearful falling off now. <sup>f109</sup>

Most of the Negro members of Baptist churches withdrew to form churches of their own. In some instances, encouraged and supported by the military authorities, they seized the church buildings of the whites. All of this aggravated the disturbed religious conditions. Even three years after the close of hostilities the religious conditions in the South were still distressing.

There are scattered churches to be reconstructed, feeble ones to be strengthened, houses of worship to be rebuilt or repaired, Sunday schools to be reorganized or gathered, seminaries and colleges to be sustained, reopened and re-endowed, pastors to be relieved from secular labors, that they may devote themselves to the ministry, mission treasuries to be supplied, that laborers already in the field may be supported, and others sent forth to re-enforce and encourage them, and millions of freedmen who must hear the gospel from our lips or die without the knowledge of it. <sup>f110</sup>

## **HOME MISSION SOCIETY**

The first tendencies toward the separation between Southern and Northern Baptists had been seen in the work of the American Baptist Home Mission Society from 1835 onward. This was due to the need of mission work in the Southern states and the Republic of Texas and in the seeming neglect of that need on the part of the Society. Likewise, the first suggestions toward the reunion, and the friction growing out of such suggestions, arose in connection with the work of the Society. When the Society met in annual session in St. Louis, in 1865, the South was prostrate. Rev. J.M. Pendleton introduced the following: "RESOLVED, That, in the Providence of God, this Society is called

to consider Kentucky and Tennessee as embraced in the sphere of its labors, and to decide as to the best method of cultivating this portion of its vast field.”

In discussing the question, Dr. Pendleton said:

I think this Society, in the selection of its missionaries for Kentucky and Tennessee, should give the preference to Kentucky and Tennessee ministers, so far as suitable men can be found. Who are suitable men? I would say men of unquestionable loyalty to the Government of the United States, *men who approve the policy of the Government on slavery.*<sup>f111</sup>

Dr. Pendleton was a Virginia-born, Kentucky-reared pastor in Kentucky and teacher at Union University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee. He developed antislavery sentiments. When the Federal army captured Murfreesboro in 1862, he took a pastorate in Ohio and, later, in Upland, Pennsylvania. His Southern brethren, especially those in Kentucky and Tennessee, resented his attitude.<sup>f112</sup> It is probable that the unwise and premature move in the Home Mission Society, led by Dr. Pendleton, raised barriers against the closer co-operation advocated by Dr. Jeter and others. There were moderate men on each side, who ardently desired reunion for the sake of Christian fellowship and work. The Board of the Home Mission Society, on September 27, 1865, passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That the Board of the American Baptist Home Mission Society do sincerely desire, and will fraternally welcome, the co-operation of their Baptist brethren in the Southern States in the glorious work of publishing the gospel in all its fullness of doctrine, precept and practice, throughout the land; and in all *Christian effort* to enlighten and Christianize every creature.<sup>f113</sup>

This fraternal attitude on the part of some in the North continued. The *New York Examiner and Chronicle* expressed, in an editorial, the readiness and desire to co-operate with and assist the impoverished South:

Undoubtedly there are in our Southern churches multitudes of good Christian men and women, as good as are to be found; — undoubtedly they have multitudes of good and faithful pastors, sharing with them a common lot of poverty. Let us establish, they with us and we with them, better relations. If our lot is a more favorable one, let them share its blessings in our aid to build up with them the common cause of our country’s evangelization; it is not as conquerors or oppressors that Northern Baptists would come to such co-operation, but as brethren, seeking to restore wastes and turn them to joy and gladness. ... The South is to rise, and for the resurrection Baptists should be preparing, by strengthening the things which remain and are ready to die. We never hear of their churches languishing, their colleges dying, their missionary life paralyzed, without an irrepressible desire for the speedy coming of the day which shall make all these interests a common cause to the whole Baptist family.<sup>f114</sup>

There were gestures of peace and fraternity expressed in personal correspondence also. Dr. Pharcellus Church wrote Dr. Jeter: “My idea is this, that the cause of alienation between us has disappeared. I mean differences of labor and social institutions. We are citizens of one earthly, and I hope, heavenly polity, and it were an act of madness, as well as of wrong, to perpetuate division and alienation.” <sup>f115</sup>

The moderate men, North and South, were outnumbered by the extremists, as in 1845. Dr. Church, continuing in the same letter, wrote: “The flexibility, wisdom and apostolical character of genuine congregationalism never had a better chance of showing themselves. ... If I were to attend your General Association, many of your folks would be shy of me, and so of you in our Missionary Union, some on our side receiving you coldly.” In the same issue of the *Religious Herald*, J.L. Burrows wrote: “Some two months’ travel and observation in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York, have convinced me that ecclesiastical re-union and co-operation between the Baptists North and South are at present impracticable.” <sup>f116</sup> Men on both sides wrote words that plagued Baptists in the following years.

During the summer after the collapse of the Southern Confederacy, when the question was uppermost whether any attempt should be made to revive the Southern Baptist Convention, a correspondent in the *Examiner and Chronicle*, endorsed by the editor as a “representative” man, wrote as follows:

The position of the Northern Christians is one that involves nothing unfraternal. ... They do not hate, they have never hated their Southern brethren. They stand ready to welcome their return to fellowship and cooperation the moment there are reliable indications of repentance for the atrocious wrongs of the past five years. They know but too well how fierce and foremost have been Southern Baptist ministers in prayers for the Confederacy, in denunciation of the North, in fiery appeals to the prejudices and hatred of the Southern people. To talk now about a general amnesty of all political sins on both sides as a condition of union is an evasion of the question of radical wrong. ...

As soon as conditions in the South permitted, associations and state conventions began to hold their annual meetings. The question uppermost was: “Shall the Southern Baptist Convention continue?” Many of the bodies voted that the separate work should go on. The board of the Baptist State Convention of Texas issued such a call. Individual leaders favored it. The Virginia *Religious Herald*, January 4, 1866, carried this statement:

... in view of the fact that the General Association of Virginia passed resolutions declaring non-co-operation *by a unanimous vote* ... and that these resolutions were endorsed by every district association in the State, which has taken any action on the subject, there can be no sort of doubt, that the

overwhelming voice of our denomination in Virginia is against co-operation, and in favor of *doing our own work in our own way.*<sup>f117</sup>

## HOME MISSIONS DISRUPTED

The fall of the Confederacy was the signal for the complete disorganization of the work of the Domestic Board. Confederate currency was worthless, and none other was available. Nothing was done by the Board for nearly four months.

... the Corresponding Secretary, in response to the action of the General Association of Kentucky, inviting the Boards of the Southern Baptist Convention to send their representatives to that State for aid, to enable them to resume their respective labors, left Marion upon this mission. He arrived in Kentucky in season to be present at the meeting of the Elk Horn Baptist Association. Here greeted him a genuine old Kentucky welcome, not soon to be forgotten. The signal note was here sounded, and found its echo throughout the State. In the short space of some six weeks, he had secured about \$10,000. This assured the friends all through the South that the Board was again upon its feet, and ready for another trial.

Missouri and Baltimore also came forward and added the weight of their liberality.<sup>f118</sup>

Here and there, throughout the devastated portions of the South, there were some who made substantial contributions.

The Board did not forget the Negroes just out of slavery:

It will also be observed that several of the appointments have been made exclusively to the colored people, but in no case without their having been consulted, and wishes gratified. ... When these people were in a state of slavery, they were the objects of our constant solicitude and prayerful effort; and now that they are freemen, does not detract from our interest in their behalf.<sup>f119</sup>

In December, 1865, the Domestic Board sent Rev. Russell Holman to New Orleans to recover the property of the Convention, the Coliseum Place Baptist Church. Major General Canby in-formed Mr. Holman that the property would be restored on the following conditions:

1. That he prove the Southern Baptist Convention to be an incorporated body;
2. That he secure the signatures of the corporators to the application;
3. That the corporators prove their loyalty by furnishing a certified copy of their amnesty oath, or a copy of their special pardon, in the event of coming under the exceptions to the amnesty proclamation;
4. That title to the property be proved;

5. That certificate of non-alienation be furnished;
6. That he show that the freedmen had no claim upon the property.

By the first of March, 1866, all the necessary papers were in hand. Mr. Holman returned to New Orleans, secured a military order, March 8, and received the keys, March 12. The congregation gathered by the Rev. Mr. Horton had drifted away. The original church, about one hundred and eighty members in 1861, had dwindled to about fifty. <sup>f120</sup>

The Indian missions of the Board were wholly suspended during the war. Some of the Indians took the Federal side, some the Confederate. Some of the Indian preachers died in battle. Many of the church members fell away. The Convention of 1866 recognized its obligation to the Indians, Negroes, and whites, and, as finances and workers were available, the Board resumed each phase of its work.

The American Baptist Home Mission Society enlarged its work in the South and entered into co-operative work with such state conventions as chose to do so. In those early years, the concept of denominational solidarity had not developed as it has in later decades. The denominational agencies, even in the South, were still considered voluntary societies with which individuals or Baptist bodies might co-operate according to preference. Southern Baptist bodies, whose tasks were great and whose resources were small, approached the Home Mission Society for assistance. In a letter dated July 15, 1877, Dr. J.H. DeVotie, secretary of the Georgia Convention, wrote to the secretary of the Home Mission Society, Dr. S.S. Cutting,

We cannot do this vast work alone. We are too poor and impoverished. You can help us if you can find a safe way. ... Let us appoint and commission these colored men who have education and others equally adapted to the work. The Secretary of this Board to give you the name of each, his field, the amount expended, and a final report of all labor and its results. ... I believe the time is not far distant when such a course would disarm all opposition here, and harmonize us all in occupying this great field for our blessed Lord. <sup>f121</sup>

The Society did not always wait for the Southern body to take the initiative. Dr. J.S. Backus, secretary of the Home Mission Society, had written, January 7, 1868, to Dr. William C. Crane, who was president of Baylor University at that time:

Should your State Convention see fit to accept our Invitation we to co-operate with you as with the States named, I think we should be able to add for the coming year two dollars to each one received in your State. That is, for each dollar raised by the General Missionary that your Board should recommend to us, aided by your Board and pastors, we should try to appropriate in your

States as your Board should direct three dollars to encourage and help your work.

In view of the extending and expanding co-operative work of the Home Mission Society in the South, the Domestic Mission Board made repeated and successful efforts to make similar working-agreements with Baptist general bodies. The Board reported to the Convention in 1867:

The influence of the Board has been in no small degree advanced by the more general co-operation of the District Associations. Hitherto many of them have deemed it advisable to act independently of any connection with this Board of the Convention, in their associational missions. But the present scarcity of money has rendered it impossible, upon their limited fields of labors, to secure, in many cases, contributions adequate to the support of a single Missionary; they have therefore thought it best, and, indeed necessary, to obtain the assistance of the Domestic Board in this work. ... We would then invite the universal co-operation of all our District Associations in this mission work. The independence of their organizations is not in any wise interfered with. <sup>f122</sup>

Again, in 1869, the Board revealed the expansion of this program.

Several of our State Conventions have formed an auxiliary connection with the Board, whereby the State and general efforts are united, thus avoiding the additional expense of two Agencies upon the same field. Mississippi and South Carolina State Conventions are working successfully in this arrangement, and Georgia and Alabama leave the Home work to the Domestic Board, and contribute all funds for this purpose directly to its treasury. <sup>f123</sup>

During the two years following this report, other general bodies — the conventions of Middle Tennessee, West Tennessee, East Tennessee, and North Carolina — made working agreements with the Board, but the economic depression in the early 1870's made retrenchment necessary, and debt accumulated. It was then that some of the Southern bodies turned to the Home Mission Society, and the future of the Domestic Board, which name was changed to the Home Mission Board in 1874, became uncertain. At the end of this period, the fortunes of the Convention were improving, but many Southern Baptists saw no place for the Home Board.

## **SOUTHERN BAPTISTS CONTINUE SEPARATE ORGANIZATIONS**

During the first year after the close of hostilities it seemed wise not to press for reunion of Southern and Northern Baptists. The bodies in the South that took action favored the revival of the Southern Baptist Convention and the continuation of its work. In May, 1866, the Southern Convention, in session at

Russellville, Kentucky, did not formally vote to continue its identity, but it made plans and transacted business on that assumption. The reports of the committees on the work of the Foreign Mission Board and the Domestic Mission Board were adopted, recommending “that our Board of Foreign Missions be instructed to preserve our missions now in operation,” and “that the Board of Domestic Missions be instructed to direct its future labors chiefly upon the basis of Evangelization ... having in view the strengthening of the churches which exist, and planting others in the waste places of the country.”

f124

The *Religious Herald*, May 10, 1866, carried the following statement:

The denomination, in both sections of the country, has settled down in the conviction that, for the present, at least, there can be no organic operation between them ... something, we hope may be done to calm the troubled waters; but for any merging of the denominational institutions, the churches, on neither side, are prepared and the wise men on both sides deem it expedient.

f125

However, some agitation for reunion continued, North and South, on the grounds of the poverty of the South, economy in operations, and fraternal relations. Apparently, there were not many on either side who favored reunion, but, because of the consequent uncertainty, the Convention felt compelled, in the 1868 meeting, to issue an official statement of its position:

WHEREAS, the Southern Baptist Convention has reached a crisis in its history in which its future usefulness, and perhaps its very existence, will greatly depend on its prompt and decisive action on certain matters, “*Resolved*, 1st. That the Southern Baptist Convention is a permanent institution. ... The necessity of sustaining it is more imperative now than at any former time.”

At this session an official delegation from the American Baptist Home Mission Society, brought a fraternal message, stating: “... we are here without instructions as to any special aim to be pursued, or measures to be proposed; our appointment being but the expression of a desire, on the part of those who sent us, to put themselves into a position favorable to the most friendly and free communication with a great coordinate society. ...”

In its response, the Convention said: “Two bodies exist; the divisions of history remain; but we thank God that one spirit animates either organization, and that the lines once red with mutual slaughter are now traversed by interchanges of peace and good-will.”

f126

In 1870, the Sunday School Board, in its annual report, made reference to the desire of some to see reunion:

... we seriously apprehend that any attempt at *organic union* for the present, would be found to be not only inopportune and impolitic, but would seriously retard the work of real union, by exhuming the seeds of peace before the germs shall have become fully imbedded in the soil. ... Meanwhile let us follow the reiterated conviction of this Convention, that while fraternization with Northern Baptists is desirable, and will be sought, separate action in general denominational enterprises is the policy of true peace and surest progress.<sup>f127</sup>

The Convention approved this statement of the Sunday School Board and, in a special report, declared: "All are agreed that the Convention and its Boards should be maintained in their integrity. No measures which endanger their existence or diminish their efficiency, are to be tolerated."<sup>f128</sup>

The following year, a proposal to appoint a committee to consider means of securing co-operation of the Convention's boards "with general societies of the Baptist denomination devoted to the promotion of Foreign and Home Missions, of Publications, and of Ministerial Education"<sup>f129</sup> was tabled. In 1875 the Home Mission Society sent a delegation to the Convention with an official message. In its response the Convention said:

... inasmuch as the wide extent of our territory and other causes (not necessary to enumerate) render it neither probable nor desirable that our Northern and Southern organizations should be merged into one, we are all the more solicitous that we should preserve the most fraternal relations, while each strive to do the work of the common Master in its own appropriate sphere.<sup>f130</sup>

The era of political reconstruction in the South ended with the inauguration of President Hayes, March 4, 1877, and his recall of Federal soldiers from the South. Gradually, Southerners had been regaining control of their state governments during the 1870's. Likewise, Southern Baptists were succeeding in rehabilitating their denominational work and were becoming more determined to remain a separate body.

The end of their "reconstruction era" came with the Atlanta Convention, May 8-12, 1879. Dr. I.T. Tichenor, one of the greatest statesmen and most devoted servants the Convention has ever had, introduced the subject, as he later explained, to bring to an end the issue of reunion. He presented it in the following form:<sup>f131</sup>

WHEREAS, the time has come when all who believe in Jesus should work mightily for the deliverance of the nation from the bondage of sin; when the voice of Divine Providence calls us to greater sacrifices and nobler efforts to secure the triumphant coming of His kingdom; and

Whereas, the cordial co-operation of the Baptists of the United States would tend greatly to promote their efficiency in this grand work; and

Whereas, the love of Jesus and the wants of dying men demand that, allowing “the dead past to bury its dead,” we, leaving the things which are behind, should press forward to deliver the kindreds of the earth from ignorance and vice, and bring them into the liberty wherewith Christ is able to set them free: therefore,

*Resolved*, That five brethren be appointed by this Convention to bear our Baptist brethren of the Northern States, at their approaching anniversaries, expressions of our fraternal regard and assurances of our readiness to co-operate cordially with them in promoting the cause of Christ in our own and all foreign lands.

*Resolved*, That we respectfully suggest to them the propriety of holding, at some convenient time and place, a meeting of representative men from all sections of our common country, to devise and propose such plans of co-operation between this Convention and other Baptist bodies of the United States as may best contribute to the more efficient working of the Baptist brotherhood, to the good of all men, and to the glory of our Redeemer.

After debating the question for half a day, Dr. John A. Broadus finally introduced a proposal which was adopted: <sup>f132</sup>

*Resolved*, That five brethren be appointed by this Convention to bear to our Baptist brethren of the Northern States, at their approaching anniversaries, expressions of our fraternal regard, and assurances that, while firmly holding to the wisdom and policy of preserving our separate organizations, we are ready, as in the past, to co-operate cordially with them in promoting the cause of Christ in our own and foreign lands.

Dr. Henry H. Tucker of Georgia, one of the messengers sent by the Southern Baptist Convention to the Northern anniversaries, 1879, expressed the attitude of the Baptists of the South. After indicating the changed relations between Southern and Northern Baptists, he said: “If these be our feelings, you may ask, why we do not unite with you in the enterprise which we hold dear, in common? I can answer this question satisfactorily, and in a word: It is because we can accomplish more for the cause of Christ when left to ourselves. If this be true, as we think it is, you will be just as anxious for us to remain apart as we can be.” Dr. Tucker gave four reasons for remaining apart, although fellowship had been restored: the body would be too large, too unwieldy; at convention-time, few cities in the North and none in the South would be able to accommodate it; distances were so great that few from the South would be able to attend; under the present plan, the members of the Southern churches could be-come better acquainted with their leaders.

The editor of the *Journal and Messenger*, Cincinnati, Ohio, who attended the Southern Baptist Convention in 1879, expressed friendly sentiments on May 28, as reproduced in the June 5, 1879, issue of the *Christian Index*: “If Northern and Southern brethren would meet and mingle more, not in any official or representative character, but simply as Christian brethren, they would discover that apprehensions on one side and suspicions on the other form the principal grounds for all such discussions. . . . The country is too great for one convention or even two.”

## FOREIGN MISSIONS

The South’s progressive recovery from the destruction of the war determined the course of the Foreign Mission Board. The Board had opened its mission in Rome, Italy, in 1871. At the 1879 Convention, the Committee on New Fields laid down a principle of action that motivated the Board before that year and has continued to motivate it since:

We must say, however, that we have a very profound conviction that as a denomination, we must make some advance movement even to preserve what we have already achieved. Stability and progress mutually act and react upon each other. Unless our activity and zeal shall move on *parr passu* with the increase of our numbers and resources, our very home prosperity will recoil against us, and blast our foreign operations with mildew. <sup>f133</sup>

It was during the 1870’s that a special call came to Southern Baptists to undertake religious work in Brazil. At the close of the War Between the States, in the midst of the economic destruction in the South and the clashing of racial, social, and political theories, many Southerners despaired of the South’s future and sought a new opportunity elsewhere. In the half-decade following the war, many colonies emigrated to Southern Brazil. Among them were Baptist church members and a few Baptist preachers. Some of the emigrants ultimately returned to the South; others remained permanently, and their descendants are there today.

In the late 1870’s a church was organized in Brazil by these emigrants and made repeated appeals to the Foreign Mission Board in Richmond. At the 1879 Convention, the Board reported that the “First Baptist church of Brazil, near Santa Barbara, in the Province of Sao Paulo . . . desires to be received by the Board as a self-supporting mission, because of the moral aid which the church would receive from the Board, and the material aid which the Board would receive from the church.” The church wrote to the Board: “We neither ask nor desire any disbursement of the finances of the Board for our support. We consider that we are self-sustaining in every relation connected with the temporal duties and responsibilities of the church.” Rev. E.H. Quillian, the

pastor, also wrote to the Board: “I am well acquainted with the church, and am assured that she has the ability to aid the Board. The members are prosperous in their basket and in their store, and are on the highway to wealth. ... I am fearful that prosperity will make us worldly-minded.”

The Committee on New Fields, at the same time, reported to the Convention:

When the providence of God fairly offers a broad and inviting field — one that is likely to entail but a small expenditure of money — one in which there is already a per cent of people who went from our own country, who speak our own language, and among whom there are numbers of our own denomination in such numbers as to constitute centres of influence at several points — it would seem to leave us no alternative — and such is the condition of Brazil. The “First Baptist Church in Brazil,” near Santa Barbara, in the Province of Sao Paulo, is already a self-sustaining organization, under the pastorship of Rev. E.H. Quillian, and has expressed an earnest desire to be recognized by our Board, for the purpose of carrying on missionary work in the surrounding country, both among emigrants from the United States and native Brazilians. ... In several localities not very far distant from Santa Barbara, there are other colonies from the United States in which there are some Baptists, who, under the labors of an efficient Missionary, might be consolidated into churches, and thus, in a comparatively short time, and by a moderate expenditure, would embody an influence in that country with vast promise of usefulness. The preliminary work in Brazil is already accomplished, and we are simply invited, most pressing, to occupy the field. Those brethren in that distant field desire to be put in such communication with the great Baptist brotherhood as to feel the quickening pulsations of spiritual life to strengthen and encourage them for the work before them.

General A.T. Hawthorne of the Confederate Army, a leader in the emigration from Alabama to Brazil, was converted in an evangelistic meeting in Texas, became a preacher and a leader among Baptists in Texas. He sponsored the call of the emigrees and, as the representative of the Foreign Board in Texas, led in making it possible for the Bagbys and Taylors in the early 80’s to open the prosperous mission in Brazil.

Thus ended fourteen years of uncertainty, but years of growth and undergirding for greater things. The Foreign and Domestic Boards soon made larger plans; Sunday school work was pushed, leading within another decade to the second Sunday School Board; educational work was making progress; and, within the states, there were movements toward consolidating several bodies into efficient state conventions in co-operation with the Southern Baptist Convention.

## 6. — THE WILL TO GO ON, 1879-1899

During the preceding period the leaders in the Southern Baptist Convention were concerned with the question "Shall the Convention continue to exist?" Their task was to develop in the thinking of the constituency a will to go on in spite of the unfavorable conditions. As indicated in the previous chapter, the suggestion to reunite with Northern Baptists was made from time to time. In the 1879 session the Convention made what proved to be the final pronouncement of a determination to continue its own work. Thenceforth, for two decades or thereabouts, the danger consisted, not in an inner hesitancy to go on, but in a pressure from without that threatened disintegration of the home front.

### **CONSOLIDATIONS**

During the eighties and nineties, consolidation was in the air. This atmospheric condition and the improving means of communication and transportation reacted on Baptist bodies in several states of the South and resulted in the consolidation of two or more general bodies into a vigorous state body. Tennessee consolidated in 1874, Mississippi in 1875, Texas in 1886, Missouri in 1887, and North Carolina in 1898. Other states followed. This movement to consolidation and the contemporaneous development of corporate consciousness within state boundaries, encouraged by Secretary Tichenor of the Home Board, strengthened the Southern Convention as a distinct entity and deepened the determination to go on, holding to a separate existence.

### **DIVISIVE ISSUES IN HOME MISSIONS**

As the divisive tendencies between the North and the South had first arisen in the late 1830's and early 1840's within the sphere of home missions and the efforts at reunion after 1865 were made in the same phase of work, so the friction within this period growing out of the resurgence of the Southern Convention, was centered on the relations between the Home Mission Board of the Southern Convention and the American Baptist Home Mission Society. The Society began work among the Negroes before the close of the war. After the war, the work was enlarged. Co-operative efforts with some of the white state conventions were begun, and advances made toward affiliation between the Society and the Southern Convention.

## HOME MISSION SOCIETY EXPANDS IN SOUTH

After the Convention voted definitely to continue its separate existence and program, the Northern Society planned an enlarged program for the South. In 1880, its Board reported to the annual meeting of the Home Mission Society that the work with Negro bodies was expanding, and “quite as gratifying are indications of the collective co-operation of a similar character on the part of white brethren in some of the Southern States.” In the report for 1881, the Board said: “The first to co-operate with us under this plan was the Mississippi Baptist Convention (white), Rev. A.H. Booth being General Missionary for that State and Eastern Louisiana.” The report made in 1882 says: <sup>f134</sup>

In October, 1881, the usual plan of co-operation was entered into between the Society and the Texas Baptist State Convention, <sup>f135</sup> and the East Texas Baptist Convention; and in March with the Arkansas State Convention, including missionary work among the white and the colored population; and about the same time with the Association of the District of Columbia. The Society unites with the Mississippi Convention in the support of a general missionary for the colored people. ... In Georgia two general missionaries are supported whose salaries are paid one-third each, by the Society, by the White Convention, and by the Colored Convention of the State. Other requests have been made by Conventions both white and colored in the South ... but they came when the finances of the Society would not warrant further enlargement and so for the time were declined. So far as possible the Society has extended its hand to all asking help, knowing no lines of separation, anxious only that weak interests should be strengthened and destitute fields be cultivated, all over this continent.

The Society not only employed missionaries in the South but also assisted white churches to build. In the years 1882-1896, the Society assisted churches in eleven Southern states in the amount of \$18,341.76. The co-operative work between the state conventions in the South and the Home Mission Society (and the Publication Society also) was being so rapidly extended financially, geographically, and organizationally, that far-seeing Southern leaders perceived the gradual undermining of the very work and life of the Southern Convention. If the Northern Societies met the mission needs in the Southern states — fostering old churches and establishing new ones, carrying on Sunday school work, founding schools, and supplying literature — within a generation most of the Southern churches would be in intimate alignment with the North. Dr. E.T. Winkler, pastor of the First church, Charleston, South Carolina, published an article in the *American Baptist Reflector* <sup>f136</sup> which was widely copied. He discussed home missions in the South and the duty of the nine hundred thousand white Baptists of the South to do their own work. The Home Mission Society, he stated,

... has also established such a plan of co-operation with various Southern State Conventions, that the Missionaries are largely supported by the North and make their reports to both bodies. ... Last fall the Southwestern Missionary District was established by the Northern Society and was put under the charge of Dr. S.W. Marston. It embraces precisely those “regions beyond” which were designated by the Southern Baptist Convention as the special field of its Home Mission Board, for it includes Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, the Indian Territory, and Western Louisiana. ...

The facts prove beyond the possibility of question that the Southern Baptist Convention is being supplanted in its own domain. Every one of the border states of the South is occupied by the Home Mission Society; and most of our older States are in cooperative alliance with the American Baptist Publication Society in colportage and Sunday School work. ... What the result will be, unless a great change takes place, no prophet is needed to foretell.

Dr. H.L. Morehouse, corresponding secretary of the Society, answered Dr. Winkler in the same issue of the *Baptist Home Mission Monthly*. He concluded:

Ours is not the “Northern Society,” it is the *American Society*; its work prosecuted in every state and territory its receipts coming from all parts of the country; its aim being not to make conquests of domain for the sake of the Society, but to make gracious conquests for Christ. And to this work — in the closing words of the Annual Report — we summon and welcome with us all who with us believe that what should be done we must attempt to do.

Far-seeing leaders among Southern Baptists realized that, if the field of the Home Board were pre-empted by the Home Mission Society and the Sunday schools of the South were supplied with literature from the North, the Southern Baptist Convention would finally be dissolved. Among those leaders was Dr. Isaac Taylor Tichenor. It has already been mentioned that he was one of the greatest statesmen that Southern Baptists have produced. At the beginning of the period, he was president of the Alabama Poly-technic Institute. It was he who introduced, in 1879, the resolutions concerning relations with other Baptist bodies that resulted in the final Convention pronouncement to remain a separate body. On July 1, 1882, Dr. Tichenor became secretary of the Home Mission Board, which had been located in Marion, Alabama, since its organization in 1845. There had been suggestions that the Home Board be abolished,<sup>f137</sup> not because of adverse criticism of its membership, but because the new South and the new opportunities called for a change. It became evident that it should either be abolished or strengthened.

Accordingly, the Convention of 1882 moved the Board to Atlanta, and Dr. Tichenor was called to the secretaryship.<sup>f138</sup>

## NEW DAY IN HOME MISSIONS

A new day began to dawn. “No one surpassed the new Secretary as dreamer of dreams and seer of visions in denominational needs and power of conquest, and not many equaled him in making others through his eloquence on the platform see what he saw and believe what he believed.” <sup>f139</sup> At that time, of the twenty-one bodies (conventions and general associations) that were entitled to representation in the Southern Convention, only seven were co-operating with the Home Board; of these, four were located west of the Mississippi River. <sup>f140</sup> The twofold objective of the new administration of the Home Board was to align the state conventions and general associations of the South with the Home Mission Board of the Southern Convention and to enlarge the mission program of the Board.

To facilitate the new alignment and to strengthen the home front, it was necessary to consolidate the Baptists within each state into one body and then to ally that consolidated body with the Home Mission Board. Secretary Tichenor planned his strategy and moved into action. He “formed the closest co-operation with the various state boards, and brought the state mission secretaries together with him in annual conferences and thus became the leader in the greater unity and solidarity of Southern Baptists, en-titling him to be called the ‘Father of Co-operation.’” <sup>f141</sup>

In the Home Mission Board’s report to the Convention for 1892 a survey of the ten years was given: <sup>f142</sup>

Ten years ago the Convention then in session at Greenville, S.C., resolved to remove the Board from Marion, Ala., to Atlanta. The condition of the Board at that time excited the gravest apprehensions. Its total receipts for the year were about \$28,000. It had but forty missionaries. Except those in the Indian Territory it had few west of the Mississippi river. The Baptist Convention in Arkansas was in co-operation with the Home Mission Society of New York. Nothing had been attempted in Missouri for years, and that State seemed lost to the Board forever. Texas was divided into five missionary organizations, four of which were receiving aid from the Home Mission Society, and the fifth was paralyzed by its own dissensions. Thus the entire territory west of the Mississippi River had passed out of the hands of the Board.

East of the river, Mississippi was in alliance with the Publication Society, Georgia was co-operating with the Society in New York in work among the negroes, while Florida was hesitating between remaining with the Board, or forming alliance with the same Society. The State Boards had grown vigorously, and from several of the States the Home Mission Board was excluded by action of their State Conventions. It is not to be wondered that the Convention at Greenville pondered the question whether removal or abandonment was the wiser policy. When it was decided to remove it to

Atlanta, and the present Board was put in charge of its affairs, the outlook was by no means assuring. A survey of the field indicated a great defeat and a lost cause.

Impressed with the conviction that the existence of this Convention depended upon the resuscitation of its fortune, the new Board threw itself into the arduous work before it with the determination to use every proper effort to reclaim its lost territory, and make itself a sup-port to the Convention. This could not be done without money, and our impoverished and disheartened people could not be expected to give a speedy or a liberal response to its demands. But such were the earnestness of its efforts and the happy results of its policy, that in five years there was not a missionary to the white people of the South who did not bear a commission from either the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, or one of our State Boards in alliance with it. Its territory had been reclaimed. Texas had been united in one great Convention in hearty sympathy and co-operation with the Board. So was Arkansas, so was Louisiana. A new spirit had possessed Missouri, and our cause has risen there until that State is among the strongest supporters of the Board, and of the Convention. The Board had demonstrated its right to live, and had won the confidence of the denomination. It was a hard struggle; no one but those who managed its affairs will ever know how much of toil and anxiety it cost, or what unceasing labor it required. They are written in the book of God's remembrance, and will be known only at the final day.

Thus, in the 1880's and 1890's, the Home Board was laying, broad and deep, the foundation for the future of the Southern Baptist Convention. In the Home Board report to the Convention of 1893, Dr. Tichenor quoted a paragraph from Dr. J.B. Gambrell: <sup>f143</sup>

Multitudes of peoples speaking strange tongues will flow into this Southland. At first the Northern man with American ideas will come, but he will be followed by men from every nation under heaven. To prepare for, meet and christianize these millions is the work of the Home Board. Along the mountain fastnesses of the Virginias, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, Alabama and the great coming cities of the South the battles are to be fought within a generation which will decide the spiritual destiny of this country a thousand years, as human affairs run. ... There never was a time when we needed broader, deeper, more far-reaching plans for our Home Board than now.

The Board included within its purview the whole population of the South — the native white element, resident in the towns, country, and mountains; the colored element; the Indians; and the foreign-speaking peoples.

After ten years of Dr. Tichenor's leadership in home missions, the attitude of rivalry between the Home Board and the Home Mission Society passed away. The 1894 Convention appointed a committee of five to meet a committee from

the Home Mission Society to discuss questions of co-operation and territory. Similar overtures had been made before by the South, with no result. But this time the Home Mission Society agreed to confer with the Home Board on a level of equality. On September 12, 1894, the conference was held at Fortress Monroe, Virginia, and marked the end of one era and the beginning of another. After full, free, frank, and fraternal discussion, the representatives of the Convention and of the Home Mission Society agreed upon a program of education and missions among the Negroes in the South. Concerning work among the white people of the country, they agreed as follows:

We believe that, for the promotion of fraternal feeling and of the best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, it is inexpedient for two different organizations of Baptists to solicit contributions or to establish missions in the same locality, and for this reason we recommend to the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention and to the American Baptist Home Mission Society that, in the prosecution of their work already begun on contiguous fields or on the same field, all antagonism be avoided, and that their officers and employees be instructed to co-operate in all practicable ways in the spirit of Christ. That we further recommend to these bodies and their agents, in opening new work, to direct their efforts to localities not already occupied by the other. <sup>f144</sup>

## **FOREIGN MISSIONS — EXPANSION**

During the period between 1879 and 1899 there were several significant developments in the foreign mission work of the Southern Baptist Convention. Brethren who attended the 1879 Convention were of the opinion that the foreign mission interests, with ever-enlarging prospects, constituted one of the greatest unifying factors in those decisive days.

The next year, on December 23, 1880, two missionaries, W.B. Bagby and his wife, Anne Luther Bagby, were appointed missionaries to Brazil. In 1884, they led in the organization of the first Baptist church to be constituted in Rio de Janeiro. Now, almost within the span of service of the first Southern Baptist missionary couple in Brazil, there are some seventy-five Baptist churches in that city. The same year the Bagbys were appointed, the Southern Baptist Convention, through its Foreign Mission Board, entered Mexico. The first missionaries to that country, as to Brazil, went from Texas and were largely supported by Texas Baptists. Another new foreign mission field, Japan, was entered in 1889 by Southern Baptist missionaries. Among those early volunteers who laid enduring foundations the first two decades of our service in Japan were the McCollums, Walnes, Maynards, Clarks, Willing-hams, Doziers, Rays, Rowes and others.

Two secretaries of the Foreign Mission Board, Henry Allen Tupper, who served from 1872 to 1893, and Robert J. Willingham, from 1893 to 1914, were men of vision as were their predecessors and successors. Besides the men, Southern Baptist women were enlisted also, writing a glorious story which will be related a little later in this volume. It was during this period that Southern Baptists witnessed the beginnings of educational institutions, designed to train national Christian workers, and, early in the present century, medical missionaries began their blessed ministry in China and Africa.

Along with this gratifying expansion in the world-mission enterprise were growing convictions concerning Scriptural stewardship and a consequent increase in missionary gifts.

## 7. — BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD

We turn now to another phase of Southern Baptist interest and activity, which was sponsored by the Home Mission Board almost a score of years — Sunday schools and Sunday school literature.

Among the subjects cited in the 1845 call of Virginia Baptists was the question as to whether it would “be better to organize a separate Bible society and publication society.” Even before the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention, there had been calls for a Southern publication agency. Indeed, it was out of such a need that the first step toward separation came. In May, 1844, Rev. James Davis introduced a resolution in the State Convention of Georgia calling for the formation of a Southern Baptist publication society, but it was defeated.

### SOUTHERN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

At the meeting in Augusta, the Rev. J.S. Baker introduced a similar resolution <sup>f145</sup> which was also voted down, but, during the months following, there were continued calls for such an institution. From Virginia to Alabama, they came. <sup>f146</sup> The Central Association of Georgia, in its 1846 session, issued a call for a convention to meet at Savannah, May 13, 1847, immediately preceding the State Convention. Delegates from Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama met and formed the Southern Baptist Publication Society, May 13, 1847. <sup>f147</sup> This Society was distinct from the Southern Baptist Convention, having no official connection, but the leaders and active supporters were active in the Convention. The Society was located in Charleston, South Carolina, and rendered worth-while service in furnishing a literature for Southern Baptists until the exigencies of the war ended its career.

During the year following the consultative Convention in Augusta, a short time before the meeting in Richmond in June, 1846, “A Southern Baptist” published *A Calm Appeal to Southern Baptists, in Advocacy of Separation from the North in the Works of Benevolence*. Internal evidence suggests a South Carolinian as the author, but in a discussion between Dr. John L. Waller and the *Christian Index*, the editor of the *Index* seems to be the author. <sup>f148</sup> The *Appeal* calls for complete separation from Northern Baptists in all phases of work, but especially names the American and Foreign Bible Society. But the Convention in Richmond rejected the proposal to establish boards of publication and Bible distribution. In lieu thereof, it was resolved:

1. That this Convention do now constitute its Mission Boards, as its agents for the distribution of the Bible. ...

2. That it be recommended to the Boards, to cultivate the most friendly intercourse with the American and Foreign Bible Society. ...

*Resolved*, That this Convention does not deem it advisable to embarrass itself with any enterprise for the publication and sale of books. <sup>f149</sup>

## BIBLE BOARD

This program was followed five years. At the Convention in Nashville, in 1851, the mission boards were released from the duty of Bible distribution, and a Bible Board, located at Nashville, was created. One of the circumstances that influenced this action was the division of the supporters of the American and Foreign Bible Society over the question of a revision of the King James Version. The American Bible Union had been formed in 1850 to promote a new translation. Should the Southern Convention hold to the distribution of the old version, through the American and Foreign Bible Society, or promote a revision through the American Bible Union? If the Convention continued to affiliate with the North in Bible publication and distribution, it must choose between the two. The advocates of complete separation from the North in all phases of the work seized the Bible revision controversy as the opportunity to establish a Bible Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. This Board functioned in the distribution of the Bible, but its efficiency was impaired by becoming identified with Landmarkism in the last half of the decade. Its location was Nashville, the center of Landmarkism, and its secretary was A.C. Dayton, one of the famous Landmark trio.

The Baptist Tract Society had been formed in 1824 under the leadership of a Southerner, Noah Davis. In 1840, the name was changed to the American Baptist Publication and Sunday School Society, and, in 1844, the words “and Sunday School” were dropped.

The Southern Convention made no effort to provide a Sunday school program or literature. There were many Southern Baptists who desired a literature produced in the South. At a meeting of the Concord Association, Tennessee, in 1857, Dr. R.B. C. Howell, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, introduced a resolution calling for a convention to meet in Nashville, October 23, to form a Southern Baptist Sunday school union. <sup>f150</sup> The Georgia State Convention had a committee of five who had been working on a state Sunday school program for three or four years, and who, in 1854, had proposed a Southern Sunday school convention. They now hailed the Nashville proposal. <sup>f151</sup> Delegates from Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, and the Creek Nation met in convention. A constitution was prepared and the Southern Baptist Sunday School Union formed. A.C. Dayton was named president.

In order to enlist more Southern Baptists, the organization was declared tentative and referred to a Southwide convention to be held in Americus, Georgia, April, 1858, in connection with the meeting of the Georgia State Convention. <sup>f152</sup> The incipient Union fell into the hands of the Landmark faction to begin with, and at once lost the possible support of many Southern Baptists. They were not willing for the Landmarkers to supply the Sunday schools with literature carrying the peculiar tenets of Landmark-ism. Due to the controversy that arose over the control of the pro-posed Union, the Americus church requested that the meeting not convene. <sup>f153</sup> However, J.R. Graves, A.C. Dayton, and the other Landmarkers carried on the work of the Union until the war.

When the war began, cutting off Southern churches from communication with publication houses and Bible and Sunday school agencies in the North, there was a tendency evident in the South-ern Baptist Convention to combine these several lines of activity under one agency. In 1861, on motion of Dr. J.P. Boyce of South Carolina, the Convention appointed “a special committee of five ... to consult with the Board of the Southern Baptist Publication Society, as to the possibility of a union of the Bible Board and that society ... to report at the next meeting of the Convention.” <sup>f154</sup>

By the time the Convention met again in 1863, Nashville, the headquarters of the Bible Board, was in the hands of the Northern army. The special committee, appointed in 1861, reported in 1863:

The present position of the Bible Board has satisfied your committee that the best course of the Convention will be to abolish the Bible Board, and to commit its work to the other Boards. They would there-fore recommend the following resolutions for the adoption of this body:

*Resolved*, That the Bible Board of the Southern Baptist Convention be and the same is hereby abolished. <sup>f155</sup>

At the same session of the Convention, Rev. B. Manly, Jr., of South Carolina introduced the following: <sup>f156</sup> “*Resolved*, That a Committee of seven be appointed to inquire whether it is expedient for this Convention to attempt anything for the promotion of Sunday Schools, and if so what?”

The report of this committee of seven, read by Chairman Manly, is a concise, to-the-point survey of the question.

There seems to be no imperative reason restricting this work to State limits. The same plan and means which are effectual in one region will apply, if extended, to another. The books which suit Virginia Baptist Sunday Schools, will be useful in Alabama, and the agencies for stimulating interest in the subject in Georgia, can be applied with little in-crease of expenditure, and

great increase of efficiency to the Carolinas. In fact, with aggregate expense slightly enlarged, the expense to each is greatly diminished, since many thousands can be supplied at much smaller individual cost than few ... Sunday schools, too, may be more efficiently promoted by similar united efforts.

There is now no general organization actively engaged in this work. Here is at once an open door, and an urgent claim, both opportunity and argument for activity.

## **BOARD OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS, SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION**

The committee recommended the following:

- 1. Resolved,** That a Board be established consisting of the usual number, to be entitled the Board of Sunday Schools of the Southern Baptist Convention.
- 2. Resolved,** That the Board be charged with the duty of taking all measures adopted to promote the establishment, enlargement, and higher efficiency of Sunday Schools throughout our land; provided that the Board shall not establish a printing house.

The new Board was appointed and located at Greenville, South Carolina. <sup>f157</sup> Although it was formed in the midst of war and, as subsequent events showed, in the year when the tide was turning against the Confederacy, its work was taken seriously and begun in earnest. The Board

... held its first meeting, May 18, 1863. An address to the Baptists of the Confederate States was prepared and speedily issued, setting forth the reasons which were believed to have weight with the Convention in organizing a Sunday School Board, indicating the plans which the Board had formed, and asking for voluntary agents and general help. This appeal was met in an encouraging manner. Various brethren in different States made collections for the Board, at Conventions, Associations and Churches; the first contribution being given at the General Association of Virginia, June, 1863, where the President received more than \$3,000. The denominational newspapers lent us their powerful aid, frequently commending the great Sunday School cause, and the efforts of this new organization, to the earnest support of the brethren; and the Sunday School Boards existing in some of the States expressed their willingness to co-operate with us.

Soon after the Sunday School Board was organized, application was made to the Baptist leaders in Baltimore to purchase twenty-five thousand Testaments for it. The American Bible Society at once made a donation of the Testaments "for the use of the Sun-day Schools of the Southern Baptist Convention," which were sent by flag of truce to the Board.

In the midst of war and the disturbed conditions, economic and others, the new Sunday School Board projected large plans and accomplished much. In its first report of the work achieved during the last two years of the war, there is a statement of ninety-two thousand books placed in Sunday schools and a budget of \$47,684.10. Due to the conditions of war, the report covered work in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama only. In several of the states the state board employed a general Sunday school missionary to develop interest and activity in Sunday school work. In the states, such as North Carolina, which had a Sunday school and publishing board of the State Convention, the Southern Sunday School Board worked through those agencies.

The Board recognized a wider opportunity of service than do Sunday schools of later times:

A large proportion of the children of our country have now no means of learning to read but in the Sunday School, and experience has shown that they can there readily learn both to read and write. Parents need the help of the Sunday Schools in the moral and religious training of their children in these days of evil. And the numerous orphans, whose claims upon us are recognized by all, may find in the Sunday School a great orphan asylum, requiring no capital and little expenditure of any kind, interfering with no other scheme, but aiding them all.

From the close of the war to the end of 1865, the Board did function actively. Beginning with January, 1866, however, the publication of a monthly paper was issued, *Kind Words for the Sunday School Children*, and, as other means and methods were available, the Board planned a larger program.

The Sunday School Board, located at Greenville, never received hearty support in all the states.<sup>f158</sup> Accordingly, in 1867, it was pro-posed to unite it with the Southern Baptist Sunday School Union. This proposal failed, but the next year the Board was moved to Memphis, Tennessee. “It was solemnly and distinctly pledged by the brethren at Memphis, that the Sunday School Board would not be made a vehicle for the propagation of Landmark views.”<sup>f159</sup> Since Tennessee was under Landmark influence, there was fear in many quarters that the peculiar tenets of Landmarkism would permeate the Sunday schools of the South. For that reason, the Board at Memphis never gained general support and, in 1873, was consolidated with the mission Board at Marion, the name becoming the Domestic and Indian Mission and Sunday School Board.

In 1874 the name was changed to the Home Mission Board. It continued, through this period, to hold before Southern Baptists the need and the pattern of Sunday school work. The continued publication of *Kind Words*, together with its weekly lesson-leaflets, furnished a measure of Sunday school teaching

and formed the groundwork for a larger program in the next period. It is this publication that furnishes a historical link between the two Sun-day school boards.

## **SOUTHERN BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL LITERATURE**

Dr. Tichenor, secretary of the Home Mission Board, realized that if the Southern Convention were to continue, not only must the home mission opportunities be met by the Convention, but also the churches must be supplied with a literature that was Southern in origin, need, and adaptability. In the Home Board's report for 1885, he said: <sup>f160</sup> "A committee of wise and prudent brethren ought to give earnest consideration to the question how far it is proper for the Board to attempt to furnish Sunday school literature to the Baptist churches of the South. Here is a wide field of usefulness and future influence. Shall we attempt it, or shall we surrender it to others?" In response, the Convention adopted a report, mildly approving the suggestion, and gently hinted that something be done: "We suggest to the Home Board to mature some plan by which these growing demands may be met." <sup>f161</sup>

Dr. Frost recorded his impression of Dr. Tichenor's vision: "He talked and I listened. I was sympathetic, but unable to follow his sweep of thought in outlining the future, showing what the Baptists of the South might accomplish, and the imperative need that a people make their own literature." <sup>f162</sup>

Dr. Tichenor and the Home Board interpreted the "suggestion" of the Convention as authority to proceed in the preparation of literature for the Sunday schools of the South. In his report the following year, <sup>f163</sup> he said that the Board

... therefore solicited proposals for the accomplishment of these objects, being fully convinced that it was the duty of the Board and Convention, if possible, to supply the Sunday-school needs of its constituents. Of several proposals received, the Board accepted that made by Bro. H.H. Cabaniss, of Atlanta, Ga., and has made and confirmed with him a contract for five years, by which he agrees to publish the several editions of *Kind Words*, in first-class style, and also to bring out by or before October next a full grade of *Quarterlies* three in number, and a *Magazine for Teachers*.

## **AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY**

The storm that had been gathering over the years broke, at last. The American Baptist Publication Society — Southern in its origin in 1824 and early support, and a friend to the South since the war — was not ready to relinquish the territory which furnished receipts ranging from \$30,000.00 to \$50,000.00 a year. The Society strengthened its organization in the South and prepared to

contest the new venture of the Convention, in the latter's territory. It had many allies and supporters among Southern Baptists. There were those who recognized the Society as *American* in its work as well as in name. It was well equipped and experienced, capable of continuing a worth-while service to the churches of the South. Others considered that the Home Board had a distinct task in the field of missions and should not involve and impair that work by engaging in the business of publication. Still others were unconvinced of the Board's place in the Southern Convention's economy.

The strife that followed threatened the very life of the Board. Dr. Tichenor, in his ten-year survey, referred to it as "the heaviest denominational conflict of the last century." As the struggle proceeded, the friends of the new Sunday school literature became more ardent and the opponents more decided. The Convention of 1887 adopted a report containing the following paragraphs:

**3.** The success of the new, as well as the increased propensity of the former publications, have more than met the most sanguine expectations of the publisher and the Home Mission Board. The Sunday-schools within the territory embraced by the Convention, from those of the largest cities to those of the most obscure country places, have extended a generous patronage and given assurance of cordial approval and appreciation of the excellence of this literature.

*Resolved*, That this Committee recommend that the Convention do all in its power to foster, sustain and advance this great interest of the denomination, appealing to all Baptists ... to exert their influence to induce our Sunday-schools to adopt our Sunday-school publications. <sup>f164</sup>

Southern Baptists were fortunate to have as president of the Convention through much of this troublous period Dr. Patrick H. Mell. He served seventeen years, 1861-1871 and 1879-1887 — a longer tenure of office than any other man. He was one of the greatest of parliamentarians. Later, commenting on the Southern Baptist Convention which met at Waco, 1883, a Texas newspaper said: "Southern Baptists can never cease to admire the genius of Dr. Mell as a presiding officer. He rules with the inflexible rigor of a tyrant, and yet with a spirit so genial and sympathetic that no reasonable man can ever be embarrassed by his presence."

By 1888, the friction in the South between the agencies of the Convention and the Societies of the North had become so serious that a conference was desired. The suggestion arose in the General Association of Missouri and was passed to the Southern Convention by the Home Mission Board. A committee of five, to be appointed by the Home and Foreign Boards, was authorized by the Convention "to confer with representatives of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, the American Baptist Publication Society and the American

Baptist Missionary Union, not with a view of uniting the Baptists, North and South, into one organic body, but to adjust all questions of difference which have arisen between them in the prosecution of their work.” <sup>f165</sup>

The committee reported to the Convention in 1889 that conferences were held with the representatives of the Home Mission Society and the Missionary Union, and agreements were reached concerning the situation in Missouri.

But in the field of Sunday schools and publication they reported: “We also had a conference, full and free, with the representatives of the American Baptist Publication Society, and we were unable to arrive at any agreement.” <sup>f166</sup> At the same session of the Convention, a committee of fifteen on Sunday school publications reported “that the publisher of this series has a contract with this Convention, both of a legal and moral character. As said contract does not expire until June, 1891, your Committee are of the opinion that any further agitation of this question is inopportune at this time.” <sup>f167</sup>

A paragraph in the Home Board report for 1889 indicates the growing self-consciousness of the Convention and its determination to maintain its identity and its own program.

Some of our pastors have expressed the opinion that the International series does not fully meet the needs of our Sunday-schools; that we should have something which shall bring our denominational principles and practices more frequently and more strongly in contact with the minds of our children. The Board sympathizes with this view, and respectfully suggest to the Convention the desirableness of adopting some measures, either by modification of the International Lessons, or something in addition to them, to meet a want so vital to the best interest of our churches. <sup>f168</sup>

Dr. Tichenor and the Home Board had progressed so rapidly in the rehabilitation of the morale of the Southern Baptists that, by 1890, a larger program was necessary to conserve what had been gained and to make further advance. In February, Dr. J.M. Frost, a pastor in Richmond, Virginia, gave notice that he would propose, in the Convention in May, that a board of publication be established. Recognizing the need for the further step, Dr. Tichenor, in the Home Board report, reviewed the Convention’s Sunday school work for the preceding three decades: <sup>f169</sup>

Nearly thirty years ago the Convention entered upon the work of Sunday-school publication, which has been continued by its order and under its direction to the present time.

When the Board was removed to Atlanta it found a number of these publications in its charge ... the Board submitted to the Convention the question of improving them and under its direction subsequently submitted a contract for that purpose ... under the existing arrangement these publications

have attained a success most gratifying to the Board. ... Their success is no longer problematical. The property of the Convention in them has, in a little more than three years, so augmented in value that what could not then have been sold for exceeding five thousand dollars is now worth thirty thousand, and at the expiration of the present contract may be made to yield to the Convention ten per cent annually upon that amount. ...

If it shall be your pleasure to commit this great and growing interest to a separate Board, we will rejoice that the success it has attained in our hands has made such a separation an act of wisdom, and we will heartily co-operate with the new Board in the work of the Convention.

The Convention, meeting in Fort Worth that year, authorized the appointment of a committee of nine to

... be entrusted with the management of our Sunday-school publications, now published in Atlanta, as the *Kind Words* series, and be authorized to do, what, in their judgment, may seem wise to improve the series and increase its circulation, consistent with the present contract, and to this end the Home Board is instructed to transfer to the committee the said literature and contract under which it is now published. <sup>f170</sup>

The next year the second Sunday School Board was established.

When the 1891 Convention met in Birmingham, Dr. Frost and Dr. J.B. Gambrell, who had held opposing views, were appointed a subcommittee to bring recommendations to the larger committee on the proposed Sunday school board. They spent the greater part of one day in a room in the Florence Hotel, discussing many things but never losing sight of the charge committed to them. At the close of their conference, Dr. Gambrell proposed that Dr. Frost write the report and even name the location provided Dr. Gambrell be permitted to write the closing paragraph. That was agreed upon; the report was written and the closing paragraph added. Here is that closing paragraph, written by Dr. Gambrell:

In conclusion, your committee, in its long and earnest consideration of this whole matter in all its environments, have been compelled to take account of the well known fact, that there are widely divergent views held among us by brethren equally earnest, consecrated and de-voted to the best interest of the Master's Kingdom. It is therefore, recommended that the fullest freedom of choice be accorded to every one as to what literature he will use or support, and that no brother be disparaged in the slightest degree on account of what he may do in the exercise of his right as Christ's freeman.

Then Dr. Frost, by agreement with his colleague, added one sentence to the last paragraph.

But we would earnestly urge all brethren to give to this Board a fair consideration, and in no case obstruct it in the great work assigned by this Convention. <sup>f171</sup>

The report of this subcommittee, after approval without change by the larger committee was read to a crowded Convention, tense with interest. Many brethren were ready with their speeches. Then, before anyone could voice his opinion, Dr. John A. Broadus, widely loved president of the Southern Baptist Theological Semi-nary, pleaded with the Convention to vote without debate. The great body of Baptist brethren honored his request and adopted the report with only a few dissenting votes. Through the sheer power of his influence, Dr. Broadus did what no other man could have done. It is doubtful if the Southern Baptist Convention has ever witnessed a more sublime moment.

In his report for the Home Board for 1891, Secretary Tichenor portrayed the future of the Southland. With the statesman's grasp of the condition of things as they are and with the imagination to see things as they will be, he called upon Southern Baptists to arise and possess the land:

Men speak of the new South as though it were another race that now inhabited this country. It is a misnomer. It is the old South shaken from her bed of ease by the earthquake of civil commotion, rebuilding her devastated homes according to the demands of her new environment, and proving herself as skillful in constructing the new, as she was dauntless in defending the old.

... That these things are so, and that they will affect most profoundly the religious welfare of not only our own country, but that of all the nations of the earth, it needs no argument to prove. <sup>f172</sup>

The wisdom of Dr. Tichenor's strategy for rebuilding the home front and stabilizing the Convention and all of its work is seen in the Fortress Monroe agreement with the American Baptist Home Mission Society. But his plans had not been fully matured. Several well-known Southern Baptist leaders had not favored the new Board, <sup>f173</sup> and, even after its formation, many pastors continued to secure the literature for their Sunday schools from the American Baptist Publication Society. That literature in form and content continued to prove acceptable, and the Southern pastors saw no reason to change. Many of the writers were Southerners and the Society claimed to be "American":

The American Baptist Publication Society is by thousands recognized as the Society of the whole country in producing a literature that is suited to the needs of Sunday-schools everywhere ... it is owned and managed by and for the Baptists of the entire land, North, South, East and West. Its issues have not been surpassed, either by other societies, or by private publishing houses; its entire profits go to the developing of the denomination, and toward the help of needy churches and schools in every part of our country whence the

calls for help come. It publishes the most complete series of lesson helps in the world. ... <sup>f174</sup>

The new Board, resulting from the success of Dr. Tichenor's enlarged plans, was the instrument of even larger success in the new field. Its separation from home missions relieved the Home Board of a center of attack and made possible agreement with the Home Mission Society. The enlarged plans and new emphasis brought Dr. Frost to the fore. Under his wise, Christian leadership, the new Board held the sentiment already created and gradually gained in favor with the rank and file of Southern Baptist churches. The steadily rising annual receipts of the Board attest its increasing favor with the churches.

But the Publication Society was not ready to vacate its place in the life of the Southern churches. A branch house was opened in Dallas, November 1, 1892, and announcement was made that it would supply the Sunday School Board series of literature as well as its own. Dr. Benjamin Griffith, secretary of that Society, said that the branch was opened in answer to the request from many Texas Baptists. Dr. J.B. Link, an established leader in Texas, claimed some of the credit for securing the branch. <sup>f175</sup> In other States, also, prominent Baptist leaders supported the work of the Society in the South. Branch houses had long been located in Atlanta and St. Louis (later moved to Kansas City). In the Alabama State Convention, 1892, the report on Baptist literature was read by Dr. George B. Eager, pastor of the First church, Anniston. He said that the hope of this country was in Baptist literature and that "the American Baptist Publication Society was organized to meet just this demand." <sup>f176</sup> The Society claimed to be Southern and to have equal relation to the organized work in the South with the Sunday School Board. It was given a place on the program of the state conventions and of the Southern Convention.

Dr. A.J. Rowland, secretary of the Publication Society, wrote to the Sunday School Board, March 18, 1896, stating: "We are in-formed by those whom we believe to be acquainted with the facts, that there is an earnest desire on the part of many of our brethren in the South that our Society should make overtures to your board looking to greater harmony in the publication of Sunday school literature. Influenced by this and also by a desire to enter into close relations with our Southern brethren, we present the following propositions for your earnest consideration:"

**1.** That the Society, beginning July 1, 1896, print the literature for the Sunday School Board, carrying the Board's imprint, and distributed in the name of the Board;

2. That beginning not later than July 1, 1897, the Society publish for the Board a “Southern Series” to be used exclusively in the South;
3. That the Society will pay to the Board one half of the profits on the series, to be used at the discretion of the Board;
4. That the Board appoint an editor of “The Southern Series,” the appointment to be confirmed by the Society.

The Sunday School Board replied at length, April 1, 1896, that

1. ... we cannot accept your proposition, deeming such alliance neither desirable nor feasible.
2. We have no thought whatever of surrendering the work entrusted to us by the Southern Baptist Convention. Under the blessing of God our work has had in these five years a success almost phenomenal, and altogether without precedent in Baptist circles. ...

In conclusion we venture to express the conviction that it is possible for you and us to mark out a plan for co-operation in which we could conduct each his respective work in a way that would render no in-justice to either and be helpful to both. We have always held ourselves ready for this and are willing to make any concession toward it, provided always the Board itself be not marred as to its integrity, or weakened in its efficiency for meeting the great responsibilities God has laid upon us and attaining the great possibilities which God has opened to us here in the South. <sup>f177</sup>

Failing in this offer, the Society “then circularized the Baptists of the South to make the offer effective through the approaching session of the Convention ... but it failed to get any public consideration, though the situation was painful in private circles.” <sup>f178</sup> The Convention, in the following May, adopted a special recommendation “that the printing arrangement be left to the discretion of the Board.”

The agitation continued during the next year and, for the first time, came to the floor of the Convention in May, 1897. In addition to the many friends of the Society among the Southern pas-tors present, it was commonly reported that there were present, as members of the Convention, seventeen officials and employees of the Society. One of these, the Rev. J.M. Robertson of Texas, district Bible secretary of the American Baptist Publication Society for the Southwest, made a public attack on the Sunday School Board. <sup>f179</sup>

This open attack was the beginning of the end of the struggle. Many who had held aloof from the Board sprang to its defense. Dr. W.E. Hatcher of Virginia replied to Mr. Robertson, concluding: “I have been a life-long friend of the Publication Society, but it must not come here to interfere with our work. We

have our way of doing things, and woe betide the man who crosses our path.” The future of the Sunday School Board was established from that hour. For several years, the friction continued, but early in the next period the Convention won in its Sunday school program and thereby further strengthened and unified the denominational life in the South.

## **CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD TO THE DENOMINATION**

The publication of *Fifty Fruitful Years*, by Dr. Prince E. Burroughs, marked the celebration of the Golden Anniversary, in 1941, of the Sunday School Board. Those were fruitful years, not only in the different phases of Southern Baptist service for which it was constituted in 1891, but in everything that the Southern Convention had undertaken.

As early as 1894, three years after the Board was created, it helped to promote “Missionary Day” in Sunday schools, in co-operation with the Woman’s Missionary Union and the mission boards. Since that time, it has had a vital part in every missionary task undertaken by Southern Baptists. When the W.M.U. sought to provide a home for a Training School in Louisville, the Sunday School Board gave \$20,500.00 for that purpose. In 1918, when the Relief and Annuity Board was launched, the first gift of any size was \$100,000.00 from the Sunday School Board.

In 1951, the figures showed that from 1892 to 1951 the Sunday School Board had given to causes outside of its own control, through denominational channels, a total of \$10,797,634.00. The 1952 *Annual* of the Southern Baptist Convention gives the analysis of denominational appropriations for the preceding year, <sup>f180</sup> a total of \$1,247,135.32 for that one year. A few items are: the Seminaries and Training Schools, \$4,900.00; Executive Committee, S.B.C., \$60,000.00; State Sunday School and Baptist Training Union regular workers, \$182,045.48; Associational promotion, \$29,-134.81; Bibles, books, tracts, periodicals, donated, \$85,231.21. These and many other appropriations have been made, year after year.

The Sunday School Board has done more than reinforce financially every cause dear to the hearts of Southern Baptists. It has been a powerful factor in stabilizing the thinking of Southern Baptists. It has been true to the faith and ideals of the men who founded it; above all it has been true to the teachings of the Scriptures. Through the books, periodicals, and tracts which have come from the great publishing plant, it has sent leaves of healing into every nation. It has instructed, inspired, and indoctrinated multitudes of men and women, young and old. What investments for the glory of God!

## 8. — THE CONVENTION AND INTERNAL CONFLICTS

As we have traced the development of the Southern Baptist Convention, we have observed divergence of views and consequent controversies. Such conflicts characterize democratic bodies. A denominational consciousness had barely found expression in the early 1820's, under the impact of Luther Rice's messages on missions, before men began to oppose missions. Alexander Campbell, Daniel Parker, and John Taylor led the fight against missions. Churches and associations were divided; antimissionary groups, Arminian in theology, followed Alexander Campbell; and the Hardshells or hyper-Calvinists went with Parker, Taylor, and others. The disciples of Mr. Campbell got control of a number of Baptist churches, including the First Baptist Church, Nashville, and the First Baptist Church, Little Rock. Antimission propaganda blighted many areas for years. The father of R.C. Buckner and H.F. Buckner was excluded from a Baptist church in East Tennessee on the charge that he was missionary in belief and practice.

The Southern Baptist Convention arose out of the current American conflict over slavery, but, behind the immediate occasion arising out of the slavery issue, there were fundamental disagreements over home missions and differing conceptions of the nature of Baptist general bodies. As we have already learned, on the whole, Northern leaders preferred independent societies to conduct each phase of religious work; <sup>f181</sup> Southern leaders desired a denominational organization, comprehensive in its program, conducting all lines of activity. <sup>f182</sup> After Southern Baptists withdrew in 1845, the General Convention was changed into the American Baptist Missionary Union, annulling the modicum of representative character in the older convention. <sup>f183</sup> It was even a new sort of "society," composed of individual life-memberships only. The Southern Convention was formed on a representative basis, denominationally comprehensive. Within the life and work of this body, there was a struggle for half a century around fundamental principles and methods, in which the very character and life of the Convention were involved.

The sixth decade of the nineteenth century marked a new period in the life of the Southern Baptist Convention, because of development within and of circumstances without. The Convention was a new sort of organization within Baptist life and was certain to meet decided opposition from those who were not thoroughly committed to a genuine denominationalism.

## SEARCH FOR AUTHORITY

In the midst of complex religious and political situations, there was in Europe and America a passion for antiquity in the search for authority. The papalists found it in the Bishop of Rome — to them, the successor of Peter — and recognized him as infallible. The high-churchmen of the Church of England found it in the church, the body of Christ, speaking through all the bishops. Among Baptists, there were three reactions to the search for authority. The Campbellites emphasized, first, historicity (Thomas Campbell); then, apostolicity (Alexander Campbell). The latter “restored the ancient gospel.” J.R. Graves “reset the old land-mark” and stressed both apostolicity and historicity. The Hard-shell (antimission) Baptists simply named themselves “Primitive” Baptists and pursued the even tenor of their way.

A contemporary religious current in America entered into the formation of these reactions. The revival that swept America just after the Revolution and extended into the nineteenth century placed emphasis upon the subjective, mystical element in religion. There was an overemphasis upon emotional manifestations.<sup>f184</sup> Campbellism was one phase of the inevitable reaction against these manifestations. Campbell chained the Holy Spirit in his operations to the written Word to avoid extreme emotionalism. He emphasized the objective, formal element to the point of severance from Baptist life.

Almost a generation after Campbellism began, another reaction against the subjective element in religion arose in the same geographical area. Just as the Southern Baptist Convention began its existence, the Landmark type of formal, high-church<sup>f185</sup> emphasis began to appear as a phenomenon. Within the Protestant Episcopal Church, high-churchism put the emphasis upon the church (in the general use of the term) as the body of Christ. The Baptist counterpart began by putting the emphasis upon the church (in the local use of the term) as the apostolic institution on earth which had had a continuity of existence since the days of the apostles. Within ten years after the Southern Convention was formed the movement was in full swing.

## THEORIES OF SUCCESSION

The source of authority in religion and the external form of that authority involve some theory of historical succession. The Romanist theory locates succession in *one* bishop; the Anglican finds it in *all* the bishops. Among Southern Baptists, there have been four theories, or four emphases in the theory, of historical succession.

**1.** *Church succession* — one congregation grows out of and is formed by the authority of another. A church in Arkansas traces its ancestry through

Dyersburg, Tennessee, thence to a church in Virginia, thence to Welsh Tract Church, Delaware. The Welsh Tract Church emigrated from Wales. The Welsh received the gospel from Vienne in Gaul. Hither, it came from Antioch in Syria. This church sprang from the church in Jerusalem, which was the church organized by Jesus. This theory of succession requires congregational church government from the first century to the present and historical connection from one congregation to another. The congregations are independent ecclesiastical entities, but are interlocked historically.

**2. *Apostolic succession*** — the continuity consists in a succession of validly ordained ministers from the apostles, who were ordained by Jesus, to the present. Under this theory, the validity of the “orders” (ordination), and not the form of church organization, furnishes the channel through which the stream of history flows and assures the apostolicity of the church. Only ordained ministers may be members of the presbytery to ordain a minister, and each ordaining presbytery must have at least three members.

**3. *Baptismal succession*** — historic externality consists in valid baptism, that is, baptism performed by a validly baptized and authorized minister. The Broad River Association, South Carolina, in 1818, answered, in a circular letter, a query as to the acceptance of alien immersion: “... that as certain priests anciently failed to show their genealogy among the lawful priests, and were rejected; in like manner should all administrators of the ordinance of baptism be rejected, who fail to show their own baptism according to the gospel, by a minister who has himself been baptized in a regular line from the Apostles down to the present day.”

**4. *Spiritual succession*** — true historic continuity (~~40618~~ Matthew 16:18) consists in a succession of genuine followers of the Lord Jesus, a succession of Christian experience. “What Baptists claim ... is simply this: that along the whole tract of time, there are traces of our principles and of adherents to our principles.” <sup>f186</sup>

Dr. J.R. Graves had his own theory of succession. He endeavored to distinguish between the succession of the church and of the kingdom. Christ’s kingdom shall never be destroyed. Since the kingdom is composed of the sum total of all the local churches, and the kingdom is external, therefore local churches, the constituent units of the kingdom, have existed from the time Jesus founded the first one: <sup>f187</sup>

... the organization he first set up ... which Christ called his church, constituted that visible kingdom, and to-day all his *true* churches on earth constitute it; and, therefore, if his *kingdom* has stood unchanged, and will to the end, he must always have had true and uncorrupted churches, since his kingdom can not exist without true churches. <sup>f188</sup>

This is the Roman Catholic theory of church succession — identification of the Catholic Church with the kingdom. Graves had a catholicism of his own, often using, under the pseudonym Fidus, “Baptist Church” largely in the same sense as the Romanist uses Catholic Church.<sup>f189</sup> His theory of succession was not really a distinct one, but was covered by theories one and two.

The first three theories or emphases are logically related and historically associated. A valid church must validly authorize a minister in order that a baptism may be valid. Each of the four views may be seen in Southern Baptist life in the first half of the nineteenth century. Sometimes one may be emphasized, some-times another. Sometimes two of them may be related together. But there was no tendency to conjoin the first three related views and practices into a logical rigid system until about 1850. The atmosphere of the second quarter of the century — the period of the Campbells and of high-churchism in the Protestant Episcopal Church — set the stage for a high-churchism among Baptists. The occasion that brought forth the effort to correlate and systematize the related views was a query sent by a church to the annual meeting of the Muscle Shoals Association, Alabama, in 1847. The Rev. R.B. Burluson wrote to the *Western Baptist Review*, Louisville, February 25, 1848, as follows:

Will you give your views on the following questions, viz.: Is the immersion of a person in water into the name of the Trinity, upon a credible profession of faith in Christ, by a Pede-baptist minister who has not been immersed, a valid baptism? This question is agitating the Muscle Shoal Association very much, and unless some judicious plan can be devised to settle the difficulties amicably, no one can divine what will be the consequences. Your views on this subject, published in the Review, will be much valued.<sup>f190</sup>

Editor Waller first considered the question historically. He said that it had been much discussed through the centuries and just recently by Baptists and Episcopalians (high-churchism). The question was one for the local church; the association had no jurisdiction. It resolved itself thus:

Is the administrator necessary to the validity of baptism? [The affirmative requires proof that there have been validly immersed administrators, and that each of us has baptism from such] ... Let all those who can furnish clear and indubitable evidence of the validity of their baptism, according to the terms of the affirmative of this question, vote non-fellowship for those churches and ministers who believe it right to receive a member who has been immersed on profession of faith by a Pede-Baptist minister, and let all the rest keep silence. ... What can be more fair? Surely no brother in all Alabama would wish to condemn in another what he allows in himself.

According to Editor Waller, the necessity of the historical succession of “valid” baptism and the impossibility of tracing it render baptism “useless and

nugatory! If we cannot know that we discharge a duty there can be no benefit or advantage in efforts at its observance. Its performance or its neglect ... amount to the same thing; ... Doubts must ever surround our baptism. It cannot, therefore, furnish the answer of a good conscience towards God.”

In answer to the position of the *Western Baptist Review*, a correspondent of the *Tennessee Baptist*, who used the pseudonym “Fidus,” <sup>f191</sup> said: “The unbroken practice of the Baptist Church, from deep antiquity till now or within a few years, is higher authority than scores of Reviews.” In another issue, addressing the Rev. R.B. Burleson, Fidus said: “Would you be looked upon as the enemy of the Baptist Church? Aspire not with a maniac ambition to be an Erostratus to the American Baptist Church.” <sup>f192</sup>

## LANDMARKISM

This discussion precipitated the several elements of succession that had been held in solution in Baptist life. J.R. Graves, J.M. Pendleton, and A.C. Dayton composed the triumvirate that led in formulating and giving momentum to the Baptist type of high-churchism. Pendleton was the prophet, Graves the warrior, and Dayton the sword-bearer in the new campaign. Graves called a meeting of interested Baptists at Cotton Grove, Tennessee, June 24, 1851. The following questions were submitted by him:

**1st.** Can Baptists consistently, with their principles or the scriptures, recognize those societies, not organized according to the pattern of the Jerusalem church, but possessing a different *government*, different *officers*, a different *class of membership*, different *ordinances*, *doctrines* and *practices*, as the Church of Christ?

**2nd.** Ought they to be called Gospel Churches or Churches in a religious sense?

**3rd.** Can we consistently recognize the ministers of such irregular and unscriptural bodies, as gospel ministers in their official capacity?

**4th.** Is it not virtually recognizing them as official ministers to invite them into our pulpits, or by any other act that would or could be construed into such a recognition?

**5th.** Can we consistently address as brethren, those professing Christianity, who not only have not the doctrines of Christ and walk not according to his commandments, but are arrayed in direct and bitter opposition to them? <sup>f193</sup>

These questions were referred to a mass meeting, to be called in connection with the annual meeting of the Big Hatchie Association at Bolivar, July 28, 1851. There, they were discussed and adopted unanimously. These propositions of Dr. Graves constituted the first official pronouncement of

Landmarkism. Dayton entered the fray with a novel, *Theodosia Ernest*, which had wide circulation. In it, he set forth the characteristics of the New Testament church (in the local sense only) <sup>f194</sup> and the steps in its development through the centuries. Pendleton wrote a tract on the third and fourth questions. Since Baptist churches were the only New Testament churches (others were human societies), therefore Baptist ministers were the only validly ordained gospel ministers. Baptist ministers could not preach in other pulpits, and ministers of other denominations could not preach in Baptist pulpits. Nonaffiliation in pulpit ministry became the slogan of the new movement. When Pendleton finished the tract, he gave it to Graves, who published it, in 1854, under the title *An Old Landmark Reset*. Hence arose the name of the new movement in Southern Baptist life.

High-churchism of the Roman and Anglo-Catholic types finds its external expression in the episcopate. The Landmark type externalizes itself in the local church. The word “church” in the New Testament, according to Landmarkism, is always used in a local sense. When there was only one church, the one in Jerusalem, it was, according to Landmark teaching, co-terminous with the kingdom. When local churches multiplied, the kingdom was composed of all the churches together. Membership in the kingdom was secured by becoming a member of a local church. <sup>f195</sup> Upon this conception of the church, Landmarkism was developed into a rigid, high system.

Dr. Pendleton, whose tract on pulpit affiliation suggested the name, endeavored to hold Landmarkism to that single practical application of the theory of the church. But he could not prevent the logic of his theory from developing according to its genius. He went North during the War Between the States, and upon his return years later, in 1883, he apparently could not affiliate with Dr. Graves’ advancing rigid system.

About the year 1855 Dr. Graves republished, in America, Orchard’s *History of Foreign Baptists*. This work gave a plausible historical justification of the Landmark type of high-churchism. According to Orchard, the continuity of the local church, which Dr. Graves deduced from the nature of the kingdom, is proved from the facts of history. <sup>f196</sup> Almost at once the new movement gained momentum and proved a fiercely fighting force. After the war, the isolation of the South in the national Union; the deepened sectional consciousness in the fight against the Northern effort to “reconstruct” the South; the struggle against carpetbaggers and freedmen to preserve Anglo-Saxon civilization; the struggle of the Southern Baptist Convention to preserve its very existence — all these, and more, furnished ready soil for the growth of Landmarkism and its ecclesiastical exclusiveness.

During the first half century of the Convention's history, there were four distinct controversies growing out of the fundamental tenet of Landmarkism — the primacy of the local church. Or, perhaps better said, this fundamental tenet manifested itself in four emphases as the life and work of the Convention progressed. Landmarkers claimed that the local church had ultimate authority over the proclamation of the gospel (nonpulpit affiliation); over the ordinances of the gospel (antialien immersion and church-communion); over the method of propagation of the gospel (anti-convention and antiboard). The fourth phase of the controversy expressed itself in the sphere of history. The taproot of highchurchism is historical continuity. If the local church could not be traced to the first century, then the very life of Landmarkism was endangered. The final phase of the struggle was, therefore, the most widespread and intense.

Since Landmarkism arose out of the discussion over the authority of the administrator of baptism, the first phase of the struggle involved the recognition of validity in ordination. The discussions became sharp soon after Cotton Grove in 1851. Dr. Pendleton's tract summarized the argument and furnished ammunition for the fray. The Southern Convention met in Montgomery in 1855, the year after its publication.

After the organization, some one offered, as usual, a resolution inviting ministers of other denominations to sit with us and participate in our deliberations. This was at once sharply objected to, and there arose a debate that lasted a whole day. Presently the words "Old Landmark" were used; and some of us from distant portions of the South, upon asking what in the world that meant, were told that Rev. J.M. Pendleton, of Kentucky, had published in Nashville a tract entitled, "An Old Landmark Reset." In this he is said to have maintained that it was a former custom of Baptists not to give any invitation or to take any action which might seem to recognize ministers of other persuasions as in a just sense ministers. These were also the views of Rev. J.R. Graves, editor of the "Tennessee Baptist," published at Nashville. These honored brethren, and a number of others from that part of the country, maintained these "Landmark" views with great earnestness and ability. Those who held a different view appeared in many cases to be taken by surprise, through the novelty, as it seemed to them, of the "Old Landmark;" and they did not always agree among themselves, nor maintain any well-considered or very consistent position. After the day's discussion, it was proposed to end the matter by letting the resolution be withdrawn, upon the understanding that those who saw no objection to its passage would concede thus much to the views of their brethren who objected so strongly. ... The controversy in the next few years rose high, and in some quarters threatened division. <sup>f197</sup>

The so-called question of pulpit affiliation was widely discussed and counted a major issue. There have even been echoes of it in the twentieth century.

The doctrine of non-pulpit affiliation very quickly brought the ordinances of the church into notice. Dr. Graves began publishing a column in his weekly paper entitled, *Keep Before the People: six Fundamental Doctrines, six Important Facts, six Important Principles*. The fifth fundamental doctrine dealt with the Lord's Supper: "But the members of no one church have a right to come to the table spread in another church, though 'of the same faith and order'; for each church is independent."<sup>f198</sup> This theory and practice of church communion became one of the main characteristics of Landmarkism and is one of its very noticeable results still abiding in some areas of Southern Baptist life.

Landmarkism never carried the local church's authority over baptism as far as it did over the Lord's Supper. In the observance of the Lord's Supper, participation therein is limited to those who are members of the church observing the ordinance. But, in respect of the ordinance of Baptism, a church may accept one baptized by another Baptist church without reimmersion. However, an immersion based on confession of faith performed by one not a Baptist may not be recognized. Some churches examined candidates for membership on the basis of letters from Baptist churches to ascertain whether they had been converted before they had been immersed.

English-speaking Baptists, from their rise on English soil, disagreed over the question of the recognition of the ordinances as practiced by other denominations. Baptists in America in the early years generally rejected the immersions administered by others. However, in America as in England, there have been Baptist churches that accepted such immersion as confession of faith.<sup>f199</sup> The different views on the acceptance of "alien immersions" preceded the rise of Landmarkism. Indeed, Dr. Graves seems to have begun his "high-church" development out of the discussion between Dr. J.L. Waller and himself (Fidus) over this question.<sup>f200</sup> After the Landmark principles were formulated in the Cotton Grove resolutions, making the local church the foundation stone of the new movement, and the publication of Orchard's *History* gave the historical basis, the opposition to the acceptance of alien immersions became more vocal. The church has supreme authority over the ordinances. No immersion is valid baptism unless authorized beforehand by a local church. Indeed, Landmark highchurchism went a step beyond the usual brand. A Roman or Anglican bishop may "confirm" an alien baptism and thus regularize it, but a Baptist church has no such authority.

The Landmark contention for the necessity of nonpulpit affiliation and the regularity of baptism (especially the latter) waxed warm through the 1850's. The War caused the papers to suspend publication, and all minds were otherwise occupied. As soon as life in the South began to settle down at all, the controversy began again.<sup>f201</sup> The issue went so deep that non-fellowship with

other Baptist groups was suggested, to which an editorial in the *Western Recorder* expressed opposition:

We regret to see that a correspondent in one of our exchanges calls for division among Baptists on the subject of "alien immersion." ... Our voice is for peace. ... This is a question which relates directly to the churches, and indirectly to the denomination at large. Each church must decide for herself whether she will admit parties on their baptism received from other than Baptist hands. ... We earnestly protest against the policy advocated by the said correspondent. <sup>f202</sup>

An attack was made on the Southern Seminary because one of its first professors, Dr. William Williams, was in favor of the acceptance of alien immersions. Dr. Boyce was against such acceptance, but he was unwilling to make the question a test of fellowship. From the beginning of the Seminary, he was unwilling to have the institution committed to either side of the question. When plans were being made to move the Seminary from Greenville, South Carolina, to Louisville, Kentucky, Dr. Boyce published five articles in the *Western Recorder* to remove objections to the school on the part of Kentucky Baptists. The last of the articles dealt with the doctrinal question. <sup>f203</sup>

The two issues of the control of the local *church* over the preaching of the gospel and the ordinances were never made tests of fellowship by the Convention. <sup>f204</sup> The question of method of propagation of the gospel came near bringing division in the nineteenth century and did do so in the first decade of the twentieth. The attack on the Convention and its method of work came within a few years after the beginning of Landmarkism and within the formative period of the Convention's life.

Dr. Graves, his followers in Nashville, and the Concord Association had a personal interest in the course of affairs at the meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, and it is not easy to separate the personal attitudes from the doctrinal differences. Dr. Graves and Dr. Howell became embroiled in bitter conflicts soon after the latter became, for the second time, pastor of the First church, Nashville, in 1857. This resulted in the exclusion of Dr. Graves and some of his followers from that church. They formed another and were accepted by the Concord Association. Dr. Howell and his church were denied seats. The question came to the meeting of the General Association of Middle Tennessee and North Alabama. Again, Dr. Graves won.

Dr. Howell had been president of the Southern Baptist Convention since 1851. Dr. Graves predicted the destruction of the Convention, if he were re-elected in Richmond in 1859. The Landmarkers appealed from the First church to the Concord and the General Associations, but Dr. Howell and his church had no right of appeal to the Southern Convention. The Convention had no right to

enter into the question and elect Dr. Howell president. However, he was re-elected on the first ballot and immediately resigned. The *right* of the Convention to elect him under the circumstances was not challenged in the Convention. His resignation removed the personal element from the contest and left the Convention free to debate the fundamental issue of the method or methods of doing mission work.

The question involved the very life of the Convention. When Dr. Graves became sole editor of the *Tennessee Baptist*, June 29, 1848, he seemed to be in full accord with the mission program of the new Convention. But after the rise of Landmarkism (1851-1854) his whole point of view changed. President N.M. Crawford of Mercer University published an article in the *Tennessee Baptist*, September 4, 1858, expressing his opinion against the authority of the Foreign Mission Board over the churches on the mission fields. In a footnote Editor Graves says:

No man has lower views of the authority of a Missionary Board to dictate to missionaries or churches than we have. ... We, no more than Bro. C., believe that our Missionary machinery is scriptural or expedient. The scriptural plan is clearly exemplified in the New Testament, and it is simple and effectual, and the sooner we return to it as a denomination, the better for us and for the world. ...

We do not believe that the Foreign Board has any right to call upon the missionaries that the churches send to China or Africa, to take a journey to Richmond to be examined touching their experience, call to the ministry, and soundness in the faith. It is a high-handed act, and degrades both the judgment and authority of the Church and Presbytery that ordained him, thus practically declaring itself above both.

A correspondent asked him to indicate a better, a more scriptural method. Dr. Graves replied that Paul established churches in Macedonia. These churches contributed to Paul's mission work. Why may not the same method be used in Tennessee or Georgia? Let Baptist churches unite — one, two, a dozen, or a whole Association, to send a graduate of Union to Japan and send the funds through a commercial house doing business in Japan. Then, Dr. Graves showed the connection of the personal fight between Dr. Howell and himself with his opposition to the Convention of which Dr. Howell was president:

There are elements at work that threaten the disruption of the relation of the Convention and the Foreign Board to the body of the Southern Baptists. There are schemes of consolidation and centralization now urged by certain brethren who exercise a controlling influence in the Biennial Convention which, if they succeed in consummating, will as certainly destroy the present union of Southern Baptists in Foreign Missions as the Convention meets in May next. And there is a determination on the part of some, moved more by partizan

than missionary zeal, to make the next Biennial Convention an ecclesiastical Court and to force its decision into antagonism with Churches and Associations. <sup>f205</sup>

The Landmark objections to the Convention centered specifically around the Foreign Mission Board. They were summarized in President Crawford's letter on "Methods in Missions" and re-viewed by the *Christian Index*, March 16, 1859. The present method, he insisted, was unscriptural, unnecessary, ineffectual. In the sessions of the Convention at Richmond, the issues were fully debated.

Such was the anxiety of the Convention that all should be satisfied, and that every objection should be heard and considered fully and fairly, that by special order every restraint was taken off, and the closest scrutiny invited. That the opportunity was well employed, no one present can deny. The Foreign Board submitted to the minutest catechism, and opened its records without reserve to every member of the Convention. Mr. Graves, on the other hand, in a long speech which seemed to have been well considered, presented the popular objections to the system until in his own language he tabled the last objection — was understood to acknowledge himself fully satisfied, and pledge himself to a hearty cooperation, at least for the next two years. <sup>f206</sup>

But, apparently, he was not fully satisfied, his public statement notwithstanding. After the full day of debate, Dr. Graves and the two secretaries of the Foreign Mission Board, Dr. J.B. Taylor and Dr. A.M. Poindexter, retired to the Foreign Mission rooms in the First Baptist Church building and continued the debate far into the next morning. Dr. Taylor's youngest son had gone to the mission rooms to wait for his father. He fell asleep.

Opening my eyes, I discovered Elders Graves and Poindexter and my father seated near the desk of the latter. ... I am persuaded that, had a stenographer been present and taken down the conversation, or rather debate, between two skilled debaters (Graves and Poindexter) ... the world would have learned of, perhaps, the most remarkable private discussion in our Southern Baptist history. For many months Graves had been vigorously attacking the policy of the Foreign Board through his widely-circulated paper; and now he was face to face with the two secretaries. There was plain talking, but many a time since I have thought of that occasion as proving that Christian men can differ widely, express themselves freely, and even charge each other with having said and done wrong things, and yet not lose their tempers.

The east was glowing and the roosters crowing when, at last, the brethren shook hands and parted. ... <sup>f207</sup>

There is no doubt of Dr. Poindexter's ability as a speaker and a debater. When the announcement was made in the Raleigh Convention, May, 1872, of his

death, Dr. Richard Fuller paid an unforgettable tribute to the departed missionary leader. According to Dr. John A. Broadus, Dr. Fuller spoke somewhat as follows:

I almost think sometimes that I would not exchange places with an angel in heaven; if I did, it would not be with Gabriel, but rather with that angel whom John saw flying in the midst of heaven, carrying the everlasting gospel to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, “Fear God, and give glory to him.” Fly faster, O angel on thy mission; sweet angel, fly faster; and if thou canst not quicken thy flight, go turn over thy commission to Poindexter’s spirit, and he shall bear the message with more rapid wing and more glowing love than thou canst, O angel. He knows a love thou canst never know; he is now singing a song thou canst never learn — the song of a re-deemed soul bought by the precious blood of Christ. <sup>f208</sup>

As a result of the free and full debate on the general plan of organization and the method of conducting mission work, the Convention instructed the Foreign Board to act as agent for those churches and associations that desired to work on the Landmark plan. Such churches and associations would appoint their missionaries and send their funds through the facilities of the Board.

There is no reason why our denomination may not co-operate harmoniously in missionary matters. All those who prefer that the Board at Richmond shall have the appointing power and be held responsible for its exercise, can throw their funds unconditionally into its treasury. Those Associations and Churches that prefer appointing their own missionaries can do so, and the Board will transmit their funds, while the missionaries will be amenable to the Associations and Churches sending them forth. Here are two plans of operation submitted to the brethren. Let them make their election. Let them remember that they have no good excuse for doing nothing. The missionary spirit enters essentially into a Church organized according to the gospel. <sup>f209</sup>

But apparently the unanimity was on the surface only. The opposition continued along the same lines and with as much of the personal element as before the session of the Convention. An editorial summary found three well-defined groups in the opposition:

- (1) those who were against the Convention on principle;
- (2) those who were friends of the Convention, but by affiliation and in conversation gave aid to the enemies;
- (3) those who objected to specific acts of the Convention in Richmond: re-election of Dr. Howell, making the Bible Board at Nashville to be composed of members of the First church, and certain practical workings of the Foreign and Domestic Mission Boards. <sup>f210</sup>

There was another objective of Landmarkers. After 1859, there was no effort on their part to abolish the Convention, but they were persistent in the efforts

to change its character. The Convention, although originally constituted to do any sort of denominational work, confined itself at first to the work of missions only. Under the influence of the former basis of co-operative work — the voluntary basis expressing itself in distinct societies (to which Northern Baptists re-committed themselves after 1845) — the Convention was not a true ecclesiastical body, composed of churches but of individuals sent by churches and other contributors to the mission work of the Convention. The effort of Landmarkism, after 1859, was to eliminate the financial basis of co-operative work and change the Convention into an ecclesiastical body composed of churches. In 1869, Dr. Graves proposed such an amendment to the constitution. Again, in 1874 and in 1891, similar proposals were made. The agitation of the question continued through the meeting of 1895. Within the Convention, the question was quiescent until 1902, but agitation was continued within the state bodies.

## GOSPEL MISSIONISM

A movement arose in the 1880's that threatened the very existence of the Convention itself. It was known as "Gospel Missionism," from the contention of its advocates that the methods which they proposed to be followed on the home and foreign mission fields were in accordance with the principles and practices of New Testament missions. The movement had two distinct phases: one in the homeland and one on the foreign field. The Gospel Missioners proposed that the foreign missionaries live as the natives in the matter of housing, dress, and food.

At the 1888 Convention in Richmond, Brethren Crawford, Joyner, and other leaders of the movement insisted that American missionaries to China could reach the people only by dressing and eating like the Chinese and adopting their social customs. But Dr. R.H. Graves testified: "I have never worn Chinese clothes, because when I went to China they suspected I was a spy; so I boldly wore my American clothing, and told them I came not as a spy in Chinese clothing, but as an American missionary, who came to bring them the gospel. It is character and not clothes that tells on the Chinese. I have been working thirty-two years as missionary in China, and our work there is not a failure." <sup>211</sup>

The leaders also insisted that the native Christianity be self-controlling and self-supporting from the beginning. They opposed definite salaries and all debt for the support of missionaries. They proposed, also, fundamental changes in administration on the mission field. The leader in this movement was Dr. T.P. Crawford of China, missionary of the Foreign Board of the Convention since 1852. When Dr. Crawford was appointed to China in 1852, his support was

promised by the Big Hatchie Association, the original Landmark Association. He had made investments during the war that, by 1880, were assuring him a comfortable living apart from any support from the Board.<sup>f212</sup> After him, the movement was called Crawfordism.<sup>f213</sup>

In the homeland, the Gospel Mission emphasis upon the local church found a response in those who were under the influence of Landmarkism. The two movements — Landmarkism in America and Gospel Missionism in China — were agreed in opposition to Boards and in making the local church the agency through which and by which kingdom work was to be done. After thirty years in China, Dr. Crawford's Landmark ideas began to come to the surface. The Landmark element in the Mississippi Valley, especially in Arkansas and Texas, rallied in theory to the Gospel Mission movement. Even some of the Primitive Baptists were momentarily aroused. The Rev. Ben M. Bogard wrote some articles in their paper, *The Regular Baptist*, as a result of which he and the Rev. G.P. Bostick met the Primitives from Tennessee, Kansas, and Missouri. "As a result a vote was taken endorsing Gospel Missions, and by which they agreed to promote mission work among the heathen to the extent of their ability. ... They had simply op-posed the Board system of mission work. When Gospel Mission was presented to them they readily fell into line."<sup>f214</sup>

The Gospel Missioners made the same attack on the Convention and its boards that the antimissionaries and J.R. Graves, as well as Alexander Campbell, had previously made; they proposed the same methods in the homeland and on the foreign field. Mr. Bostick, associated with Dr. Crawford in China, resigned from the Board's service and appealed to his home association, the King's Mountain Association, North Carolina, and to the churches "to cease co-operating with the Board and to contribute directly to his support as an independent missionary in North China."<sup>f215</sup> Rev. D.W. Herring, also of China, resigned because the Foreign Board would not adopt the plan proposed, namely:

... that these missionaries were to be directly supported by the individual churches or groups of churches entirely independent of the Board, which should have nothing to do with the money — unless to forward it to the missionary "without cost" — and have no control over or direction of the missionaries. In short, the Board was to endorse and assist him in special work, which should be entirely independent of itself, either as to support or direction. It must assist him in the inauguration of a work, which in its ultimate results would be to disintegrate the work of the Southern Baptist Convention.<sup>f216</sup>

As in the case of Dr. Graves and his Landmarkism in the 1850's, so in the Gospel Mission movement in the 1880's and 1890's, a terrific onslaught was made on the Convention and its organized work. But opposition was strong:

We are not always satisfied that the so-called Gospel Mission brethren are dealing frankly and openly. For example, they claim that they are able to conduct their work without a secretary, and yet they have arranged to keep in this country nearly all the time one of their number, who is to present the claims of their work before the churches and associations, wherever that can be done. ... These brethren will not be found going among the churches that have never been brought into sympathy with our general work. There are hundreds and thousands of such churches in the South. Let these brethren go among these churches, if *they* wish to do a work of real value. But their policy is not to create and develop interests where none now exists, but, by ex-citing distrust of present methods, to divert from the Foreign Board the interest which, under God, has already been created and applied.

... No worse fate could befall the common work of Southern Baptists than for it to come under the blighting influence of extreme Landmarkism. ... It can be successfully shown that the territory within which that anomalous hybrid, Baptist high-churchism, prevails is precisely the territory in which scarcely anything is done for the salvation of the perishing nations. From this extreme Landmarkism to anti-missionism is only a logical step. The spirit of the extreme Landmarkers is opposed to co-operation.<sup>f217</sup>

By the turn of the century, Gospel Missionism was weakening in its efforts and its attacks on the Convention. Some of the missionaries who had left the Board's service died and others began to return to the Board forces.<sup>f218</sup> Occasionally, a Landmark association sent a messenger to the Convention. The discussions arising out of the contest clarified the thinking of many Southern Baptists and left the Convention more unified in its life and work.

The fundamental difference in ecclesiology that had been in evidence for half a century came to a head in 1905. Dr. Graves had been dead thirteen years, but a group of his followers carried out the logic of his teachings and presented an ultimatum to the Convention. This ultimatum had been prepared and adopted by a conference of the representatives of fifty-two churches convened in Texarkana, Arkansas, March 2, 1905. It was submitted to the Southern Convention the following May:

First, we want the money and the associational basis of representation eliminated from the Constitution and a purely church basis substituted instead. We believe in the churches to whom the Lord gave the commission, and that a church which is willing to co-operate should be entitled to a seat in this Convention by messenger. ... The numerical basis is objectionable because such a basis carries with it the idea that the commission was given to the individual as such and not to the churches as such. Nothing short of exclusive church representation will satisfy us.

The Convention, in the answer to the ultimatum, said in part:

These petitions call for action so entirely out of harmony with the principles of our organization, and the methods upon which our work is conducted, that we feel constrained to (deny them). We feel the strongest assurance that the principles upon which the work of our Convention is organized and conducted are in accord with the teachings of God's word, and in harmony with Baptist history, Baptist usage, and Baptist doctrine. <sup>f219</sup>

Many Landmarkers, in the main in Arkansas and Texas, withdrew from even a nominal affiliation and organized another body.

In the seaboard states where the Landmark agitation expressed itself in methods of mission work only, there was no formal separation. When the first aggressive leadership of Gospel Missionism passed away and some of the missionaries returned to work under the Board, a quieter leadership came to the fore. The severe at-tacks on the Board and its work ceased; Gospel Missionism carried on quietly. But west of the Mississippi River, the differences in fundamental principles and methods were expressed in the clashes between leading personalities. Hence, the agitation was prolonged to the point of separation.

With the collapse of Gospel Missionism and the end of the Whitsitt controversy, <sup>f220</sup> the Landmark agitation of half a century came to an end. The more aggressive and vocal Landmarkers withdrew from the Convention, but the agitation left a deposit in the thinking and organization of Southern Baptists. The fight of Dr. Graves and his followers, first on the existence of the Convention and then on its character, developed a sense of unity and corporate consciousness. This development and the exodus of the extreme Landmark element made possible the great advance in the second half-century of the Convention's history.

## **THE CONVENTION AND STATEMENTS OF FAITH**

In the first few decades of the development of the Southern Baptist Convention there were controversies, as we have already seen: Landmarkism, suggestions of reunion with Northern Baptists, establishment of a Southern Baptist Sunday school and publication board, Gospel Missions, proposed consolidation of mission boards, discussions concerning Baptist succession, revision of the constitution of the Convention, etc. But for many years the Convention did not adopt a statement of faith.

One of the earliest confessions of faith adopted by English Baptists was the London Confession, the first moderately Calvinistic type in 1644. Later, in 1677, came the adaptation of the Westminster (Presbyterian) Confession, altered to conform to Baptist views of the church and the ordinances. This Confession was approved by the General Assembly of Calvinistic Baptists in

1689 and was the basis of the confession of faith which was regarded by the Philadelphia Association as the standard of beliefs. However, it is not known that it was ever adopted by the Association in any formal way. The Philadelphia Confession of Faith came to be adopted by many churches and associations.

The New Hampshire Confession, much briefer and less Calvinistic than the Philadelphia Confession, was published in 1833 by the authority of the Board of the Baptist State Convention of New Hampshire (not by the Convention itself). This is probably the most widely used and the most influential of any statement of doctrine among American Baptists.<sup>f221</sup> The circulation of this statement of faith was due largely to the fact that Dr. J. Newton Brown, who had a large part in formulating the New Hampshire Confession, was an editor of the American Baptist Publication Society for a number of years and, through the facilities of that organization, distributed the New Hampshire Confession in every part of the country served by the Publication Society. Moreover, it was the basis of Pendleton's *Church Manual*.<sup>f222</sup>

According to Dr. McGlothlin, "The larger Baptist bodies in America have as a rule abstained from making doctrinal statements or formally adopting existing confessions. Indeed, the Southern Baptist Convention at its organization in 1845 says, 'We have constructed for our basis no new creed, acting in this matter upon a Baptist aversion for all creeds except the Bible.'"

The most complete statement of faith ever considered by the Southern Baptist Convention was affirmed by the Convention in 1925, although there were briefer statements in 1914, 1919, and later in 1938 and 1940, in connection with, in order: a proposal for Christian union; the reply to the proposal of the interchurch world movement; a report on proposed interdenominational relations; and in reply to an invitation to join the World Council of Churches. The 1925 statement was based on the entire revised New Hampshire Confession, with several additional articles. In the preface, the occasion for such a reaffirmation of Christian fundamentals was explained: "The prevalence of naturalism in the modern teaching and preaching of religion."<sup>f223</sup> The action of the Convention, of course, did not have any binding effect on any individual, church, or other organization.

Probably the nearest that the Convention has ever come to interference with the cherished independence of churches was at the Oklahoma City Convention in 1949 when an amendment was proposed to the constitution: "No one who belongs to or is affiliated with any state or local council of churches which is connected with or sponsored by the Inter-council Field Department of the Federal Council or any one or more of its six affiliated councils shall be eligible to serve on any board, agency, or institution of this Convention —

either as an official, employee, or board member.”<sup>f224</sup> The practical effect of such amendment if adopted would have been to penalize any co-operating church by restricting for that church the privilege of full representation and opportunity for service by any or all of the messengers it might send to the convention. The proposed amendment was defeated largely by the influence of President R.G. Lee, who, with other leaders, opposed its adoption.

In 1950, at Chicago, the Convention voted as follows: “We hereby reaffirm our conviction that Southern Baptists cannot enter into organic connection with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America or any other organizations which would compromise Baptist principles and truths revealed in the inspired Word of God.”<sup>f225</sup>

## 9. — THEOLOGICAL TRAINING IN THE LIFE OF THE CONVENTION

During the generation immediately preceding the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention, many colleges arose out of the inspiration and needs of the mission movement that swept through American Baptist ranks. In at least ten Southern states there are Baptist colleges, founded in that period for the specific purpose of training ministers. The training was both literary and theological.

### FIRST THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND AGITATION FOR CONVENTION-WIDE SEMINARY

About the time of the formation of the Convention, theological schools began to gain in popularity. They first appeared in the 1820's and 1830's but were not at first generally accepted. President Robert Ryland of Richmond College was opposed to theological seminaries.<sup>f226</sup> As late as 1857, President Francis Wayland, of Brown University, wrote to Professor J.P. Boyce, of Furman University: "Whether seminaries and theological schools are the proper places to educate the ministry, I know not. It is a matter of experiment in our day, and time alone can decide it."<sup>f227</sup>

The first known suggestion of a Southwide theological school came from Dr. Basil Manly, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Charleston, South Carolina. He reviewed what was being done in Georgia and the Carolinas, but showed why such state efforts could not meet the need. "I would respectfully propose," he wrote, "that measures be taken to have a convention of the friends of this cause from the Carolinas and Georgia, and such other of the Southern and Western States as may be disposed to unite with them, to assemble at some central point to deliberate and form some united plan for the accomplishment of this great object."<sup>f228</sup> The suggestion was received with favor in South Carolina but not in other states.

It is now obvious from the manner in which the proposition for united efforts among several States has been received, that no such efforts may be expected soon, and that no union will be formed. ... The friends of union in South Carolina have at least the satisfaction to know that the most liberal advances have been made by them, and if the object is lost they are not to blame. ...

... It remains for the South Carolina Baptists to manage their own Institution in their own way. ... If we but carry forward our Institution, at any convenient site, with the energy and enlightened policy which the cause demands, we need not despair of union yet. The truth is, if we make but a good Institution,

and hold out the substantial advantages which an intelligent student has a right to expect in an institution of this kind, students will flock in from all quarters, either with or without the formality of union among the States. <sup>f229</sup>

The effort had been made to have one institution for South Carolina and Georgia, but the plans failed. <sup>f230</sup> It was proposed that North and South Carolina co-ordinate their schools:

President Wait, of Wake Forest College, made an interesting communication respecting the efforts of our brethren in North Carolina, in promoting of the cause of education, and on the desirableness of such union between the members of the denomination in the two States, as that our sons, in pursuing a collegiate education, should be sent to the Wake Forest College, and that on their part their young men, pursuing theological studies, should repair to the Furman Institution. <sup>f231</sup>

The interest in Virginia seemed to lag. The Rev. James B. Taylor wrote in his diary, June 9, 1845:

“The cause of ministerial education needs resuscitation in Virginia. There is certainly less interest in its promotion than formerly. It becomes important to make more vigorous efforts in behalf of this object.” <sup>f232</sup>

President J.L. Dagg, of Mercer Institute, wrote to Dr. Ryland, proposing that Virginia unite with the other states in establishing a common theological institution. The Virginia Baptist Education Society appointed a committee, in 1844, of which Dr. Ryland was chairman, to consider the question. The next year the committee reported, in part, as follows: <sup>f233</sup>

The Committee soon became convinced, that for the present, nothing could be done to accomplish the object. Your Board is deeply impressed with the importance of this enterprise. . . . The difficulty lies in selecting a site for such a School. Our Brethren, in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, have, in each of those States, an Institution, partly endowed, which they would gladly have adopted as the common Theological School of the Southern and South-western Baptists. It might be well for the Society to propose some equitable manner of selecting a suitable location for the contemplated Institution; and we have little doubt, but that our Brethren in all the States, interested in the enter-prise, would cheerfully acquiesce in the arrangements.

The next year the board of the Education Society reported: <sup>f234</sup> “We are fully persuaded of the importance of having one, and but one, Theological Institution for the Baptists of the South. . . . But the denomination of the different States, in which Theological Seminaries have been founded, cleave to them with an interest and tenacity which forbid the hope that they can be brought to concentrate their patronage on a single Institution.”

Just previous to the call for the famous meeting in Augusta, the *Christian Index* advocated such a theological institution. The question was not raised in the Convention, however, but was discussed in private conference.

At Augusta, in 1845, the necessity and possibility of such an Institution were quietly and informally canvassed by such brethren as J.B. Jeter, R. Fuller, William B. Johnson, J.L. Reynolds, and others, but of course, no plan was formulated and no action taken. ... A wide-spreading and formidable opposition held practical movements in restraint. Most of the Baptist colleges in the South had Theological Departments, and, did not, as they thought, need it. <sup>f235</sup>

In the following July, the Mississippi Convention recommended that the newly formed Southern Baptist Convention adopt one or more seminaries. During the decade following 1847 there were specially called educational conventions to consider the question of theological education, but the Southern Baptist Convention did not, as such, assume the responsibility of that phase of work.

At the annual meeting of the Education Society of Virginia in 1846, a delegation from the board of trustees of Furman Theological Institution, headed by the Rev. W.B. Johnson, D.D., appeared as corresponding messengers. Dr. Johnson "submitted a statement of the condition and prospects of that Institution, and invited the cooperation of the Society in the cause of Theological Education." A committee of seven was named to confer with the South Carolinians, but nothing seems to have resulted from the conference.

In Tennessee a slightly different plan was in the making.

Our brethren in Tennessee seem to be advancing rapidly in their labors of love. We are pleased to find that they are about taking measures to establish a Theological School at Nashville, to be connected in some way with the College located in that city. ... Literary studies ... are to be prosecuted in the college, but the Theological studies in a department gotten up by the Baptists specially for that object. <sup>f236</sup>

The hand of Dr. Howell is evident here.

## WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

It was in the West that the plan of a theological school that transcended state lines first gained momentum and established such a school. The Baptist leaders saw the need and were not hindered by local pride and state patriotism. A call was made for "a General Meeting for the promotion of the cause of Christ, as connected with the interests of the Baptist Denomination in the Western States, to be held in Cincinnati, commencing November 6, 1833." The Convention resolved "that the present circumstances and wants of the denomination in the

West call loudly and imperiously for a Western Baptist institution for the education of the gospel ministry and that a Western Baptist Education Society ought to be organized for the same purpose.” The Society was formed, and the Western Baptist Theological Institute opened in Covington, Kentucky, in 1845. <sup>f237</sup> But the Institute opened on evil times. An able faculty was selected — R.E. Pattison, E.G. Robin-son, Asa Drury, and Ebenezer Dodge — but they were all Northern men of antislavery sentiments, teaching in a school located in a slave state. The Institute “appealed to Southern Baptists for funds, and considerable subscriptions were made in Mississippi and Alabama; but owing to the feverish state of the Southern mind at that time about the causes which brought the Southern Baptist Convention into existence, J.L. Waller, R.B. C. Howell, and others of us in the Southwest, refused to support that institution.” <sup>f238</sup>

The friction over the abolition issue grew in intensity until the Board of Trustees finally closed the Institute, <sup>f239</sup> sold the property in Covington, and divided the proceeds between the trustees from Kentucky and those from Ohio. While the friction progressed, President R.E. Pattison declared himself antislavery. Editor R.B. C. Howell wrote:

We presume they all (Faculty) concur with him. ... This, with the South West, is an insuperable objection. ... It is a remarkable fact that every regular Theological School, capable of giving to its pupils a thorough education, belonging to the denomination, in the whole country, is now in the hands of anti-slavery men. ... What, then, are we to do? ... The South West must have its own Theological School. But are we able to originate and sustain an institution of this kind? We certainly are fully able, *if Kentucky goes with us*. ... If she is really anti-slavery, she will prove it by adhering to that Seminary. Then Tennessee, Mississippi, and the other South Western States must take care of themselves. We have left the alternative, as Georgetown is not Theological, either to originate and endow a Seminary of our own in some central position, to do which our present ability is very questionable, or to cross the mountains and attach ourselves to Mercer University, in Georgia, or to the Howard College, in Alabama, neither of which is, we suspect, at present, prepared to give anything like a regular course of instruction in Divinity. <sup>f240</sup>

Kentucky did join with Tennessee in reacting against the anti-slavery position of the Theological Institute at Covington. The Long Run Association resolved: “This Association deems it (Covington) an unsafe place to educate the rising ministry of the South West.” Editor Howell comments: “Shall not Mississippi, Kentucky, and Tennessee unite and create, in a suitable central position, such a Theological School as we need? Arkansas and Missouri will doubtless join us.” <sup>f241</sup> Editor J.L. Waller insisted that the Southwest must have a Theological School and named George-town as the place. <sup>f242</sup> Dr. Howell promised support

if Georgetown were selected; he argued that Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Missouri were interested and ought to be consulted. He proposed Nashville as more central. <sup>f243</sup> Again he wrote:

Covington, we must repeat, is not a safe place to educate our young men; the South will, while it remains as it is, never patronize it; that it is well endowed does not alter the case at all; and we must, therefore, have a Seminary of our own, cost what it will, in the principles of which we can rely, and where the young ministers of the South West can receive sufficient and suitable instruction. <sup>f244</sup>

## PLANS FOR A CENTRALLY-LOCATED THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

The American Baptist Indian Mission Association held its annual meeting in Nashville, October 28, 1847, and Dr. Howell called a meeting of those in attendance who were interested in a theological school. About one hundred and fifty from eight states and two Indian nations were present. The Rev. J.M. Pendleton of Kentucky presided. A committee — R.B. C. Howell, chairman, P.S. Gayle and J.R. Graves of Tennessee, Adiel Sherwood of Illinois, J.B. Taylor of Virginia, R. Holman of Alabama, T.W. Haynes of South Carolina, R.W. Elledge, of Mississippi, J.L. Waller, S. Baker and A.D. Sears of Kentucky — was appointed to consider the subject and report thereon. The following was presented, Saturday afternoon, October 30, and adopted: <sup>f245</sup>

*“Resolved, That to meet the wants of the South, a Theo-logical School located in a central position, and in every respect thoroughly prepared to impart to its pupils a full and perfect knowledge of the word of God, and of all the branches of learning necessary to its correct exposition and to the effectual discharge of the pastoral office, is absolutely necessary.*

*“Resolved, That the Churches in the whole South require at present but one such Seminary, and to secure it, it is necessary that we direct, in this behalf, all our energies to one point.*

*“Resolved, That this subject be fully laid before our churches and brethren throughout the whole South, in such a manner as, if practicable, to unite them all in the good work, and to elicit their opinion and action in the premises.*

*“Resolved, That to the brethren from all parts of the South, when assembled in Triennial Convention, at Nashville, in May, 1849, we submit the executive of this great work, and the question of the locality of the proposed Seminary.*

R. B.C. HOWELL, CHAIRMAN”

The Southern supporters, many of whom were not slaveowners, decided that they were left only one choice — to form a Southern institution. To bring into

the movement the Baptists of *all* the Southern states was at once the desire and the problem of those who took the lead in the conference at Nashville. Hence, the conference referred the question to the Southern Baptist Convention in its second regular triennial session in Nashville in May, 1849. The Convention was the only body of Baptists that was representative of the Baptists of all the Southern states. In the mean-time, the subject occupied the attention of Baptist leaders of the South.

Those who favored a Southwide seminary disagreed among themselves as to the relation of the Southern Baptist Convention to the project. It will be remembered that when the Virginia Baptist Foreign Mission Society issued the call for Southern Baptists to meet in Augusta to consider forming a Southern missionary organization, it was suggested that subjects other than foreign missions would come before the Convention. Theological education was specifically mentioned. Some of the leaders at Augusta desired to form a society for foreign missions only. Others, such as Dr. W.B. Johnson, president of the South Carolina Convention, favored a denominational convention, authorized to conduct every sort of work.<sup>f246</sup> Such a convention was formed, but opinion continued to be divided over the question of how far afield it should go in prosecuting desirable aims.

It is proposed in some quarters to bring the Southern Baptist Convention into the relation of paternity to this school; and it is thought that the matter will be submitted to that body, at its approaching meeting. We hope not. The Convention is charged with a specific business — the management of our missions, foreign and domestic — and we see no good that is to be gained by encumbering it with other matters. ... The experience of the old Triennial Convention in reference to Columbian College, which hung like a mill stone around its neck for some years, makes us rather chary of all similar schemes.<sup>f247</sup>

Mississippi Baptists had already expressed themselves. “The Committee on Education ... recommended that the ‘Southern Convention’ should adopt a Theological Seminary or Seminaries, for Southern and South Western patronage.”<sup>f248</sup>

As the time drew near for the meeting of the 1849 Southern Convention, to which the question of a Southwide seminary was referred by the education conference in Nashville in October, 1847, the question was being widely discussed.

We are gratified to perceive that our contemporaries in the Atlantic States are noticing the proposition originated here more than a year ago to create and endow a Theological School of high grade for the South. ... The Board of the Alabama Convention has had a meeting on the subject. They find two difficulties in the way — the Howard College at Marion, which may perhaps

teach Theology at some future time, and a supposition that such a school ... is impracticable. ... The President of the State Convention of South Carolina, has called together that body to deliberate on the subject. ... The editor of the Southern Baptist is not informed correctly. He imagines the project was originated by brethren at the last Triennial Convention [of Southern Baptist Convention] and was referred to the approaching meeting at Nashville to be decided. <sup>f249</sup> But the Religious Herald labors under mistakes more glaring than any other paper we have seen. ... The Herald ... supposes that we desire the Triennial Convention to originate and take charge of the proposed school. ... Our brethren of Georgia understand the matter in hand. ... We trust that the brethren who may be here at the Convention will be prepared to give an opinion upon the subject. <sup>f250</sup>

The Southern Convention as such did not consider the question. The Convention, appointed to meet in Nashville in May, 1849, was called to meet in Charleston by President W.B. Johnson because of the report of cholera in Nashville. The Western messengers, not learning in time of the change of time and place, met in Nashville, presided over by Vice-President R.B. C. Howell. This group adjourned to meet in Charleston on the date set by President Johnson. In the afternoon of May 26, after the adjournment of the Convention for the day, “a conference then took place on the subject of establishing at the South a Central Baptist Theological Institute of a high order.” This session was presided over by H.D. Duncan of South Carolina. <sup>f251</sup> A resolution was introduced by Dr. A.M. Poindexter of Virginia to consider the establishment of a theological institute by Southern Baptists. Virginia’s Rev. I.S. Tinsley favored the question. Dr. J.B. Jeter, also of Virginia did not consider the subject feasible because of local state interests. Dr. Basil Manly, Jr., favored the project on the score of economy, efficiency, and practicability. The conference adjourned to meet May 28. At that session, the resolution was approved and a committee of twenty, with Dr. Poindexter as chairman, was appointed to place the subject before Southern Baptists.

From this time onward, the leadership in favor of a general theological seminary passed into the hands of the seaboard states. In 1850, Dr. Howell, who had led in the movement for the pre-ceding five years, moved from Nashville to Richmond, leaving no one in the West to take his leadership in this field.

There was no conference on the subject of a general seminary at the meetings of the Southern Convention in Nashville, 1851, and in Baltimore, 1853. In June, 1854, at the meeting of the Virginia Baptist anniversaries, the Baptist Education Society, under the presidency of Dr. Howell, concluded its report as follows:

Your Board would suggest the propriety of inquiring whether anything, and if so, what can be done to promote *theological education* among our young ministers. As we have not, and do not propose to have a theological institute of our own, it may be wise for us to select among the different schools open to our choice, one on which we will, so far as our influence may, concentrate the patronage of the denomination in this State.

The board of the Virginia Baptist Education Society sent a memorial to the meeting of the Convention at Montgomery in 1855. An education conference (not the Southern Baptist Convention) considered the question of a Southwide seminary and called an education convention to meet in Augusta, Georgia, in April, 1856.

Dr. Howell's leadership in the effort to establish a central semi-nary for the South, a leadership begun while he was a pastor in Nashville and continued during his pastorate in Richmond, culminated in the meeting in Augusta. Henceforth, the leadership passed into other and younger hands. To the Augusta meeting, April, 1856, the Education Conference invited the colleges, education societies, state conventions, and general associations throughout the South to send representatives.

About the time Dr. Howell had become settled in Richmond and Landmarkism was dividing the Baptists in the West, James P. Boyce was leaving Princeton Seminary and moving toward a pastorate in Columbia, South Carolina. It is he who will ever re-main in Baptist history as the founder of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Others prepared the way, and great men labored with him, but his was the leadership that called the institution into being and gave it permanence. Under a sense of divine call, he held on through war, reconstruction, indifference, and even opposition from the brethren. When he was ordained, a member of the presbytery asked him if he proposed to give his life to preaching. He replied: "Yes, provided I do not become a professor of theology." That sense of vocation continued to abide with him to the end, culminating in victory.

## **EDUCATION CONFERENCE IN 1856**

The education convention met in Augusta, April 30, 1856. There were sixty-eight delegates from Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Louisiana. Forty-eight of these were from South Carolina and Georgia. A committee was appointed to present business for the convention. The committee reported that the project of a Southwide theological school faced many difficulties and recommended that another conference be called, to convene during the two days preceding the meeting of the Southern Baptist

Convention in Louisville, May, 1857. The committee further recommended that a special committee, of Dr. B. Manly, Sr., Dr. Poindexter and Dr. Jeter, be appointed to make a study during the year and report at Louisville on the following:

What funds exist subject to the control of Baptists for theological instruction in each of the institutions at the South and South-West;

Whether the trustees or other parties, holding legal control over these funds, can and will contribute them in any form, and if any, what, to the uses of a common theological institution to be located at any other point within or without the limits of their own States severally — should aforesaid Convention, to assemble at Louisville, in 1857, adjudge such different location best for the common good;

Whether these funds, in case they are limited to a spot, can and will be placed within the control of such a board of trustees as may be appointed by competent authority agreed upon for a common theological institution, located at a point now occupied; also, if any restrictions are to be imposed on the use of such funds, when placed under new authority — what restrictions.

That the same committee be authorized and requested to use adequate means for ascertaining what efforts will be made in favor of any location already occupied or not by the inhabitants and friends thereof, and what pecuniary subscriptions or pledges will be given as a nucleus, in case such location should be selected for the common institution; the object of all these inquiries being to ascertain, in the fullest measure possible, whether such a demand is felt for a common institution of this kind as may be a basis and encouragement for future united action. <sup>f252</sup>

Rev. James P. Boyce was a member of the committee, and his hand is seen in its writing. <sup>f253</sup> In July, following the Augusta convention, the State Convention of South Carolina made an offer, having reference to the third paragraph of the resolutions of the Augusta education convention, just quoted. Dr. Boyce was a leader in each convention. He apparently had his plan for consummating the long cherished central theological school, as follows: The education convention in Augusta would appoint a committee to inquire into the resources and possibilities, to report a year hence; in the interim, the South Carolina Convention would make a definite offer on the basis of the committee's instructions; the committee would make its investigations and report the responses from different states, and lay the whole matter before the education convention in Louisville, including the concrete offer from South Carolina. The terms proposed were: That the theological funds of Furman University would be turned over to the trustees of the general theological school, that South Carolina would increase these funds to \$100,000.00, on condition that

the pro-posed seminary be located in Greenville and that the other states raise an equal amount. <sup>f254</sup>

The education convention met in Louisville, May 7, 1857. There were eighty-eight delegates from Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Kentucky. There was much earnest discussion and some serious difference of opinion on the merits of the South Carolina offer, but the final vote on acceptance was unanimous. The advocates of other locations presented the claims of their respective colleges, e.g., Georgetown and Union University. There was at times sharp disagreement.

Dr. Manly, Sr., president of the education convention, wrote to his wife:

Sabbath afternoon. I redeem a moment to say that yesterday after-noon the matter of the Theological Seminary was decided in favor of Greenville — *no one voting, No.*

It is perfectly wonderful — the effect of prayer and love. God’s hand is in it. G — (of Tennessee) made every effort in private and some loud and noisy efforts in public, to prevent action, to distract counsels; but at last he was powerless, as limber as a rag, overborne and conquered. When it was done, I said a few words and we all knelt and bowed down and worshipped. I prayed, and all wept, and what was my surprise before I could stand erect, to find G — grasping my hand and saying that he wanted to take it once, at least, before we unite in heaven. The hand of God has been signally manifest. What so many have longed for and sought, but never found, God has now enabled us to see practicable. The Lord hasten it in his time! <sup>f255</sup>

## DECISION AND LOCATION

The education convention adjourned to meet in Greenville, South Carolina, May 1, 1858, to organize the new institution. It was hoped to begin work in the fall of that year, but all arrangements could not be perfected by that time, the decisive consideration being the failure to complete the faculty. Dr. Broadus and Dr. Winkler declined, but Dr. Broadus reconsidered and finally accepted. The convention occupied five days in full and free discussion. The two great questions were the course of study and the fundamental doctrinal principles. In order to meet the needs of the Southern Baptist ministry, a curriculum was not set forth, but a number of separate “schools” were set up. A ministerial student could, on the basis of his previous preparation, carry the work of as many of the schools as he desired.

The question of the doctrinal position of the new seminary was of tremendous importance. If the new school was to be a *Southern* seminary, it must be Southwide in its reach and sympathies.

While, however, it was deemed essential to avow distinctly and unreservedly the sentiments universally prevalent among us, both as to doctrine and practice, it was equally important that upon those questions upon which there was still a difference of opinion among Southern Baptists, the Seminary articles should not bind the institution. ... The members present were mostly from the East. In the West chiefly there had lately arisen peculiar views known as Landmarkism.<sup>f256</sup> Had those present chosen, they might have inserted an article which would forever have prevented any one holding such views from even being a professor in the Seminary. The whole influence of the institution would thus perpetually have been cast against those views. Would that have been just? So also as to any other question upon which there was division of opinion. ...

It will be seen, therefore, that the wise course of the Convention was to [refrain] from binding the Seminary upon any point upon which the denomination is not agreed.”<sup>f257</sup>

An abstract of principles was prepared, mainly the work of Dr. Basil Manly, Jr., and adopted by the education convention in Greenville. They set forth the great fundamental teachings that have been held by Southern Baptists, without aligning the Seminary with any group emphasis or local practices. Every professor has subscribed to these principles to this day.

## **OPENING OF SOUTHERN SEMINARY**

The Seminary opened its doors in Greenville in the fall of 1859. The first faculty — James P. Boyce, chairman, John A. Broadus, Basil Manly, Jr., and William Williams — has never been surpassed, and perhaps not equalled, by the first faculty in any seminary in America. They had received the highest intellectual training that America offered — the University of Virginia, Brown, Harvard, Princeton Seminary, Newton Theological Institution. They set a standard of high scholarship united with a deep, genuine piety, a standard carried on by their successors.

In the beginning no money was invested in buildings, the idea being that provision should first be made for the support of the teachers. The discarded house of worship of the First Baptist Church, first rented, then bought, was divided by inexpensive partitions into two lecture rooms and a library.<sup>f258</sup> The first volumes in the library were the theological portion of the Furman University library.

There were twenty-six students the first session, representing Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, Florida, and Missouri. Among them were J. William Jones, chaplain of Lee's army during the war; and C.H. Toy, who planned to be a missionary to Japan and later became a member of the

Seminary faculty. The second session the enrolment was increased by ten, with several other states represented.

## SEMINARY SUSPENDED BY WAR

At the close of the third session, June 1862, it was thought best to suspend the work of the Seminary because of the war. Dr. Boyce, chairman of the faculty, requested the professors to retain their connection with the institution, with the understanding that they engage in other pursuits to provide a living until the reopening of the Seminary seemed practicable. For a season, both Dr. Boyce and Dr. Broadus served as Confederate chaplains. During the war, Dr. Broadus began his *Commentary on Matthew*.<sup>f259</sup> He was also a contributor to *Kind Words* in its first years.

Early in the summer of 1865, Dr. Boyce called the faculty together to consider the possibility of resuming work in October. The outlook was discouraging. The institution had practically no financial resources, although, fortunately, there was no debt. When the four professors came together, after praying much over the question, Dr. Broadus said, "Suppose we quietly agree that the Seminary may die, but we'll die first." They held together. When the Seminary did reopen November 1, only seven students were enrolled. In the homiletics class, Dr. Broadus had only one student, and he was blind. He gave that one student the best he had. Those lectures were the basis of the textbook *Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, now used in seminaries around the world.

## REOPENING AFTER THE WAR

The Seminary remained in Greenville until 1877, but it was increasingly apparent that South Carolina, prostrate from the war, could not provide adequate support for it. Early in the 1870's, definite steps were taken to secure a more favored location and to provide endowment. The Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Mobile in 1873, gave its hearty approval to the plea by Dr. Boyce that the Seminary be removed. A financial crisis which swept over the country that summer delayed removal, and 1877 came before the Seminary could be located in its new quarters in Louisville, Kentucky. Greathearted friends in Kentucky and other states in the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention had brought cash and pledges to the point where the trustees, the faculty, and many friends believed the movement to finance the seminary in its new home would succeed. Still, as the months passed, urgent need for large gifts became apparent. Dr. Boyce and his colleagues prayed that God would lead someone to give \$50,000.00 to endow a chair in the institution.

The answer to their petitions came. One day, early in 1880, Dr. Boyce came into a colleague's study, holding out an open letter, and saying, "Here is the answer to our prayer." The letter was from former Governor Joseph H. Brown of Georgia, inviting Dr. Boyce to visit him and explain the financial situation and prospects for the Seminary. When Dr. Boyce returned from that trip, he had with him \$50,000.00 in cash and first-class securities. <sup>f260</sup>

After the charter of the Seminary had been amended, requiring that the principal of all contributions for endowment made since February 1, 1880, be held forever sacred and inviolate, only the income to be expended, the Nortons of Louisville gave a very generous sum. Then came encouraging responses from New York.

## RELATION TO THE CONVENTION

The life of the Seminary was intimately related to the life of the Convention, not only in providing trained leaders, but in the significant reinforcement given to the Convention by Boyce, Broadus, and other members of the faculty in some of the most critical periods in the history of the Southern Baptist Convention. Dr. Boyce presided at nine sessions of the Convention (1872-1879, 1888). He was president of the Convention in 1879 when Southern Baptists decided definitely to continue as a distinct organization rather than renew intimate relationships with their brethren in the North. It was Dr. Broadus who, in that meeting, offered the amendment which settled the question. It was also Dr. Broadus who, in 1891, by his great personality, called the Convention from what threatened to be a heated debate, to accept almost unanimously the report of the special committee recommending the constitution of the Sunday School Board. Two years earlier at the Memphis Convention in 1889, he had been publicly solicited to accept the office of president of the Convention, but he declined with the remark that there were two things that he never could accomplish: one, to ride a bicycle; the other, to preside over the Southern Baptist Convention. <sup>f261</sup> But in its long and glorious history, Southern Seminary furnished three presidents of the Southern Baptist Convention (Boyce, Mullins, Sampey) and two others who had taught in the Seminary (Dargan and McGlothlin).

In the *Review and Expositor*, January, 1935, Dr. Sampey related the story of the assignment of work to the two young professors J.R. Sampey and A.T. Robertson, assistants to Doctors Broadus and Manly:

I was conferring with Doctor Broadus about some details of our work, when he turned to me and said, "Sampey, in dividing the work with the new man you have right of choice by reason of your previous work in the Seminary. Will you take Greek and New Testament with me, or Hebrew and Old

Testament with Manly?” That was a fateful moment for two men whose friendship during the next forty-six years might be compared with that of David and Jonathan. My reply was prompt: “Doctor Broadus, much as I should like to continue with you in Greek and New Testament, the facts in the case seem to settle the matter. Robertson knows much more Greek than I do, and I know more Hebrew than he does, having taught him all that he knows. For the good of the Seminary, I ought to take Hebrew and let Robertson have the Greek.” The great man smiled and said, “Very well, that will be the plan.”

Even after the material development of the Seminary seemed assured, there were dark days. One of those experiences involved one of the most useful men of the faculty, Dr. Crawford H. Toy, who became a pronounced evolutionist and Darwinian. He was influenced by German teachings in the field of historical criticism, presenting the rationalistic reconstruction of the history of Israel and the relocation of the leading Old Testament documents.<sup>f262</sup> He finally resigned in May, 1879. Later, he was elected professor of Hebrew at Harvard University. When he was preparing to leave Louisville, Dr. Boyce accompanied Dr. Toy to the railway station. As he bade Dr. Toy farewell, he lifted his right arm before him and said, “Oh, Toy, I would freely give that arm to be cut off if you could be where you were five years ago, and stay there.”<sup>f263</sup>

## WHITSITT CONTROVERSY

The year before the Southern Convention was formed, there came to America a Swiss scholar, whose service of nearly fifty years of teaching revolutionized theological study in his adopted country. He closed his career in 1893, as professor of church history at Union Seminary, New York. Professor Philip Schaff’s teaching covered several departments. The method of all his studies was the historical-scientific. Among the young American scholars whose education was secured after Professor Schaff’s method had become influential, and whose teaching was conducted after that method, was Dr. William H. Whitsitt. He became professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1872, president in 1895. He approached the study of Baptist history in a scientific attitude of mind. What were the facts of our history? No theory, however long cherished, might stand against the facts. As early as 1883, there were objections to his method and its results. But the storm did not break then for several reasons. Dr. Whitsitt had not advanced in his views to the point where he aroused any large number of the brethren.<sup>f264</sup> Writing to the *Texas Baptist*, April 19, 1883, he says: “In answer to your polite request I beg leave to say that I have never affirmed the impossibility of a succession of Baptist churches, but I have admitted my inability to demonstrate the existence of a succession from the historical material at my command.”

On the other hand, Landmarkism had not developed to such a point as to drive many away. <sup>f265</sup> Some of the views were held by Baptists who, a little later, were driven away from any sympathy with Landmarkism. The cleavage had not become so pronounced by 1883. Furthermore, Dr. T.T. Eaton, who was to become the leader in the attack on Dr. Whitsitt, had recently gone from a pastorate in Petersburg, Virginia, to a pastorate adjacent to the Seminary, in Louisville, Kentucky. He did not become editor of the *Western Recorder* until 1886. His father, Dr. J.H. Eaton, was anti-Landmark, <sup>f266</sup> and the son had been in an anti-Landmark atmosphere for the preceding twelve years. Even as late as 1895, his ecclesiology was not Landmark. Landmarkism became decidedly self-conscious and vocal in the Gospel Mission agitation, from 1886 onward.

The storm broke in 1896. Dr. Whitsitt, in an encyclopedia article on Baptists, gave the now well-known story of a London congregation sending to Holland in 1641 to secure immersion from a congregation of immersing Mennonites. <sup>f267</sup> In 1880, four of his articles on English Baptist history had been published in *The Independent* as editorials. In substance, he held that Baptists in England revived immersion in 1641. Both the facts and the method of first publishing them aroused many Southern Baptists. But the issue was more than a question of certain facts of history. It was a clash between the older approach to a study of Baptist history — the deductive method — and the consequent theory, and the newer method — the inductive — with the results thereof. <sup>f268</sup> The controversy raged in Baptist papers, in associations, in state conventions, in the Southern Convention — wherever and whenever Baptists assembled. After three years, Dr. Whitsitt resigned both the professorship of church history and the presidency of the Seminary.

It should be said that the attack on Whitsitt was not continued solely because of his teaching concerning modern Baptist history in England. Some of his friends thought that his phrasing of the questions involved might have been happier. Dr. McGlothlin, who succeeded Dr. Whitsitt, taught the same views as is true in all standard Baptist seminaries today. But there were other factors involved — personal factors — which became more apparent as the controversy became more acute. The conflict brought the fundamental questions to the attention of Baptists and clarified the atmosphere. Landmarkism won the battle, but lost the war. The Southern Seminary “lost its president, but did not lose its soul.” <sup>f269</sup>

Following the controversy and Dr. Whitsitt’s resignation, Southern Baptists united on Dr. E.Y. Mullins, a product of the South (Mississippi and Texas) but at that time a pastor in Newton Centre (Boston), who had not been identified with the controversy. Under his leadership, the Seminary attained a standing, materially, spiritually, doctrinally, and intellectually, which commanded the respect and devotion not only of Southern Baptists but of Christian leaders

around the world. Reinforced by such scholars and teachers as Robertson, Sampey, and Carver, and younger professors, — all trained men and loyal to the Scriptures — Dr. Mullins builded well, setting the pattern developed and enlarged in later years by Sampey, Fuller, and McCall.

## **NEW HOME OF SOUTHERN SEMINARY AND W.M.U. TRAINING SCHOOL**

Because of crowded conditions in the old buildings in down-town Louisville and the heavy expense incident to the renovation of the property should the Seminary remain at the original Broad-way site, the trustees of the Seminary purchased some fifty acres at the “Beeches” on Lexington Road, in the beautiful Cherokee Park section. In March, 1926, the Seminary was transferred to the first buildings that had been completed at the new location. Additional buildings were provided as rapidly as possible.

It was in the administration of Dr. Ellis Fuller, president 1942-1950, especially, that the plant was enlarged to care for the steadily increasing enrolment. During that period, the Alumni Memorial Chapel was completed, and greater housing facilities provided. Through the generosity of friends of the Seminary, additional land and buildings across Lexington Road were given to the Seminary, providing a home for the School of Music. And for the first time in the history of the Seminary, announcement was made in the 1951 report to the Convention that the enrolment had passed the 1000 mark.

The W.M.U. Training School <sup>f270</sup> remained in its downtown location until September, 1941, when it entered its new home at the “Beeches.” The enrolment for the 1951-52 session was 195, representing twenty-two states and two foreign countries. Graduates of that School have gone to the ends of the earth as missionaries.

In succeeding chapters we shall read the thrilling stories of the Southwestern, New Orleans, Golden Gate, and Southeastern seminaries.

## 10. — THE WOMEN'S WORK

The present efficiently working organization of the Baptist women of the South is the result of a development which began with isolated, local "female" societies and gathered momentum in the face of indifference and even active opposition growing out of the age-old seclusion of women from public life.

The abolition of slavery in the English-speaking world and the wave of democratic principles in the nineteenth century called attention to the limitations of the rights of women in every sphere of life outside the home. Over-zealous women sometimes deepened the prejudice by the methods they pursued in contending for their rights. In the religious realm, the prejudice was as great or greater than in the secular. Southern Baptists, in particular, were ultra-conservative on the question of women taking any part in church life, especially in the matter of women speaking before mixed audiences. The social objection was strongly buttressed by theological argument. Women's entrance into religious activities in public had to proceed a short step at a time. If they formed organizations at all, they had to work behind the scenes.

### EARLY MISSIONARY SOCIETIES

Before the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention there were local societies of women, of different names, the purpose of which was to raise funds for local objects or for home and foreign missions.

Mite societies and other missionary organizations of Southern women date back to the early days of the century, and yielded then to the treasury of the Triennial Convention contributions which are recorded as "extraordinarily liberal." Very much of the interest which has given rise to the great general organizations of today for the conduct of foreign missions is clearly traceable to the loving zeal and busy earnestness of these societies. <sup>f271</sup>

When Luther Rice returned to America in 1813, local societies of all kinds began to be formed to support Judson and him. Among them were many women's societies and many children's societies directed by women. A missionary society was formed in Richmond, Virginia in 1813. One was formed in Fredericksburg — The Female Baptist Society for Foreign Missions — in 1814. <sup>f272</sup> While Rev. Robert B. Semple had a general missionary society in the Bruington church, Virginia, as early as 1815, a women's society was organized there in 1835. <sup>f273</sup>

The Savannah River Association, 1831 and 1832, mentions with appreciation the liberality of the Black Swamp Female Foreign Missionary Society, the

Female Burman Missionary Society of Barnwell, the Hiltonhead Female Baptist Society, the Beaufort Female Burman Missionary Society, the Female Missionary Society of Grahamville, the Female Burman Missionary Society of Pipe Creek.

The Bethlehem Sewing Society was organized in 1831 at McMinnville, Tennessee, to raise money to build a house of worship. When the State Convention was formed, the society declared itself auxiliary to the Convention and sent funds for foreign missions. In 1836, societies were formed at La Grange and Lexington. At the latter place, there were two: a Female Mission Society and a Male Mission Society, the purpose of which was to secure a preacher for the community, as there was no church there.<sup>f274</sup> During the pastorate of Dr. B. Manly, in Charleston, the ladies of the Baptist church sent a box to Ava, Burma. Mrs. Kincaid and Mrs. Simons, missionaries, acknowledged the gift in a letter of appreciation.<sup>f275</sup> The annual report of the Columbia County Female Missionary Society showed that the society had sent \$80.00 to the Georgia Association for missions in Burma.<sup>f276</sup> The minutes of the General Convention, from 1814 to 1844, show that female societies sent funds for foreign missions and, on the basis of those contributions, appointed delegates (men) to the triennial meetings.

There were no representatives of women's societies in the consultative convention at Augusta, out of which came the Southern Baptist Convention. The constitution, however, provided for representation from mission societies that sent funds for missions. As soon as the mission work of the Convention began to take shape, women's societies were represented in the Convention.

Entering heartily into the development of the work was a host of devout women who sought to identify themselves with the Convention work through ways God has especially entrusted to them — training the children; teaching the colored people on plantations and elsewhere; and also the Indians; outfitting students and missionaries; and observing strictly seasons of prayer. These and other efforts bespoke their loyalty and revealed their capabilities.<sup>f277</sup>

The women of other denominations also had been forming local societies to foster interest in and render aid to missions, since the rise of the great missionary movement among the young men of Williams College. In 1860, under the leadership of Mrs. Doremus, the Woman's Union Missionary Society, interdenominational, was formed in New York. Mrs. Ann J. Graves, of Baltimore, whose son, Rev. R.H. Graves, M.D., had gone to China in 1855 under the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, was stirred by this larger movement. The Baptist women of Baltimore, who had taken a prominent part in the union movement, met in the lecture room of the First Baptist Church, October, 1871, and formed the Woman's Mission to

Woman. <sup>f278</sup> This interest among the Baltimore Baptists found its source and inspiration in the letters that Dr. Graves wrote his mother from China. It was he who employed the first Bible woman in China, to read and distribute the Bible. As his mother gathered groups of women to hear the letters read, they prayed for China and China's women. Mrs. Graves became the first secretary of the Woman's Mission to Woman.

This local development in Baltimore and the consequent re-action in other states were hastened by a general meeting in Baltimore.

## GENERAL MEETINGS

In 1868 there had been held the first general meeting of Southern Baptist women as far as it is known. The Convention was in Baltimore and the meeting for the women was called by Mrs. Graves to hear accounts of her son's work in Canton. ... The effects were far-reaching for the aim was to enlist the women of the South. Soon as organization was effected in Baltimore with Mrs. Graves, corresponding secretary, others sprang up in South Carolina, in Richmond, in Kentucky, and the famous missionary triplets appeared — the mite box, regular contributions, and regular meetings for prayer. <sup>f279</sup>

The quick response by women of other states to the beginnings of organization in Baltimore and Maryland was effected by a circular sent throughout the South:

We now appeal to the women of our Baptist churches to sustain this mission by their prayers and contributions. It is not intended to interfere with the regular missionary collections or to solicit aid through public meetings. We have adopted the plan of having mission boxes in our homes, each member being pledged to put in at least two cents a week, if convenient, on a set day, the Sabbath being preferred. Small sums voluntarily and regularly contributed are found to be more reliable in providing funds than subscriptions, being of greater benefit to the giver by awakening an interest in the cause and cultivating the "grace of giving." We suggest the organization of branches in each state, to attend to the business, and missionary circles in each church or neighboring churches united, to meet regularly for prayer and the dissemination of missionary intelligence. The cooperation of the different branches should be arranged in the simplest form of organization, that each and all may be working to unite with one heart and mind in carrying out the work to the glory of God and the extension of the knowledge of Christ, that through Him all the families of the South may be blessed." <sup>f280</sup>

South Carolina and Virginia responded at once. The Woman's Missionary Society of Newberry, South Carolina, and the Woman's Missionary Society of Richmond were formed, the objective of the latter being the support of Miss Edmonia Moon in China. The Foreign Mission Board, recognizing the

possibilities in the new movement, agreed to supply the mite boxes. Four hundred were sent to the Richmond society, which brought in \$1,299.00 the first year. <sup>f281</sup> The number of societies in the several states increased to such an extent that, in 1874, the Foreign Mission Board recommended that an executive or central committee for the women's work be appointed for each state. These appointments were first made by the Board in consultation with judicious brethren in the state concerned. After the committees were set up, they were authorized to fill vacancies. Within ten years the committees had become self-perpetuating. <sup>f282</sup>

## CONVENTION RECOGNIZES WORK OF WOMEN

In 1875, the Convention took official recognition of the work of the women's societies.

It is regretted that we cannot now command the requisite details and statistics to show the amount of work they have done, and the sums of money they have secured to the treasury of our Board. But enough is known of the results of the agencies adopted by our Christian sisters, to attest their enlarged zeal and practical wisdom, in executing our Redeemer's commission. ...

Our female missionaries in China are to a considerable extent supported by the alms obtained through the hands of their sisters in these Southern States. That they are also blessed by their ceaseless and fervent intercessions, none can doubt. Too much commendation can scarcely be bestowed upon the noble achievements of these gentle and loving servants of Jesus. All our pastors are affectionately urged to "help those women" who are laboring and ready to labor with us in the Gospel. ... The native earnestness, the loving sympathies, and the ready and intuitive tact of woman, most happily qualify her as a valuable auxiliary in this work; more especially in that department of it which seeks the salvation of those of her own sex. <sup>f283</sup>

The following year the Convention adopted a report on the women's work, which says, in part,

We think it would be a good plan to establish a female missionary society in every church, which all the ladies should be invited to join. A monthly meeting, encouraged by the pastors, and an annual meeting, with special services, would nourish its vitality. Contributions might be made either through the mite boxes which the Board furnishes, or by regular amounts or public contributions. The gatherings could be divided among the objects of the Convention. <sup>f284</sup>

This suggestion was adopted by some of the societies. Recognition was taken of the fact that the women's societies, organized first for foreign missions, were beginning to divide their funds with the Home Mission Board. The Board's report concluded with the statement that

The efficiency of the effort ... might be greatly augmented by a more general organization in each church, or by associated labors where Churches are sufficiently contiguous, as in the large cities, and in some parts of the country, to admit of frequent meetings. With but here and there, a plan for combined effort, streams of supply have already been opened from these sources to the treasuries of our Boards. Let the Christian women of our Churches generally, adopt some such plan, and press it with zeal and energy, and like the rock smitten by the Prophet's rod, the dry places shall become fountains of blessing to the needy. <sup>f285</sup>

The Convention resolved: "That our sisters in all our churches be and are hereby invited and urged to co-operate with us in the work of Home Missions, by such special methods of organization as they may judge wisest and most efficient." The work of the women's societies for foreign missions had grown to such an extent that the Convention in a special report declared that "the time may be at hand when it will be advisable that they shall appoint a Central Committee to combine their efforts, to stimulate the work, and to give permanent record to their success." <sup>f286</sup>

A general organization of the women of the South was not yet in order. There was much prejudice on social and theological grounds against women engaging in any sort of public activities. There was not sufficient sentiment for a Southwide organization, and the development in the several states had not reached the point of making the effort desirable. In 1878, the Foreign Mission Board, in its annual report, declared that "more general and separate organization seems undesired, and undesirable, as not in harmony with the views and genius of the women of the South." The Convention agreed with that position. For the time being, the efforts should be given to the development of the women's work by states. It was recommended

1. That the Boards of our Convention organize Central Committees of women in each State represented in that body.
3. Each Society may decide in what direction its funds shall go — either to the Foreign or to the Home field, and to what objects to be appropriated.
4. These Societies should be auxiliary to the State Conventions, or to the Southern Baptist Convention.
5. They may select their own way to report to the Boards of this Convention, either through the Central Committee, or through their churches, or directly to the Boards.

The following year the Convention clarified the first item in the report by declaring

**1st.** That two Central Committees be appointed in each State, the one for Home and the other for Foreign Missions, and that these appointments be left to our two Boards to arrange as in their wisdom may be deemed best. ...

**3d.** That these societies report regularly to the two Central Committees respectively, and that these Committees report to our Boards. <sup>f287</sup>

The women's societies were showing such efficiency in developing interest and increasing contributions that, in 1881, the Convention adopted a report recommending "that when the Foreign Mission Board shall deem it wise so to do, they appoint some competent woman as superintendent of this work, whose duty it shall be to collect and disseminate information, and in other ways to stimulate and strengthen woman's work for woman in mission fields, said superintendent to act under the direction of the Foreign Mission Board."

<sup>f288</sup> But the Board, in the exercise of the discretion allowed, decided not to make such an appointment. The following year, in its report to the Convention, the Board said: "Realizing, however, that a false step now might entail fatal embarrassments for years to come, we have chosen to move slowly and cautiously in the exercise of the discretion allowed by the Convention. The Board has not deemed it wise as yet to appoint a general superintendent of woman's work."

The Home Board expressed the hope that some understanding might be "reached by which the cooperation of the Baptist women of the South in the work of Home Missions may be more generally secured." The Convention adopted a report on home missions recommending

that the Home and Foreign Mission Boards, should they deem such action expedient, unite in the appointment of some competent woman as superintendent of the State Central Committees, whose duty it shall be to collect and disseminate information and in other ways to stimulate and strengthen woman's work for woman in all lands, said superintendent to act under the direction of both Boards.

But, as evidence of divided sentiment on the question, the Convention adopted another report, dealing with foreign missions, that "no change of the plan of organization seems desirable." <sup>f289</sup> The Foreign Board, "having already considered the question, did not think it expedient to unite in such an appointment." <sup>f290</sup>

Again, in the Convention of 1884, the same question was raised. Mr. Joshua Levering introduced the following:

*"Resolved,* That the Home Mission Board be and are hereby authorized and requested to appoint at as early a day as possible, under such rules as it may be fit to adopt, a competent woman as the Superintendent of Woman's Work for Home Missions, whose duty it shall be to visit various cities in the bounds

of the Convention, organize societies where they do not exist, collect and disseminate information, and in every way possible stimulate and strengthen the work of women for Home Missions.”

Dr. J. William Jones opposed the resolution. He feared it would be the entering wedge for women’s rights and women’s speaking in public. Rev. C.D. Campbell offered an amendment:

*“Resolved, That the Home Mission Board be further re-quested to appoint some suitable sister, under the conditions hereinbefore mentioned, to superintend the collection and dissemination of information in regard to the work among the colored population of the South.”*

Rev. J.W. Willmarth of Philadelphia warned Southern Baptists against the tendency to liberalism in the North and West: women speaking in public to mixed bodies, new theology, etc. Let women have their societies in the churches but work under the Boards of the Convention. Rev. J.W. M. Williams favored the Levering resolutions: “I am afraid the women will work without us if we don’t permit them to work with us.”<sup>f291</sup> But the opposition was strong and vocal.

For several reasons, the resolution encountered opposition, and, in-stead of being decided on its merits, was referred to the Home Mission Board. This means probably that nothing will be done on this line during the present year ... that we need some more effective means for stimulating and systematizing the liberality of our Southern women is beyond all doubt. The women love organization and work well together. It remains for our wise men to formulate some scheme that will effectually utilize our Southern women.<sup>f292</sup>

## **SHOULD WOMEN BE ADMITTED TO CONVENTION?**

The enlarging and developing work of the local societies of the women of the South presented four questions: Should the women be admitted to seats in the Southern Baptist Convention and participate in the activities of the Convention without respect to any distinction of sex? Should the women form a Southwide organization and work with or through the Convention, as they might choose? Should the women work through their churches and have their contributions represented, by men, in the Convention, their contributions being credited to the state convention or general association? Or, should the women form an organization wholly apart from the Convention, raising their funds, appointing their missionaries, and conducting their work in their own way?

A hint of the last of the four methods was heard in the debates, usually in the form of a warning. Each of the other plans had its advocates, and the three were taking shape contemporaneously. The first began to appear early. In 1877, in New Orleans, Mrs. Myra E. Graves, widow of Henry Lea Graves,

president of Baylor University, was a member of the Convention, representing Brenham Baptist Church, Texas. Again, in 1882, in Greenville, Mrs. Graves was a member of the Convention, representing the State Convention of Texas.

<sup>f293</sup> If the “woman question” had not become an issue, the custom of enrolling women as members of the Convention might have become fixed. The second method began to take shape in 1884.

In conformity with the spirit of the times and voicing a latent need for co-operation of sympathy and endeavor, in Baltimore, in 1884, the first general meeting of Southern Baptist women was called, during a session of the Convention. But as the ladies in attendance were only chance visitors and not delegated by any working body at home to present reports or transact business, this first and the two following sessions of 1885 and 1886 served the good but transient purpose of a conference, whose work closed with the close of the session. <sup>f294</sup>

In that meeting, the women resolved “that the societies here represented make the Union meeting permanent, to meet annually, during the sessions of the Southern Baptist Convention,” and that the central committee of the state in which the Convention met arrange the program. The annual mass meeting, here begun, pointed the way, should the first method fail or seem not wise.

The crisis arrived in 1885, in Augusta. The Convention gave a definite negative answer to the first question, suggested the third as the proper method, but laid the groundwork for the second as the final form. The Arkansas State Convention appointed two women among its representatives. When Mrs. M.E. Graves appeared from Texas at the two meetings previously mentioned, no notice was taken of the fact. But by 1885 the issue was very much alive.

... Rev. J. William Jones made a point of order, claiming that ladies were not eligible to sit as members of the Convention, and moving that the report of delegates from Arkansas be referred to a committee of five to report upon their right to admission. The President appointed on that committee J.W. Jones, Virginia; B. Manly, Kentucky; J.H. Kilpatrick, Georgia; J.M. Carroll [J. L.], North Carolina; and M.B. Wharton, Alabama.

After deliberation the committee brought in a majority and a minority report. The former, signed by brethren Manly, Wharton, and Carroll, declared that while they did not deem it expedient and for the best interests of the Convention to allow ladies to come as members, they saw nothing in the Constitution to prevent their membership. The minority report, signed by brethren Jones and Kilpatrick, proposed to respectfully deny admission to the female delegates from Arkansas. Bro. Jones said, if there was nothing in the written instrument denying them a place in the Convention, there was the common law, the unbroken custom of the Convention during its entire existence, which declared against receiving them and had all the force of the Constitution itself. ...

... It was generally admitted that nothing in the Constitution prohibited women from taking seats, but some contended that the Convention had a right to interpret the Constitution as prohibitory. But it was rightly considered by others, that while the Convention had a right to interpret the Constitution, it had no right to interpret into it what was not there, nor out of it what was in it. But few seemed to think it best that women should have seats and the prejudice against them having seats was strong enough to get 202 votes against the plain terms of the instrument, in favor of the minority report, to 112 against it, and of admitting the sisters from Arkansas as having a right to seats under the Constitution, and then amending it afterwards, if such was the will, of the body. ... The matter was ended by withdrawing the report of the committee, by consent, and the President [Mell] ruled that record of the matter might be excluded from the minutes. <sup>f295</sup>

Later in the session, on motion of J.W. Jones, a committee of one from each state was appointed to consider the whole question of woman-membership in the Convention. The report of the committee, recommending a change in the constitution so as to exclude women, was adopted. The word “members” in Article III of the Constitution, defining the basis of representation, was changed to “brethren,” <sup>f296</sup> thus specifically barring women from membership in the Convention.

In another report, the Convention suggested how the women might continue their mission activities:

We think it important that there should be Women’s Central Committees established and fostered by State Conventions, or Associations, with the co-operation of the Boards of the Convention. ... Let such funds be credited also to the General State Convention or Association. Then let these moneys be represented in this body by delegates chosen, if they prefer, by the local societies, upon the same bases and conditions specified for all other moneys reported.

Thus the societies of women would be grouped in each state under a central committee, appointed by the state convention or association, and would function under the direction of that body. The women, in their annual meeting, begun in 1884, agreed with this general method of work. They reported to the Convention, through N.A. Bailey, a series of resolutions: <sup>f297</sup>

*“Resolved 1.* That it is not the desire of the Baptist women of the South to have separate and independent organization for the prosecution of Woman’s Mission Work.

*“Resolved 2.* That we desire to prosecute our work directly through the churches, and to have representation in the S.B.C., through our respective State Conventions, as heretofore.

“Resolved 3. That the above resolutions be transmitted to the S.B.C., now in session, with the request that they be read before the body.”

During the ensuing year, the state conventions began to follow the suggestion that the women’s work be articulated around a central committee in each state, appointed by the state convention or general association. The Foreign Board reported in 1886:

“The work of our Christian women having been relegated by the Convention to the State organizations, does not come now directly under the supervision of our Board.”

In this new correlation of the women’s societies with the state bodies and their work, the women’s program was broadened. The Home Board, in its annual report, stated:

“We are gratified to know that these societies, al-most without exception, have resolved to limit themselves to no one department of Christian missions, but to share with their brothers in the support of every enterprise fostered by the denomination.”

This phase in the developing work of the societies was a very important one. It saved them from becoming one-sided in their thought of missions and held them to a well-rounded denominational program. It strengthened the work of the state bodies also. State interests became welded with the work of the Home and Foreign Mission Boards. This was the period when the state conventions in the South were entering into co-operative work with the American Baptist Home Mission Society of New York. The home front of the Southern Convention appeared to be on the point of disintegration. The chief objective of Dr. Tichenor, secretary of the Home Mission Board, during the first ten years of his tenure of *office*, was to ally the state bodies with the Home Board. The women’s societies were wholly committed to the support of the boards of the Southern Convention. The integration of the societies with the state conventions through the state central committees, appointed by each state body, greatly forwarded Dr. Tichenor’s objective and had much to do with his success. <sup>f298</sup>

With the woman question satisfactorily disposed of in 1885, after several years of discussion, the 1886 session of the Convention, in Montgomery, was so free from any divisive question that the Convention resolved, “That we render thanks to our Lord for the harmony, enthusiasm and brotherly love that have characterized the proceedings of the session of this Convention.”

The annual meeting of the women in connection with the session of the Convention that year was an important one. During the preceding year, the state central committees were being appointed, the women’s societies were

being grouped by states under the leadership of the central committees, and a corporate consciousness was being developed. *The Heathen Helper*, edited by Miss Agnes Osborn, Louisville, furnished a medium of communication among the societies throughout the South and served as a voice to express the developing consciousness. The meeting of women at Montgomery — “when the women led the devotional periods, read reports, papers, poems, stories, and spoke freely and apparently fully” — deepened the sense of Southwide solidarity and of the need for permanent organization. Some of the leaders were in favor of perfecting such an organization the next year. But the development in the different states was not proceeding at the same pace. The Foreign Mission Board, in its annual report for 1887, said: “Their organization is gradually becoming more complete, which organization differs in different states, and has been left by the Board to the ladies themselves, and the counsel of the brethren in the several states.” When the Southwide organization was at last formed, not all the states were ready for it. By the time the annual meeting of the women took place in Louisville in 1887, however, sentiment had so far advanced that a call for such a body was made.

In Louisville, 1887, the need for something more effective made itself heard in a series of resolutions, approved by some of the leading minds of the convention which called upon state central committees to appoint delegates to the next annual meeting who should be authorized to form a general organization if deemed desirable, with power to elect officers, choose location and define duties. The object of the organization was the further support of missions now conducted by Southern Baptists, with no desire to interfere with the management of the already existing boards of the convention, either in appointment of missionaries or in the direction of mission work; but an earnest purpose on the part of the women to be more efficient in collecting money and disseminating information on mission subjects. <sup>f299</sup>

Under the leadership of Miss M.E. McIntosh, South Carolina, and Miss Annie W. Armstrong, Maryland, these resolutions were passed in the following form:

Whereas, the Baptist ladies assembled at Louisville, in connection and sympathy with the Southern Baptist Convention, are deeply impressed with the importance of the thorough and efficient organization among the ladies of the South, to aid in the support of missions now conducted by Southern Baptists; therefore

**1. Resolved,** That a committee be appointed to request Central Committees of the several states, each to appoint three lady delegates, to meet during the next session of the Southern Baptist Convention, to decide upon the advisability of organizing a general committee; and if advisable, to provide for the appointment, location, and duties thereof.

2. *Resolved*, That the above is not to be construed as a desire upon the part of the ladies to interfere with the management of the existing Boards of the Convention, either in the appointment of missionaries, or the direction of mission work; but is a desire, on their part, to be more efficient in collecting money and disseminating information on mission subjects.

3. *Resolved*, That in order to provide for our next meeting, a committee composed of the Secretaries of Central Committees of the various States, be appointed to confer with the Central Committee of the State in which the Convention shall be held (Virginia) to select a presiding officer and secretary, and to arrange a programme.

A copy of these resolutions was forwarded to secretaries of state central committees, requesting a delegation of three from each state to be present at the next annual meeting.

In the fall of 1887, a series of articles on “General Organization for Woman’s Missionary Societies of the Southern Baptist Convention” was published in the *Religious Herald*. ... Though adverse as well as favorable criticism greeted the articles, their object was accomplished in spreading incontrovertible facts before the reading public, two of which were never assailed: the boards needed more money; general organizations secured more money. That the proposed organization could work through and by a church and not necessarily in opposition to, or in spite of a church — as was predicted in some quarters — remained to be proved. Comparison of the work of Southern Baptist women with all others was very uncomfortable; but especially with Southern Methodist women, where circumstances made comparison more just, was turned into a discreditable contrast. <sup>f300</sup>

The General Association of Virginia was not favorable to the general program of the women’s work. Therefore, no central committee had been appointed for that state. In 1888, the Foreign Mission Board reported:

No Central Committee having been formed by the General Association of Virginia, your Board, as a provisional measure, filled vacancies in the committee for this State. The Board was influenced in part by the consideration that our Christian women, who held a meeting last year at the time and place of the Convention, requested that some preliminary arrangements be made for a similar meeting this year by the Central Committee for Virginia. As an act of Christian courtesy and hospitality the committee has complied with this request without regard to what may be designed or determined by this ladies’ meeting.

## **ORGANIZATION OF SOUTHERN BAPTIST WOMEN, 1888**

The Southern Baptist Convention met in Richmond, May 11-15, 1888. On the first day, Friday, May 11, the women met in the Broad Street Methodist

Church in their fifth annual meeting. But this meeting convened under different circumstances and in different capacity from any of the preceding four. Those had been mass meetings — each woman attending in her own name and private capacity. Under the first of the resolutions passed at the Louisville meeting the preceding year, the central committees of twelve states appointed thirty-two delegates to meet at Richmond for the express purpose of considering the advisability of forming a Southwick organization composed of the state central committees. Two of the state committees — Alabama and North Carolina — had not appointed delegates. The women present from those states were there as in previous years — in a private capacity. Monday, May 14, the vote was taken on the resolution to organize. All of the officially appointed delegates were in favor of organizing, but the delegates from Virginia were restrained from voting by the opposition expressed by their General Association, and the delegates from Mississippi preferred to wait for the action of the board of their State Convention. Miss Heck, so well-known in the women's work in later years, was in favor of organizing, but she had not been appointed a delegate by the Central Committee of North Carolina, of which she was president. The delegates from the Central Committees of ten states — Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas — voted to organize. The Central Committee of Mississippi joined in July, 1888; Virginia, in March, 1889; Alabama, in April, 1890; and North Carolina, in April, 1891.

When the vote was taken, in Richmond,

The Southern Baptist Convention was in session at the First Baptist Church a short distance away. While the women were forming the organization in the Methodist Church, there was uneasiness in the Convention. The attitude of many there might be expressed in the words of one pastor who, suffering that same uneasiness, said he always felt it safer to attend the women's meetings, as "You never could tell what the women might take to praying for, if left alone." The discussion on the Convention floor as to the organization grew heated. Some predicted the women would follow other women's organizations and control their own money, send out their own missionaries, desire to serve on boards, and, in the end, seek to run the Convention. <sup>f301</sup>

However, on the second day of the Convention, the following re-port was adopted without a word of discussion: "That this Convention and all its officers and employees encourage the formation of women's missionary circles and children's bands in all our churches and Sunday Schools for the double purpose of exciting interest in mission work, and raising funds for the spread of the Gospel." Which provoked the comment by the *Christian Index* reporter, "This reminds us of the forcible reply of our Saviour to those who

would hinder the woman in her effort to serve her Lord and Master, ‘Let her alone.’ “

The preamble of the constitution set forth the purpose of the new organization and answered the doubts and fears of many concerning the direction the movement might take. It stated:

“We, the Women of the churches connected with the Southern Baptist Convention, desirous of stimulating the missionary spirit and the grace of giving, among the women and children of the churches, and aiding in collecting funds for missionary purposes, to be disbursed by the Boards of the Southern Baptist Convention, and disclaiming all intention of independent action, organize and adopt [the constitution].”

When this plan “was presented, those ladies who before fancied they saw a ghost of independent action in it, quickly went over to the other side and endorsed the movement. It will not in any way interfere with the plans of the churches or the states, but will only seek to help them to raise their own moneys to be paid to their church treasurers.” <sup>f302</sup>

The name chosen for the new organization was “the Executive Committee of the Woman’s Mission Societies — (Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention).” At the Fort Worth meeting, 1890, the name was changed to “Woman’s Missionary Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention.” The first constitution provided for membership in the annual meeting as follows:

“Article V. Representation in the Annual Meeting.

“The officers of the committee and three delegates from each state shall be entitled to vote. Only such delegates as are personally present and duly accredited by the Central Committee or State Societies they represent shall be entitled to vote.”

This general principle of representation has been preserved, al-though there have been changes in name and development. The present constitution limits representation from any state to fifty delegates.

The new organization was a true denominational body. The Southern Baptist Convention began as an organization authorized, by its constitution, to do any sort of denominational work, but not based solely on other Baptist bodies — conventions, associations, and churches. Any individual or representative of any group of Baptists, interested in the work of the Convention, could be a member of the Convention. The women’s organization was formed in the interest of missions only and was based on the Central Committees of the states. Through the years, the accepted name, both Southwide and in the several states, has been Woman’s Missionary Union. The Southwide body is

composed of the delegates of the state bodies, together with its own Executive Committee. The state bodies differ in the sources of representation — no two of them seem to have the same.

The headquarters of Woman's Missionary Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention, were first located in Baltimore. From that city, the expanding work was conducted until it was realized that a location more central to the Southern territory would function for greater efficiency. After several years of in-formal discussion, the Union, at the annual meeting in 1921, voted to move the headquarters to Birmingham.

The object of Woman's Missionary Union, as declared in the first constitution and included in the constitution to the present, is twofold: <sup>f303</sup>

“**1st.** To distribute missionary information and stimulate effort, through the State Central Committees (later called State Woman's Missionary Unions) ...

“**2nd.** To secure the earnest sympathetic co-operation of women and children in collecting and raising money for missions.”

The first Southwide report published, that of the organizational meeting in 1888, listed contributions of \$45,768.32 to missions (state, home and foreign), ministerial education, Sunday school and Bible work, local church work, and “other objects.” Thus the Union began, in the true sense, “auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention,” interpreting its objective — missions — in the broadest meaning to include all the work carried on by the Convention. But missions, in a more limited sense, has been, from the beginning, the primary aim of the Union.

Miss Lottie Moon, missionary in China under the Foreign Mission Board, wrote a series of letters in the *Foreign Mission Journal*, the *Religious Herald*, and the *Christian Index*, stirring Baptist women of the South to greater interest and endeavor. During the year preceding the formation of the Union, when the initial steps were being taken, Miss Moon suggested that Southern Baptist women institute a week of prayer and offering in connection with Christmas. “Need it be said why the week before Christmas is chosen? Is it not the festive season, when families and friends exchange gifts in memory of the Gift laid on the altar of the world for the redemption of the human race, the most appropriate time to consecrate a portion from both abounding riches and scant poverty to send forth the good tidings of great joy to all the earth?” <sup>f304</sup>

## **FIRST CHRISTMAS OFFERING FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS**

Miss Moon suggested that both Boards of the Convention be included in the special Christmas offering. The first Christmas, 1888, following the formation

of Woman's Missionary Union, the special offering was made and has been an annual feature of the women's societies ever since. The first goal was set at \$2,000.00. The societies raised an excess of \$3,000.00. It was Miss Annie Arm-strong, the first corresponding secretary of the Union, who suggested that the offering bear Miss Moon's name, and, in 1918, the Union adopted the name "Lottie Moon Christmas Offering for Foreign Missions." In increasing amounts, Woman's Missionary Union has strengthened the hands of the Foreign Mission Board by this special offering, in addition to the regular contributions. A high peak was reached when the 1952 Christmas offering totaled \$3,107,160.66.

## **INTEREST IN HOME MISSIONS**

As with foreign missions, the interest and activity of the Union in home missions date from the first year of its history. Even before the Union was formed, the women's societies raised funds to assist in buying the building in Havana, Cuba, which serves as church building, school, and headquarters for the Southern Baptist mission work in that island. The secretary of missions in Arkansas, Rev. E.L. Compere, requested the women to assist the missionaries on the frontier. The societies began to send "mission boxes" and "mission barrels" to the families of the devoted missionaries, and thus established contacts and aroused interest in the struggling churches in the West. A gift of \$3,500.00, from Mrs. Anna Schimp of Baltimore, was the beginning of the Tichenor Memorial Church Building and Loan Fund of the Home Mission Board. In the early 1890's, the Union began to work, through the Home Board, among the Negroes and the foreigners in the South — Germans, Chinese, and Mexicans. About the same time, the Board's work in Cuba again came to the attention of the Union. The Spanish-American War prevented anything being done, however; but after it was over, as a result of which Cuba gained her independence, work was again resumed. Among other activities, the Sunbeams, a department of Woman's Missionary Union activity for primary age, raised the funds to construct the church building in Cardenas.

In 1894 the Union voted to observe a "Week of Self-Denial," the purpose of which was to increase gifts to missions. The following year, in response to a plea from Dr. Tichenor relative to the increasing financial burden of the Home Mission Board, that week was set apart as a special season of prayer for and contributions to home missions. From that time, the "Week of Self-Denial" continued to be dedicated to the cause of missions in the home-land. In 1922, the name was changed to the "Thank-offering," and, in 1933, the designation was again changed to the "Annie W. Arm-strong Offering for Home Missions," in commemoration of the first secretary's interest in the work of the Home Board. In 1952 this offering was \$991,484.40.

One of the special phases of the program of Woman's Missionary Union from the beginning has been the work with children in training them in the principle and practice of missions. The large increase in the gifts of the present generation of Southern Baptists over those of preceding generations is largely a result of the training and missionary education of children. In April, 1886, a Sunday school class in the Fairmont church, Virginia, was organized into a missionary society by the pastor, then a student in the University of Virginia. He was the Rev. George Braxton Taylor, a son of Dr. George Boardman Taylor, missionary to Italy under the Foreign Board, and grandson of Dr. James B. Taylor, who was the first secretary of that Board. The class had been called the Sun-beam Class. The mission society was called the Sunbeam Band. Similar bands began to increase in number throughout the South. Dr. Taylor conducted a column in the *Foreign Mission Journal*, in which he provided programs and outlined the work of these groups. For ten years, "Cousin George," as Dr. Taylor was affectionately known, conducted his column, succeeding so well that the work outgrew his time and effort available for it. He asked the Foreign Mission Board to make better provision for its growing needs. In 1896, Woman's Missionary Union took charge of the Sunbeam work at the request of the Foreign Mission Board. The Union has continued to the present, enlarging the work with the passing years. The sum total of the gifts has been large, but the greatest result has been and continues to be the training and education of the next generation of church and denominational leaders, at home and abroad, in the splendid mission enterprise.

## **AUXILIARIES FOR TRAINING**

Before the Southwide organization of the women's societies was formed in 1888, the younger women of the South had societies of different names to raise funds for local work and home and foreign missions. After 1888, the younger women continued and expanded their activities. Their societies were not clearly differentiated from the women's groups, nor were they counted among them. As the young women grew older, they normally passed into the membership of the women's societies, and, apart from any other consideration, it was wise for these societies to cultivate and encourage the younger women. Their membership was thereby constantly being enlarged. The names of the young women's societies varied in different states. In Alabama, the name "Young Woman's Auxiliary" had come to be generally used, and, in 1907, Woman's Missionary Union adopted that name for its enlarging program for young women.

If the churches throughout the South were to be led into larger missionary interest and activity, the boys — the deacons and pastors of tomorrow — must not be neglected. The minutes of Woman's Missionary Union of North

Carolina for 1907 reported five boys' bands. Miss Fannie E.S. Heck, leader of North Carolina women and president of the Southwide Woman's Missionary Union, was led to consider the great possibilities in these bands. While listening to the hymn, "The King's Business," she thought of the name "Royal Ambassadors" for boys united together in the interest of missions. In October, 1907, at the semiannual meeting of the Executive Committee of Woman's Missionary Union, a committee on mission work for boys was appointed, of which Miss Heck was chairman. At the annual meeting of the Union in May, 1908, the committee reported, with the recommendation. <sup>f305</sup>

"1. That the Woman's Missionary Union take in hand and press the organization of Missionary Societies for Boys.

"2. That the general name for the organization be: 'The Order of Royal Ambassadors,' having a special Constitution, Motto, and Pin."

The report was adopted and the great training program begun. One of the delegates from North Carolina, Mrs. Pettaway, "became so interested in the organization that she cut short her trip and hurried home to Goldsboro to organize the first Royal Ambassador Chapter in the Southern Baptist Convention. The Carey Newton Chapter of Goldsboro, First Church, stands No. 1 on our State list and the first in the South." <sup>f306</sup>

In the missionary education program of Woman's Missionary Union, there was a gap for some years. Between the Sunbeams, on the one hand, and the Young Woman's Auxiliary, on the other, there was no place for the girl too old for the first and too young for the second. The Young Woman's Auxiliary began to meet the deficiency by sponsoring "Junior" Young Woman's Auxiliaries. The need grew with the increase in the interest and development, until, in 1913, Woman's Missionary Union created a new department of its work under the title the Girls' Auxiliaries.

## **TRAINING OF WOMEN MISSIONARIES**

The enlarging work of Southern Baptists at home and abroad called for the training of women for Christian activity. The need in the foreign field seemed to be the most pressing.

That women missionaries, whether they were to work as single women or as wives of missionaries, needed training was hardly a debatable issue. To meet the need, they were going to training schools in the North in increasing numbers, and those schools were increasing their facilities in the fields of both theoretical and practical instruction.

The matter came to the attention of the trustees of the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, in 1901, and a committee, appointed at the annual meeting to inquire further, reported, in 1902,

1. That we find that there is a necessity, distinct and urgent for such a school for Southern Baptist women. ...
2. That after conference with the Faculty of the Seminary we find that instruction well suited to the young women can be provided with-out expense to the Seminary.
3. That there are no dormitories or boarding arrangements for the young women at the Seminary. ... We may hope that a suitable dormitory may be provided for the young women. ...
4. That we commit this matter to the Faculty of the Seminary, re-questing that the matter be duly considered, that they undertake such work in this direction as seems wise to them, and that they report to the Trustees year by year as to the prospect and value of the work.

To this report, President Mullins added that the faculty were pre-pared to welcome any young women who desired to avail themselves of the courses of study provided by the Seminary.

The wives of married students in the Seminary and young women living in Louisville accepted the privileges offered by the Seminary. But in October, 1904, four young women from out of state — Miss Rena Groover of Georgia, Miss Alice Huey of Alabama, Miss Ella Jeter of Oklahoma, and Miss Clemmie Ford of Tennessee, appeared on the scene and forced the issue. They rented a room in the apartment of Rev. and Mrs. J.H. Moore, students in the Seminary, but the arrangements were not satisfactory and their difficulties were many. Finally, Miss Eliza S. Broadus, daughter of Dr. Broadus, called a meeting of women of the Baptist churches of Louisville, and a committee from the different churches of the city was formed. Mrs. S.E. Woody was chairman; Mrs. W.J. McGlothlin was secretary-treasurer. This committee rented a house on Fourth Street, furnished it, and looked to the Baptist women of the city to provide the funds. The young ladies moved in the day before Thanksgiving. <sup>f307</sup>

By the summer of 1905, twenty-five young women were pre-paring to attend the Seminary. The local committee rented a larger house on Broadway, three blocks from the Seminary, and appealed to the Baptist women of the South for support. In the annual meeting the preceding May, Woman's Missionary Union had rejected the proposal to assume responsibility for a training school. The officers, Mrs. J.A. Barker of Virginia, president, and Miss Annie Armstrong of Maryland, corresponding secretary, disapproved "of the work in its present state and of the methods of the Louisville women in bringing it

before the Southern women, impression of disloyalty to the officers of the Union being made.”<sup>f308</sup>

However, the Union adopted resolutions commending “to the prayerful investigation of our sisters all over the Southland the work now being done at the Theological Seminary at Louisville and the desirability of sustaining a home for the young women who may avail themselves of the training offered ...” and recommended “that all sisters who feel that the object is worthy render such assistance as they may feel able.”<sup>f309</sup>

## **WOMAN’S MISSIONARY UNION TRAINING SCHOOL**

In 1907 the Trustees of the Seminary voted to surrender “to the Woman’s Missionary Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention, the entire management and control of the Woman’s Training School, in connection with our Seminary, and that we offer to the Training School all the advantages of our classrooms.” At the same time, the temporary board of managers of the Training School home, in Louisville, offered “to the Woman’s Missionary Union the furnishings collected during the three years of its existence, valued at \$900, also to subscribe \$500 towards a Building Fund for the Woman’s Missionary Union Training School.” Woman’s Missionary Union accepted both offers and took the necessary steps to establish a Training School distinct from, but affiliated with, the Southern Seminary.<sup>f310</sup> The purchase of the first building for this purpose was made possible in 1912 by a gift of \$20,500.00 from the Sunday School Board. As mentioned in a previous chapter, the School now occupies beautiful buildings on property adjoining the Seminary.

The Southwestern Seminary and the Baptist Bible Institute make provision for the training of women, but do it as a part of their regular program and not in separate schools. Those two schools are co-educational in the full sense, women being eligible to all their privileges, including degrees.

## **MARGARET FUND**

Another phase of the work of Woman’s Missionary Union in missions and education remains to be told. In 1904, Mrs. Frank Chambers of New York, a former Alabamian, gave \$10,000.00 “for a home for the children of our missionaries, Home and Foreign, and a temporary ‘rest’ for missionaries ... upon condition that the Baptist women of the South take charge of and support the same.” The gift was received with enthusiasm and the condition gladly accepted. A home was bought in Greenville, South Carolina, and named “The Margaret Home for Missionaries’ Children,” in honor of the mother of the donor. The Home was furnished by Baptist women of the South and conducted

for ten years as a home for the children of the missionaries serving under the Boards of the Convention. The children attended the schools in Greenville.

After a few years, in the face of changing conditions, it seemed wise to conduct this program of assistance on a different plan. Careful investigation of similar work conducted by others, was made for a year and a half. Then, at the annual meeting of the Union in 1914, the committee of the Margaret Home recommended:

“(1) That the Margaret Home for missionaries’ children be sold.

“(2) That the fund accruing from said sale be known as the Margaret Fund for Missionaries’ Children.

“(3) That this fund be invested and that the interest be used toward the education of such children.” <sup>f311</sup>

The plan was adopted and carried out. In 1943, the total investments under the new program amounted to \$89,668.00. Since the awarding of the first scholarships in 1918, four hundred and fifty-five students had been assisted, at an expenditure of \$410,442.64.

## CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES

The first corresponding secretary of the Woman’s Missionary Union was Miss Annie W. Armstrong. She had been *a* leader in the expanding work of the women of Baltimore and Maryland. Before the formation of the Southwide body, she had much to do with the increase in the number of local societies in the South. From 1888 to 1905 Miss Armstrong gave her time, her strength, and, almost, her health without any remuneration but the consciousness of leading in a great work for the kingdom of God. From 1906 to 1912, Miss Edith Crane carried on in the tradition set by her predecessor. In the greatly expanding work since 1912, Miss Kathleen Mallory was the executive leader until her retirement in 1948, when Miss Alma Hunt was elected to succeed her.

Up to 1913, its twenty-fifth anniversary, Woman’s Missionary Union made no reports directly to the Convention. The reports were made to the two mission boards and incorporated in their reports to the Convention. In 1913 Dr. W.O. Carver advised the preparation of a direct report, relative to the twenty-fifth anniversary, which he succeeded in getting before the Convention. This was the first time the women had been permitted to make their report direct to the Convention. <sup>f312</sup>

Since 1918 women have been enrolled as messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention. This change has called for a closer articulation of the work of the Union with the Convention, as well as a recognition of women’s privileges

under the constitution of the Convention. Step by step, the change has been effected, although as late as 1929, when the Convention met in Memphis and, in compliance with the request of the 1928 Convention, Mrs. W.J. Cox, then president of Woman's Missionary Union, was introduced to address the Convention, a well-known brother picked up his hat and walked out of the hall with the comment that he would not stay to hear any woman speak to the Convention. To-day, women may serve as members of the various Boards and other agencies of the Convention.

## 11. — EXPANDING HORIZONS, 1899-1919

The turn of the century saw a new nationalism and a stronger national consciousness developing in the United States. It saw, also, the entrance of the United States upon a role of international influence and power. The United States was thrown into the maelstrom of world politics as a result of the Spanish-American War. Islands in the Caribbean, Hawaii, the Philippines, and smaller islands in the Pacific came under the American flag. The Spanish-American War showed to the world a united nation, and the growth and change of that nation were as significant as the unification of the former antagonistic sections. The economic and political picture had greatly changed since 1870. A new generation, born or reared to manhood since the close of the War Between the States, was coming to leadership in public life. The discoveries and inventions of modern science facilitated communication and travel, which in turn, made possible transaction of business on a world-wide scale. The development of the giant corporations and cartels furnished the agencies and established international relationships. These relationships, importantly, had their industrial and political phases.

In the United States, the Federal government and the states enacted laws designed to protect and direct the growing social organism. There still appeared, now and then, the struggle between nationalism and states' rights which has been recurrent since the beginning of American independence.

### NEW SPIRIT AMONG SOUTHERN BAPTISTS

A comparable situation was developing within Southern Baptist life. The failure of extreme Landmarkism, after a half-century struggle, to dominate the Convention in its fundamental character and in its work of foreign missions and theological education, left the Convention with a sense of unity and a spirit of aggressiveness. After the withdrawal in 1906 of a large number of the Landmarkers from any semblance of association with the Convention, these new features and characteristics became more apparent. The *Central Baptist* commented editorially on the second meeting of the Convention after the close of the Whitsitt issue:

Within the last few years there have been some sharp controversies in the South about men and measures and doctrines. Rumor said these were irreconcilable divisions. When this question <sup>f313</sup> came forward, it was introduced with significant prophecies that underneath it were these old sores concealed by this thin covering. Ominous predictions were made of serious consequences to follow debate and decision. The writer watched each vote with a view to identifying parties to old discussions, expecting to see them

lined up on this issue. Every vote made deeper the mystery to such inquiry. Men who were opponents on a former issue voted together now, and long time friends stood opposed. ... When it was all over it was found that former things had passed away and all lines had become new. New regiments were formed out of the old ones. Fresh lines were marked, some running this way and some that, but none of them following former cleavages. ... There is a new South among Baptists, if this debate can be taken as expressing present feeling. <sup>f314</sup>

The *Religious Herald* expressed the opinion that

The one feature of this Convention which dominated everything else, the one spirit which pervaded all its sessions, characterized its utterances and inspired every measure was its sublime and uplifting hope-fulness and enthusiasm. If we are not sadly and utterly mistaken in our diagnosis and prognosis, the Convention enters upon this new year of its life and work with a new sense of its responsibility to God, of its vast opportunities and possibilities for usefulness, of its ability, under the Divine blessing, to hasten in some real way the coming of the kingdom of Christ on earth. <sup>f315</sup>

While the Southern Convention was eliminating antagonistic elements, enlarging its borders, and strengthening its stakes, the state conventions were also reflecting the improved economic and social conditions in the South. Due to geographical, missionary and, sometimes, doctrinal reasons, state conventions and general associations had been formed in the earlier years without special regard to state lines. There were, at times, two or more general bodies in one state, and a general body might include territory in more than one state. Immediately preceding the under discussion period, as a part of the efforts of Secretary Tichenor to restore the home front and regain lost territory, unification conforming to state boundaries began to take place. This was not only a result of developing state consciousness but, at the same time, hastened it. A consequence was the increasing importance of state conventions as units of the total work of Southern Baptists. In some of the states, the conventions were further strengthened by the se-cession of Landmark elements to form their own state bodies. The withdrawal of the opposition left a freer atmosphere.

This development of the life and work of the state conventions grew out of the strategy of Secretary Tichenor in securing a working alliance between the Home Mission Board of the Southern Convention and the several state mission boards. The formation of the state central committees of the women and their co-operation with the Boards of the Southern Convention were factors in this gratifying growth.

This relationship of the Southern Convention and the state conventions worked very well, so long as the several bodies were co-operating in the same general

direction. But when there appeared to be clashing of interests between “nationalism” and “states’ rights,” the situation was the more serious because of increased vigor in each direction. During this whole twenty-year period, there were manifestations of the development of the Southern Convention and of the state conventions and of the friction between the two arising out of particular situations.

In 1898, there were presented to the Southern Convention, through the Home Mission Board, resolutions from the State Convention of Georgia which read, in part, as follows:

“Whereas, The nineteenth century ... has witnessed such marvelous progress of our Baptist people, not only in numbers but in every qualification which fits them to be a mighty agency in the hand of our Redeemer in his purpose to give his gospel to every creature, be it

“*Resolved*, That this Convention respectfully suggests to the Southern Baptist Convention that it recommend the observance of the year 1900 as a year of thanksgiving by our Baptist churches in which special efforts be made to more fully inform them of the gracious fullness of the Divine blessing received during this century, and to better organize and equip them for the mighty work which lies before them in the century to come.”

A committee, composed of one representative from each state and of the secretaries of the Boards, was appointed to carry out the suggestions of the Georgia resolutions. No further organization or machinery was contemplated.

f316

In May, 1900, the Centennial Celebration, observed at the Southern Baptist Convention in Hot Springs, Arkansas, was characterized by addresses by B.H. Carroll, J.B. Gambrell, E.Y. Mullins, W.E. Hatcher, Lansing Burrows, and other giants in the Convention. Concerning the “types of Baptists” at that Convention, Dr. W.E. Hatcher, of Virginia, wrote:

“I was asked by an untraveled brother what sort of people the Western Baptists were. I replied that the Western Baptists didn’t come. All the Baptists at Hot Springs were Eastern Baptists; at least they all looked exactly alike. Southern Baptists would find it a foolish business to attempt to divide.” f317

## **ENLISTMENT AND CO-OPERATION**

The special committee, approving the suggestion and suggesting as a goal the enlistment of every church and church member nominally in co-operation with the Southern Convention, recommended in part:

7. That a committee of one from each state be appointed, to whom shall be added the corresponding secretaries of the three Boards and the statistical

secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention, whose duty it shall be to take charge of this work. ...

8. That each state convention or association, or its Board, be re-requested to appoint a committee of five to co-operate with the Committee named above, and that such state committees be requested to appoint a committee of five in each District Association, who shall in turn provide for a Committee of three in each church within their bounds. ...” <sup>f318</sup>

This committee made an elaborate report in 1900. The work as-signed to the Committee was analyzed, the work accomplished during the year was reviewed, and suggestions and recommendations were made to the Convention for future progress, that the work already done might not be lost and more might be accomplished. Among other things, it was recommended

“(1) That the three Boards of this Convention each appoint a Committee of three ... which committees shall constitute a joint committee of co-operation. This Committee shall have the authority to employ a Secretary of Co-operation and such other agencies as may be deemed necessary to do the work herein contemplated. The expenses of this work shall be borne equally by the three Boards.”

After spirited discussion the report was adopted, <sup>f319</sup> but the reaction throughout the South was indicative of the attitude toward further organizational development.

The chairman of the Centennial Committee suddenly, a few days before the Convention, hits upon a scheme of permanent organization which commends itself to him. This scheme is far-reaching and even radical in its bearing, if carried out according to its original design ... scarcely anybody, at its first presentation, understands its full import. Advocates of the measure, who have had opportunity to examine it, use three-fourths of the time allotted for its discussion. Gradually the full meaning of the measure begins to appear. ... when representatives of the minority were trying to secure the floor, to point out objections to the scheme, the previous question is ordered, and the scheme is adopted. ... The measure in question is not complete until the State Associations and Conventions have passed upon it. <sup>f320</sup>

## COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATION

In 1901, the Committee on Co-operation submitted a full report, <sup>f321</sup> giving the story leading up to the appointment of the Committee, its work during the year, and setting forth the work yet to be done. The Committee recommended that “the Convention provide a suitable agency therefor, and for the expenses of the same.”

It was recommended

“2. That a special agency be employed to be known as the Committee on Cooperation of the Southern Baptist Convention, composed of the following fifteen brethren and located in Baltimore. . . . We recommend further that this committee be authorized to employ a secretary, fix his remuneration, and also provide such other agencies as in their judgment may be necessary.” <sup>f322</sup>

A warm discussion followed. The Convention rejected five of the recommendations of the special committee, including the one just quoted. Apparently, there had not yet developed sufficient sentiment in favor of further organization and machinery to care for the expanding work and developing life of the Southern Convention. These problems of reorganization and increased mechanism arose out of the growth of Southern Baptists — growth in numbers, in gifts (however inadequate), in multiplicity of interests and in organizations.

The home mission activity of the Convention greatly increased in the opening years of the twentieth century. Speaking on the Convention in Savannah, Dr. J.B. Gambrell said, “We are evidently entering upon a new era as to missionary policy and missionary work throughout the South. . . . We are well started in a great career for enlargement all over the South. There is no question that we are out of the narrows and the next ten years are likely to be tremendous in development and work done.” <sup>f323</sup>

The enlarging plans in mission work brought problems of administration. There was a developing friction between the Foreign and Home Mission boards in the execution of the enlarged plans, and, in some of the states, between these two boards and the several state boards.” <sup>f324</sup> There were problems arising out of the enlarging scope of the Southern Convention’s program.

The increasing number of corollary interests that gathered around the Convention constituted a problem in the arrangement of the daily sessions of the annual meeting. Ultimately, all except the Woman’s Missionary Union were absorbed into the Convention. But before sentiment for absorption prevailed, some adjustment of schedule had to be made. In 1909, on the motion of Secretary Lansing Burrows, the Convention adopted the following resolutions:

*“Resolved,* That it is the desire of this Convention that at its annual meetings it have the right of way without distractions incident to many corollary meetings; and that the brethren who have in charge the separate interests entrusted to them be requested not to arrange for their separate meetings prior to the assembling of the Convention.

*“Resolved,* further, That the Committee on Order of business of this session, together with the President of the Convention, be continued to arrange the

order of the next session with special reference to these corollary interests, requesting that their matters be considered as part of the Convention's business.

*“Resolved, further, That if this be done, the Convention gives its assurance that it will, as far as within its power, order sufficient time in its sessions to all these corollary interests for full consideration of their methods, and make its arrangements for a continuation of the sessions of the Convention over the following Monday or Tuesday if necessary.”*

There was yet another problem that grew out of the increasing momentum of the Southern Convention. As a consequence of the improved economic conditions and transportation facilities throughout the South, the attendance on the annual meetings increased above the general average of the first half-century. This affected both the method and the character of the meetings. The *Religious Herald* pointed out the consequent threat to due deliberation of issues before the Convention:

It must be frankly admitted, however, that the real work of the Convention is no longer done by the Convention itself. It is practically impossible, with the present organization and methods, and in the physical conditions in which the Convention is frequently forced to meet, to deliberate about anything. So it has come to pass that debate is practically unknown and conference is out of the question. We are coming rapidly to the place, if we have not already reached it, when we must rely wholly upon the Boards and standing committees to do our thinking for us. This is to some extent both desirable and inevitable. At the same time we cannot suppress the conviction that it is not best for us, or for the interests which we seek to promote, that our great representative body should degenerate into a mere celebration, a place for set and formal reports and addresses, a sort of spectacular gathering, full of holy enthusiasm, it may be, but lacking utterly the deliberative element.<sup>f325</sup>

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR MORE DELIBERATION IN CONVENTIONS**

All of these problems of increase in numbers and development of organization and function brought forth discussions of division of the Convention. “Might we not have three annual meetings and a great triennial convention, covering the whole territory?”

“The signs of the times are that the day is not far distant when the trans-Mississippi Baptists, with their two seminaries, one at Fort Worth, Texas, and one at Kansas City, Missouri,<sup>f326</sup> and with their growing sense of the power which comes from numbers and wealth will desire to conduct their own missionary operations.”

The *Biblical Recorder* was more cautious: “Manifestly, the Convention is to a degree unwieldy, and its representation is not always representative, yet it has, year by year, increased in use-fulness and power. It is on the first edge of its possibilities, and not without the weightiest reasons, should we dissolve this mighty compact of our fathers.”

Using these quotations, Dr. Gambrell seized the opportunity to declare his long-cherished desire for some method of expressing national Baptist sentiment.<sup>f327</sup>

The South, like the nation, has grown by stages or epochs. ... The war came and left the South bleeding, exhausted and friendless. Then came reconstruction with nothing noble and inspiring in it, but everything ignoble and depressing. Following this period was a long period of convalescence, with numerous set-backs. We are now at the end of this period and the South stands today like a robust giant, full of rich blood, ready for all eventualities. ... I believe the hour has come for the South to get out of the corner and let our influence and power flow even into the current of national life.<sup>f328</sup>

Earlier, he had more specifically discussed the question of division, raised by several editors:

There should be five general bodies, and then triennial or biennial meetings, and this triennial or biennial Convention should be for counsel only. ... I should be very much opposed to the division of the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention, and to stop at that. ... I have always opposed the delimitation of territory as between the North and the South. ... Therefore, I did rejoice exceedingly in the organization of the General Convention of America. ... as far back as 1892, I expressed the belief publicly that the time would come when we might have five general bodies to cover the entire territory of the United States.<sup>f329</sup>

## **ARTICULATION AND CORRELATION**

Since the closing decade of the nineteenth century, when both the Southern Baptist Convention and the several state conventions began to realize a vigorous self-consciousness, there has been a problem of articulation and correlation. In original Baptist ecclesiology and denominational policy, conventions, large or small, were formed on a voluntary, individual basis and not on a church basis. The agents of the boards of the Southern Baptist Convention had the same freedom of approach to the churches and other contributors as had the agents of the boards of state conventions. With the improved economic conditions of the South, the increasing work, the developing mechanism and larger contributions, some program of correlation became necessary for the best interest both of the Southern Convention and the state conventions.

The first decade of the twentieth century saw the issue forced upon Southern Baptists, together with the efforts and methods of meeting it. The Baptist General Convention of Texas sought, in 1914, to solve the problem of correlation within that state by consolidating all of its agencies under one executive board. Other state conventions began to follow the example set by Texas. Within a dozen years consolidation was realized in all the state conventions and general associations of the South. This was producing a problem within the Southern Convention, clearly de-fined by the editor of the *Baptist Courier*.

There has come within recent years a transition of emphasis from Convention work to state interests that has been greater and more general than our people seem to be aware of. The evidence that we have of this is in the statistical tables of the minutes of the Convention. ... If these statistical tables are used with due care they will yield an instructive comparison and will reveal the transition of emphasis we speak of. ... (Between 1910 and 1915) Home and Foreign Missions made an increase of about 7 percent; and State Missions an increase of about 50 per cent. Does this not indicate that a tremendous change of emphasis is taking place? ... When we compare the figures for the five years before 1910 with those for the subsequent five years we see that this transference of emphasis is a thing characteristic only of the latter period. ... The emphasis has certainly passed from Convention over to state emphasis.

As to the causes of this change of emphasis our own opinion is that we cannot ignore the growing multiplicity and importance of our state interests, the organization of the state secretaries of the South, and the increasing tendency of the state boards to take over the work of the Convention Boards. All three of these causes are at work. <sup>f330</sup>

There was serious concern because of the limitations placed upon the Southern Convention by the insistence upon "states' rights." Dr. R.H. Pitt entered into the defense of "nationalism" in a ringing editorial, "Set the Convention Free."

<sup>f331</sup>

It seems plain to us, however, that for a number of years past the South-ern Baptist Convention has been steadily losing its primacy and in no small degree its independence and autonomy among our Southern Baptist organizations. So far as the vital policies of the Convention are concerned, they are determined practically by State organizations. Then when they have been thus determined, State Secretaries and State Boards practically control and determine the methods of carrying out these policies in their respective territories.

... We are already beginning to note bad results from this sort of assertion of State sovereignty. For years past the rate of growth in the gifts of Southern Baptists to their great Mission Boards has been slow and unsatisfactory. It has not kept pace with the growth of the denomination in numbers and wealth ...

but with the constantly increasing spread of intelligence that the rate of growth ought to be greater year by year. ... Most of the other States, it is true, show some increase, but the increase is not at all comparable to the growth of their Baptist population in numbers and resources ... the Convention ... must be left free and its agencies must be left free, in their efforts to arouse the interest of our people and to secure their hearty and sustained co-operation ... it must have free access to our churches, from which, indeed, according to the theory of our organizations, the Convention comes directly. <sup>f332</sup>

... The Southern Baptist Convention is not composed of representatives from the State Conventions or State Associations. As a matter of convenience, our State Boards are requested by the churches to name representatives, <sup>f333</sup> but they do not represent the State Boards. They represent the churches of the State from which they come. ... There is no good reason why a Convention Board should hand over the interests of its work, in Virginia, for example, to a State Board appointed, not by the Convention itself, but by the General Association, and responsible in no way to the Convention.

An earlier editorial, in the *Baptist World*, sounded the same warning against the limitations and restrictions put upon the Southern Convention by the state conventions or boards. The conclusion was: "If the Southern Convention is going to live up to its great ideal of freedom, it should jealously guard the rights of its boards to do their own work in their own way. ... What we are saying is not in opposition to close relations between the general and state boards, such as already exists in some states." <sup>f334</sup>

The discussion of the problems involved in reorganization of the Southern Baptist Convention continued for a decade or more. The opinion was general that reorganization was needed and imminent. The work of the Convention had increased and was still increasing at a rapid pace. The machinery had been set up in previous years, when the program was comparatively small, and had become inadequate. Many plans of reorganization were proposed — unification of American Baptists into one national body; several regional conventions affiliated together in some sort of national federation; division of the Southern Convention into an Eastern and a Western convention, the Mississippi River being the dividing line; the consolidation of the boards of the Southern Convention into one executive board with administrative departments. There was little sentiment in favor of unification, only a voice here and there for federation, a little more sentiment for division. Occasionally, the majority in an annual meeting would have voted for consolidation, if the question had come to a direct vote. <sup>f335</sup> In 1913, the Rev. John E. White, Georgia, introduced the following: <sup>f336</sup>

"Whereas, The tasks, opportunities and responsibilities now facing Southern Baptists are vastly more extensive and complex than faced our fathers sixty years ago ... and

*“Whereas, We all recognize that in the unprecedented conditions of our time Southern Baptists must within a few years determine the place we are to hold in the religious progress of the race ... therefore be it,*

*“Resolved, First, that a Commission of seven judicious men among us be appointed by the President of the Convention, of which he shall be Chairman, which shall, during the coming year, make a careful study and a thorough examination of the organization, plans and methods of this body, with a view to determine whether or not they are best adapted for eliciting, combining and directing the energies of Southern Baptists and for securing the highest efficiency of our forces and the fullest possible enlistment of our people for the work of the Kingdom. ...”*

## COMMISSION ON EFFICIENCY

The following year, the Commission on Efficiency, appointed under authority of the resolutions quoted above, made a long re-port concerning a rearrangement of the By Laws and procedure in the annual meetings, the relations between the Boards, and the relations between the Convention and other Christian bodies. The important question of reorganization of the Southern Convention was touched upon in the recommendation that the Boards be not consolidated but retained separately. This was recommended for further study. <sup>f337</sup> After another year of study and counsel, the Convention declined to consolidate the Boards into one, but made changes in the plan of membership, that the Boards might be more representative of the Convention’s life and territory. <sup>f338</sup>

But the question of consolidation would not remain settled. In 1916, Mr. M.H. Wolfe of Texas proposed: “That Articles V to X of the Constitution of this Convention be amended and revised so as to create one strong Executive Board which shall direct all of the work and enterprises fostered and promoted by this Convention.” The committee appointed to study the question asked that they be given a year to prepare a report, because of the importance of the issues involved. <sup>f339</sup> The committee was instructed to publish its report in the denominational press, so as to give sufficient time for discussion before the annual meeting of the Convention in May.

A majority report (twelve members of the Committee) and a minority report (one member) were published in January, 1917. Sentiment for consolidation, which was strong in the session of 1916, had been waning. The majority report was against it. Mr. J.F. Brownlow, Tennessee, proposed a plan of consolidation, calling for all the boards and agencies to be merged into the corporation, the Southern Baptist Convention, which should have a Board of Directors composed of the secretaries of the state conventions. <sup>f340</sup> This Board would hold all the property and direct all the work of the Convention. The

suggestion received little favor. By the time the Convention met in New Orleans in May sentiment had crystallized around the majority report published in January.

## **BEGINNING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The final form, as adopted by the Convention, recommended

“that the Boards of the Convention remain separate, ... and believing that some improvement in the methods of conducting the work would be attained by the creation of a standing committee of the Convention to act for the body between its sessions in ways hereinafter set forth, we recommend that an executive committee of seven, representing the different parts of the territory of the Convention, be selected annually by the Convention. ... The duties of the committee shall be to have oversight of the arrangements for the meetings of the Convention with power to change both the time and place of meeting in case an emergency arises making such change necessary; that this committee shall act for the Convention ad interim on such matters as may arise pertaining to the general business of the Convention and not otherwise provided for in its plan of work; that this committee shall also be empowered to act in an advisory way on all questions submitted to it on matters arising between the Boards of this Convention, but only on request of one or more of the Boards concerned; that this committee shall have no further duties except as other things may be specifically committed to it by the Convention itself at its annual meeting. ... <sup>f341</sup>

In 1927, as we shall see in chapter XIV, the membership and functions of the Executive Committee were greatly enlarged. An executive secretary was employed, and the Committee became, in fact as well as in name, the executive of the Convention.

Thus, after more than three quarters of a century of activity and functional development, the Southern Baptist Convention found its voice, through which it can speak and act on any occasion, to meet any situation arising at any time between annual sessions.

## 12. — ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING

Reference in chapter 11 to the relationship of correlated organizations to the Southern Baptist Convention leads us to a consideration of Training Union activities, which have become a very vital part of the Southern Baptist Convention's program.

In the last half of the nineteenth century, interest in young people had begun to develop. As in the case of missions, Sunday schools, Bible distribution, and other phases of religious activity customary in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the several denominations did not, as such, carry on this particular work. There was not enough interest on the part of members of any one denomination to conceive and develop a denominational program in any one, much less in all, of those lines of activity. None of the ecclesiastical bodies in Europe had such programs. As a consequence, when interest in any phase of religious work developed — missions, education, philanthropy — within a church body, a “society” for that specific work was formed — the sequence being: first, an interdenominational or nondenominational society; and second, denominational societies. American Christians followed the method originated in and received from Europe.

### **INTERDENOMINATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

In 1844, the Young Men's Christian Association was formed in London, by George Williams, to care for the moral and religious welfare of clerks and other young men who were neglected by church organizations of that city. This was one of the nondenominational societies formed for a specific objective. Interest in the enlistment and training of youth increased in England and America. After the War Between the States, religious interest took several practical directions in this country.

The Interdenominational Sunday School Movement had its rise (largely due to a Baptist layman, B.F. Jacobs) in the early 1870's. The methods in evangelism begun and developed by Dwight L. Moody influenced all evangelical denominations. Varying and divergent methods were tried within and among different denominations to interest young people. In congregations of different denominational groups, societies of young people were formed under different names and of different types. Even within the same denomination, the names of local unions varied. With the enlarging interest in and among young people, the second step in the development was a combination of several societies in a local area. The third step was the formation of a national or even an

international fellowship. The denominational and interdenominational developments paralleled each other.

One of the first, if not the very first, combinations of local societies of young people arose in Brooklyn, New York. A young people's association was formed in the First Baptist Church, Pierrepont Street, in 1867. Similar organizations were formed in other Baptist churches of the area. In October, 1876, fifteen leaders, from eight associations in as many Baptist congregations, met to consider the formation of a larger fellowship of young people. Discussions during the following year resulted in the formation of the Young People's Baptist Union of Brooklyn.<sup>f342</sup> The membership continued to increase showing that the times were ripe for such a movement.

## **CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR**

Among other denominations, also, comparable developments were taking place, leading toward young people's organizations co-extensive with each denomination. But the momentum necessary for such results was secured through an interdenominational fellowship. Pastor F.E. Clark of the Williston Congregational Church of Portland, Maine, desired to interest his young people in religion primarily.

It was supposed in many churches that young people especially must be coaxed and wheedled into being religious, and the literary society, and the mutual improvement club, and the musical soiree were often relied upon to win young people to the church, and to hold them in filial loyalty to the church after their conversion. ... The young people, though for a little while attracted by the literary society, or the musical, or the different colored teas and variety entertainments, soon lost their interest in them when the novelty wore off. ... In despair over these light and trivial methods of winning the young people, the Society of Christian Endeavor started off with a different aim, a higher purpose, and far more strenuous methods than any that had been tried in the past.<sup>f343</sup>

This first Society of Christian Endeavor was formed by Pastor Clark, February 2, 1881. Hitherto there had not been sufficient momentum in the efforts based on a religious objective. Perhaps better said, the efforts based on the higher objectives were not correlated. Within a decade, the Christian Endeavor Movement overlapped denominational and national boundaries.

As in the case of missionary activity, at home and abroad, Sun-day schools, and work among college students, this interdenominational or nondenominational movement aroused and developed interest and activity within denominational limits. Congregationalists and Presbyterians continued

to use the name “Christian Endeavor.” Some congregations in other denominations also use the name.

Within fifteen years, at least nine of the major Protestant denominational bodies had formed organizations for their young people, as follows: The Brotherhood of St. Andrew (Episcopal), 1883; The Epworth League (Methodist), 1889; Baptist Young People’s Union of America, 1891; the Walther League (Lutheran), 1893; Baptist Young People’s Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention, 1895; the Luther League of America, 1895; The Young People’s Religious Union (Unitarian), 1896; The Junior Daughters of the King (Episcopal), 1896.

## **BAPTIST YOUNG PEOPLE’S UNION OF AMERICA**

The Baptist Young People’s Union of America was the result of momentum developed in a series of movements. Christian Endeavor societies were formed in Baptist churches, especially in the Eastern states, and became more and more popular. In the West and Northwest, Baptist leaders thought that such societies were not adequately meeting the need. Consequently, strictly Baptist organizations were formed, bearing different names, such as Loyalists, Judson Leagues, Baptist Unions, etc. In some of the West-ern states, state organizations were formed. The leaders of the Loyalists began the publication of a paper in Chicago as the organ of that movement. In the West, this movement predominated among Baptist young people; in the East, the Christian Endeavor took the lead.

The Chicago Loyalist paper was turned over to the American Baptist Publication Society. To allay friction and to forward work among young people, the secretary of the Publication Society called a conference of Baptist leaders from all sections in May, 1891. At this conference, it was agreed that *names* should not divide, that all would join in a new national organization, each local group using whatever name it desired. In July, 1891, at Chicago, the Baptist Young People’s Union of America was formed. “Within the Union, Christian Endeavor Societies, Loyalist Societies, Societies bearing the name of Young People’s Unions and societies bearing no special names, were to stand on the platform of an absolute equality.”<sup>f344</sup> As the name indicates, the field of this Union was the United States and Canada.

## **BAPTIST YOUNG PEOPLE’S UNION SENTIMENT IN THE SOUTH**

In the North, there was no Baptist denominational convention to foster this work among the young people; furthermore, there was no sentiment in favor of such a convention.<sup>f345</sup> Therefore, the Baptist Young People’s Union of

America arose and continued to function as another of those independent “societies.” The geographical area was North America, and the movement began to gain headway in the South. Local unions were being formed in churches, and statewide conventions began to be held. <sup>f346</sup> The local unions in the South were grouped into a department — known as the Department of the Green — within the Baptist Young People’s Union of America.

It was at this period — the last decade of the century — that a vigorous corporate consciousness was developing within the life of the Southern Convention. Dr. Tichenor’s program of rehabilitating the home front, begun in 1882, was bearing fruit. <sup>f347</sup> Consolidation was taking place within states, leading to vigorous Baptist state conventions (e.g., Texas, 1886). In such an era of self-consciousness and aggressiveness, leaders in the Southern Convention saw an independent, self-governing society, interdenominational and international in scope, winning the young people of the churches that were allied with the Convention.

The Sunday School Board of the Convention had just been established and had not yet proved its right to be. If Southern Baptist Sunday schools used literature published in Philadelphia and the young people of Southern churches were formed into unions allied with a society wholly apart from the Southern Convention, what would be the future of the Convention? That body cautiously took cognizance of the young people’s movement, in 1893, in the following report: <sup>f348</sup>

- 1.** That already many of the churches have inaugurated movements to secure the increased spirituality of our Baptist young people; their stimulation in Christian service; their edification in Scripture knowledge; their instruction in Baptist doctrine and history; and their enlistment in all forms of missionary activities through existing denominational organizations.
- 2.** That wherever in the judgment of the local church a society specially for the training of its young people would be helpful and expedient, we recommend that such societies be constituted as are strictly Baptist and denominational and be under the sole authority of the local church without interdenominational affiliation.
- 3.** In order that such literature as may be needed in attaining the ends had in view in these movements may be easily available to the churches, the Sunday-school Board be requested to provide the literature suitable for the purposes above mentioned and place the same where it may be needed.

The only opposition appeared to be from Landmark influence, which was always hesitant about the Convention’s going into larger spheres of activity. The Gospel Mission movement was in full swing, and the reference in the first resolution to “Their enlistment in all forms of missionary activities through

existing denominational organizations” would normally arouse the Landmarkers. However, the entire resolution, offered by Dr. Henry McDonald of Atlanta was adopted — the first concerning Baptist Young People’s Union work ever adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention. <sup>f349</sup>

In 1894 a longer and stronger set of resolutions was submitted to the Convention and adopted. <sup>f350</sup> These resolutions were more detailed and specific, indicating the progress of the movement in and among the churches.

It is many years since the need of specific work for young people began to impress itself upon pastors and churches. By the force of felt need the movement began to extend and the last few years have seen a marvelous increase in the number of societies and efficiency of work. There can be no doubt of the value and permanency of this movement where wisely directed. At its last session the Convention gave its approval to this line of effort when denominational and as controlled and directed by the churches. Under the conditions as now existing satisfactory progress has been made. In view of this your committee would offer the following suggestions:

WHEREAS, There is at this time a widespread movement in the direction of the organization of Christian young people into societies for various kinds of study and work; and

WHEREAS, This movement, so far as concerns the young people of our churches, gives promise of great good if wisely directed; therefore,

*Resolved*, 1. That the Convention call the attention of the churches to this movement, suggesting to them the advisability of taking the direction thereof each within itself.

*Resolved*, 2. That we recommend to the churches the organization, where practicable, of young people’s societies, unions, or whatever they may be called, or at least the holding of young people’s meetings, in which the young people shall be aided in the study of the Bible, our denominational history and doctrines, and of the work being carried on by us as a denomination; and in which they shall be stimulated to effort in the development of Christian character and activity.

*Resolved*, 3. We recommend that these societies, unions, or meetings, as the case may be, shall be strictly denominational, and shall be under the control and direction of the local churches. ...

*Resolved*, 4. That all questions concerning the form these organizations shall take, and their combining into Associational, State, or more general organizations, ought to be determined entirely by the local church to which they belong. ...

*Resolved, 7.* That we suggest to the Sunday-school Board the preparation for distribution of such literature as shall be suitable for use in the organization and conduct of Young People's Societies. ...

As indicated in the fourth resolution, sentiment was developing to combine the young people's societies, organized first in local churches, into larger groups, coterminous with associations, state conventions, and even with the Southern Convention. This sentiment seemed to be stronger in the Eastern part of the territory of the Convention. Opposition seemed to be mainly west of the Alleghanies. <sup>f351</sup>

A call, signed by several prominent Southern Baptist leaders, was issued for those interested to meet in the First Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., Thursday morning, May 9, 1895, pre-ceding the session of the Convention. <sup>f352</sup> A large and representative gathering assembled. Dr. R.H. Pitt of Virginia introduced resolutions calling for a general organization of the young people of Southern Baptist churches. The discussion indicated four attitudes on the question:

1. Those who were opposed to any organization of young people;
2. Those who favored working within the Baptist Young People's Union of America;
3. Those who favored a Baptist Young People's Union, auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention and fraternal in attitude toward the Baptist Young People's Union of America;
4. Those who favored the Convention's taking control and organizing some agency to direct the work among young people, as it was doing in missions and Sunday school work. This group were few in number and not vocal in the meeting. <sup>f353</sup>

The movement to organize was defeated by a vote of 215 to 164. The representatives of the first and second attitudes, al-though widely separated in sentiment, combined to defeat any sort of general organization of young people in the South. But the proponents of a general organization among Baptist young people of the South would not acknowledge defeat. A battle had been lost — at least, the first skirmish — but the objective was worth a continued campaign.

General organizations conforming to state boundaries had al-ready been formed in several states and seemed to be rendering good service. Some of these state organizations were satisfied with affiliation with the Baptist Young People's Union of America, but leaders in several of these state organizations continued to advocate a Southwide organization. The Georgia State B.Y.P.U.

met in Macon in September, 1895. Among Georgia denominational leaders present, whose influence was Southwide, were President J.B. Gambrell <sup>f354</sup> of Mercer University, J.B. Hawthorne, J.L. White, Henry McDonald and T.W. O'Kelly — all well-known pastors. The Convention unanimously adopted the following:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this Georgia Young People's Convention that the cause would be greatly advanced by the organization of a Southern Baptist Young People's Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention. We therefore request the following brethren from this and other states to take this matter under consideration, and if it seems wise to them and any others they might consult, to issue a call for a meeting of delegates from the Baptist churches within the bounds of the Southern Baptist Convention to meet at a suitable place and time for the organization of such a Southern Baptist Young People's Union:

Four ministers in Georgia and two in each of twelve other states — twenty-eight — were requested to consider the question and decide upon a course of action. <sup>f355</sup>

This committee issued a call for those interested in forming an organization of Baptist young people in the South to meet in the First Baptist Church, Atlanta, November 21, 1895. When the delegates assembled, there were 236 from ten states — 210 from four states (Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee) and twenty-six from six states (Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia). Three messages were read to the body. From Richmond, Virginia, came a message from the "Executive Committee of the Department of the Green appointed by the Southern delegates present at the fifth International Convention of the B.Y.P.U.A.," requesting that Southern Baptist young people organize a Southern department of the B.Y.P.U.A., under the absolute control of Southern Baptists.

From the state Baptist Young People's Union of Maryland came a request not to organize "a separate Southern Baptist Young People's Union in connection with the Southern Baptist Convention," because the decision at the conference at Washington the preceding May "ought to be accepted as the final decision of the denomination," since the constitutions of local unions in the several states made provision for co-operative alignment in the work of the Southern Convention. "We beg the brethren interested to pause in the separating work, and consecrate their talents, their zeal and their prayers to the glorious cause of bringing all the young Baptists of the South into loving harmony and union with their brethren throughout the land." A similar request from the Baptist Young People's Union of Missouri, based on the conditions in Missouri as a border state, was read.

## BAPTIST YOUNG PEOPLE'S UNION, AUXILIARY TO SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

After much parliamentary wrangling and discussion concerning the purpose of the meeting in Atlanta — whether it had convened to decide if Southern Baptist young people should organize, or if it had met for the purpose of organizing — there was formed the *Baptist Young People's Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention*. The annual meetings should be held in connection with the annual meetings of the Southern Baptist Convention, except when otherwise directed by the Board of Directors of the Union. The constitution provided, "It shall be the aim of the union to maintain friendly and fraternal relations with the kindred Baptist organization, the Baptist Young People's Union of America." The election of officers under the constitution was deferred until the first annual meeting of the Union immediately preceding the session of the Southern Baptist Convention in Chattanooga, May, 1896.

The Southern Convention recognized the need of and

The increased interest in the Christian culture of the younger members of the churches. ...

... The importance of establishing and securing this work in the local church is of far higher value than any subsequent question of alliance with this or that general organization. Amid the many agencies to aid in this work, we are glad to recognize the recently formed Young People's Union for the furtherance of this cause in our churches in the South, and hope that it may accomplish all the good which is contemplated by its friends.

Whatever divergence of views may exist in regard to general organizations, let all seek to cultivate the spirit of peace and fraternal goodwill, avoiding that which would mar the work in which all may honestly and hopefully engage.

f356

The newly organized Union was another one of those independent, self-governing societies, numerous in Baptist history, each with a specific objective and method of work. Its relation to the Southern Convention was at first nebulous. As the Union proved its place in Southern Baptist life and work, it was drawn more closely to the Convention and its relation to that body became clearer. The minutes of the sixth annual meeting of the Union, held in New Orleans, were published with the minutes of the Convention in 1901. A report of the Baptist Young People's work was made to the Convention in 1902. From year to year the relationship became more intimate. f357

Since Dr. J.M. Frost was one of the promoters of the formation of the B.Y.P.U., the Sunday School Board, of which he was secretary, worked closely with and fostered the work of the Union. This intimacy grew until the

B.Y.P.U. disappeared as a separate organization. From 1910 onward, the officers and executive committee of the B.Y.P.U. were elected by the Southern Baptist Convention.

## **BAPTIST YOUNG PEOPLE'S UNION WORK INCORPORATED IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD**

Finally in 1918, on the eve of the tremendous consolidation within the life and work of the Convention, the Baptist Young People's Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention, was disbanded and its work ultimately was wholly incorporated into the work of the Sunday School Board of the Convention. The approval of the young people's work, in 1893, seemed to be the first positive step of the Convention into a realization of the principle incorporated in Article V of the constitution; the absorption of the Union by the Convention seemed to be the initiation of the complete realization of that principle, illustrated in the new legal interpretation of the charter of the Convention (1944, p. 11). <sup>f358</sup> In the act of absorption, in 1918, was consummated the desire of the least vocal group in the conference in Washington, May 9, 1895, a group so small and so quiet that Dr. Frost and Dr. Gambrell, leaders in the forward movement, did not recognize it as a distinct group. <sup>f359</sup>

As a further evidence of the growing life and activity of the interests of the Convention, the young people's work in the local churches was expanded into the "General B.Y.P.U. Organization" including adults (1925). <sup>f360</sup> In its report to the Convention in 1929, it set forth its fundamental principles, stating:

The B.Y.P.U. sets itself whole-heartedly to the task of training its members in doctrine and in active participation in the world-wide missionary program of the Southern Baptist Convention. ...

An adult organization, called the Baptist Adult Union, is provided for those above the age of thirty.

... We commend the General B.Y.P.U. Organization as the best instrument known for finding and developing that leadership. An efficient General Organization can enlist and train in the Senior B.Y.P.U. and Baptist Adult Union all the leaders needed. <sup>f361</sup>

As the general objective of enlistment and training came to be better visualized, the name was changed, in 1934, to the Baptist Training Union. <sup>f362</sup> Year by year, this great objective was more clearly stated. The general objectives are:

1. To establish the Baptist Training Union more thoroughly in the thinking of our people as the church program for the training of all church members and

as an essential element in the Christian educational program of every Baptist church.

2. To make substantial progress in the enlistment of all our people in all our church and denominational life through a permanently effective means of enlistment, namely the training process.
3. To present God's challenge to our young Christians to meet the demands of the new day with a complete dedication of their lives to the Master in any life calling into which he might direct them, and to be ready at all times to respond to his call to preach the gospel at home or in the uttermost part of the earth, or to enter any other field of Christian service as a vocation.
4. To fortify our people with the truth and equip them better through Christian training to meet the issues — social, political and religious — of the complex age in which we live. <sup>f363</sup>

The purpose to which the Training Union is dedicated is expressed in the following terms;

- “1. Growth in Christian Intelligence;
2. Development of Christian Character;
3. Development in Christian Efficiency;
4. Growth in Church and Denominational Loyalty.” <sup>f364</sup>

At the end of the first half-century of Convention life, Southern Baptists began definite steps toward a membership-training program: the Woman's Missionary Union, the Sunday School Board, the Baptist Young People's Union. <sup>f365</sup> By the end of the first century, provision had been made for training and enlisting the entire church membership: Sunbeams, Girls' Auxiliary, Royal Ambassadors, Young Woman's Auxiliary, Woman's Missionary Society, Baptist Brotherhood, Baptist Training Union, and Sunday School. A Junior Baptist Brotherhood to parallel the Y.W.A. may be in the making.

## **BAPTIST STUDENTS**

In the second decade of the twentieth century, there appeared to a few leaders a serious lack in the training program of Southern Baptists. Young people grew up in the churches, being taught and trained in the several organizations and classes suitable to their ages and development. But when they entered college, the de-nomination had no provision for them. In Baptist colleges, the denominational atmosphere, supposed to prevail, was expected to hold the student to proper attitudes. In college classes, he was expected to receive the right instruction. The Baptist church on or near the campus was the center around which the religious atmosphere was articulated. In other than Baptist institutions, the Baptist church nearest the campus was supposed to meet all the religious needs of the students. But even in Baptist churches, near some

Baptist campuses, there were no Baptist Young People's Unions. The religious life of Baptist students in many denominational and nondenominational colleges was directed by the Y.M.C.A. and Student Volunteer Movement.

## **BAPTIST STUDENT MISSIONARY MOVEMENT**

In May, 1914, some Baptist schoolmen, in attendance on the Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tennessee, conferred on the question of meeting the denominational need on college campuses. In July, a similar conference was held in Waco, Texas. At a third conference in Fort Worth, Texas, the Baptist Student Missionary Movement of North America was launched, November 16, 1914, on its short but momentous career. Rev. Charles T. Ball, professor of missions in the Southwestern Seminary, was the leader in the movement and became chairman of the group promoting it. Professor Ball was granted leave of absence for six weeks during the third quarter (February and March) to travel in the interest of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement.<sup>f366</sup> This movement covered the United States and Canada. Headquarters were established at Seminary Hill, Fort Worth, Texas. An executive committee of seven, of which Professor Ball was chairman, had general direction. Plans were laid to gather students in state and national conventions from the colleges of Canada and the United States.

The first convention was held in Fort Worth, March 22-26, 1916. The speakers were from the North, the South, Canada, and mission fields. The student attendance was not so widely representative, but, for the first international convention of a new movement, it was considered a success and indicative of the need of such work on college campuses as was contemplated by the new movement.<sup>f367</sup> The second and larger convention was held a year later. Of that meeting, Dr. Gaines Dobbins, editor of *Home and Foreign Fields*, wrote in the March issue:

Two of the most significant gatherings held in recent years by Baptists were the conventions of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement, the one held in Fort Worth, Texas, one year ago, and the other in Louisville, Kentucky, January 31 to February 4, 1917.

The fact of the coming together of these more than five hundred young men and women from Baptist schools of North America is highly noteworthy, but that they should have met for five days' study and conference with the subject of missions the one supreme concern is a fact the significance of which can scarcely be overestimated.

Plans were perfected looking to the perpetuation of the organization, with increased scope of purpose and usefulness. Two years hence a third conference is being planned,<sup>f368</sup> at which it is expected that more than a

thousand students will be in attendance. In the meantime an adequate organization, with headquarters at Fort Worth, Texas, will conserve the influences that have gone out from the Louisville meeting, endeavoring to make the organization one of the most powerful of missionary factors through its work among the Baptist students of North America.

Reports of some of the notable addresses will appear in an early issue of *Home and Foreign Fields*.<sup>f369</sup>

Dr. Ball was influenced by his interest in the Student Volunteer Movement and, in a measure, followed the plans and methods of that organization. It was just at that time that the Student Volunteer Movement was declining in interest and influence under pressure of “modernism” and the growing social concern (“the social gospel”), so that Baptists were open to a denominational organization.

In the issue of *Home and Foreign Fields* for November, 1917, Professor Ball, wrote at length on the history, purposes, and plans of the new movement. The purposes, as declared by the Louisville Convention, he presents as follows:<sup>f370</sup>

“1. The stimulation, development and maintenance among all Baptist students in North America of an intelligent and aggressive interest in missions at home and abroad.

“2. The securing among all Baptist students of the best possible preparation for effective Christian service.

“3. The aiding of Baptist mission boards and societies in calling out and securing a sufficient number of students to meet the needs of the various lines of work they are undertaking.

“4. The helping of all Baptist students to realize the responsibility resting upon them to promote by prayer, by gifts and by every other proper method the missionary enterprise at home and abroad.”<sup>f371</sup>

In January, 1917, publication of the *Baptist Student* as the organ of the new movement was begun, to be published monthly from October to June, inclusive. In January, 1918, it changed to a quarterly. It dealt with students and student life and contained news items from the Baptist schools of North America. The scope of the field covered by the articles widened with each issue of the magazine, indicating the widening of the purpose and objective of the movement.

The first issue of the *Baptist Student* announced the appointment of Miss Rachel C. Sims of North Carolina as student secretary for women in the schools of North America. She assumed her duties October 1, 1916, and worked for one year. Rev. A.L. Aulick and Mrs. Aulick became student secretaries, November 1, 1917. Mr. Aulick gathered information concerning

Baptist students in denominational and nondenominational schools, held conferences with students, and called conventions of students within states. Mrs. Aulick gave special attention to the preparation of suggested programs for Baptist Student mission bands, based upon reference studies in a “mission library,” composed of missionary literature available through the office of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement, Fort Worth.<sup>f372</sup> They worked singly and together among Baptist students in any type of college — state, independent, or denominational. General Secretary Ball and Assistant Secretary Mrs. Berta K. Spooner also gave much time and effort to the same sort of work among students in addition to administrative duties. Some of this work among students was conducted in schools in the North, but most of it was in the schools within the territory of the Southern Convention.

The progress of the activities of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement of North America aroused the interest of Southern Baptists in Baptist young people enrolled in colleges of every sort. Previous to the projection of the Movement, no work had been done for Baptist students in Baptist or non-Baptist institutions by the denominational agencies. Any such work was left to the churches near the campuses. Very little was attempted even by churches adjacent to campuses of Baptist colleges. The work of Mr. and Mrs. Aulick, the reports of campus activities in the *Baptist Student*, and the enthusiasm engendered by the international conventions at Fort Worth and Louisville and by conventions within the states, showed both the need, the opportunity, and what could be accomplished.

A comprehensive survey of the Baptist student situation in the United States and Canada, based upon questionnaires answered by three-fourths of the Baptist and state schools and many schools of all denominations, published in the *Baptist Student*, April, 1920, revealed detailed information from every part of the continent concerning the total enrolment, the number of students for the ministry, volunteers for mission work, number enrolled in mission study — both voluntary and curriculum requirement — and other statistical information.

Enthusiastic state conventions of students aroused interest among Baptist leaders in some of the states. In November, 1919, the Mississippi State Convention,<sup>f373</sup> instructed the Board to elect a student secretary to work under the direction of the state mission secretary. In December, 1919, the Baptist General Convention of Texas<sup>f374</sup> took similar action. The committee making the recommendation to the Texas Convention closed its report in these words: “The committee desired to express its approval of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement. The proposed Student Secretary would in no way conflict with that movement and would co-operate with and strengthen this as

all other special efforts.” The executive board reported to the Convention, November 11, 1920:

Last year this convention instructed your Board to inaugurate the Baptist Student Work. ... The Board ... elected Rev. J.P. Boone as Student Secretary. (He began work April 1, 1920). ... The Student Conference was held in connection with the Palacios Encampment (1920). As a result of the conference a Baptist organization was worked out. This organization is called the Baptist Student Union.

It was at this juncture that the Seventy-five Million Campaign was launched by the Southern Baptist Convention. The methods of the Baptist Student Movement, combined with the fervor and momentum of the Campaign, led the Foreign Mission Board to hold three sectional conferences of and for students in Greenville, South Carolina; Louisville, Kentucky; and Fort Worth, Texas, in the spring of 1920. Secretary J.F. Love of the Foreign Mission Board, set forth these lessons learned from these conferences:

- 1.** One of the marks of the new day into which Southern Baptists have come is the evident moving of the Spirit of God upon the student life of the South. ...
- 2.** The Conferences have revealed that it is highly important that the Foreign Mission Board shall cultivate a close acquaintance with the student life of the South, and that these students crave the personal touch with the Board and its missionaries. ...
- 3.** There is a lesson to be drawn from these Conferences which those in charge of our schools and our home churches should not miss. These young people need and respond to personal attention. They have spiritual aspirations, pulsing desires for Christian service. ...
- 4.** Southern Baptists are regaining some of the things which they have lost. ... The Lord is again visiting our schools and the hearts of young men and women are turning to the mission fields. ... <sup>f375</sup>

Attention has been called in previous chapters to the two methods of co-operative work in the history of Baptists — the independent society method and the all-comprehensive convention method.

According to Dr. Ball, the founder of the student movement, the Baptist Student Missionary Movement continued its work, so far as means at its disposal would permit, until the meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention in Washington, D.C., May, 1920. At that time, the Foreign, Home, Sunday School, and Education boards included in their reports to the Convention a resolution calling for the appointment of one member from each of these boards, co-operating with the Woman’s Missionary Union which was also to

appoint one representative, making five in all, to have charge of student activities in the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Because of this action by the Convention, the Baptist Student Missionary Movement entered into an agreement with the five general boards to turn over to them the work which the movement had been doing in the Southland, three of these boards — the Home, Foreign, and Sunday School — agreeing to meet certain financial obligations incurred by the movement during the Seventy-five Million Campaign. It was not thought best to try to raise money independently for the movement after the campaign started. Since the movement was launched as a North American enterprise, it was thought best not to include it in the campaign. <sup>f376</sup>

The termination of the work of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement and the creation of an agency of the Convention to do similar work resulted from a practical problem as well as from a question of ecciesiology. The problem had to do with the approach to and the work with students in the colleges. In reports to the Convention in 1920, three of the boards stated that, in several recent information conferences, the question had been given ear-nest and prayerful consideration by Brethren B.D. Gray of the Home Mission Board, J.F. Love and T.B. Ray of the Foreign Mission Board, I.J. Van Ness of the Sunday School Board, and J.E. Dillard of the Education Board. Desiring to make such an appeal to the students that would be listened to and welcomed by college officials and students, representatives of the boards concerned considered the best way to proceed.

## **INTER-BOARD COMMISSION**

There was uncertainty concerning the proposed new method of student work. The Convention adopted the reports of the four boards, but there was not agreement in the plans proposed in the several reports. The Foreign, Home, and Sunday School boards proposed an interboard commission to direct the student work; the Education Board had plans of its own. The Convention approved both proposed plans by adopting the report of each of the boards. The uncertainty in the plans of the Convention and the time required to perfect any new plan brought delay and loss of a school year.

The Baptist Student Missionary Movement closed its work in June, 1920. For the school year, 1920-1921 there was no South-wide work among the students. Some state conventions, Texas, for example, had already laid plans before the close of the work of the Baptist Student Movement and proceeded with those plans. Complaint was made that one Southwide plan was given up, but no other had been projected. <sup>f377</sup> The report of the Foreign Mission Board in 1921 recognized this criticism and replied: <sup>f378</sup>

The Boards are in conference and are progressing as rapidly as possible in working out their joint scheme for college activities in accordance with the plans approved by the Convention last year. This work is esteemed to be one of great importance to the development of the young Baptist life represented in the schools of the South, and the Boards desire to move cautiously and wisely into this work, taking time to perfect their plans before announcing them, or attempting to put them into operation. Meanwhile, close touch is being kept with the student life through the respective organizations of the several Boards and the State student agencies. A special committee has already decided that the work shall be conducted through an interboard committee, which shall include representation from the W.M.U.; that there shall be definite headquarters; that a secretary and a woman student worker shall be elected; and a student magazine shall be provided. These decisions will be presented to the respective Boards for ratification.

As indicated in this quotation from the report of the Foreign Mission Board, the organization of the new method of student work was being set up. The Inter-Board Commission — B.D. Gray, Home Board, chairman; I.J. Van Ness, Sunday School Board, secretary; T.B. Ray, Foreign Mission Board; W.C. James, Education Board; Miss Kathleen Mallory, Woman's Missionary Union — met in Atlanta, April 15, 1921, and planned the work of the Commission, making recommendation to the Convention concerning details of organization and work. In November, Memphis was selected by the Inter-Board Commission as headquarters and Mr. Frank H. Leavell was elected the executive secretary. He began work January 1, 1922.

Gradually, as the Commission and Mr. Leavell acquired knowledge of the situation and perfected plans and methods to meet and seize the opportunities on the college campuses, the slack that had appeared since the termination of the Baptist Student Missionary Movement disappeared. The means and methods previously used were adopted and extended. The program announced was to

promote study courses annually or semi-annually; hold state student conferences annually; issue attractive poster announcements monthly; promote vital student group meetings weekly and monthly, dedication services yearly, mission study monthly, visitation by outstanding denominational leaders annually, semi-annually or quarterly; provide a new or much improved college literature; a more definite and positive organization for volunteers; state-wide conventions for volunteers annually; great inspirational South-wide student conventions bi-annually. <sup>f379</sup>

During the first year the work was projected along the lines indicated by Mr. Leavell. A monthly magazine, *The Baptist Student*, <sup>f380</sup> was begun in September, 1922, which has proved its worth as a medium of information and inspiration to thousands of students.

## **BAPTIST STUDENT UNION**

The Inter-Board Commission worked with the state convention agencies in the several states to enlarge and develop the religious program for students. Full-time student secretaries for college campuses were employed. Adjacent to many state college campuses, Bible professorships or professorships in religion have been established by state conventions. Courses offered are credited on college degree. Thus, the Southern Baptist Student program provides the Christian element in general educational training, an element that cannot be provided by the state college. At the same time, the personal religious life and activity of students in Baptist and non-Baptist schools have been encouraged by the program of the Inter-Board Commission in co-operation with the work of the state convention student program.

## **TRANSFERRED TO THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD**

In 1928, the Southern Convention transferred the student work to the Sunday School Board. The Inter-Board Commission was abolished, but the office, the personnel, and the program were moved intact to Nashville and made a part of the sphere of activity of the Sunday School Board. The name used in Texas since 1920 — Baptist Student Union — for the organization covering local campus religious activity was adopted.

Thus, the Convention has placed the major part of its program of enlistment and training — the Sunday school, the Baptist Training Union, the Baptist Student Union — under one agency for minimum of expense and maximum of efficiency and results. This program in the churches, however, is shared by the Baptist Brotherhood of the South ( another Convention agency) in reaching the men, and by Woman's Missionary Union (a separate organization) in reaching and training the women and children. With the possible exception of the younger men, an enlistment and training agency has been provided by the Convention and the Woman's Missionary Union for every age, from infancy to old age. In some churches Junior Brotherhoods may be in the making.

## **RIDGECREST**

At the 1907 meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, former Governor Northen of Georgia offered the resolution that was to instigate the establishment of what, in later years, came to be the Ridgecrest Baptist Assembly. But that was not the real beginning of Ridgecrest.

As far back as 1895, about the time that he became the leader of Baptist Sunday school forces in North Carolina, Dr. B.W. Spilman dreamed of a Baptist assembly for North Carolina. Later, when he was elected state

secretary of that work, he visited three sites in East Tennessee, seeking an attractive location, suitable also for a Southwide general assembly, but nothing developed from those exploratory trips. In 1902, while attending the state Sunday School Training School at Montreat, his conviction deepened that Baptists should have something on the same order. At the North Carolina Convention in 1905, Dr. Spilman asked that a committee be appointed to investigate the possibility and to re-port to that body the following year. As a result of that step, 940 acres of land were purchased in the Swannanoa Gap area and incorporated by the North Carolina Baptist Convention in 1907.

It was in response to an invitation from North Carolina that the Southern Convention approve the plan that Mr. Northen submitted his resolution: "That at the request of the North Carolina Baptist State Convention, the Southern Baptist Convention does hereby endorse the movement without assuming any financial responsibility." Dr. Spilman, the first field secretary of the Sunday School Board, was chosen as the first general secretary of the Ridgecrest Baptist Assembly. The first conference was held in 1909, with emphasis on Sunday schools, B.Y.P.U., missions, lay-men, Bible conferences, and preaching.

There were many struggles in those early years. After some discussion, final agreement on the present name, the Ridgecrest Baptist Assembly, was reached in April, 1912. Near the close of World War I, its management and control passed into the hands of the Education Board of the Southern Convention which, during its life, 1919-1928, handled the properties and programs. After the dissolution of the Education Board, the Executive Committee of the Southern Convention arranged for the Sunday School Board to operate Ridgecrest, with such arrangement renewed from time to time until, in 1944, the Convention transferred to the Sunday School Board all its property at Ridgecrest.

Sources: *Annuals*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1907-1944; Prince Burroughs, *Fifty Fruitful Years* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1941), pp. 188-189; J.M. Price, *Baptist Leaders in Religious Education* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1943), p. 136; Hight C. Moore, "The Dream and the Dawn," *Baptist Quarterly Review*, April-June, 1948, pp. 48-56; C. Sylvester Green, *B.W. Spilman* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1953).

## 13. — WIDENING AREAS OF CHRISTIAN TRAINING AND SERVICE

We must not forget the high purpose and keen foresight of the fathers who constituted the Southern Baptist Convention. With rare discernment, they laid foundations on which might be builded institutions and interests that would fulfil Christ's pro-gram of teaching, preaching, and healing. They were men of vision who, in drafting the constitution for the new Convention, provided for theological schools, publication of Christian literature, and unselfish ministry to the physical, spiritual, and cultural needs of the men, women, and children whom they sought to serve.

We have already reviewed the early home and foreign world-missionary activities and the building of training schools for preachers and missionaries at home and abroad. That was only the beginning. Other seminaries were needed to join hands with the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. We shall always treasure the sentiment expressed by Dr. Broadus in a letter, dated July 14, 1943, from Dr. John R. Sampey to the author:

During the closing years of the life of Doctor Broadus, especially after the death of Doctor Basil Manly in January, 1892, he frequently invited me to join him in his afternoon walks. On one of these he said to me, "It will not be long before another theological seminary will be founded among Southern Baptists, and it will probably be in Texas." He then added to his young colleague one significant remark, "When the new seminary comes, it ought to be with the good will of the Southern Seminary."

It has been for me a real pleasure to follow the hint of my great teacher, and encourage the closest co-operation between the two seminaries.

### **BAYLOR THEOLOGICAL COURSES**

As the population of the South and the Baptist church membership increased, along with the development of the idea of theological training, the need that Professors Boyce and Broadus saw as a possibility became a reality. From 1860 to 1900, the population in Texas increased by 404.57 per cent. During the same period, Baptist church membership in that state increased by 1643.48 per cent. Many of the ministers were recruited, as were many of the church members, from other states.

But in 1841, early in their history, when there were very few small churches, Baptists formed the Texas Baptist Education Society. The Society established

the first Baylor University, at Independence, in 1845. The primary purpose was to train a ministry for the churches:

“The object of this Society was declared in the Constitution to be, ‘to assist in procuring an education for those young men who give evidence of being called of God to preach the Gospel, and who shall have the approbation of their respective churches.’” <sup>f381</sup>

In 1867, a School of Theology in Baylor was announced, but it was not opened until 1882. In that year, a theological course was announced as follows: “Students for the ministry are instructed in a special course of Biblical Literature, Sacred History, Christian Doctrine, Ecclesiastical History and Polity, and the Composition and Delivery of Sermons.” <sup>f382</sup> The death of President Crane, in 1885, meant the beginning of the end of old Baylor at Independence. <sup>f383</sup> The school finally merged with Waco University, Waco, Texas, December, 1885. Later, it was decided to retain the name of Baylor University.

Waco University, established in 1861, made provision for training young ministers, a procedure customary in all Baptist colleges for men at the time. Not until 1866 is there reference to a theological department. That year the trustees reported: “The theological department is in successful operation, and to young men preparing for the ministry superior advantages are afforded for lectures and instructions in theology.” <sup>f384</sup> In 1871, Dr. B.H. Carroll became pastor of the Waco Baptist Church. The next year, the catalogue announced: “Reverend B.H. Carroll, pastor of the Waco Baptist Church, became assistant to the president in the ‘Theological Department.’”

In August, 1886, *Baylor University at Waco* was chartered in contradistinction to *Baylor University* (the school chartered by the Republic of Texas), and was located at Waco. The consolidated school (Baylor and Waco), named Baylor University, <sup>f385</sup> continued a comparable program of ministerial training. In 1893 the trustees established the department of Bible teaching, covering a two year course: “The first year will be devoted to a study of all the books of the Bible, in their order. The second year correlates its more important teachings into a system of Doctrine and Discipline.” Dr. Carroll was in charge of the department. Arrangements were made for a series of lectures to ministerial students: On Pastoral Duties and Church Order, by Dr. R.C. Burleson; Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, by Dr. J.H. Luther; on other topics, by other lecturers, arranged by the president of the faculty and by Dr. Carroll.

In the following years Dr. Carroll’s name appears in the list of teachers as principal of the Bible school or the Bible department. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the need had so enlarged and sentiment so developed that a department of theology was created in 1901 with Dr. Carroll as dean and

professor of English Bible; Dr. Albert Henry Newman as professor of church history; and Dr. Robert N. Barrett, missions and other subjects. A curriculum leading to the degree of Bachelor of Theology was outlined. With some changes in the faculty, this program continued until 1905.

Early in 1905, Dr. Carroll, after much prayerful consideration, became convinced that the time had come to yield to the under-current demand, steadily increasing for fifteen years, to establish a full, first-class theological seminary. He devoted six weeks of the summer that year to raising an emergency fund of \$30,000.00 which would support the seminary for three years and thus, at the same time, serve the double purpose of giving the people an object lesson in the seminary's value and a demonstration of its feasibility. Having easily secured this fund by private canvass of a few individuals, he then submitted to the trustees of Baylor University the consideration of the propriety of creating a theological seminary as a distinct school of the University. On Dr. Carroll's personal guaranty of sustaining the seminary for three years without cost to the University, the trustees unanimously adopted the proposal.<sup>f386</sup> A faculty of five was selected for the seminary; some courses, offered by teachers in other departments of the University, were credited on the degrees in theology.

During the next two years, the Baylor Theological Seminary increased in popularity, and seminary sentiment developed. Friction arose in administrative matters between the president of the University and the dean. The whole problem came before the trustees. They adopted the following:

WACO, TEXAS, September 30, 1907 — Your committee appointed to suggest a plan to harmonize differences between the Literary and the Theological departments of the University, report as follows:

**1st.** We recommend that the Board of Trustees request the Convention to immediately incorporate the Seminary with its domicile at Waco until, if ever, it seems most to the interest of the Redeemer's Kingdom to remove it elsewhere.

**2nd.** That till its charter is obtained the Seminary be conducted under the same plan and arrangements now in operation.

**3rd.** That the charter name of the Seminary shall be such as to clearly differentiate it from Baylor University at Waco, Texas.

**4th.** That in case our request is granted by the Convention, the University will continue to furnish teaching quarters to the Seminary temporarily, till suitable accommodations can be provided for it.<sup>f387</sup>

## **SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

These resolutions from the trustees of Baylor University were presented to the Baptist General Convention and approved in 1907. Under this authority, a charter was secured, March 14, 1908, from the office of the Secretary of the State of Texas, creating the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. The Seminary graduated its first class June 24, 1908. Under instruction of the State Convention and through the courtesy of the authorities of Baylor University, the Seminary continued to use the facilities of the University until a permanent location should be secured. In the summer of 1910, the permanent home on Seminary Hill, on the southern edge of the city of Fort Worth, was occupied. Dr. B.H. Carroll continued as president of the Seminary until his death in 1914. Dr. L.R. Scarborough who, since 1908, had been professor of evangelism — the “Chair of Fire” as Dr. Carroll termed that department — was elected Dr. Carroll’s successor and served as president until his retirement in 1942 because of ill-health. In 1945, Dr. Scarborough passed to his glorious reward. Following his retirement, Dr. E.D. Head was elected president.

The Southwestern Seminary has pioneered in two directions in regard to personnel and in two directions in regard to courses of study. Coeducation became popular in the Southwest earlier than in the Southeast. The Seminary, in keeping with that atmosphere, opened its doors, its courses of study, and its degrees to women on exactly the same terms as to men. During the first full scholastic year of the Seminary, 1908-1909, twenty-six women were enrolled. In 1904, Dr. R.C. Buckner and others had opened, in Dallas, a training school for women. When the Seminary moved to Fort Worth, the Dallas training school was merged with it.

The Southwestern Seminary led the way in offering privileges of training for service to laymen also. From the beginning of its corporate existence, a few have taken advantage of its privileges, but with the increased demand in the churches and in denominational work for laymen the number has greatly increased. Especially has this been true since the development of the work in religious education and in sacred music.

The Seminary has led in two other directions also. About the time that Southwestern was in process of becoming a separate institution, the work in Sunday schools and among young people was gaining momentum. In 1906, the Southern Baptist Seminary established the department of Sunday school pedagogy, the first such full professorship in Christian history. Courses were offered in the Southwestern Seminary in connection with other departments until 1915. In that year Rev. J.M. Price became the head of the new department, the name of which was changed to religious education. The enlarging program of degrees indicates the expanding program in religious

education. In 1919, the degree of Bachelor of Religious Education was offered; in 1920, the degree of Master of Religious Education; and, in 1924, the degree of Doctor of Religious Education. In 1921, the department was enlarged into the School of Religious Education. The faculty in the department and School was enlarged from year to year to meet the enlarging program.

In the field of church music, also, the Southwestern Seminary led the way. From the beginning of the department, the aim has been to prepare men and women for effective service in the music life of the local church and the denomination. In 1915, Professor I.E. Reynolds was called to begin the work of the department. The developing program, with an increased faculty, indicates at once the need and the acceptance of the training of men and women for such work. The department was enlarged into the School of Gospel Music. In 1920, it began to offer the degree of Bachelor of Gospel Music and, in 1923, added the degree of Master of Gospel Music. In 1926, the School entered its new building, the George E. Cowden Music Hall, much of the cost of which was given by Mrs. George E. Cowden in memory of her husband.

At the Kansas City meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1923, the trustees of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, representing eleven Baptist state conventions — New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Southern Illinois, Florida, Mississippi and Texas — took the initial steps in approaching the Southern Baptist Convention with the proposal to transfer, to the Southern Baptist Convention, the ownership and control of Southwestern Seminary, the title of which was vested in the Baptist General Convention of Texas.<sup>f388</sup> In the 1924 session of the Southern Convention, the formal offer, with the concurrence of the eleven state conventions, was made to transfer to the Southern Baptist Convention the ownership and control of the Southwestern Seminary, and the Convention accepted the offer.<sup>f389</sup> At the 1925 Convention, a report was submitted concerning the legal phases involved in the transfer, together with copy of amended charter.<sup>f390</sup> At the 1926 Convention, the trustees of Southwestern Seminary reported that the charter had been properly amended to comport with the laws of Texas and that the matter of transfer was closed.<sup>f391</sup>

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary has made many notable contributions to the life and spirit of the Southern Baptist Convention. Many preachers, teachers, and missionaries have gone from the Schools of Theology, Religious Education, Gospel Music, and Missionary Training to bless the whole world. It was Dr. B.H. Carroll who, at the 1906 session of the Southern Baptist Convention, made a memorable address on evangelism which confirmed the Home Mission Board's policy on evangelism and gave a mighty impetus to evangelistic fervor throughout the South.

A tense situation had developed, based partly on personal issues. Dr. Carroll, frankly facing the evangelistic opportunity, prefaced his message with the observation, "While the boys were permitted to take a swim on the subject, they were not allowed to go near the water. Even the great commoner, J.B. Gambrell, was restive and embarrassed." Dr. Gambrell commenting on the situation said, "I never had as hard a time to make a speech so as to say a thing without mentioning it. I could not get upon the report and ride."

We quote from Dr. Carroll's description of a camp meeting in West Texas:

Stockmen worth millions gather on the boulders with their cowboys and hold their prayer meetings. ... A group of cowboys have ridden 200 miles to be present half a day. We meet them: "Have you come to be saved?" "Sure thing!" they reply. "But it must be done mighty quick; we start home at daylight." One service is sufficient. They hear, we pray, they are saved. That same night the whole camp gathers where we have dammed up the mountain stream; 1500 feet on either hand the precipitous sides of the canyon overhang. The full moon, in meridian at midnight, looks and glances itself in the baptismal waters which catch its sheen and ripple with smiles at its image ... the mountain stream ... becomes the monument, as its waters part, that carries up stairways of starlight and moonlight this story of hope to the disembodied saints in heaven. ...

If I were the secretary of this (Home) board, I would come before this body in humility and tears and say: "Brethren, give me evangelists. Deny not fins to things that swim against the tide, nor wings to things that must fly against the wind." <sup>f392</sup>

Dr. Carroll's successor, Dr. L.R. Scarborough, incarnated the spirit of evangelism as did no other man in his day. He was chosen by Southern Baptists to lead the Seventy-five Million Campaign when the goal was oversubscribed. He served as president of the Southern Baptist Convention in the years 1939 and 1940. Always and everywhere, he stressed co-operation and loyalty among Southern Baptists. The story is told that one day, during Dr. Carroll's last illness, he looked into the face of his young colleague and said, "Lee, keep the Seminary lashed to the cross. If heresy ever comes in the teaching, take it to the faculty. If they will not hear you and take prompt action, take it to the trustees of the Seminary. If they will not hear you, take it to the Convention that appoints the Board of Trustees, and if they will not hear you take it to the great common people of our churches. You will not fail to get a hearing then." He was ever faithful to that trust.

## **BAPTIST BIBLE INSTITUTE**

The city of New Orleans has long made an appeal to the Baptists of the United States and, especially, to the Baptists of the South. Its strategic importance and

missionary opportunities bore heavily upon them. In the first decade of the American Baptist Home Mission Society's life, Baptist leaders in the South complained that the Society was neglecting the Southwest. New Orleans was one of the places named in the complaints. This seeming neglect of that area by the Society entered into the division in 1845. <sup>f393</sup> New Orleans became one of the first mission fields of the Domestic Mission Board of the new Convention.

One of the early Baptists in New Orleans, Cornelius Paulding, took a leading place because of his zeal and his means. Among other things, he furnished a preaching place for the first Baptist missionary to the city, Rev. J.A. Raynoidson, 1817. In 1849, he expressed to Dr. Basil Manly, Sr., a desire to use his wealth in "doing something noble for the cause of religion and the Baptists." This brought forth a letter from Dr. Manly to his son, Basil, suggesting a Baptist college and a Baptist theological seminary in New Orleans.

What do you think of a great *Baptist College* for the South-West, to be located in New Orleans? The idea seems to me very rational, feasible, eligible. That is, and is to be, the place of chief commercial importance through the whole region drained by the Mississippi, — extending from the Chattahoochie to the Rio Grande, from Missouri to the Gulf. ... When we have once got our great college established there, endowed, officered, and in full motion, we will then place by its side a *first-rate* theological Institution, — for profound acquirements in the line. This must be on its own separate basis, and governed by a *different set of Trustees*. <sup>f394</sup>

Nothing resulted from Mr. Paulding's expressed desire and Dr. Manly's letter. Throughout the fifties, Dr. Manly and other leaders were developing sentiment in favor of a Southern seminary. Then the war and reconstruction left Southern Baptist institutions on the bare edge of existence. New Orleans was not forgotten, but all efforts available were expended to preserve church life. There was neither time nor means for a school.

In the first decade of the twentieth century, sentiment began again to arise in favor of a large program in New Orleans. Editor P.I. Lipsey of Mississippi wrote an editorial in his paper, *The Baptist Record*, on theological seminaries, in which he dealt at length with the need in New Orleans. About the same time, Dr. Charles Manly published his article, already quoted, on "The Rise of Seminary Sentiment Among Southern Baptists." Other South-ern Baptist papers took up the subject.

In order to see just how brethren throughout the section immediately surrounding New Orleans felt, an invitation was sent to a large number of brethren to meet to consider this matter at an hour during the meeting of the Houston convention. <sup>f395</sup> The result of the conference was that Brethren Dodd,

Christian, and Crutcher were asked to prepare a statement to be submitted to the conventions of Louisiana and Mississippi, and also to the Home Mission Board, asking for the appointment of a committee from each of these states to look into the advisability of such an institution, and take such other steps as might be deemed wise. ... The matter has received favorable comment from many sources, and was endorsed by Bible conferences at Clark Memorial School, at Hattiesburg, Mississippi, and the Southwestern Bible Conference at Shreveport, Louisiana. <sup>f396</sup>

The three committees were called for, and met with the pastors of New Orleans in the Coliseum Place Baptist Church, February 22, 1916.

The joint committee passed resolutions approving the establishment of such a school, outlining the scope of the Institute, and recommending that steps be taken at once to found it. At a mass meeting of the Baptists of New Orleans during this session of the joint committee resolutions were adopted pledging their cooperation in the founding of the school. ...

The Baptists of New Orleans, led by the pastors, decided that they would invite the Southern Baptist Convention to hold its 1917 session in that city. ...

... At that session of the Convention ... the memorial of the joint committee (recommended) establishing the Institute. This memorial was referred to a special committee (which) reported, recommending the establishment of the Training School, and the Convention unanimously and enthusiastically adopted the report. In this report recommendations were made for the Home Mission and the Sunday School Boards to cooperate with other interested bodies in establishing and safeguarding the Institute. <sup>f397</sup>

The members of the Board of Trustees were elected by the Southern Baptist Convention and nine state conventions. The full Board held its first session July 10, 1917, and chose the name Baptist Bible Institute. Rev. B.H. DeMent, Th.D., D.D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Greenwood, South Carolina, was elected president. The trustees learned that the old location of the Sophia Newcomb College was for sale and could be procured at less than half of a fair evaluation of the property. Thus, the Institute opened in September, 1918, on the campus on Washington Avenue, equipped with buildings built for school purposes — administration, library, chapel, dormitories. It has proved to be a great mission agency in the midst of the greatest mission field within the territory occupied by the Southern Baptist Convention.

Before the Baptist Bible Institute was opened, there were only six struggling Baptist churches in that city, and there was no Baptist church West, on the Southern Pacific, for more than 125 miles. The spiritual destitution was tragic. All of this has been changed under the tremendous spiritual impact of the teachers and students of that mighty missionary force witnessing in one of the

most challenging mission fields in the South. Today, throughout South Louisiana, Baptist churches and missions abound.

By action of the Southern Convention in 1946, an amendment to the charter was approved, changing the name to New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. The institution is a member of the American Association of Theological Schools and measures up to the standards set for theological seminaries. The next year, the Convention recorded its approval of the building of a new plant on the seventy-five-acre site purchased on Gentilly Boulevard, where the new plant was formally opened and dedicated in September, 1953. New Orleans Seminary has had four presidents: B.H. DeMent, W.W. Hamilton, Duke McCall, and Roland Q. Leavell. The Southern Baptist Convention is receiving rich returns from the investments made in this school with its departments of theology, music, religious education, missionary education, and Christian training.

The glorious traditions and high standards of theological training are being sustained in the two new schools, Southeastern Seminary and Golden Gate Seminary, opened since the beginning of the second century of the Convention.

## EDUCATION BOARD

In 1915, at the Houston Convention, an education commission was constituted.<sup>f398</sup> Four years later, at Atlanta, the commission was made the Education Board and located at Birmingham.<sup>f399</sup> The purpose of the new board was defined as “the promotion of education throughout the South and especially education under Baptist organized control and for distinctly Christian ends.”<sup>f400</sup>

In 1918, the year before the Seventy-five Million Campaign was projected, the Convention had endorsed the recommendation of the Education Commission that a five-year program, with a goal of 35,000 students and \$15,000,000.00 be undertaken in behalf of Southern Baptist schools.<sup>f401</sup> Of the first \$5,000,000.00 anticipated from the campaign, \$3,000,000.00 was to be distributed among the seminaries and training schools, with \$100,000.00 to be given to each of the following schools: Ouachita, Louisiana, Stetson, Ewing, and Montezuma.<sup>f402</sup> This program was superseded by the Seventy-five Million Campaign.

Without tracing in detail the activities of the Education Board through the nine years of its existence, we record the action of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1928, in voting to discontinue the Education Board and to commit to the reconstituted Educational Commission responsibility for gathering facts and data necessary to its work, with the interests and obligations of the Education Board to be committed to the Executive Committee of the Convention.<sup>f403</sup> At

that time, the reported indebtedness of the Education Board was \$381,378.72, of which \$345,000.00 was in first mortgage bonds. <sup>f404</sup>

## MONTEZUMA COLLEGE

Closely related to the Southern Baptist Convention, especially through the Education Board and then through the Executive Committee, were the affairs of Montezuma College in New Mexico. Toward the close of the Seventy-five Million Campaign the Commercial Club of East Las Vegas gave to New Mexico Baptists the Montezuma property to be used for the operation of a Baptist school. This magnificent estate consisting of 840 acres of land, with beautiful stone buildings with 343 rooms in the main building, had originally been owned by the Santa Fe System as an attractive resort before the development of the Grand Canyon property.

Following considerable renovation, Montezuma College was enabled to open its doors in 1922 through an advance of \$25,000.00 by the Education Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. <sup>f405</sup> Montezuma had been promised \$100,000.00 out of the Seventy-five Million Campaign. <sup>f406</sup> The promoters of Montezuma who had expected that, because of the health-giving climate and the Switzerland scenery, students would be enrolled from many states, were disappointed. By 1927, the Southern Baptist Convention, already interested in New Mexico because of its tremendous missionary needs and possibilities, was seeking to find some plan whereby Montezuma might be saved. <sup>f407</sup>

Despite efforts to strengthen Montezuma, conditions became more discouraging. Finally, in 1929, in Memphis, the Southern Baptist Convention agreed to borrow an amount not to exceed \$250,000.00 to enable New Mexico Baptists to refund their indebtedness. <sup>f408</sup>

The next year, a detailed report was given to the Southern Convention concerning the first mortgage bonds, totaling \$250,000.00, signed by the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, by authority of the Convention. <sup>f409</sup> The Montezuma property, with an estimated valuation of \$500,000.00 was cited as collateral. This was a preferred item, with \$25,000.00 to be paid annually by the Executive Committee of the Southern Convention.

In 1931, the Education Commission reported for Montezuma, "Closed temporarily"; in 1932, "Closed." In 1938, the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention reported that the Montezuma property had been sold to Archbishop R.A. Gerken for \$19,537.99. <sup>f410</sup> Since then, Montezuma has been used as a training school for hundreds of Roman Catholic priests preparing for service in Mexico!

## NEGRO MINISTERIAL EDUCATION

Southern Baptists were slow to recognize and utilize their opportunity to help provide trained preachers for Negro Baptists. The first definite step in that direction was the adoption, at the 1913 Convention, of the following resolution, offered by Dr. E.Y. Mullins:

Whereas, The National Convention of Colored Baptists has appointed a Committee to consider and report upon the question of establishing a Theological Seminary for the education of colored Baptist preachers; and,

Whereas, The Negro brethren have expressed a desire for conference with and the advice and co-operation of the white Baptists of the South; and,

Whereas, Many brethren who have given the matter careful attention think it advisable for this Convention to pledge its sympathy and co-operation in this enterprise; therefore,

Resolved, That this Convention, through its President, appoint a committee of nine to advise and confer with the colored brethren on the subject, and also that we pledge ourselves, so far as we are able, that so soon as the movement has assumed definite form, we will give practical financial assistance in such ways and by such means as may be determined upon hereafter.

Resolved, further, That this Committee be instructed to report upon this matter at the next annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention. <sup>f411</sup>

The 1914 Convention approved a recommendation of the Committee that the Southern Baptist Convention be requested to raise \$50,000.00 toward the establishment of such a seminary, provided the National Baptist Convention supply the necessary grounds and additional equipment to warrant the expectation of a successful school. <sup>f412</sup> Because of a division in the ranks of the National Baptist Convention at their 1915 Convention in Chicago, resulting in two conventions, National Incorporated and National Unincorporated, <sup>f413</sup> the matter was delayed for awhile. One of the chief issues resulting in division was whether a board should be self-perpetuating and independent of the body appointing it. The two conventions did not reunite. The National Baptist Convention, Unincorporated, has not co-operated with the National Convention, Incorporated, and the Southern Baptist Convention in supporting the Negro Baptist Seminary.

One of the most significant decisions of the Joint Commission of the Negro Seminary was the selection of Dr. O.L. Hailey as secretary of the Commission <sup>f414</sup> ( S.B.C. and N.B.C., Inc.). Dr. Hailey served in that capacity until his death in 1934. He was trusted by all of his associates, black and white, and by his patience and wisdom contributed much to the training of Negro Baptist

preachers. In the Seventy-five Million Campaign, \$200,000.00 had been allocated to the Negro Seminary.

The institution was placed in the hands of two controlling groups; one the “holding” body, to hold and control the property; the other the “governing” body, to direct the affairs of the Seminary — both to include representatives of the National Baptist Convention, Incorporated, and the Southern Baptist Convention. <sup>f415</sup> It was definitely decided to locate the Seminary in Nashville, and it was opened October 1, 1924, on property on White Creek’s Pike adjacent to the campus of Roger Williams University, where the Seminary students expected to secure supplemental academic training. However, Roger Williams University was closed in 1927 through bankruptcy and was eventually merged with Howe Institute in Memphis. For about three years, the Seminary, having disposed of its property, occupied quarters rented from Meharry Medical School, but finally returned to its former location. <sup>f416</sup> In 1937, the purchase of the Roger Williams property to be used for a missionary training school was reported. <sup>f417</sup>

In 1930, another step was taken by the Southern Baptist Convention, which revealed a deepening interest in the welfare of the Negro race. Added to the report on the Seminary, was a statement bearing the subhead “Facing the Facts,” in which attention was called to the high percentage of illiteracy among Negroes — 22 per cent as compared with 2 1/2 per cent among white native-born Americans. <sup>f418</sup> That same year, the Seminary Commission announced a gift of \$5,000.00 from Mrs. W.J. McKie, Corsicana, Texas, as a memorial to her father, Rev. Jacob Beverly Stiteler, pioneer Texas Baptist preacher and one of the early teachers in Baylor University, who was interested in the education of Negroes.

Following the death of Dr. Hailey in 1934, <sup>f419</sup> Dr. E.P. Alldredge served as acting secretary of the Commission, then as chairman, until his retirement in June, 1949. He rendered distinctive service in acquainting Southern Baptists with the needs and growth of the Seminary. Dr. Alldredge was succeeded by Dr. L.S. Sedberry, pastor of Lockeland Baptist Church, Nashville, under whose leadership as executive secretary the Seminary has steadily grown.

In 1937, we witnessed another significant expansion of interest in Negroes — the inclusion in the agenda of the Convention of a Committee on Negro Ministerial Education. The next year, the Convention approved the recommendation of that Committee “that a committee of three be appointed to meet with a similar committee from the Northern Baptist Convention to consider the problem of ministerial education for Negroes and to advise as to how this may be the most wisely promoted.” <sup>f420</sup> For many years since reconstruction days, Northern Baptists had maintained Baptist schools for

Negroes in the South, with co-operation on the part of Southern Baptists as circumstances permitted. <sup>f421</sup>

In its first report in 1938 the startling fact was disclosed <sup>f422</sup> that fifteen Negro Baptist institutions in the South averaged only one graduate with the A.B. degree to enter the ministry over a period of seven years. The Committee expressed its gratification that the faculties of the three Southern Baptist Convention seminaries at Louisville, Fort Worth, and New Orleans were co-operating with the Negroes in providing ministerial training. That study was the beginning of ever-enlarging acquaintance with the needs of Negroes and a more sympathetic response thereto.

Ten years later, the Convention authorized a survey of Negro Baptist churches and their leadership, to be made in co-operation with the Southern Baptist, the Northern (now American) Baptist, and the National Baptist, Incorporated, conventions. The progress and some of the findings of that survey were summarized in brief reports in the Southern Convention minutes of 1949, 1950, 1951, and a more comprehensive report in 1952. <sup>f423</sup> Here are a few of the many startling facts:

Negro Baptists have, in round numbers, one ministerial student in training in the United States, in standard institutions of learning, for each 5,000 church members; Southern Baptists, white, have one ministerial student for each 1,070 church members. There were only 120 Negro Baptist theological students, with college degrees, in training in the United States in seminaries and divinity schools — one ministerial student for each 41,666 church members; Southern Baptists, white, have one ministerial student for each 3,111 church members. Only two Negro theological seminaries in the United States, neither Baptist, were accredited by the Association of Theological Schools — Howard University School of Religion and Gammon Theological Seminary. One Negro Baptist theological seminary, Virginia Union University, had associate membership.

The Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention is making a large contribution through the teacher-missionary pro-gram carried on in co-operation with Negro Baptist colleges and training centers throughout the South. This program, which has been an important factor in the promotion of ministerial training, was in operation in 1952 in twenty-four Negro Baptist institutions of learning in the South.

The three older white Baptist seminaries in the South, Louisville, Fort Worth, and New Orleans, have admitted Negro Baptist preachers to their classes. Southern, for example, had five men enrolled in 1951-52, one a student from

Nigeria who was pre-paring to teach in the Nigerian Baptist Theological Seminary.

## **BAPTIST HOSPITALS**

The program of Jesus included teaching, preaching, and healing. For years, many Southern Baptists failed to see in the New Testament the ministry of healing. Then our horizon was widened as we found new meanings in the story of the good Samaritan, in the picture of the judgment as portrayed in Matthew 24, and in the healing miracles of Jesus.

The first Baptist hospitals in the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention were community or state projects. The first were erected in St. Louis, Missouri; Atlanta, Georgia; Houston and Dallas, Texas; Jackson, Mississippi; and Memphis, Tennessee.

At the 1920 Washington Convention, the first steps were taken toward the construction of a Southern Baptist hospital in New Orleans. In 1923, in Kansas City, a Hospital Commission was created by the Convention to which was committed the responsibility of erecting and administering the hospital. In March, 1926, the Southern Baptist Hospital was opened and began its blessed ministry.

## **EL PASO SANATORIUM**

During the 1916 session of the Southern Baptist Convention, a question was raised concerning the need of a sanatorium, to be built by Baptists, for tuberculosis patients. A committee, which was appointed at that meeting, reported the next year, recommending the proposed institution. The recommendation was approved by the Convention, and the building and maintenance of the sanatorium were committed to the Home Mission Board. El Paso was selected as the site.

The institution was reported in operation in 1920, with building and equipment that cost approximately \$500,000.00 <sup>f424</sup> Very early, financial difficulties arose, and, in 1924, Southern Baptist Sanatorium bonds had to be issued by the Home Mission Board. <sup>f425</sup> The average annual deficit until 1930 was \$26,000.00 Expenses were met until the sanatorium was closed in October, 1937, and the bonds which had been issued in 1924 were finally liquidated in 1943 (after being twice refinanced at lower rates) largely through the Hundred Thousand Club and the skilful business administration of Dr. J.B. Lawrence, secretary of the Home Mission Board.

In 1938, the Home and Foreign Mission boards exchanged their properties in El Paso. <sup>f426</sup> The former sanatorium building now houses the Baptist Spanish

Publishing House for the Foreign Mission Board and supplies all Spanish-speaking America with leaves of healing designed to meet every need in spiritual culture.

## **RELIEF AND ANNUITY BOARD**

One of the most acute problems faced by Baptists through the years was the case of aged and disabled preachers. The old preachers were the forgotten men. Occasionally, collections were taken for them at associations or fifth Sunday meetings. In a few states, funds had been created which helped, in small measure, to relieve the urgent needs of the veterans of the cross.

In 1916, Dr. William Lunsford, a pastor in Nashville, Tennessee, raised a question in the pastors' Monday conference concerning the debt owed by Southern Baptists to their aged and incapacitated preachers. His appeal stirred the hearts of all who heard him. The Sunday School Board, located in Nashville, considered the proposal and appropriated \$100,000.00 to start a fund for Ministerial Relief.

The 1917 Convention meeting in New Orleans appointed a Commission to study the whole question and report the next year. On the recommendation brought with that report, the Convention, meeting in Hot Springs, Arkansas, created the Board of Ministerial Relief and Annuities to be located at Dallas, Texas. In the early years of its operation, one of the best friends of the Board was Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr., who had been particularly interested in the welfare of old preachers and had given \$5,000,000.00 to the Old Ministers' Fund of the Northern Baptist Convention. At the 1921 Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. Lunsford, who had become secretary of the Board, reported gifts from Mr. Rockefeller the preceding year aggregating \$300,000.00, to the Southern Baptist Board of Ministerial Relief and Annuities. The donor made additional contributions to that Fund.

The new provision of Southern Baptists for aged and disabled preachers went beyond the matter of relief in days of need. It planned to encourage and assist men in the active ministry to build reserves against the time when they, because of old age or disability, would no longer receive regular incomes from their ministry. This was known as the Annuity Plan. As developed through years, through the co-operation of churches and employing denominational agencies, many men who might otherwise face distressing financial privation are now, when in retirement, receiving a modest competence. Provision is being made for widows of preachers who had availed themselves of the advantages of this plan. The three secretaries who have rendered glorious service were William Lunsford, T.J. Watts, and Walter Alexander.

At the end of 1943, twenty-five years after the beginning of the ministry of the Relief and Annuity Board, there were reported 10,903 members of the Ministers' Retirement Plan — including churches and various denominational boards. By December 31, 1951 there had been issued 31,000 certificates of participation in various retirement plans. There were 1,448 names on the Relief roll, and the amount paid to beneficiaries in 1951 was \$268,204.37 which was \$10,922.11 in excess of receipts from Southern Baptists for that purpose.

## 14. — GROWTH IN CO-OPERATION, ORGANIZATION, STEWARDSHIP, AND EVANGELISM

The Southern Baptist Convention, as has been seen, was formed on a comprehensive basis. It was not a “society” organized for home and foreign missions, although it was frequently called so in the early years, but it did confine its activities, in the main, to missions at home and abroad. Its constitution allowed the formation of as many boards as would be needed. As a consequence, many worthy objects came under the patronage of the Convention with the passing of the years, one of which was what Dr. Gambrell termed the highest hour in the 1912 Convention: the projection, in that meeting, of the movement to raise the Judson Centennial Fund of \$1,000,000.00 for schools and other facilities on foreign fields. The words “I cannot write of it without blinding tears of inexpressible happiness” reflected the deep emotions of Dr. Gambrell’s heart. <sup>f427</sup> The state conventions, also, were expanding similarly in the same directions. The number of worthy appeals became so many that the churches were forced either to neglect some of them or their own local needs, or both.

### **LACK OF CORRELATION AND OF BUDGET METHODS AND CONTROL**

The lack of correlation of appeals was paralleled by a lack of budget methods and control. The Convention or its agencies set the financial objective and, by special collections and campaigns, endeavored to raise the needed funds. Single voices, here and there, called for more system in church and convention finance, but they seemed to make little impression. A few churches approached the budget method. As laymen became more prominent in the life of the Convention, they raised the call, “More business in religion.” Dr. J.B. Gambrell, a representative of the older method, once responded, “More religion in business.” A method suggested to remedy the chaotic conditions was the combination of all the boards of the Convention into one executive board. <sup>f428</sup> Out of this discussion came the creation of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1917. The first step toward correlation and unification was made, which, the direction indicated, would lead the Convention to systematize its methods, adopt budget-control for its agencies, and enlarge its scope. In his comments on the 1917 Convention, Dr. Gambrell wrote: “A large and very strong committee, with Deacon M.H. Wolfe, chairman, . . . worked out the very best solution possible — an

executive committee with limited and defined powers; not to control the Boards, but to deal with such things as might arise between the meetings of the Convention, and such things as the Convention, itself, might assign to the committee.”<sup>f429</sup> Subsequent development consisted only in enlarging the reach and responsibility of the Executive Committee.

World War I unified the people of the United States in thought and act as they had never before been unified. In military effort, in financial drives to support the effort, in Red Cross and Community Chest efforts — in various sorts of drives, the people were brought together in a sense of national unity. The political school of Washington, Hamilton, Marshall, and their confreres was at last triumphant over the school of Jefferson. This development had its reaction on ecclesiastical bodies. All of the larger Protestant groups had similar concerted efforts. Even before the United States became involved directly in the world conflict, a sense of the need of a world program and of a unification and articulation of method began to grip Southern Baptist leaders.

The Rev. Rufus W. Weaver, of the District of Columbia, called upon his brethren to unite in raising \$100,000,000.00 for Jesus in five years.<sup>f430</sup> In 1918, the Education Commission of the Convention proposed a five-year program to raise \$15,000,000.00 for the Baptist schools of the South. During the following convention year, this program was approved by the several state conventions, the Laymen’s Missionary Movement, and the Executive Committee of Woman’s Missionary Union. The Executive Committee of the Laymen’s Missionary Movement, in its 1919 report to the Convention,<sup>f431</sup> said in part:

While the Committee would not undertake to make any definite recommendations, it recognizes the importance of utilizing on behalf of our Kingdom enterprises the altruistic spirit, the enlarged vision, and the thorough methods of organization that have come from our experience with the World War. The other denominations in our territory are appropriating in a large way the lessons of this new day.

In other reports and resolutions at this session of the Convention, there were calls for an enlarged financial program. All of these were referred to a Committee on Financial Aspects of our Denominational Program. This Committee reported,<sup>f432</sup> in part: “In view of the needs of the world at this hour, in view of the numbers and ability of Southern Baptists, we suggest, (1) that in the organized work of this Convention we undertake to raise not less than \$75,000,000 in five years.”

The Relief and Annuity Board, in its report and recommendations, adopted early in the proceeding, had asked the Convention to authorize “an appeal to the denomination at large for \$5,000,000 for reserve and endowment ... and that the time limit of the appeal, be fixed at seven years.”<sup>f433</sup> The Seventy-five

Million program, adopted in a later session of that Convention, superseded the proposed \$5,000,000.00 for the Relief and Annuity Board.

## **SEVENTY-FIVE MILLION CAMPAIGN**

The Convention adopted the recommendation and laid plans for an organization to carry out the program. A Campaign Commission of fifteen members was appointed to make all plans in consultation with the agencies of the Convention and the state bodies and to conduct the campaign. An office was opened in Nashville. Dr. L.R. Scarborough, president of the Southwestern Seminary was elected general director for the South. A director was selected in each state, in each association, and in each church. Southern Baptists were enlisted beyond any conception of enlistment theretofore. From July to November, intense, well-planned preparation was made. A tremendous Southwide drive was begun the first week in December. The total subscriptions amounted to \$92,630,-923.00, but the financial condition and other reactions during the period 1920-1924 limited the collections to \$58,591,713.69.

## **BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF CAMPAIGN**

The five-year Campaign left two lasting results on the life and work of Southern Baptist churches. The five-months' period of preparation, from July to November, the subsequent whirlwind campaign for subscriptions, and the continued emphases through-out the five years enlisted church members and made them stewardship-conscious as they had never been before: The membership of the churches increased 40 per cent between 1915 and 1929, and the per capita contributions of Southern Baptists increased, during the same period, 12 per cent. During the five-year period preceding the campaign, the average annual per capita contribution had been \$5.08. During the campaign period, 1919-1924, it was \$9.37. During the 1925-1929 period following the Seventy-five Million Campaign per capita contributions were \$10.52, an increase over the five-year period preceding the campaign by 100 per cent. But the per capita contributions to missions *decreased* one-third during the same period. The economic depression following 1929, combined with other conditions within Baptist life, checked for several years a continuation of such increases.

The second lasting result of the Seventy-five Million Campaign was the adoption of more system in raising and disbursing the finances of the Convention. When the agencies of the Convention were few and the sum total of all work was small, each agency planned its own program and raised its own funds. The general plans and programs were approved at the annual meeting of

the Convention and recommended to the churches. Any debts contracted were debts on the particular agency involved, although, in fact, they were debts on the Convention. When the work of the Convention increased in amount and complexity, the older methods failed to meet the new conditions. The Convention itself developed into a more closely articulated body. Changing conditions and conceptions brought older ideas of ecclesiology to the surface — ideas current when the Convention was formed. The Southern Baptist Convention ceased to have any semblance of a society for missions and became a truly denominational body.

The Convention's financial methods and programs did not keep pace with its developing character. A few churches in several states adopted a financial plan approaching the budget program, but the new plans were not generally received. In the Southwest, especially, the older method of special campaigns in the spring before the meeting of the Southern Convention and in the fall before the meeting of the state conventions was popular. <sup>f434</sup> There were special campaigns in the several states for missions, education, or benevolences. Leaders, prominent in state conventions and in the Southern Convention, opposed the newer methods. The Seventy-five Million Campaign, some of the very prominent leaders of which had consistently opposed a budget-plan of church and denominational finance, being thus exemplified, forced into consideration and made popular some semblance of the budget method. The active leaders of the older method, some consciously, some unconsciously, were changed into a new attitude.

## **COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS EFFICIENCY**

In 1925, a Committee on Business Efficiency was appointed to make a study of the business of the Convention and of all its agencies, and to report thereon, with recommendations. The Committee, of which Dr. Austin Crouch was chairman, made an exhaustive study of the entire Convention and its agencies in their several business methods. A financial statement of each of the agencies was prepared and submitted, and the committee discussed with leaders throughout the Convention area the question of Convention financial methods. They reported <sup>f435</sup>

... the constituency of this convention is becoming insistent that the work of the agencies of the convention shall be more closely correlated, and that the agencies themselves shall be brought into such relations with the convention as will guarantee in advance both efficiency of administration and the prevention of incurring any indebtedness, except for current expenses between the meetings of the convention.

The Committee indicated two needs of the Convention:

It has been widely assumed that the convention since the inauguration of the 75 million program has been working upon a Budget basis. But the slightest review of the history of our so-called Budget System overthrows this assumption. Up to this time the convention has never had a real budget. ...

After very earnest consideration your committee is convinced that the convention should have some agency keeping in close touch with all the boards, institutions, and other agencies of the convention. The affairs of the convention and its agencies are too varied and too great to be handled effectively without it.

The committee recommended “that the Convention at this time commit itself to budget control,” and “that the Convention go on record as favoring a single agency to function along the lines presented in the report.”

### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ENLARGED**

The Committee on Business Efficiency was continued and ordered to publish the final form of its report in the denominational press at least two months before the annual meeting in 1927. Out of this thorough study of the functioning of the Convention and its agencies, extending through ten years but culminating in the three years, 1925-1927, the Convention adopted, in 1927, the policy of working on a budget basis. The membership of the Executive Committee was enlarged, so as to make it representative of every part of the Convention territory, and its authority and responsibilities were greatly increased. The Committee was authorized to perfect its own organization and to elect an Executive Secretary who would be the executive officer of the Committee and, therefore, of the affairs of the Convention ad interim. The newly formed Executive Committee elected Dr. Austin Crouch to this office.

The Convention was organized “for the purpose of carrying into effect the benevolent intentions of our constituents, by organizing a plan for eliciting, combining and directing the energies of the whole denomination in one sacred effort for the propagation of the Gospel.”

Its objective was “to promote Foreign and Domestic Missions, and other important objects connected with the Redeemer’s Kingdom, and to combine for this purpose such portions of the Baptist denomination in the United States as may desire a general organization for Christian benevolence.”

It had required eighty-two years of experience in practical work and in study of the problems arising to enable the body to find its external expression and continuity.

The Executive Committee of the Convention now has a permanent locale and can speak and act, at any time, in the name of the Convention in accordance with general and special authority granted it by that body. Acting for the Convention ad interim, it is a continuing body, both legal and denominational.

## **POWERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The authority, functions, and duties of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention are defined in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Convention: <sup>f436</sup>

**(5)** The Executive Committee shall be the fiduciary, the fiscal, and the executive agency of the Convention in all its affairs not specifically committed to some other board or agency.

The Executive Committee is specifically authorized, instructed, and commissioned to perform the following functions:

**(a)** To act for the Convention ad interim in all matters not otherwise provided for.

**(b)** To be named in transfers of real and personal property for the use and benefit of the Convention either by deed, conveyance, will, or otherwise and to affix the seal of the Convention to all approved transactions, and

To take title to and hold, or to convey title to all properties, real or personal, and all funds, monies and securities that are donated or transferred or left by will to or for the use of the Convention. As to such properties, funds, monies and securities as the Executive Committee shall hold and not convey title to, the Executive Committee shall be custodian of such, holding them in trust for the Convention to be managed, controlled and administered by the Executive Committee in accordance with the direction, general or specific, of the Convention.

Rules governing the handling of securities set out in Article VII, Section 3, of the Constitution shall be observed by the Executive Committee.

**(c)** To receive and receipt for all current funds of the Convention including all undesignated co-operative missionary, educational, and benevolent funds and all current special or designated funds for missionary, educational, and benevolent purposes which may be contributed by individuals, churches, societies, corporations, associations, or state conventions; and to disburse all undesignated funds according to the percentages fixed by the Convention and all the designated funds according to the stipulations of the donors.

**(d)** To have oversight of the arrangements for the meetings of the Convention, with authority to change both the time and place of the meetings in accordance with the provisions of Article XI, Section 3, of the Constitution.

**(e)** To act in an advisory capacity on all questions of co-operation between the different agencies of the Convention, and between the agencies of the Convention and those of other conventions, whether state or national.

**(f)** To present to the Convention each year a consolidated and comprehensive financial statement of all agencies of the Convention, which statement shall show the assets and liabilities of all agencies and institutions, and all the cash receipts of the year.

**(g)** To recommend to the Convention a comprehensive budget for the Convention and for all its agencies and institutions for the Convention year, which budget shall include the budgets of all the boards, agencies, and institutions of the Convention as approved by the December meeting of the Executive Committee, together with the percentage of Southwide funds which may be allocated to each cause.

**(h)** To conduct the general work of promotion and the general work of publicity for the Convention in co-operation with the other agencies and institutions of the Convention.

**(i)** The Executive Committee shall not have authority to control or direct the several boards, agencies, and institutions of the Convention. But it is instructed and commissioned to study the affairs of those boards, agencies, and institutions of the Convention, and to make recommendations to them concerning needed adjustments and also to make whatever recommendations concerning them to the Convention it deems advisable.

**(j)** In carrying out these instructions the Executive Committee is authorized to make its own by-laws in keeping with the Constitution and By-Laws of the Convention; to hold meetings whenever deemed necessary; to make reports of all meetings to the Convention; to notify all the boards, agencies, and institutions of the actions of the Convention, and to advise with them as to the best way of promoting all the interests of the Convention.

**(k)** In accordance with the action of the Convention in Atlanta in 1944, the expenses of the Executive Committee shall be derived from the Operating Budget of the Convention specifically established for this purpose and formally approved by the Convention.

In order that the original charter granted by the legislature of Georgia, December 27, 1845 might be continued in perpetuity and that the authority granted the Executive Committee might have a basis in law, an act was passed by the legislature of Georgia February 17, 1943, "To authorize any and all eleemosynary or religious corporations ... for the propagation of the Gospel to exercise and carry on certain powers." <sup>f437</sup> Under the terms of this act it is provided

That any eleemosynary or religious corporations heretofore created in Georgia or hereafter chartered is, by virtue of its existence, authorized, in addition to

the propagation of the Gospel, to conduct schools for the training of the youth; to own and operate for itself or for others printing plants, publishing houses, and any desired methods or means for the dissemination of news and information; to own and operate hospitals, nurses homes and any and all kinds of institutions for the alleviation of pain and sufferings; to own and operate for itself or others orphan asylums, old people's Homes and any and all institutions for the care of the needy and dependent; to conduct and carry into effect any plan for the care, maintenance and support of its workers and employees who may have become disabled, been retired, or otherwise made eligible for the benefits of said plan, and in connection therewith to conduct a plan for the establishment and payment of annuities in connection therewith; and further to do any and everything necessary and proper for the accomplishment of the objects herein enumerated, and in general to carry on any lawful business necessary or incident to the attainment of these objects.

## **BUDGET PLANS**

During the period of the development of the Executive Committee and its functions, the budget plan of financing the work of the Convention was adopted. Following the five-year Seventy-five Million Campaign, the Convention decided upon an annual program. A Commission of Future Campaigns was appointed in 1924 to study the question and recommend a method. The problem was recognized as one of enlistment. Before 1919, very few churches had endeavored to enlist the membership in regular giving. The Seventy-five Million Campaign demonstrated the possibilities and the method of enlistment. One of the abiding results of the Campaign was to show Southern Baptists the desirability and the possibility of enlisting the whole membership of the churches in the work of the Convention. The Commission on Future Program (henceforth called the Cooperative Program) estimated in 1925 <sup>f438</sup> that there were 500,000 regular contributors among the church members; that fewer than 28 per cent of the churches had any well-defined system of finance; that only about 373 per cent of the membership of the churches took any share in the support of the denominational enterprises.

## **COOPERATIVE PROGRAM**

Out of the pressing needs and the experience of the five-year program, the Convention adopted an annual program. The churches were asked to make a canvass of the membership, near the end of the calendar year, to secure subscriptions to the annual budget for the following year. The Executive Committee meets in December and makes allocations on a percentage basis to the several phases of the work of the Convention. The several institutions and agencies of the Convention submit to the Committee their budget needs. In 1939 the Executive Committee reported to the Convention: <sup>f439</sup>

The Cooperative Program is the greatest step forward in Kingdom finance Southern Baptists have ever taken. It was slow and gradual in its formation. It arose out of the desires and efforts of pastors and churches to find a plan whereby all worthy denominational causes might be cared for fully and fairly without conflicting with the necessary progress and work in the churches themselves. It is believed to be sane, scriptural, comprehensive, unifying, equitable, economical and thoroughly workable. It is based upon the assumption that all denominational causes will be included, that all agencies and institutions will co-operate in its promotion, that all pastors will represent and present all causes and seek to secure regular, proportionate and adequate support by putting on the Every Member Canvass every year. ...

It should be constantly borne in mind that the plan arose in the needs of our people and was not handed down; all the objects included are concrete and should be so presented; the percentages of distribution of funds are based upon the relative budget needs of the causes them-selves; state and Southwide agencies should and do heartily co-operate; after the expense of the state office is taken out, the receipts should be equitably divided between the state and Southwide causes, 50-50 distribution being considered the ideal and should be reached as soon as possible.

The Cooperative Program should be looked upon as the budget plan for using the contributions of our people in financing the affairs of our denomination.

This plan of finance evidently has been gaining favor and en-listing more churches and church members. In 1942, the receipts were 171 per cent more than the receipts for the year 1933. The surprise is not that so many churches do not follow the plan; rather that so many, in so few years, have adopted it, in view of the opposition by prominent denominational leaders before the initiation of the Seventy-five Million Campaign.

The two permanent results of the Seventy-five Million Campaign — the budget method of financing the program and a unifying over-all agency for planning and executing the budget — came about largely because of a distressing temporary result of the campaign. The Convention and its agencies were left burdened with a load of debt.

An appeal had been made to Southern Baptists to subscribe \$75,000,000.00, payable in annual installments of \$15,000,000.00 a year. The members of the churches pledged \$92,000,000.00. It was assumed by the various causes that an annual income of \$15,000,000.00 could safely be counted upon. With this feeling of assurance, the denominational work, state and Southwide, of missions, education, and benevolence was enlarged; new mission stations were opened, new buildings were erected, new missionaries were sent out, and marvelous spiritual results were obtained. Large obligations were assumed for the expanding program.

## **DEPRESSION, DEFICITS, AND DEBT**

For the first year of the 75 Million Campaign all was well, as \$15,000,-000 was paid into the treasury for the various causes. But, ... A terrible financial depression set in, and the denominational contributions declined accordingly. Because of the depression only \$58,000,000 of the \$92,000,000 was finally collected, being \$17,000,000 short of the original 5-year goal. Each year, therefore, Southern Baptist Convention causes, as well as State causes, showed deficits. By December 31, 1926, Convention causes had accumulated a staggering debt of approximately \$6,500,000.

Because of the heavy decline in receipts, it became necessary to borrow money, by bond issues, by bank loans, and by individual loans, all at high interest rates. The time came when it was not possible to meet payments on bonds and loans at maturity. In some cases loans had to be renewed from time to time, without any payment on principal.

The distressing financial condition of our causes produced deep despondency on the part of Southern Baptists. The morale of our people was at the breaking point. Our workers were discouraged, and our creditors were clamoring for payment of loans, some even threatening legal proceedings to collect or throw the Convention and agencies into bankruptcy.

Something had to be done and at once. The Executive Committee, together with the Southwide Executives, determined that steps should be taken to change the deplorable situation. It was determined to find a way out. <sup>f440</sup>

## **THE HUNDRED THOUSAND CLUB**

The plan of the Baptist Hundred Thousand Club, recommended by the Executive Committee and approved by the 1933 Convention, called for fair and just treatment of all creditors, and for the liquidation of debts. The plan sought to enlist 100,000 persons who would agree to give one dollar a month, over and above their regular subscriptions through the churches. There was a gratifying response, and defeat was turned into victory. <sup>f441</sup>

As the financial situation of the Convention improved, it became possible to refinance indebtedness at lower rates. Much re-financing was done, at great saving to the Convention and some of its agencies. Complete deliverance from debt for the Convention and all of its agencies was achieved in 1944.

In order to assure the constituency of the Convention that no such accumulation of indebtedness should ever again occur, if at all possible to forestall, the Executive Committee placed before the Convention an elaborate plan of operating budgets, investments, and audit reports, covering the finances of the Convention and of all of its agencies. This plan was studied by the

Executive Committee and discussed in the Convention for two successive years and adopted. <sup>f442</sup>

## TIDES OF EVANGELISM

During this period in which tremendous organizational development was taking place, the Southern Baptist Convention did not neglect the emphasis upon the spiritual phase of its work. In 1921 <sup>f443</sup> a series of resolutions was passed, the heart of which was expressed in the words: “we believe the time has come when we should put on a campaign of personal soul-winning at least as thorough, well organized, and far-reaching as was the 75 Million Campaign for money.” The committee appointed to give a careful study of the resolutions reported <sup>f444</sup> “that it is impracticable to attempt from a central Southern headquarters to organize and direct in detail as to plans, time and methods so great a spiritual undertaking.” The committee recommended that each state convention, association, church, school, the organizations of laymen, women, and young people engage in a series of co-ordinated evangelistic efforts — each to carry on its own work in accordance with its own needs as to time and method. The Department of Evangelism of the Home Mission Board was commended and requested to join in this program. In the report of the Conservation Commission for the same year, the spiritual results of the financial campaign of the year before are expressed as follows:

The tides of spiritual and evangelistic and missionary power which have swept over our churches, bringing hundreds of thousands into the fold, the mighty vision which He has given to our people, the establishment of the sacrificial and heroic spirit, the deepening of the prayer life of our churches, the calling out of more than 10,000 of our young people in the spirit of voluntary service to give their lives to Him, the development of a great denominational consciousness, the development of a new and stronger leadership among our people, in other words, the mighty movement of God lifting and building and inspiring all the work of our king puts us under everlasting obligation to our God and under a new sense of a responsibility to go forward in a new, greater fashion. <sup>f445</sup>

The interest in an emphasis upon evangelism on the home and foreign fields is in evidence in the reports and recommendations made to the Convention from year to year. In 1930, the Convention declared that <sup>f446</sup> “... we regard with sacred importance the primary place of Evangelism in the New Testament. If we would follow the New Testament, we must ever give the soul-winning propagation of the gospel first place in all our Baptist enterprises and work. We are well assured that any lapse in our efforts in this direction cannot do less than lead to failure in all else that we may attempt to do.”

From time to time, the Convention itself has projected a program of evangelism, but the greater part of the evangelistic effort has been made by the Home Mission Board, the several state convention boards, the associations, and the churches.

This evangelistic fervor of Southern Baptists was comparable to the contribution that the Separate Baptists had made to the union of the Regulars and the Separates in Virginia and the Carolinas in 1787. Then there were less than 40,000 Baptists in the South. Fifty years later, 1840, there were less than 350,000. In 1940, there were more than 5,000,000 white Baptists. The Convention completed its first century with a great centennial program of evangelistic zeal and effort. In 1950 there was a total white membership of 7,000,000.

## 15. — THE LAYMEN

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century men, prominent in public life and in business in the United States, began to take an active part in religious affairs locally and denominationally. The training of the children, boys and girls, by the women's societies for two decades was beginning to tell in pulpit and pew in Southern Baptist life.

At the convention of the Student Volunteer Movement, held in Nashville, Tennessee, February 28-March 4, 1906, Mr. John B. Sleman, Jr., of Washington, D.C., was profoundly stirred and experienced a vision of the responsibility and opportunity of the laymen of all the denominations. He was impressed by the fact that some of the greatest minds were giving their thought to missionary opportunities, that the various boards were being conducted by men of keen discernment and deep consecration, that many barriers had been removed, and that the nations were looking to us for light and liberty. He was particularly impressed by the presence of three thousand young men and women eager to go as evangelists of light to the people who were sitting in darkness. Yet the boards were saying, "Wait, we have not the funds." He believed that some aggressive measures should be adopted by which men of means and business capacity might share the vision of these volunteers. <sup>f447</sup>

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions arranged for an interdenominational meeting to be held November 13-14, 1906 in New York, to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the famous Williams College haystack prayer meeting, the beginning of the organized foreign mission movement of North America. A group of prominent laymen, influenced largely by Sleman, issued, in the form of "A Call to Prayer," an invitation to a selected group of laymen of different denominations to come together on that occasion to consider their opportunities and obligations.

The address was given by J. Campbell White, United Presbyterian, just home from India, and made a deep impression as he recited the remarkable achievements of the laymen of that small denomination. The time of the meeting was largely spent in prayer. The world missionary movement began with ten days' waiting on God in the upper room, preceding Pentecost. The foreign missionary interest and activities in North America, especially in the colleges, began with the haystack prayer meeting. The Student Volunteer Movement had its birth in a chain of prayer meetings at Mount Hermon. Here were laymen calling upon God and receiving from him a divine mandate. <sup>f448</sup> As a result of this conference, the Laymen's Missionary Movement was

launched. An executive committee of thirty laymen was appointed to direct this campaign of education, with Samuel B. Capen, of Boston, as chairman. <sup>f449</sup>

This committee, in a communication to the annual conference of the mission boards of the United States and Canada, meeting in Philadelphia, January 9, 1907, stated the purpose of the Movement:

1. It is not a new missionary board to collect funds or to administer them; it is not to raise up or send out missionaries; it is not to seek to use its influence among young people, students or women, but its work is to be chiefly among the mature men of the Church.
2. It is not an interdenominational movement which proposes to do its work outside of regular denominational lines or to make a new missionary Brotherhood independent of those already established.

We earnestly recommend to the Foreign Mission Boards of all denominations that they secure groups of laymen to promote campaigns of intelligent and generous interest in Foreign Missions, with special reference to the men of the Church, the expense of these movements to be borne whenever possible by such groups of men, so that funds of the Boards shall not be drawn upon.

The Laymen's Missionary Movement spread rapidly in the United States and Canada. Within three years, several of the leading denominations perfected comparable movements among their laymen. The Southern Baptist Convention was among the first, perhaps the very first denominational organization, to take action in 1907. Mr. Joshua Levering of Baltimore and the Honorable W.J. Northen of Atlanta took the lead in calling a conference of laymen to meet the day before the annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention that year. After a day of discussion and spiritual enthusiasm the conference appointed a committee, of which Mr. Levering was chairman, to present the subject to the Convention.

After a full and free discussion of the report by laymen and ministers, the Convention approved the new movement. The executive committee, named in the report, elected Mr. J. Harry Tyler, chairman. The headquarters were located in Baltimore.

The next year (1908) the executive committee made its first report to the Convention. After giving a survey of the origin, purpose, scope, method and development of the Movement, the re-port noted specifically: <sup>f450</sup>

1. That this movement is not an organization, or brotherhood, but its object is to *arouse* and *stimulate* dormant forces to proper activity, along the line of missions.

2. That a broadening of its scope, so as to embrace other objects, weakens its efficiency and dissipates its energy. It *must be specific* in order to be intense. Strong business men cannot be enlisted if the Movement becomes too general or all-comprehensive. If it is encumbered with various denominational or local enterprises it will be smothered. Under no circumstances should it embrace more than Home and Foreign Missions. *This limitation is vital to its very existence.*

The Executive Committee feels that the Convention is to be congratulated that it so early saw the vision, and by its action in Richmond, last year, availed itself of the principles underlying the Movement for the development of its work in carrying out the Great Commission.

From the moment of its organization, the executive committee realized that it was absolutely essential to secure a competent lay-man to give all his time to the interests of the Movement. The committee reported the following year that Professor J.T. Henderson, who had been elected general secretary, had entered actively upon his duties July 1, 1908. He had continued his connection with Virginia Intermont College, Bristol, but had devoted most of his time and attention to this movement.

The new secretary proved, during his first ten months, that the executive committee had chosen wisely. He traveled more than twenty-five thousand miles, delivered one hundred and twenty-five addresses in thirteen states, attended eleven state conventions and many associations, and participated in numerous institutes and conferences. Under his wise leadership, the Movement made so much progress, enlisting so many laymen of the churches of the South and developing the work, that, in 1914, Professor Henderson resigned his connection with the Virginia Intermont College and gave all his time to the further enlistment and training of the laymen.

From the beginning of Professor Henderson's secretaryship the program had three emphases: organization, education, inspiration. The executive committee, which was located first in Baltimore, then in Chattanooga, Knoxville, and, finally in Memphis in 1938, has directed the movement throughout the territory of the Convention. In 1909, the committee proposed that each state convention select a committee of from three to ten laymen to exercise general supervision of the work within its territory, to have the responsibility of seeing that the Movement was presented in each association, and that a committee of not more than three be appointed to direct the cause in the association. The associational committee would have the responsibility of securing appointment of a laymen's missionary committee in each church.

The purpose of the Laymen's Movement, as announced in Chairman Tyler's first report to the Convention, was missionary. As already seen, the limitation

of its activities to missions was considered, in the beginning, as vital to its very existence. But as the Movement progressed and its activities enlarged and developed, its purpose was enlarged in a corresponding degree. The Lay-men's Movement has had a historical and functional development comparable to the Southern Convention itself. It has been one of the organizations, formed around the perimeter of the Convention but more intimately related, later, to the Convention. It became, in 1952, a Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention.

After the Seventy-five Million Campaign period, as a result of which the Convention came to a fuller realization of corporate consciousness and denominational solidarity, the name of the Laymen's Missionary Movement was changed, in 1926, to the Baptist Brotherhood of the South. The reason assigned at the time was that "the new name enlarges the scope of operation and makes prominent the idea of fellowship or brotherhood." Fifteen years later, in the report of the Brotherhood to the Convention two other reasons were given for the change: <sup>f451</sup>

"First, it was realized that there would be greater possibilities if the scope of the movement included our entire denominational program rather than being restricted to one phase, namely, Missions. Second, the name, Laymen's Missionary Movement, by implication at least, seemed to exclude our pastors, while the term Brotherhood includes both pastor and layman."

The change in name and objective illustrates the place of missions in the life of the church. It may be seen again and again in history that the teaching and practice of missions react on the home base and completely modify the life, the outlook, the activity of Christian men and women.

In the same report, the Brotherhood called attention to the fact that it was an integral part of the Southern Baptist Convention and that it was an authorized, recognized, and sustained feature of our denominational program, as much so as is the Sunday school, Training Union, seminaries, or our great Mission Boards or any other agency or activity among Southern Baptists.

Obviously, therefore, a church is not complete in its denominational structure without a Brotherhood. ... it is, therefore, incumbent upon the Brotherhood to function at all times within the framework of the church and denominational program, and in complete harmony and cooperation with every other group and organization within the church and denomination. And it is equally incumbent upon every other group and organization to extend to the Brotherhood the same cordial co-operation and support. <sup>f452</sup>

In the developing organized life of the Brotherhood, the plans have called for a secretary in each state convention. By 1943, nine state bodies — Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee,

and Texas — had such secretaries. The goal calls for organization by associations also. In many of the associations there are well-planned, organized bodies which function more or less effectively. The work lags, however, because the associational officers are voluntary workers and, in most instances, do not have sufficient time to work their whole territory. In 1944 space for reports on Brotherhood work had been incorporated in the Uniform Association Letter.

In its program of information and inspiration, the Brotherhood has endeavored to work in and through the organized life of the church, the association, the state convention and the Southern Baptist Convention. In some churches mission committees became active and enlisted a growing number of the men of the congregations. After the change of name from the Laymen's Missionary Movement of Southern Baptists to the Baptist Brotherhood of the South, the laymen's mission committee of the local church has been supplanted by an organization which included all the men of the church. This local Brotherhood, the Brotherhood of the local church, holds a weekly, monthly, or quarterly meeting which is, in many churches, a supper-program affair. A weekly meeting has been found to be more efficient. These meetings offer opportunities for fellowship and for information concerning the work and objectives of the church and the denomination and for inspiration to greater endeavor and achievement.

In many associations in the South there has been formed a Baptist Brotherhood, which has a place on the annual program of that body, and the place of the layman — his opportunity and obligation — in the life and activity of the church and the denomination has been stressed. In some of the associations, the annual Brotherhood banquet is an important event for the laymen of the churches.

Likewise, in the evolution of the program of the laymen, as announced in the 1926 report to the Convention recommending a change of name, a Baptist Brotherhood of the state has been formed within the sphere of the state convention. This offers a large opportunity for fellowship, for information and for inspiration to the laymen of the churches of the state.

The Brotherhood now urges Christian men to be faithful to their churches in attendance, in service, including personal evangelism, and in the financial support of every enterprise of the church, whether local or otherwise. This includes all the causes of the home church, together with the support of Christian education, State, Home and Foreign Missions, Hospitals, Orphanages and Ministerial Relief. All this service is to be rendered in strict loyalty to the policies of the pastor and church. <sup>1453</sup>

[In 1952, the Brotherhood reported that sixteen of the twenty-two state conventions had well-financed Brotherhood departments with competent, consecrated Brotherhood secretaries.] In some of the states, laymen's conventions, largely attended and with in-forming and inspiring programs, have been held. The Brother-hood is given a large place on the program of the Southern Baptist Convention and, also, at Ridgecrest and other summer assemblies.

As a further means of information and inspiration, the Brother-hood has made wide use of the printed page. For the assistance of Brotherhoods of churches in their weekly or monthly meetings, program material has been supplied. A quarterly of thirteen studies has been issued for those that have weekly meetings, and an annual of twelve studies has been provided for monthly meetings. Beginning with January, 1944, the *Brotherhood Quarterly* has been called the *Brotherhood Journal* and is serving a further purpose than that of program material for a weekly or monthly meeting. Its reading public extends far beyond the attendance upon the Brotherhood meetings. The Brotherhood committee distributes other literature also. Thousands of pages of tracts furnish in-formation and bases of discussion on the fundamentals of New Testament religion, and the life and work of Southern Baptists. This literature has given "substantial complimentary publicity ... to every Southwide agency and activity, and to many of the activities within the programs of our state conventions."

In the light of the enlarging sphere of activity opening before the members of the Brotherhood, the executive committee proceeded to declare a threefold objective "in order that the laymen may attain the largest degree of efficiency in promoting these causes of the Kingdom":

- (1) Spirituality: Prayer and reading of the Bible in private and in family circles.
- (2) Information: A knowledge of the fundamental teachings of the Bible and the work of the mission boards and other denominational agencies.
- (3) Service: The Brotherhoods of the local churches have committees for the various phases of church activity. In the work of these committees the men of the churches may find opportunities for service and training for longer service.

Some church Brother-hoods create committees of zealous laymen who visit backward churches and render a most valuable service, without expense, both in connection with their financial affairs and evangelistic meetings.

As already seen, the executive committee of the Laymen's Missionary Movement recognized the necessity of placing an able layman in charge of the

work of the Movement. Professor J.T. Henderson, who became general secretary July 1, 1908, led wisely and successfully, developing a growing sense of responsibility and privilege in the thinking of Southern Baptist laymen.

When the Laymen's Missionary Movement became the Baptist Brotherhood a much larger field of activity and service was indicated. With the larger field and the increasing momentum, an associate secretary was added to the staff. Mr. George J. Burnett served from July 1, 1927 to January 1, 1931. In 1936 Mr. Lawson H. Cooke became associate secretary and served until July 1, 1938. On that date, Secretary Henderson completed thirty years of service and became general secretary emeritus, and Mr. Cooke succeeded him as general secretary. On March 1, 1939, Mr. Hugh F. Latimer became associate secretary.

In 1946, the title of the general secretary was changed to executive secretary. In March of that year, Mr. George W. Schroeder was elected associate secretary. Since January 1, 1953, following the retirement of Mr. Lawson Cooke under whose leadership for fifteen years the Brotherhood had experienced phenomenal growth, Mr. Schroeder has served as executive secretary. Mr. James Sapp is associate secretary.

## 16. — THE CONVENTION AND PROBLEMS OF SOCIETY

During the century since the Southern Baptist Convention was organized, there have been tremendous changes in the United States. The permanent results and trends of the War Between the States were increasingly in evidence. A new era of creative activity was manifested in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Immigration in increasing numbers from Europe and the spread of population westward brought new problems of every kind. New political horizons opened up. The Spanish-American War projected the United States into the field of world politics. New trends and developments and discoveries in every phase of science opened up new highways for human progress. A new approach to the study of the Bible, of religion, and of Christian history brought increasing problems and tasks for the churches. In Europe, the rise of Marxism and the spread of socialistic ideas in Europe and America brought new hope to thousands and new problems to leaders in every realm.

One of our Baptist writers put it this way:

A great social awakening took place in the American consciousness. Far more than people realize, this had a religious motivation and leadership. ... Long before political parties took up the cause of reform, and changes were carried through publicly by men who spoke only a secular language, the influence of Christian social thought, Christian personalities, and definite social teaching in Christian circles were providing inspiration and ideology for the leaders of a better day.

The liberal Christian social movement. ... called for a fresh study and criticism of social and religious conditions and institutions, a new interpretation of the principles of Jesus and their application to every phase of human life. ... <sup>f454</sup>

The attitude of Southern Baptists toward the increasingly complicated problems of society and the official actions of the conventions (state and Southwide) thereon have been determined by the interpretation of the gospel for which Baptists have always stood. Sin is personal. Therefore, the salvation brought by the good news of the cross must be personal. This must ever remain the core of the gospel message. But the regenerated individual is a unit of human society; therefore he has obligations to his fellows, individually and collectively.

In his report on social service to the 1923 Convention, Dr. A.J. Barton said: <sup>f455</sup>

This gospel which we preach and which, please God, we shall always preach, in its completeness and power, for the salvation of the individual lays upon everyone who receives it the obligation of service, service to individuals, service to the family, service to the state, service to society, and service to society in social service. One can no more be a good, well-rounded Christian, or a good well-rounded Baptist, without believing in and practicing social service than one can be with-out believing in and practicing missions, Christian Education or Christian Beneficence. ...

... Southern Baptists have never preached and will never preach social service as a substitute for the work of grace in the individual heart. In our social service we take the individual work of grace for granted and on that basis we stress social and civic obligation. ...

... The story of the Good Samaritan is the social gospel dramatized; Paul's collection among the believers in Macedonia, Achaia, Galatia, for the poor, hungry Jewish Christians at Jerusalem is the social gospel in sacrificial action. The greater part of our Lord's acts on earth were devoted to meeting the temporal needs and the suffering of humanity, not that this outranks in importance the saving of individual souls and lives through grace, but that in many cases such temporal relief easily leads the way to salvation and in every case the spirit of the saved man logically and necessarily expresses itself in such service.

From time to time the Convention has reiterated its position on the proper emphasis upon and relation between the individual and social aspects of the gospel. In its first consideration of the evils of society and the application of the gospel to those evils, the Convention did not deal with society as a whole, but considered particular phases thereof. Gradually, through the years, a wider approach and a more comprehensive plan of attack have been perfected.

Dr. J.B. Weatherspoon reminded the 1944 Convention, in the Social Service Report, that we should consider not only alcohol-ism and the social evils involved in the liquor business, but other vices and social practices that are hostile to the social order and human well-being.

... We can be instrumental in bringing to the attention of our people enlightening facts, we can arrive at moral interpretations that will appeal to the Christian conscience; as occasions arise we can suggest effective implementation of moral opinion; we can become by conscious purpose a mighty moral force in the midst of the people by voicing in terms of present-day social relations the meaning of the principles set out by Jesus Christ for the guidance of Christians in their association with others. ...

We must believe firmly that the base line of all our social judgments and proposals is Christian moral teachings. ... We must recognize that the social function of this Convention is not to promote social action as a substitute for evangelism and education, but rather, to combine and coordinate in one

harmonious whole the three elements of its task — evangelism, education, and action. ... Organized Christianity should be in the vanguard of leadership in grappling with social wrongs that harass the people to whom it preaches. ...  
f456

The difficulty of the Southern Convention in dealing with social problems has indeed been twofold. Not only has the individualistic interpretation of sin and of regeneration been a determining factor, but also the character of the Convention itself has entered into the question. The constitution, from 1845 to the present, has declared that “the design of this Convention (is) to promote Foreign and Domestic Missions, and other important objects connected with the Redeemer’s kingdom.” The interpretation and application of this expression, “important objects,” are comparable to the uses made of the “welfare clause” in the Constitution of the United States. From time to time, the connotation of the expression has been enlarged in scope.

For the first half century, the Convention was considered a missionary society and was often referred to as “the Southern Missionary Convention.” Other interests had not as yet been incorporated in its plans. In 1888 Dr. Boyce, as president of the Convention, ruled out of order resolutions on temperance and was sustained by a majority vote of the Convention. f457 During the two decades, 1890-1910, there was a change in the conception of the character of the Convention. Any religious work or moral question which Baptists desired to face was considered within the purview of “other important objects connected with the Redeemer’s kingdom.” But social relationships within the secular sphere were not to be considered.

The first step of the Convention toward consideration of the evils in the social order concerned the liquor traffic. This was determined by the growth of public sentiment. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and other organized attacks were developing public sentiment against the sale of alcoholic liquors for use as beverage. The inclusion of one temperance program quarterly in the Interdenominational Sunday School Lesson Series was training a coming generation in a knowledge of the evil and an attitude thereto. The question was becoming a factor in the sphere of political action. Bills were before state legislatures for consideration. Two Southern states, Texas and Tennessee, held elections on the question. A national prohibition party was in process of formation. Denominational bodies were taking notice of the course of events.

During the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth, the Convention was occupied in the task of rethinking its own character and objectives. Several controversies — mission methods, theological education, young peoples’ work, Sunday school work, woman’s work, sources and bases of representation in the Convention — gave neither

time nor opportunity for consideration of social problems. This controversial era passed the crucial stage in the withdrawal of a large group of the Landmark followers of Dr. J.R. Graves, after their ultimatum was rejected by the 1905 Convention in Kansas City.

In 1907, at Richmond, the Convention adopted a resolution instructing the president to appoint a committee of three to plan a mass-meeting for the Sunday afternoon session of the 1908 Convention:

... said mass-meeting to consider and counsel together as to what may best be done by Christian men and ministers, especially Baptists, for creating a more wholesome public opinion; for making the criminal laws more certain, more prompt and more effective; so as to take away the reproach resting on civilization and religion by the prevalence of crime and lynching; and so as to make the law respected and effective in all parts of our common country.

This was the first time the Convention appointed a committee to report on social questions. Thenceforth, the Convention has appointed a standing committee or commission of varying title to make an annual report, which has grown in size and scope as the social outlook and interest of Southern Baptists have grown and broadened.

In 1913, a Commission on Social Service was set up,<sup>f458</sup> and, the following year, it absorbed the Committee on Temperance.<sup>f459</sup> In its first report, the Commission defined the kingdom of God and a Christian church, declared the social responsibility of the church, and indicated the method of accomplishment:

**1.** The Kingdom of God, which was the theme of Jesus' teaching and the aim of his ministry, is the organic expression of the will of God in human relations, an all-embracing social ideal to be realized in the reign of righteousness in the earthly life of man. It is the will of God operative and controlling in the individual and social life. ...

**2.** A Christian Church is an organized community of those who accept Christ as Saviour and obey him as Lord, who are committed to his ideal. It is ... an agency through which that life may express it-self in associated worship and service, and in the realization of the personal ideal of Christian character and the social ideal of the kingdom of God on earth. ...

**4.** The Christian Church is directly responsible for the right solution of social problems:

**(1)** War, whether economic or political, is the enemy of the life of man, and the Christian Church is called to leadership in its ultimate abolition.

(2) The traffic in alcohol and the habit-forming drugs obstruct squarely the progress of the kingdom, and with it the Church can have no parleying, make no compromise.

(3) Vice is a canker set deep in human life calling for a Christian surgery of the firmest nerve and the widest intelligence.

(4) The diseases which cut short the life otherwise spent in long service of the kingdom, as well as those which lower the tone and impair the efficiency of the life not cut short, the Church is under obligation to treat and cure. It must build up a wholesome public opinion on the sanctity of personal health, and on the duty to apply in organized society and the latest discoveries in public sanitation.

... Social life is to be cleansed by cleansing the life of the social unit. No mere economic program can exhaust the aim and the resources of the gospel. It is not a new distribution of wealth or a new classification of people that is wanted, but new people. The Church will do nothing, unless it do this deepest thing — transform the individual life, infect it with the ideal of the kingdom, train it for the work of the kingdom.

... Another method by which the Church can serve the common need, and so fulfill the law of Christ, is to provide for the poor, the sick, and the defective, and, what is more important to provide against them.

These are the principles underlying social service that the Southern Convention has asserted and re-asserted through the Social Service Commission from year to year. The particular application has varied according to current circumstances in the secular world.

For a number of years, because of the over-emphasis upon “the social gospel” to the loss of the individual emphasis, a tendency seen for a generation in other areas of American Christianity, the Convention hesitated to enter upon a program of increased study of moral and social problems, for fear that the proper emphasis upon the individual gospel might be lost. However, the increasing emphases on social questions and the sinister attacks by entrenched iniquity, led Southern Baptists to see the need for facing frankly and fearlessly the evils of our age. We believe that the gospel of the regenerating, transforming power of God is relevant to every individual and social problem.

In the 1944 report to which we have already referred, we find these challenging conclusions: <sup>f460</sup>

Too often religious leaders in the church have been silent concerning the evils on the door-step that press most heavily and call most insistently for Christian initiative. This does not mean that we should seek immediate and final judgment; it means rather that we should set ourselves to understand, to explore the facts, to get a true perspective, to read all in the light of Christian

motives and ends, and to set our feet a step forward in the direction of solution. For some problems there is no final solution, but in the most difficult some progress is possible. ... The Social Service Commission was not appointed to deal with problems remote from Southern life or only those in which a final Christian answer is evident; nor was it appointed to bring final recommendations concerning all the problems with which it deals. It was appointed to keep alive in our thought the problems that confront us and in which we have an inescapable Christian concern; to make report from time to time of advance or retreat or critical urgency with respect to particular issues; and to propose Convention action where in its judgment such action would help.

The Commission, considering its function to be to lead Southern Baptists into a larger appreciation of the social teachings of the gospel and the application of those teachings to the churches, the nation, and the world, has gradually through the years enlarged its scope and has been more specific in statement. From year to year, in response to emphases in current situations in political, social, economic, and religious life, the Commission has brought to the attention of Southern Baptists, in the annual reports to the Convention, questions of alcohol, family problems, gambling, social sins, race relations, labor, farm tenancy, church and state, religious liberty, war, mob-violence, civil liberties, hospitals, social security. These emphases have shown that, in their corporate capacity, Southern Baptists have been increasingly aware of current emphases on social problems in secular life.

## 17. — RELATIONS WITH OTHER BAPTIST BODIES

During the years when all phases of the work of the Southern Baptist Convention were being closely articulated, when the effort to enlist the whole membership of the churches was beginning, when an operating budget was taking shape, and the Executive Committee was being formed and its authority and powers defined, the Convention considered it necessary to define its relationship to other Baptist organizations and delimit its own sphere of activity and prerogatives. In 1926<sup>f461</sup> the Convention declared its “very close relationship to certain other organizations, but over which it had no control. Among the most important are the following: The Woman’s Missionary Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention; the Conventions of the several states within the territory of the Convention, and the District of Columbia; the District Associations which co-operate with this Convention; and the churches.”

### DEVELOPMENT OF CONVENTIONS

We have already seen in chapter 1 reference to the origin and functions of associations. Let us look now at the conventions. The purpose of the first national convention was to raise funds for foreign missions. The convention was composed of those who contributed or were appointed by those who contributed to missions. The basis of representation, therefore, was financial. National societies were formed to raise money for other objects, each group represented by a specific society. State conventions were formed to raise funds for missions, education, and other objects. They were, thus, more comprehensive than the national societies and carried more of the ecclesiastical character. There were Baptists, chiefly in the South, who desired a national body, all-comprehensive in character.

In the development of the state and national bodies and their relations with one another and with the district associations, the conception of an all-comprehensive body, based on the churches and capable of speaking and acting for the churches, began to win favor.

The two conceptions of the Southern Baptist Convention — a voluntary society for home and foreign missions or an ecclesiastical body, qualified to speak to and for the churches, have entered into the relations of the Convention with other Baptist bodies — state conventions and national organizations — and with religious bodies other than Baptist. The Convention, either directly or through its boards, has entered into relations with state conventions or

associations and district associations within its territory as one independent Baptist organization dealing with another of the same character.

## **FOREIGN MISSIONS AND THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION**

The foreign mission societies had been sending their funds to the board of the General Convention in Boston; some of the domestic mission societies (state and associational) had been co-operating with the American Baptist Home Mission Society; and some had been doing mission work in their own territory. The new Convention desired to secure the co-operation of these societies with its own work, foreign and domestic. All of the Southern foreign mission societies became contributory to the Foreign Board of the Southern Baptist Convention and ultimately ceased to exist. The question of “co-operation” in foreign mission work was no longer a problem. It became a question of “contributing” to the Foreign Mission Board.

## **HOME MISSIONS AND SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION**

In the sphere of home missions, it remained and continues to be a question of co-operation between the Home Board of the Southern Baptist Convention and the associational or state bodies. The Convention recognized three difficulties in securing the co-operation of other bodies with the Domestic Board: <sup>f462</sup> “The first cause is, that all our missionary organizations, from this Convention down to the isolated effort of a single church society, are, and ever must be, voluntary. ... No ecclesiastical authority can control, direct, or interfere in this matter. This cause can be overruled only by the greater prevalence in our churches of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

The second difficulty was found “in the great extent of country over which our labors extend, in the sparseness of population, the want of facilities of communicating and receiving intelligence, and the inaccessibility of many of those communities which need aid. Time ... will gradually overcome most of these difficulties.”

The third source of difficulty in co-operation “may be found in the various conditions of our Associations (which) may be divided into three classes.” The first class was made up of the associations that were fully provided with preaching by strong churches. They were few in number, but should be great in efficiency.

“The churches should contribute largely for Domestic Missions, and can operate most successfully by constituting (the Domestic Mission Board) exclusively the minister of their bounty. The second class consists of those

Associations which still need some missionary labor, though they are able to contribute more than will suffice for their own wants. The surplus of their contributions should certainly be devoted to more destitute regions through the agency of the Domestic Mission Board. ... In the third class may be placed all those Associations which are so far destitute, as to require for their own supply more funds than can be raised among themselves. These should, of course, obtain aid through (the Domestic Mission Board), from those whom Providence has blessed with the gospel and with earthly substance. ...”

It was

“*Resolved*, That the General Associations and State Conventions be requested to use such means as in their peculiar circumstances they may consider wisest to secure the most complete co-operation with our Domestic Mission Board.”

In 1867, the Domestic Board reported a plan of co-operation that had been made with associations <sup>f463</sup>

An association desires the services of one or more Missionaries. The subject is referred to the Executive Committee, or Board of that body. This committee meet and make the appointment, fixing the amount of salary and field of labor. They recommend the appointment of the same to the Board of Domestic Missions, stating the amount of salary necessary, and how much of it the Executive Committee will pay, the Board pay the balance, if the appointment is approved. ... The amount paid by the Executive Committee of the association will constitute the basis of representation in the Southern Baptist Convention, which is one of the advantages of this auxiliary connection.

In 1869, a comparable plan of co-operation with state conventions was adopted: <sup>f464</sup>

“Several of our State Conventions have formed an auxiliary connection with the Board. ... Mississippi and South Carolina State Conventions are working successfully in this arrangement, and Georgia and Alabama leave the Home work to the Domestic Board, and contribute all funds for this purpose directly to its treasury.”

In view of the voluntary character of each Baptist body, there is repeated action of the Southern Convention bearing on the need of co-operation between the Southern and the state conventions. Almost annual reference is made to this in the Domestic Board’s reports. By 1880, the era of political reconstruction in the South was passed, and the Southern Baptist Convention also had asserted its independence and was on the high road to recovery. Definite plans were laid and steps taken to recover territory lost during the preceding fifteen years of post-war struggle for survival. In 1881, the Convention adopted a recommendation “that the Boards of the Convention be directed to form the closest possible connection with the State Boards, where

such exist, in such a way as shall be mutually agreeable.”<sup>f465</sup> But the effort was not very successful. During the following year, the secretary of the Home Mission Board visited eight state conventions. Only three made an alliance with the Board.

As already indicated, the Southern Convention considered itself a voluntary body. As such a body, the Convention entered into co-operative mission work with state organizations and other voluntary bodies. It was on the principle of voluntary co-operation between independent Baptist bodies that Secretary Tichenor projected his program of bringing the state conventions again into free co-operation with the Southern Convention through the Home Board and, thus, save the home front of the Convention.

When Dr. Tichenor became secretary of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Convention, many of the state conventions of the South had co-operative working agreements with the American Baptist Home Mission Society of New York. Each Baptist body — convention, association, or society — was a voluntary organization, composed of the contributors (or their appointed representatives) to the work of the body. These independent bodies co-operated as they chose. One of Dr. Tichenor’s great achievements, as discussed in a previous chapter, was to bring the state conventions (white) of the South (except West Virginia)<sup>f466</sup> into full alignment with the Southern Convention. The first years of the twentieth century saw the state conventions greatly strengthened. This fact intensified the problem set forth in the pronouncement of the Southern Convention in 1928. The Seventy-five Million Campaign left a deposit of unification in the thinking of Southern Baptists and hastened the development that had been growing, looking toward the modification of the voluntary character of Baptist bodies and merging them into an articulated denominational system.

## **PRINCIPLES GOVERNING CO-OPERATION**

On the basis of the relationship with state conventions, defined by the Southern Convention, co-operative work in home missions continued, the different types of work increasing with the years. It was found necessary, by 1901, to lay down certain fundamental rules governing co-operation. The Home Board, in its report to the Convention, recounted the changed conditions in the several states that were calling for a program larger than the state conventions could individually meet. The Board proposed certain changes in the methods of co-operation to meet the larger needs.

The Convention approved the new regulations, as follows:<sup>f467</sup>

1. That the work to be undertaken by the Home Mission Board in any State should be a co-operative work as far as practicable, the terms of co-operation to be such as may be mutually agreed upon between the Home Mission Board and the State organization. The Home Board shall enter the names of all its missionaries on its own books, defining their fields of labor and the terms of their employment.
2. That the Home Mission Board “shall require from each missionary engaged in this co-operative work an exact duplicate of every report made to the other co-operative body or bodies.”
3. That the Home Mission Board “shall have all reports properly tabulated in its home office, so that its own reports may show the work being done by its own missionaries.”
4. That “where co-operative work is done with any State or local organization, such organization shall be expected and requested to make full recognition in their reports of the part or proportion of this work which is done by the Home Mission Board, and, *vice versa*, that the Home Mission Board shall make full recognition of the part or proportion that is done by any other organization.”

On the basis of these regulations, slightly revised from year to year, co-operation between the Southern Convention, through the Home Mission Board, and the state conventions continued.

Criticism also continued. The aggression which brought forth criticism always arose from the state convention point of view. This was perhaps due to the fact that, from the beginning of organized life, state conventions had a more nearly ecclesiastical relationship with the churches than did the Southern Convention. However, in one instance, the only one, the Southern Convention took the initiative and defined the relationship of the churches, through the state conventions, to the Southern Convention on a semi-ecclesiastical basis. In 1912, Dr. J.B. Gambrell presented a committee report on the functions and finances of the Home Board: <sup>f468</sup>

The criticism of the Board because of its cooperative relations to other missionary organizations is without proper thought and in the face of sound reason. It is safe to say that if from the beginning the denominational policy had been to relate every church outward, through the association board, and further out through the State Board, then with the Boards of this Convention, we would not now be listening to a report about thousands of laggard churches within our bounds. The outward reach and flow are essential to health and in the fullness of time to life itself. Besides, the cooperative tie enables the Home Board, with the massive strength of this Convention behind it and with a full view of the wide field, to go in at the weak places everywhere and strengthen the things that remain. The supreme function of the Home Board may be set down briefly under two heads: First, the Board's

duty is to look over the entire territory of this Convention, elicit, combine and direct every possible force to evangelize and safeguard our land. Second, to train a force for missionary conquest to the uttermost parts of the earth.

During the Seventy-five Million Campaign period, situations arose that led the Executive Committee of the Southern Convention to make recommendations on the relations between the Convention and other Baptist bodies:

- 1.** The Southern Baptist Convention is organized like all other Baptist bodies, on the voluntary principle. This is derived from the fundamental principle on which a Baptist church is constituted — self-determination in all matters pertaining to its own work under the lordship of Jesus Christ.
- 2.** The relation of the Convention to all other Baptist general bodies is purely advisory. It has no authority over the churches, over District Associations, State Conventions, or other Baptist bodies of any kind, nor has any other Baptist general body any authority over the Convention.
- 3.** The Convention occupies a sphere in our denominational work peculiar to itself and in conflict with no other organization or interest of the denomination. In order, therefore, that the unity, integrity and efficiency of the Convention be not weakened or impaired, it is necessary that the Convention maintain and preserve its own right and function in determining its general plans, policies, and programs as to organization and methods, the raising of funds and general objectives involved in its own work. This is simply another way of saying that the Convention should preserve its own integrity as a Baptist body.
- 4.** In all cases and degrees where the activities of the Convention are related to the activities of other Baptist bodies the controlling principle is free and voluntary cooperation for common ends. Since no Baptist body has authority over any other, there can be no question of dictation on either side. Among Baptists, moral and spiritual rights and obligations are mutual. Only confusion can result from a failure to recognize the mutuality of these relations. We cooperate not by coercion, but by mutual consent. Free conference and frank discussion enable us to reach satisfactory conclusions for cooperative work. We must never convert moral and spiritual into legal relations among Baptist general bodies.

This declaration was adopted by the Convention in 1923 and again in 1924.

Although most of the questions and friction between the Southern Convention and the state conventions have arisen in the sphere and conduct of missions, chiefly mission work conducted by the Home Mission Board, in the 1920's, friction did arise over the collection and distribution of funds for all denominational purposes. This raised questions of ecclesiastical authority and right.

## MCDANIEL STATEMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The financial issue arose from another direction, also, in the years immediately following the Seventy-five Million Campaign. In 1926, when Dr. G.W. McDaniel was elected president of the Convention the third time, he expressed, in his acceptance speech, his personal views on the current evolution issue.

“This Convention accepts Genesis as teaching that man was the special creation of God, and rejects every theory, evolution or other, which teaches that man originated in, or came by *way* of a lower animal ancestry.”

President McDaniel prefaced his suggestion concerning a statement of the belief of Southern Baptists about creation by quoting the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

Then the reporter for the *Christian Index*, from which we quote, added: <sup>f469</sup>

It was as eloquently done as any Scripture reading I have ever heard. As he moved from verse to verse, giving just the right accent to every phrase, the great audience softened under the spell of the mighty words, and when he reached the closing verses it was evident that the lowering clouds of pre-convention prophets had been swept away, and that the sunshine of God's own leading was pervading the hearts of the people. The president added, “I beg you therefore not to worry about problems; they belong to God. We should content ourselves to work at tasks to which he has set our hands, remembering that in service we discover unity.

The Convention adopted his statement as its own, with the proviso that there should be no further discussion of the issue during that session. Since the Convention had approved the McDaniel statement, and President Scarborough had announced that it had been made a part of the statement of Faith of the Southwestern Seminary, and that it “would be made a test of all officers and teachers of said Seminary,” Dr. S.E. Tull introduced a series of resolutions to the effect that

this Convention request all its institutions and Boards, and their missionary representatives to give a like assurance to the Convention and to our Baptist Brotherhood in general, of a hearty and individual acceptance of the said action of the Convention to the end that the great cause of our present unrest and agitation over the Evolution question may be effectively and finally removed in the minds of the constituency of the Convention and all others concerned.

In view of the unanimous action of the Convention on the first day in adopting the McDaniel Statement and providing “that from this point on no further consideration be given to the subject,” many throughout the South considered

that the action of the last day was unwise, invalid, and not in good faith. <sup>f470</sup>  
The members of most of the Boards and institutions declined to sign the statement.

In its annual session, November, 1926, the Oklahoma Convention precipitated the issue between the Southern Convention and the state conventions, as old as the Southern Convention itself, by unanimously passing the following:

Since the Southern Baptist Convention at its session held at Houston, Texas, in May, 1926, passed the Tull resolution, the substance of which was, that Faculty members of southwide institutions and representatives of other southwide interests be requested to sign up as endorsing the McDaniel statement concerning the Genesis account of creation; we the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma, in session assembled, hereby instruct our Corresponding Secretary to withhold pro rata of undesignated funds from such institutions and interests, until such time as they shall sign up in accordance with the above request of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The fundamental issue, raised by the Oklahoma General Convention in seeking to meet a special condition, was met by the Southern Convention in 1927 in instructions to the Executive Committee as follows: <sup>f471</sup>

**2.** That it make a full and complete statement of the basis of co-operation of the Southern Baptist Convention with co-operating state conventions and state boards. The statement should define the relations of the Southern Baptist Convention to the co-operating state conventions and state boards, and the principle of co-operation, and the methods of co-operation, the terms and limits of co-operation. The basis of co-operation should be comprehensive enough to clarify all principles involved in our Co-operative work with all other bodies. The following matters call for special attention:

**(1)** That the duties, functions and limitations of state conventions and boards as collecting agencies for the Southern Baptist Convention be clearly defined.

...

**(4)** That special attention be given to safeguarding all Southwide funds passing through the hands of state treasurers to the end that no money allocated by the Southern Baptist Convention to any object be withheld from that object or diverted to any other object. No state convention or state board or state treasurer has the moral or legal right to pursue any course with such Southwide funds other than to duly remit them to the board or agency to which they were allocated.

The action of the Oklahoma General Convention gave the Southern Convention the opportunity to make a pronouncement not only upon a special issue but also upon the general practice of some state conventions of withholding funds for Southwide objects — a practice that had become prevalent during the five-year period of the Seventy-five Million Campaign.

In 1928, the Southern Convention adopted the report of the Executive Committee, which, among other items, included the longest and most detailed statement on relations between the Southern Convention and state conventions in the history of those relations. <sup>f472</sup>

All Baptist general bodies are voluntary organizations, established by individuals who wish to cooperate for some common end or ends in the kingdom of God. <sup>f473</sup> This Convention is not an ecclesiastical body composed of churches, nor a federal body composed of state conventions. Churches may seek to fulfill their obligation to extend Christ's kingdom by cooperating with this general organization, but always on a purely voluntary basis, and without surrendering in any way or degree their right of self-determination. These associations, unions, or conventions vary greatly in form, in size, in purpose, in territorial extent and in conditions of membership. But they all are similar to churches in the fundamental principle of their organization and life in that each is in-dependent of all others in its own work, free, fraternal, autonomous, or self-determining in its own sphere and activities.

The principle of cooperation between individuals and churches and general bodies in pursuit of great common ends is also a basic teaching of the gospel. In all cooperative endeavor the principle of autonomy or self-determination should be carefully conserved.

There is no relation of superiority and inferiority among Baptist general bodies. All are equal. All make their appeal directly to individuals and churches. Each determines its own objectives — financial or otherwise — and allocates its own funds to the interests promoted by it. Each defines and fixes its own sphere of activities. But all is done with due consideration and regard for the functions of other Baptist bodies.

The powers of Baptist general bodies are never legislative, but al-ways advisory in their relations to churches, and to each other.

The cooperation of Baptist general bodies with each other may be desirable from time to time for the sake of greater economy and efficiency. But there are dangers connected with such cooperation due to misunderstanding, confusion of thinking, and sometimes to trespassing upon the rights of cooperating bodies by one or other of the parties to the arrangement.

One of the present danger points is in the cooperative relations between the Southern Baptist Convention and the various state conventions. This convention disclaims all authority over any state convention, but wishes to define its own functions and activities in relation to state bodies. The following points should be stressed:

- 1.** The cooperative relations between this Convention and state bodies as now established are limited to the one matter of collecting funds for southwide and state objects. The state convention boards are at present recognized by this Convention as collecting agencies for Southwide as well as state funds. This

arrangement, however, is not an essential in Baptist organization, but is made simply as a matter of convenience and economy, and may be changed at any time.

**2.** The fact that the state bodies first handle the funds and are more directly related to the churches in the matter of collections does not alter the basic relations involved. For the practical ends in view this Convention cooperates in the unified appeal for funds through state agencies. But in principle it retains as inalienable and inherent the right to direct appeal to the churches. Furthermore, in all matters other than money raising it retains complete control of its own affairs, with the right to fix its own objectives and to determine the amounts of money allocated to its various objects.

**3.** The power of appointing the members of all committees and boards of this Convention resides in the Convention itself. Where it is desirable that states, as such, or other territorial subdivisions of this Convention's area, be represented on the boards or committees of this Convention, this arrangement can easily be effected by consultation with the respective groups involved. But the power to appoint directly or to nominate the members of its own committees and boards must be retained.

**4.** ... The main functions of this Convention and of state bodies remain inviolable. Neither body may impose its will upon the other in any manner or degree at any time. ... As the work is at present conducted such matters (of cooperation) are the division of funds into state and Southwide, ways and means of promoting interest in the various causes, and the burden of cost of collections to be apportioned to state and Southwide funds. These are all matters involved in the one matter of joint effort: viz., the collection of money. In all other matters this Convention pursues its own objects in its own way. It has no authority to allocate funds to or divert them from any object included in the Southwide budget. In like manner no state body has any authority to allocate funds or to divert them from any object included in the Southwide budget. <sup>f474</sup>

**5.** The observance of the above principles by this Convention and by the state bodies is essential to the integrity and perpetuity of this Convention. Unless the Southern Baptist Convention insists upon its own autonomy in all phases of its own work a process of disintegration, loss of power and initiative, and gradual decline is inevitable.

## **THE HOME BOARD AND CITY MISSIONS**

The latest friction between the Southern Convention and a state convention arose, not in the handling of funds, as in more recent years, but in the conduct of mission work, as in previous years. The Home Board began city mission work during its first year <sup>f475</sup> and has continued it through the century. In 1941 the Board created a department of city missions. The work of this department

was steadily enlarged. In November, two years later, the Tennessee State Convention adopted the following recommendations of its Executive Board:

Since the type of work advocated by the Home Mission Board's new City and Rural mission program is similar to the work already being done by the State Mission Board in its Mission Pastor, Associational missionary, Industrial and General mission program, and since the pro-visions in the plan for State Mission Board participation are contradictory to the established rules of the Tennessee Baptist Convention and its Executive Board; and believing that the direct appeal for funds to finance this new Home Mission Board project would seriously jeopardize the cooperative Program, we recommend that the Convention reaffirm its approval of the State Mission Board as the proper agency to promote this work and ask the Home Mission Board to refrain from this type of work in Tennessee unless a program of cooperation can be devised satisfactory to both boards.

That we memorialize the Southern Baptist Convention or its Executive Committee to instruct the Home Mission Board to respect the action of the State Convention. <sup>f476</sup>

This action of the Tennessee Convention was presented to the Executive Committee of the Southern Convention, in December, 1943. It was referred to the Administrative Committee which conferred with representatives of the Tennessee Convention and the Home Board. The report was adopted by the Executive Committee, March 15, 1944, as follows, and referred to the Southern Convention:

The Administrative Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention ... voted to request the Home Mission Board to respect the request of the Baptist Convention of Tennessee with inference to its city mission and rural work.

We request the Home Mission Board to bring to the 1944 session of the Southern Baptist Convention in Atlanta, May 16-18, a full statement of its city mission and rural work, asking the Convention's approval of its basis of cooperation between the Home Mission Board and other Baptist bodies in carrying on its work.

The Home Board reported to the Convention that "the basis on which the Home Mission Board is co-operating with the state mission boards in city and rural mission work is the same as the basis on which the Sunday School Board is co-operating with these boards in Sunday school and Training Union work. The details, which differ somewhat, are worked out with each board." On motion of the executive secretary of the Tennessee Convention, this was adopted "as the approved plan of co-operation of the Home Mission Board with the state mission boards in the promotion of city and rural mission work."

## RELATION OF SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN BAPTISTS AFTER DIVISION

The 1845 Convention at Augusta issued an appeal “To the Brethren of the United States; to the Congregations connected with the respective churches; and to all candid men,” in order to set forth the exact status. It was not an ecclesiastical division, for there was no ecclesiastical body to divide:

Let not the extent of this disunion be exaggerated. At the present time it involves only Foreign and Domestic Missions of the denomination. Northern and Southern Baptists are still brethren. They differ in no article of the faith. They are guided by the same principles of gospel order. ... We do not regard the rupture as extending to foundation principles, nor can we think that the great body of our Northern brethren will so regard it.

The Foreign Mission Board of the new Convention was instructed to communicate with the Acting Board of the General Convention, in reference to any claim the one might have upon the other. The division of property and mission territory also was to be considered. The Foreign Board reported in 1846 that the Acting Board of the General Convention had replied that the missionaries must make choice of the board under which they would work. In regard to property, the Acting Board replied that

inasmuch as brethren from the South have retired from the General Convention and formed a new organization for themselves, the property and liabilities of the General Convention should remain with that body. ...  
*Resolved*, That it is inexpedient, either for the General Convention or for those who have retired from it, to make any claim, the one upon the other, respecting the property of the said General Convention on the one hand or the payment of its present debts on the other.

This was a fair adjustment of the situation at the time. Apparently, the two foreign mission bodies — the Southern Baptist Convention, through its Foreign Board, and the General Convention, changed to the American Baptist Missionary Union — had no further relations with each other as independent or voluntary organizations until the opening years of the twentieth century.

In the homeland, the Southern Convention considered the United States as its field. The portions to be occupied would be determined by circumstances. In 1851 and, again, in 1853, California was declared to be its territory. The Domestic Board opened a mission in that field. In 1855, the Board was directed to open a mission in Kansas, which was accomplished the next year. These missions continued until the outbreak of the war. There was no thought by either organization of conflict of interest or division of territory. The bodies were voluntary organizations and the territory was the same. The constitution

of the Southern Baptist Convention specifies the United States as its field and the Home Mission Society has called itself *American* from its beginning.

In the work of foreign missions, the Convention had no occasion for contacts with the American Baptist Missionary Union until the work of each organization increased to such an extent that co-operative work would be helpful to each. The report of the Foreign Mission Board to the Convention in 1905 said that the missionaries in Japan and China, from the North and from the South, requested that the two organizations unite in school work in those lands. In response to that appeal <sup>f478</sup>

... your Board sent a committee to confer with a like committee from the Missionary Union to see if an agreement could be reached which would be satisfactory to all. The committees met and formulated plans for such union work. These plans have been approved both by the Missionary Union and your Board, provided the Convention is willing for us to enter into the arrangement. By the plan proposed the Missionary Union and the Foreign Mission Board will each own half interest in the school property, and be equally responsible for the conduct and maintenance of the schools.

The Convention approved the agreement, and, thus, after sixty years of complete separation in foreign missions, Northern and Southern Baptist re-established co-operative relations in that sphere of work.

Hitherto, the problem in American Baptist relations had been the agency or agencies through which to express any united opinion. After 1845, Northern Baptists continued the original method of a separate, independent society to conduct each phase of work. The Southern Convention began with an emphasis upon missions, both foreign and home, but with an all-comprehensive constitution which empowered the Convention to appoint as many boards as seemed necessary to conduct any and all phases of work. North-ern Baptists had no united front along which to confer with Southern Baptists.

This situation was relieved after the organization of the North-ern Baptist Convention, 1907-1908.

For the first time in its history our denomination has two Conventions. By virtue of this fact, it is possible for the denomination itself to consider all denominational interests. There are many matters of importance to the kingdom of God in which more than boards or societies are concerned, and it is our hope that in the fraternal meeting of these two committees there may appear even larger visions for our Baptist work than have ever been given us. <sup>f479</sup>

The committees appointed by the two Conventions met in joint session in September, 1911, and in January, 1912, and agreed upon principles of comity

governing relations between these two bodies and between them and other Baptist organizations. The friction in New Mexico that called forth the appointment of the committees of conference was adjusted by transferring the mission work in New Mexico to the Southern Convention. This was done, of course, in full agreement with the Baptists in New Mexico, on the basis of the principles of comity already agreed upon. <sup>f480</sup>

The enunciation of these principles and their fraternal application soon after the formation of the Northern Baptist Convention gave direction to subsequent relations between the two national Conventions. From time to time, questions arising because of overlapping spheres of domestic missionary activity have been adjusted on the basis of the principles set forth in the New Mexico agreement. Other relations also between the two Conventions have been considered on the same basis.

## **NEGRO BAPTISTS, INCORPORATED**

There is another large convention of Baptists with which the Southern Convention has had close relations, especially within the past four decades. The National Baptist Convention, Incorporated, represents a large number of Negro Baptists who will occupy an increasingly important place in Baptist life and work. In the very beginning of the Southern Convention's life, interest was expressed in the religious welfare of the Negro. The Domestic Board was "instructed to take all prudent measures for the religious instruction of our colored population." <sup>f481</sup> In each succeeding Convention session, the Domestic Board reported the progress of the evangelistic work among the slaves.

Thus the record runs each year, until the war came and practically destroyed the work of the Convention for a period. Notwithstanding all that the South had suffered concerning the Negro in that trying day, the South still loved the Negro and the Negro loved the South, and when the work of the Convention was resumed, this was one of the first departments of work taken up by the Domestic Board. <sup>f482</sup>

At the close of the war between the States, Southern Baptists were in such a position they could do little toward helping the Negroes in their midst, no matter how kindly they felt or how much disposed they were to help. They were so impoverished by the war that they seemed utterly unable to build up their own waste places. But worse still, the Negroes who had been so true and loyal and faithful to the whites during the war, as the effect of their recent emancipation, soon had a great gulf fixed between them and their former owners. ... This condition of things made it impossible that the whites should do much for the moral and religious help of the Negro. The Home Mission Society of our Northern brethren, however, felt a call, under the conditions of affairs, to help the Negroes of the South. Gladly were they hailed by the

Negroes. And they were welcomed by the white people of the South also, wherever they showed a proper respect for the existing and ineradicable social conditions. They have contributed thousands of dollars and have done a noble work. The Home Mission Society, however, addressed itself almost entirely to establishing and operating schools in the South. ... It is questionable if all the schools that have existed for them since the war have been a compensation for the loss of religious interest which Southern pastors and Southern Christians took in them before the war. ... A race independence in religion is asserting itself. They have organized a National Baptist Convention, made up of most of their strongest men, and this Convention does not hold itself towards the work of the Home Mission Society in a way which promises to the Negro the best results from the schools which the Society has established for them. ... It is also true that the conditions which made it impossible for Southern Baptists to help the Negroes are now passing away. ... We earnestly beg the Convention to take up the problem and, if possible, to formulate some plan for solving it. ... Our co-operative work with the Home Mission Society in behalf of the Negroes needs to be supplemented in some way by Southern Baptists. <sup>f483</sup>

The Convention instructed the Home Board to use its best judgment to assist the Negroes. For some years, especially after the 1894 Fortress Monroe Conference, the Home Board and the Home Mission Society had been working with them jointly. Divisions among the Negroes themselves made co-operation with them difficult, lest it appear that the Home Board was taking sides in their troubles. "Where, however, the Negroes have been able to get together in asking us to help time along lines in which the Home Mission Society was not especially working we have felt free to help them according to our ability. ... The great mass of Negroes and also of white people are satisfied with this conservative policy of the Board." <sup>f484</sup>

The co-operative work between the Southern Baptist Convention and the National Baptist Convention, Incorporated, increased in scope and opportunity. In 1905, the Home Board presented to the Southern Convention a detailed plan for co-operation with the Home Mission Board of the National Baptist Convention, Incorporated, involving an outlay of a maximum of \$15,000.00 per year by each Board. The plan, modified by the National Convention, was heartily endorsed by the two Conventions. The Southern Convention, through its Home Board, has continued such effort with the Negroes, modifying the methods or the finances from time to time to meet changing conditions. <sup>f485</sup>

## **BAPTIST WORLD ALLIANCE**

The Southern Baptist Convention has had close relations with the Baptist World Alliance from that organization's beginning. From the earliest years of the history of English-speaking Baptists there seems to have been a yearning

for world fellowship. At least once each century of that history the yearning has been expressed. Thomas Grantham, leader of the General Baptists of England, is quoted as saying, about 1678:

“For my part, I could wish that all Congregations of Christians of the world, that are baptised according to the appointment of Christ, would make one consistory at least sometimes, to consider of matters of differences among them.” <sup>f486</sup>

The next suggestion for such a world-meeting is found in the dedication of Rippon’s *Baptist Annual Register*, London, 1790: “To All the Baptized Ministers and People ... in serious Expectation that before many years elapse ... a deputation from all these climes will meet probably in London to consult the ecclesiastical good of the whole.”

In the next century the leadership in such thinking passed to America. A writer, under the pseudonym “Backus,” argued for a national organization of Baptists. Such a denominational body could make contact with English Baptists “and thus the Baptists on both sides of the Atlantic would be united together in a solid phalanx.” <sup>f487</sup> Near the end of the century the *Religious Herald* suggested such an idea, but the Baptists of the world were not ready.

Then, about the turn of the century, the Russo-Japanese War and the Spanish-American War precipitated an intensity of world-thinking that had ramifications in several directions. Broader out-looks were moving many. The *Baptist Argue*, Louisville, began by publishing a *Baptist World Outlook* at the beginning of each calendar year. This paper was read around the world, and later the name was changed to the *Baptist World*. The editorial writers Dr. J.N. Prestridge, editor, Professor A.T. Robertson, and other members of the faculty of the Southern Seminary — suggested a world conference of Baptists. Dr. Prestridge introduced the following resolution in the Southern Convention in 1904:

“We rejoice that in the United States and other countries a general desire has been expressed among Baptists to hold a Pan-Baptist Conference, for the purpose of discussing matters of vital interest to the denomination.”

A committee was appointed to work with representatives of other Baptist bodies toward realization of the desire, and reported in 1905:

“The Baptist World Congress is assured, July 11-18, 1905, at London. ... Messengers have been appointed by every general Baptist body in the world, and the program representing every land, has been published.”

The idea of the Baptist World Alliance originated with Southerners. The Convention fostered the proposal and has had close relations with the Alliance from the beginning. Two of the six presidents have been from the South. One

of the six meetings has been held in the South. The organization is an alliance of national Baptist bodies. Hence, Baptists in the several Southern states, in so far as they have any relations with the Alliance, have those relations through the Southern Baptist Convention.

NOTE: — In 1940, due to financial conditions in Great Britain resulting from World War II, the Baptist Missionary Society could not send funds to their missions in foreign lands. The Society asked the Southern Baptist Convention for a loan of fifty thousand pounds. The Convention, in session at Baltimore, responded by declining to make a loan, but made a gift of \$250,000.00 to British Baptist Missions. The special offerings made in Southern Baptist churches amounted to more than \$300,000.00. But was it a gift?

During the War Between the States, British Baptists made contributions to the support of Southern Baptist missions in China and Africa. If those amounts were calculated at compound interest, 1865-1940 — seventy-five years — perhaps Southern Baptists have only made a small payment on the “debt” to their British brethren!

## 18. — RELATIONS WITH NON-BAPTIST BODIES

The Southern Baptist Convention was formed in an era dominated by a spirit of intense denominationalism. The papacy, endeavoring to recover after the end of the French Revolution and the end of the Napoleonic era, revived the Jesuits and began a strenuous cultivation of ultramontaniam. The Church of England responded with the Oxford Revival and renewed emphasis upon high-churchism. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, taking the cue from England, shifted the emphasis from evangelicalism to high-churchism and has so continued. American Christianity became dominated by a secretarianism which still prevails. Debate, in pulpit and in press, was the order of the day. The atmosphere in the South — economic, social, and political — following the War Between the States, was favorable to such development.

### EARLY INTERDENOMINATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

At the same time, there were influences working toward a less sectarian attitude among religious bodies. During the War Between the States, in both armies, religious bodies worked together for the moral and spiritual interest of the soldiers. <sup>f488</sup> This spirit of camaraderie affected both the ministers engaged in the work and the soldiers, after the return to peace. In the same period, the great evangelistic meetings conducted by D.L. Moody and others brought members of different denominational groups together for worship and religious activity.

All of these influences and agencies, extending back a half century and more, led to discussions of, and appeals for, Christian union. <sup>f489</sup> By 1900, sentiment had developed to such an extent that a conference was held in New York, February 12, of that year. This resulted in a constitution and a tentative Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1905. The constituting ecclesiastical bodies ratified the proposed constitution by 1908, and the Federal Council began operations.

### BIDS FOR UNION

During the second half of the nineteenth century, when so much was being said on the question of Christian union, different bodies were postulating bases of union. Beginning after the War Between the States, leaders in the Protestant Episcopal Church worked at the problem. Four principles or bases of union began to take shape. The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1886, adopted the four principles, and in 1888 the bishops of the

Anglican communion, in session at the Lambeth Palace, adopted them in the form known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral — the Holy Scriptures; the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the sacraments of baptism and holy communion; the historic episcopate.

The Southern Baptist Convention, in 1890, stated:

“We respectfully propose to the general bodies of our brethren of other denominations to select representative scholars, who shall seek to determine just what is the teaching of the Bible on the leading points of difference of doctrine and polity between the denominations,”

and that their conclusions “be widely published in all denominational papers, so that the Christian public may be thoroughly informed concerning Christian union.” As a result of this proposal, the General Christian Missionary Convention (Disciples of Christ) passed a series of resolutions dealing with their own history in this matter, the need and present proposals for union. The last resolution read as follows:

Whereas, Other religious bodies, in their representative assemblies, notably the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Free Will Baptists, and later, the Southern Baptists, impelled by the growing sentiment in favor of Christian union, have declared themselves ready to confer with representative men of other Christian bodies, on the spiritual basis of such union, we, therefore, your committee, voicing, as we believe, the sentiment of this entire Convention, and the body it represents, welcome with devout thankfulness to God these evidences of an increasing desire for a closer union and co-operation among the people of God, on the part of our scattered brethren in the various denominations of Christendom; and recommend that this Convention appoint a Standing Committee on Christian Unity, ... as the basis presented in the New Testament Scriptures, and to receive and respond to such overtures as may be presented by others, and to report to this body from year to year the result of such conferences. <sup>f490</sup>

This first report of the standing committee, so appointed, included a trilateral basis of union:

1. The original creed of Christ's Church.
2. The ordinances of his appointment.
3. The life which has the sinless Son of man as its perfect exemplification.

The creed of the Church of which the Son of God was the builder is simply this: Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. When Simon Peter declared this truth in the presence of the Master, then Christ expressed himself as pleased with it, and said that on this basis he would build his church. With this creed he is doubtless pleased today. Why longer delay the visible union of the people of God by a search for a better creed than this, so emphatically approved by our blessed Lord?

The ordinances of Christ's appointment are baptism and the supper of the Lord.

Baptism is an immersion in water of penitent believers in the name of the Lord Jesus, and into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. That this is Christian baptism is denied by none. Its acceptance is universal. The region of controversy is left by accepting this as the "one baptism." Allusion, as a mode of baptism, is in dispute; immersion, as baptism, is not in controversy. The way to peace at this point is clear.

In the Lord's supper the Christ appointed the use of bread and the fruit of the vine to symbolize to his disciples through the ages his body broken and his blood poured out for the sins of the whole world.

The life of the Christian is to be lived with a continual reference to the way, Christ Jesus. To be a Christian is to drink in his spirit of love and loyalty, reproducing in our associations with men as far as possible, aided by divine grace, the life of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the standard of right living, both Godward and manward. <sup>f491</sup>

In 1894 the Southern Baptist Convention received "a fraternal communication ... from the General Convention of Disciples." A committee (F. H. Kerfoot, G.B. Eager, B.H. Carroll, W.E. Hatcher, J.B. Hawthorne) was appointed to make reply. <sup>f492</sup> Dr. Hatcher read the reply to the General Convention of Disciples in its session in Richmond, Virginia, October 23, 1894:

**1.** In the performance of this duty we would, first of all, express our gratification at the spirit and at some of the utterances contained in the address which you sent us. Most important among these utterances is your emphatic statement that "in any efforts for union there must be no surrender of principle. The intelligent and deliberate convictions of all parties must be respected. Any union among God's people which is a result of principles ignored, or of convictions trampled under foot, would be a greater evil, in our opinion, than our present divisions." To all of this we utter a hearty and emphatic amen.

It is also a matter of rejoicing that upon so many important points you express yourselves as in such strict accord with the principles that we, as Baptists, hold to be Scriptural and obligatory upon all Christians. This is the more gratifying inasmuch as your great denomination is not generally understood as being willing to subscribe to such views as articles of its Christian faith. We refer here especially to what your committee has affirmed in reference to baptism and the Lord's Supper, and also to your utterances concerning the Holy Spirit.

**2.** Referring to what your committee were "let to submit as the basis of union authorized by the New Testament," we beg leave to say that, in our opinion, your committee has, in so doing, somewhat anticipated that which was proposed to have done by *a special conference of representative scholars*

from the different denominations. We appreciate, however, your feeling “that the time for generalities has passed, and the time for something more definite in the way of proposition and action has arrived.” At the same time, we can not but think that if any-thing at all is to be done, the one definite thing which ought to be aimed at first, is the securing of a proper representative conference, whose special duty it should be to formulate the points of difference, and to endeavor to throw such lights upon these points of difference as will enable the people of God, of all denominations, to appreciate fully what the differences are, and to decide intelligently what would be the proper course in reference to these differences. ...

We are the more strongly persuaded, from a careful reading of the paper presented by your committee, that this is the only plan by which anything definite and profitable is likely to be reached. For as soon as your committee undertakes to submit what, in its judgment, is a proper basis of Christian union, just so soon do questions of difference arise between us which need the light of profound scholarship and of Christian conference, and concerning which little can be done through general reply and rejoinder towards reaching proper conclusions.

For example, when you state in the proposed basis of Christian union the following points:

- 1.** The Original Creed of Christ’s Church;
- 2.** The Ordinances of Christ’s Own Appointment;
- 3.** The Life which has the Sinless Son of Man as its Perfect Exemplification,”

instantly there arises the questions, *What was the original creed of Christ’s Church? What were the ordinances exactly of Christ’s own appointment,* and their mode of observance, and the design for which they were given? Upon the last point, namely, the life which has the sinless Son of man as its perfect exemplification, fortunately there is not the same ground for difference of opinion.

Again, when you speak more explicitly concerning the second point of the proposed basis of union, namely, the ordinances of Christ’s own appointment, and say that you understand, “baptism to be immersion in water of penitent believers in the name of the Lord Jesus, and into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” then there immediately arises to our minds the necessity for an addition which would bring out the *Scriptural design of baptism*, and we would hold that baptism, though administered in the name of the Lord Jesus, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit without *a reasonably correct idea as to its design*, is simply not Christian baptism at all. To us the design is just as important as the act, perhaps more so. We would agree with you most heartily as to “faith being a prerequisite to baptism,” and most heartily join you in “repudiating as contrary to the letter and spirit of the New Testament teaching the dogma of baptismal regeneration.” We should, however, be constrained to ask if, in

repudiating the dogma of baptismal regeneration, you would mean also to repudiate the idea that *there can not be ordinarily remission of sins except in connection with the baptismal act*. We should feel bound to ask, too, that you define more clearly your position as to the relative importance of repentance and faith and baptism.

Again, when you set forth your special ideas concerning the Lord's Supper, we most heartily agree with you that "the ordinance is symbolic in character," and also in your statement that, "when this ordinance was established it was established at a time when only the personal friends of Jesus were present, and that afterward in the celebration of the Lord's Supper it is clear, from the New Testament records, that only those partook of the communion who were true believers in the Son of God, who had repented of their sins, and who were baptized in obedience to Christ's command, and who were striving to lead a Christian life, and that this teaching of the New Testament concerning this memorial ordinance is binding on us today." But when you come to speak concerning certain "liberty which ought to be given at this point," we could not help raising the question as to how much liberty? We should feel bound to insist that no greater liberty should be given than can be justified from the New Testament, and that this question of liberty is one of the questions that needs to have light thrown upon it, and we should welcome all the light that could be thrown upon it by such a conference of scholars as it was proposed to hold.

Dr. I.T. Tichenor presented a paper on Christian Union to the Southern Convention in 1900, and under its provisions a committee of five, President Northen being chairman, was raised "to take it in charge and make provision for its suitable publication and attend to all correspondence which may arise in connection with it." <sup>f493</sup> No further reference to the paper has been found.

## HOME MISSIONS COUNCIL

The Home Mission Board reported in 1909 that <sup>f494</sup>

there has been formed in New York City since our last Convention an organization, known as the "Home Missions Council." It is composed of representatives from the various Home Mission organizations in the United States, and has for its aim the furtherance of Home Missions throughout the country. Your Board has been asked to join this Council, but we felt constrained, in view of its importance, to refer the mat-ter to the Convention for advice and instruction. ... We ask the Convention to advise us as to whether we should join the interdenominational Council.

The Convention replied:

We desire that our Board shall have ample liberty for conference and for such concert of action with other Home Mission Boards, so far as it may deem

proper for the maintenance of kindly relations and good understanding as to the vast and unspeakable important work of Home evangelization. ...

That we cannot justify its entrance into any relations with other Boards which can possibly circumscribe our independence or liberty as to the fields we occupy ... or the methods we are to adopt ... our churches ... are independent of each other ... and therefore cannot be lined up in any sort of federation that can subject them to any external authority, or commit them to any special line of policy. ... We deem it inadvisable ( for the Board) to form any relations with the Home Missions Council which can in any way abridge its freedom, warp its policy or embarrass its actions.

The Convention thus declared that, on the one hand, neither it-self nor any of its agencies shall be bound by agreement to any policies or methods, but that the way is left open to friendly and fraternal conference as occasion may arise; that, on the other hand, the churches cannot be bound by the Convention to co-operate or not co-operate with any interdenominational organizations, since the churches themselves are independent bodies.

The action of the Convention left the Home Board free to use its judgment concerning any kind of relationship with the Home Missions Council. The Board chose not to have any alignment and was never represented at the meetings of the Council.

## **FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA**

The field of activities of the Foreign Mission Board presents problems quite different from those of the homeland. The Board, therefore, has thought it wise and helpful to keep in touch with the problems and plans of other foreign mission agencies. During that period when so much thought was being given to Christian co-operation, the Foreign Board was usually represented in the meetings of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, observing the later advice of the Convention to the Home Board not to “circumscribe our independence or liberty as to the fields we occupy ... or the methods we are to adopt.”

From 1893 to 1919, the secretaries of the Board — Drs. Tupper, Willingham, Mullins, Bomar, Ray — attended the annual meetings of the Foreign Missions Conference or related bodies and participated in the discussions. <sup>f495</sup> When the interest in internationalism waned after World War I and the success of the Seventy-five Million Campaign intensified the self-consciousness of Southern Baptists, the Foreign Board ceased to have any contact with the Foreign Missions Conference. With the resurgence of international thinking and the sense of need for Christian forces to come closer together in the face of a

totalitarian paganism that was threatening the world, the Foreign Mission Board became a member of the Foreign Missions Conference in 1938.

When the National Council of Churches was formed and the Foreign Missions Conference of North America desired to merge with that organization, the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention unanimously voted, March, 1950, to withdraw from the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. <sup>f496</sup>

## INVITATIONS TO WORLD CONFERENCES

Returning to the increasing friendliness among the denominations in the early years of this century, preparations were in progress in 1911 “to arrange a World Conference of all Christian communions to consider questions relating to Faith and Order, so far as there may be found agreement.” An invitation was extended to the Convention to participate in this conference.

“On motion of J.M. Frost, it was ordered to be referred to a committee of seven, the President of the Convention being its chairman, to make a fraternal response, and, if it is found possible, to attend the proposed Conference as fraternal messengers.” <sup>f497</sup>

For the next seven years, 1912-1918, there was an annual report of the Committee of the Southern Convention on the progress being made. In 1912, President Dargan reported, in part: <sup>f498</sup>

Upon correspondence among our Committee, we submitted to the Episcopal Commission as our reply the following paper as embodying our views, and we hope as representing those of our brethren generally:

“The Committee appointed by the Southern Baptist Convention at its meeting in Jacksonville, Fla., in May, 1911, were instructed to make a fraternal reply to the communication received from you. ... We are gratified to learn from the report of your Committee on Plan and Scope that a number of other Commissions have been appointed, and are ready, with ourselves to act with you when the time shall come. ...

We ... are pleased to find ourselves in general accord with the aims and progress therein outlined. We shall count ourselves happy on the basis proposed to confer with our brethren of other communions, on the great matters which have been referred to us by our various Christian bodies. We are thankful to recognize that there is increasing spiritual unity among all the true followers of our Lord, and we heartily engage to promote by all suitable means the furtherance and strengthening of this real, impressive and growing union among all Christians. We recognize further the feasibility, and in many cases the desirability, of a larger degree of cooperative union among the various bodies of Christians. But we cannot as yet see the way clear to the

formation of any federal directive body which will manifest this union in an organic way.

“With regard to questions of doctrine and polity, we are sure that under present conditions, uniformity, or any organic union based upon that, cannot be expected. We believe in “the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,” but we also understand that “where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” In the exercise and expression of this liberty there will no doubt remain some differences of view and of conviction in regard to many important teachings and institutions of our common Christianity. In regard to these, all Christians should hold for themselves and for each other the right to differ, but to differ in peace and love. Granting to all others most freely and cordially the freedom of personal judgment which we claim for ourselves, we feel it only frank and just to say that many of the tenets which are regarded as divisive between ourselves and our brethren of other communions are and ever must be cherished and defended by us as the clear teachings of God’s Word, and on these matters we can never evade or compromise. . . . we are sure that great steps will be taken in that direction when Christians of all communions can sit together and on terms of loving and prayerful intercourse fraternally consider each other’s point of view and submit themselves more and more fully to the guidance of their common Lord and Savior. . . .”

## **PROPOSED CHRISTIAN UNION**

The Efficiency Commission, to which reference has been made, was appointed in 1913 <sup>f499</sup> to make a study of the organizational life of the Convention “and to recommend to the Convention of 1914 such changes and modifications, if any, as in their judgment would increase the effectiveness of the Convention.”

Among other pronouncements, the Commission made a report on Christian union, which reads in part as follows: <sup>f500</sup>

We have deep and abiding joy in the spiritual unity and brotherhood which bind together all believers in Jesus Christ, of every name and every clime. We are intensely grateful for that form of personal religious experience which is the priceless possession of every soul who has known the redeeming grace of God in Christ. All other distinctions among men, whether social, national or racial, are superficial in comparison with this common bond of spiritual unity through grace. We are also in hearty accord with every movement and cause in which Christians of every name may take part without doing violence to the sacred mandates of conscience and without impairing their sense of loyalty to Christ.

In setting forth this declaration of our views on Christian union there are four things which we take for granted:

- 1.** That all true disciples agree in accepting the Lordship of Jesus Christ as supreme and final in all matters of faith and practice.

2. That none of us desire to seek Christian union by compromise of honest convictions as to duty to Christ.
3. That in the New Testament alone do we find the sufficient, certain and authoritative relation of His will.
4. That all alike desire to know and obey the revealed will of Christ.

In order to define our attitude to the question of Christian union, we deem it necessary to state our understanding of the Gospel on the following points:

1. The relations of the individual to God.
2. The nature of the change which takes place in the individual when right relations are established with God.
3. The initial ordinance whose observance is enjoined by Christ at the outset of the renewed life.
4. The nature of the spiritual fellowship and life of the church into which the renewed man enters.
5. The relation of the church to the state and to the world at large. ...

We wish to add that pending the realization of Christian union in the ideal sense, we may resort to the principle of Christian cooperation. Many moral, social, civic and other movements invite the united effort of every lover of his fellowmen and friend of righteousness. We hereby avow in the most emphatic manner our desire and willingness to co-operate in all practicable ways in every cause of righteousness. We join hands with Christians of all names in seeking common ends. ... We firmly believe there are ways by which men who stand together for righteousness may make their power felt without invading the cherished convictions of any fellow worker. ... We may have the rare joy of fellowship and cooperation in many forms of endeavor wherein angels might well desire to have a part.

In spite of world conditions, efforts of preparation were continued among the commissions already named by denominational bodies to secure the appointment of others and to have ready advanced plans for the world conference early in the post-war period.

The global conditions during World War I prevented any progress being made, since the commissions of the denominational bodies in Europe and America could not meet, and preoccupation with current events hindered the commissions in the United States and Canada.

When the Convention met in the annual session in 1919, the attitude toward the question of conference among the evangelical denominations had changed. The Commission on Faith and Order, that had been functioning since 1911, made no report and is not heard of again. The complete reversal of attitude was due to two causes.

## INTERCHURCH WORLD MOVEMENT

During the war, the Interchurch World Movement of North America was organized. Originally, it was formed as an independent society or organization, specifically in the interest of foreign missions. It was quickly changed, after formation, into a body composed of the denominations accepting membership, the constituent bodies naming the members of the general committee. In keeping with its changed character, its scope was enlarged to include all denominational activities — missions, education, benevolence. The leaders seemed to conclude that previous interest in a world conference on faith and order and the religious activities in the armies indicated that the times were ripe for closer union.

The second factor, entering into change of attitude of the Southern Convention on conference with other bodies, was the policy of the War Department on religious work in the armies during the war. President Gambrell felt constrained to make an official protest, after hostilities ceased. At the opening of the Convention in 1919, he delivered a presidential address, the first in the history of the Convention: <sup>f501</sup>

The religious war work policy of the Government was framed in a way to make of none effect the religious rights of a vast majority of the civilian population of our country and of the rights of a great majority of the soldiers in the army. It was framed in violation of the natural right of free Americans, and in opposition to the Constitution of the United States, the first amendment to which says: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." ... If Congress can make no "laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," who can? The War Department did. ... The Secretary in charge of that department avowed the policy of his department in these words: "The whole desire of the department is in the interest of breaking down rather than emphasizing distinctions." The department had no business with a desire one way or another. On this un-American, unconstitutional, whimsical notion, the religious war work was planned and carried out, except where (Roman) Catholics were involved. Their rights were everywhere respected and their interests carefully conserved. ... The result was, that in the most crucial hour in the world's history, the hour of the greatest evangelistic opportunity, the hour when the men in the camps most needed the strength of God in their hearts, the great evangelical denominations of America, which had made the moral fiber of the Nation, were forbidden as such to minister to their people. At the same time the (Roman) Catholic communion, essentially autocratic, was given place in the camps and the moral power of the Government was put behind it to boost its interests.

It is known generally that the Government created great munition centers into which it invited tens of thousands of the people to work. In these centers,

though (Roman) Catholics were in many cases a small part of the population, the Government planned to build (Roman) Catholic meeting-houses; while Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others were not allowed to build their own houses in the places. A miscalled "Liberty" Church was proposed for all non-Catholics. This was only an extension of the general plan to break down the non-Catholic denominations, while paramounting that autocratic hierarchy.

... The remedy is publicity and an appeal to public opinion. Baptists may have to lead. ... They can lead. They have a history that will not embarrass them, but will rather reinforce them.

... We should not discount the good done by our brethren of other denominations, not excepting (Roman) Catholics; but facing the present world situation, we are bound in faithfulness to preach the full truth covering the whole field of divine revelation and make Christ's program, given in the Great Commission, effective wherever men live and need the Truth. In so doing we will serve Christ and all the world in the fullest measure.

It is, moreover, a conviction as deep as my soul that this Convention, representing the sentiments and convictions of millions of Christ's baptized people, ought to send out to our fellow Baptists everywhere a rallying call to unite to make effective in all lands the unique message of Christ and His apostles which we hold in trust for our brothers in every part of the world, to the end that humanity may be made free with the freedom wherewith Christ liberates individuals and nations.

The Convention approved the address of President Gambrell and appointed a committee to make further report on the issues involved. The committee made reference to the question of governmental meddling with religion and the effort to use war conditions to force evangelical groups to unite.

The Federal authorities put religious work among the soldiers into the hands of Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews. The Y.M.C.A. was named the common agency through which the Protestants functioned. This action on the part of the political and military authorities created an atmosphere of resentment among Southern Baptists. The Interchurch World Movement leaders sought to capitalize on the religious program of the Federal Government and hasten the union of evangelical denominations. In-stead of moving further toward that objective, the Southern Baptist Convention reacted from its previous attitude of being willing to enter into conference with representatives of other evangelical bodies. Mr. J. Campbell White, one of the associate general secretaries of the Interchurch World Movement, presented the plans and objectives of the Movement; but the Convention, by an overwhelming vote, declined to join.

When Dr. White had spoken, President Gambrell, taking his hand and smiling, said, “You must not leave the platform without my personal thanks for your address. I will give you a bit of information about Baptists: Baptists do not have popes. They never put anybody where they can’t put him down. And another thing; Baptists never ride a horse without a bridle.” <sup>f502</sup>

In discussing the invitation of the Interchurch World Movement, Dr. Gambrell had already said, “You cannot unite two bushes by tying their tops together.” <sup>f503</sup>

It is interesting, in connection with this to remember that when the suggestion was made in 1917 that Dr. Gambrell be elected president of the Convention, doubt was expressed whether he would make a good presiding officer. When the gavel was handed him, he referred to the farmer who, as he was placed on the witness stand, was asked whether he could read Greek. “I do not know,” he replied, “I never tried.” But the Convention soon learned that he was master of the assembly. Once, when the discussion was generating heat, he interrupted with the observation, “Remember, brethren, a hotbox slows up the train.”

The Interchurch World Movement, in which Southern Baptists did not join, was a misconceived, ambitious program to raise in three years, possibly, \$1,000,000,000.00 for missions, but it collapsed under its own weight. To quote from *Addresses and Papers of John R. Mott*: <sup>f504</sup> “The scope of the undertaking was far too vast to be dealt with adequately within the set time limits. ... Too little care was given to the selection of men qualified to master unprecedented and baffling conditions. ... The publicity was at times governed by wrong motives and was too self-laudatory. ... There was too little actual unity and fellowship.” Money was borrowed from banks to finance the movement, but “special sources” on which the movement had depended to provide expenses yielded less than \$3,000,000.00, while the campaign expenses reached the large figure of over \$8,000,000.00. Co-operating denominations had to make up the deficit. Northern Baptists made up \$2,000,000.00 of this deficit.

This experience, perhaps, aroused and stimulated the enthusiasm that characterized the planning and execution of the Seventy-five Million Campaign, projected at the same meeting of the Convention in 1919.

The following year, when the Convention met in Washington, one of the most significant and momentous hours in the history of Southern Baptists was the address, “Baptists and Religious Liberty,” which Dr. George W. Truett delivered from the steps of the National Capitol, Sunday afternoon, May 16, 1920. The setting, the subject, and the speaker combined to make it a historic occasion. We were reminded of the fathers who had suffered that men’s souls might be free. Present in the great throng who heard him were members of the

President's cabinet, members of Congress, and ambassadors from other lands. We were told of one Roman Catholic husband and wife who, at first, denounced the speaker as he illumined the dark pages of persecution by Rome but were gloriously saved before they left the grounds that afternoon. <sup>f505</sup>

A powerful preacher, a great man, Dr. Truett, when serving as president in 1928, was wise enough to call to his side as counselor Dr. John D. Mell who, like his father, was a skilled parliamentarian. He never hesitated a moment when his judgment was sought on a question of parliamentary law. So far as we could see he was always right.

In the decade following World War I, there was a resurgence of an intense nationalistic spirit throughout the world. Its development in Europe and Asia laid the predicate for World War II. In the United States, it was illustrated in the rejection of President Wilson's program for the League of Nations and the high tariff legislation passed by Congress. The interest in a Christian fellowship throughout the world lagged. The enthusiasm and success of the Seventy-five Million Campaign, with the nationalistic background that dominated the thinking in the United States, caused the Southern Baptist Convention to forget the Commission on the World Conference on Faith and Order.

## **WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER**

The economic cataclysm of the late 1920's again called attention to the oneness of the life of the modern world. The prewar objective of a world conference on faith and order was revived. An invitation was sent in 1932 <sup>f506</sup> to the Executive Committee to appoint representatives to such a conference to meet in 1937. On reference to the Convention, the invitation was declined, the Convention declaring

“that we decline to appoint delegates to the World Conference on Faith and Order and that the Executive Committee be authorized and instructed to say in reply to the invitation <sup>f507</sup> that the Southern Baptist Convention has no authority in such matters, being only a Convention organized for missionary, educational, and benevolent purposes with no ecclesiastical functions.”

A World Conference on Faith and Order had met at Lausanne, in 1927. The World Missionary Conference had met at Edinburgh, in 1910, and Jerusalem, in 1928. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work met at Stockholm, in 1925, and Oxford, in 1937.

Just before the assembling of the World Conference, the invitation was again extended. The Executive Committee replied, “expressing to them our friendly feeling and referring them to the action of the Southern Baptist Convention in

1932.”<sup>f508</sup> The Convention, however, adopted a motion, made by Dr. W.O. Carver, “that this Convention request Dr. George W. Truett, who has an itinerary in Europe for this summer as President of the Baptist World Alliance, if at all practicable, to arrange to attend the Conference on Church, State, and Community at Oxford, July 12-26, 1937, as spokesman of this Convention.”<sup>f509</sup>

At the meeting of the Executive Committee, June 16, 1937, it was announced that Dr. Truett could not attend the Conference at Oxford on account of other engagements.

The Executive Committee elected President John R. Sampey as the official representative and spokesman of the Southern Baptist Convention to attend both the Oxford Conference and the Edinburgh Conference (on Faith and Order, August 3-18). Mrs. John R. Sampey and Doctor and Mrs. J.D. Franks of Columbus, Mississippi, ... also were elected as representatives to the conferences referred to above.<sup>f510</sup>

At the Plenary Session, on the last morning at Edinburgh, Dr. Sampey was invited to speak. He closed his brief address by saying: “I have the distinct impression that in the findings of the Conference, though we affirm more than once our belief in the Saviourhood of the Lord Jesus and his sole mediatorship, yet time and time again the church and the sacraments are thrust between the individual soul and the Saviour, as in some sense essential to his salvation.”<sup>f511</sup>

In 1939<sup>f512</sup> an invitation was extended to the Southern Baptist Convention to join the World Council of Churches, then in process of formation. The invitation was referred to a committee, which reported in 1940, in part, as follows:<sup>f513</sup>

... we would express to you our sincere and grateful appreciation for the courtesy and Christian spirit expressed in your communication. Directly replying to your invitation, permit us to advise that the Southern Baptist Convention is a voluntary association of Baptists for the purpose of eliciting, combining and directing the energies of our denomination in missionary activity at home and abroad, and in educational and benevolent work throughout the world. Our Convention has no ecclesiological authority. It is in no sense the Southern Baptist Church. The thousands of churches to which our Convention looks for support of its missionary, benevolent and educational program, cherish their independence and would disapprove of any attempted exercise of ecclesiastical authority over them.

In a world which more and more seeks centralization of power in industry, in civic government, and in religion, we are sensible of the danger of totalitarian trends that threaten the autonomy of all free churches. We wish to do nothing that will imperil the growing spirit of co-operation on the part of our churches in the work of giving the gospel of Christ, as we understand it, to all men

everywhere. In the light of these considerations, we feel impelled to decline the invitation to membership in the World Council of Churches.

In conclusion, permit us to express the sincere desire of our hearts that the followers of Christ may all be one, not necessarily in name and in a world organization, but in spiritual fellowship with the Father and the Son. If Christ dwells in all our hearts by faith, we shall be brought into a spiritual unity that cannot be broken. We invoke the blessings of the triune God upon all who name the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Under instruction of the Convention, this report was published in the denominational papers sixty days before the meeting of the Convention. A memorial signed by nineteen ministers, messengers of the Convention, from eleven states, presented the following re-quest:

The undersigned have the utmost respect for and confidence in the Committee which has just submitted its report. We believe however we represent a considerable number in our Convention who do not wish to precipitate a debate but who find themselves unable to agree to the report.

While we are fundamentally opposed to any step toward organic church union we are convinced that the basic spiritual unity of all believers should have a channel through which to give united expression to the mind and message of Christ in a world in which all Christian ideals are challenged.

In justice to our own consciences, and on behalf of those who hold with us, we wish to express our conviction that Southern Baptists along with other Baptist groups, should associate ourselves with our brethren of other denominations "in a fellowship of churches who accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour."

We request that a rising vote be taken on the report of the Committee in order that by standing we may register our conviction.

The Convention, in adopting the Committee's report, made it clear, as in previous decisions on similar questions, that the Convention could not and did not try to speak for any other Baptist bodies, since it has no ecclesiastical functions.

## **AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY**

During a part of the century of the life of the Southern Baptist Convention, the relations with the American Bible Society have been friendly. In the midst of the War Between the States, as seen in a previous chapter, the Society came to the help of the Sunday School Board of the Convention with a large gift of Testaments for use in Sunday schools and among the soldiers in the Confederate armies. Through most of the period since that war, there have been no official contacts between the Convention itself and the Society. The

churches and mission boards of the South have secured Bibles from the Society and, perhaps, occasional contributions to the Society's work have been made.

In 1935, official contact between the Convention and the Society was again established. President Sampey requested Secretary Burnett to attend the meeting of the Advisory Council of the Society in New York. A report was made to the Convention the following year, <sup>f514</sup> covering briefly the work of Bible distribution and the benefit received by Southern Baptists, at home and abroad, from the work of the Society.

When war conditions hindered the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Southern Convention adopted resolutions in 1940, commending the work of the American Bible Society. The interest in the work of the Society increased with the need for Bibles, under the accumulating war conditions. In 1943, the Society sent a long message to the Convention:

In 1942 Southern Baptists began to take a leading part in the essential task of providing the Scriptures for mission work throughout the world. During the year, Baptist churches in the Southland greatly increased their gifts to the American Bible Society for its non-profit missionary work of translation, publication and world-wide distribution of the Scriptures in cooperation with the denominational mission boards.

Southern Baptist missionaries for many years have realized the in-dispensable service which the American Bible Society renders in sup-plying the Scriptures for their work. ... On practically all the foreign mission fields of Southern Baptists, the American Bible Society serves as the principal source and in many cases the only source for the supply of the Scriptures in the language of the people. ...

The increased interest of the constituency of the Convention in the work of the Society in recent years is indicated by the in-creased gifts to the work of that body. In 1941, Southern Baptists gave \$3,324.00; in 1942, \$25,695.00; in 1943, \$53,407.00; in 1951, \$90,909.00. Since 1936, the Society has been making a report to the Convention.

The attitude of the Southern Baptist Convention, during the past century, toward other Christian bodies is thus seen to be influenced by two determining factors: the external circumstances, both secular and religious, and the internal conditions in the life of the Convention.

## 19. — A PERIOD OF EXPANSION 1946-1953

*by Porter Routh*

Expansion might best characterize the period from 1946 to 1953 in Southern Baptist history. Southern Baptists expanded their educational program through the purchase of the Wake Forest property, and the absorption of the Golden Gate Seminary in California. The Convention voted to expand its hospital service through a new institution at Jacksonville, Florida.

The first major change in the Executive Committee since its organization in 1927 came with the retirement of Dr. Austin Crouch in 1946, and the election of Duke K. McCall, president of the Baptist Bible Institute (now the New Orleans Seminary). He was succeeded in September, 1951, as executive secretary of the Executive Committee, by Porter Routh. A World Relief Offering of \$3,500,000.00 was launched at the 1946 Convention to assist not only in relief, but rehabilitation of mission properties in war-torn countries.<sup>f515</sup> During the first year of the Relief Offering, more than \$3,700,000.00 was received through the office of the Executive Committee.

The Convention also adopted a new policy at the 1946 Convention to meet the capital needs of the agencies. It was agreed that all above \$3,000,000.00 in the 1946 budget, and all above \$5,000,000.00 in the 1947 budget, would be distributed on an agreed percentage to the agencies and institutions to meet their capital needs through the Cooperative Program.<sup>f516</sup> In the period from 1946 through 1952, nearly \$14,000,000.00 was made available through the Cooperative Program to meet capital needs.

At the 1947 Convention, a proposal was brought from the Southern Baptist General Convention of California that “a committee be appointed by this Convention to make a study of the proposed plan to receive the Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary as an institution of this Convention, and that the committee report back to this Convention at its next session the results of its study, and appropriate recommendations relevant thereto.”<sup>f517</sup> The Convention voted to enlarge the function of the committee to study the whole question of theological education, with instructions to report at the 1948 Convention, and the committee was continued for another year. In 1949, it brought in a recommendation “that two new seminaries, one in the West and one in the East, be established as soon as suitable sites can be had and adequate plans be made for financing the same without in-jury or impairment to our existing seminaries.”<sup>f518</sup> To implement this recommendation, the Convention appointed a new committee “to recommend sites, enlist financial support, draw up

charters, and perform other necessary duties pertaining to the carrying out of the ... recommendations.”<sup>f519</sup>

The Convention, meeting in Chicago in 1950, voted to make “the location of the Western Seminary the present site of the Golden Gate Seminary,” and to “accept the offer of the Wake Forest College trustees ... that the Southern Baptist Convention pay Wake Forest College the sum of \$1,600,000” for the site of the new seminary in the East.<sup>f520</sup>

The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary opened in the fall of 1951 for its first session, with Dr. Sydnor Stealey as the president. Dr. B.O. Herring continued as the president of the Golden Gate Seminary until the summer of 1952, when he was succeeded by Dr. Harold K. Graves.

At the Southern Baptist Convention in Oklahoma City in 1949,<sup>f521</sup> it was voted to establish a new Southern Baptist Assembly at Glorieta, New Mexico, and the Convention, at Chicago in 1950,<sup>f522</sup> “authorized the Sunday School Board to develop the Glorieta Baptist Assembly as funds will permit and to operate it as a Southern Baptist Assembly representing all phases of Southern Baptist work, and that the Convention request all its agencies to co-operate with the Sunday School Board to this end.” The first week at Glorieta was held in 1952, and a full program was offered for the summer of 1953.

In accordance with the interpretation of ARTICLE III of the Constitution, Kansas was recognized as a “constituent body” in 1948,<sup>f523</sup> and the state convention of Oregon-Washington the following year.<sup>f524</sup> Facing the migration of Baptists from the South into the West and Northwest, the Southern Baptist Convention adopted the report of the Committee to Discuss Common Problems with Northern Baptists, which evolved into the Committee on Relations with Other Religious Bodies<sup>f525</sup> in 1949, which states that

“because local Baptist churches are independent in nature, they may be organized anywhere with or without reference to grievances of other Baptist churches, or any other religious body. This liberty, of course, should never be used as license to injure the work of other bodies ... churches, associations, and state conventions of Baptists may co-operate with whomsoever they will, irrespective of geographical location.”<sup>f526</sup>

In 1951, in San Francisco, the Convention went a step beyond this and stated:

“Whereas the Southern Baptist Convention has defined its territorial position in reports to the Convention in 1944 and in 1949 by removing territorial limitations, and whereas the Northern Baptist Convention has changed its name so that it is continental in scope, the Home Mission Board and all other Southern Baptist boards and agencies be free to serve as a source of blessing to any community or any people anywhere in the United States.”<sup>f527</sup>

The Convention machinery was somewhat changed during the 1946-1953 period. To open the period, the Constitution was thoroughly revised at Miami in 1946, with the major change calling for the rotation of members on all of the boards and the Executive Committee. Another change provided that the Committee on Boards be elected each year by the Convention from nominees chosen by a caucus of the messengers from each state in the Convention. After trying this plan for two years, the Convention voted to have the members of the Committee on Boards nominated by the Committee on Committees.

Another change called for one additional member on each board for states having 500,000 members and another additional member for each 250,000 members in excess of the 500,000. In 1953, this provision for additional members was extended to the Executive Committee of the Convention, with the first additional member for 250,000 instead of 500,000, limit of five.

The period of expansion was perhaps given momentum because of the centrality of evangelism and stewardship. The 1947 Convention at St. Louis approved a recommendation stating that

“a foundation for a program of evangelism be laid by this Convention by recommending that each state in the Convention that has not already done so, take under advisement the establishing of a department of evangelism and the electing of a superintendent of evangelism in order that the work in this field might be properly promoted.” <sup>f528</sup>

One result of this unified approach in evangelism was “the Simultaneous Crusade” in the states west of the Mississippi River in 1950, and in the churches east of the Mississippi River in the spring of 1951. The number of baptisms climbed from 253,361 in 1946 to an all-time high of 376,085 in 1950. More than 350,000 baptisms were reported in both 1951 and 1952.

The gifts reported by the churches increased from \$115,226,-949.00 in 1946 to \$248,004,289.00 in 1952. During the same period, the gifts reported for missions, education, and benevolence outside the local church increased from \$27,247,004.00 in 1946 to \$45,822,830.00 in 1952.

## **FOREIGN MISSION BOARD**

The Foreign Mission Board faced the task of relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation in 1946. Plans were made for an era of expansion and peace, with the total receipts in 1945 reaching \$3,592,000.00. Plans were made to appoint sixty new missionaries to add to the 550 already under appointment. Missionaries started on their way back to China, and, by the end of 1946 one had re-turned to Japan. Even though advance was being made in many areas, the Communists began forcing missionaries out of China by early 1948. Four

years later, all of the Southern Baptist missionaries in China had been forced to leave, but during the same period work had been started on the Gold Coast and in Southern Rhodesia, in Africa, and in eight republics in Latin America. The European Baptist Theological Seminary at Ruschlikon, Switzerland, and the Armstrong Memorial Training School in Rome had become factors in training Christian forces in Europe. In the Pacific, the work had been expanded in Hawaii, and many of the missionaries who were forced out of China were working in Korea, Formosa, the Philippine Islands, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Malaya, and Thailand.

By the time the Convention met in Houston in 1953, the list of active missionaries in foreign fields had crossed the 900 mark, with 100 under appointment to Japan. In 1952 the Lottie Moon Offering totaled \$3,280,372.79.

The unexpected death of the executive secretary, Dr. M. Theron Rankin, on June 27, 1953, brought grief to all the friends of foreign missions. He was the first foreign missionary to become the Board's executive secretary, and his ministry bore continual evidence of God's approval. At the October, 1953, meeting, the Board elected Dr. Baker James Cauthen to take his place.

## **HOME MISSION BOARD**

The Home Mission Board faced a changing South in 1946. Tremendous migrations had not only made inroads in the rural and Negro population, but had carried hundreds of thousands of Southern Baptists to the West Coast and to the urban centers of the North and Midwest. In 1946, the Home Mission Board re-reported 851 missionaries and total receipts of \$1,614,390.00. At the Southern Baptist Convention in 1953, the Home Mission Board reported 1,274 workers, including 362 summer student workers, and total receipts from the states of \$2,564,780.00.

In 1950 the Home Mission Board launched a "Five-Year Crusade" for more conferences, more churches, more mission stations, and more effective witnessing. Objectives in the Five-Year Crusade were to double the number of Goodwill Centers, to add 500,000 unaffiliated Baptists to church membership, to double the number of churches in the outposts of the board's mission fields, to have every church reporting at least one baptism, to establish 181 missions in the language-group field, to publish and distribute 200,000 mission books, and to secure a total attendance of 5,000,000 in schools of missions. In order to do this, the Board estimated that it must have 1,500 missionaries, an annual operating budget of \$2,000,000.00 with \$4,000,000.00 for capital needs each year over a five-year period.

In an effort to meet the needs of expanded building, the Home Mission Board launched, in 1952, a campaign to raise \$10,000,000.00 additional for its church building fund. This was to be raised through annuities and designated gifts.

Dr. J.B. Lawrence, elected executive secretary of the Home Mission Board in 1929, retired in 1953. At the August meeting the Board elected Dr. Courts Redford, associate secretary, to succeed Dr. Lawrence.

## **THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD**

The growth of the Sunday School Board since 1945 can be reflected in the increase of Sunday school enrolment from 3,525,310 in that year to 5,491,056 in 1952, and in the gain in Training Union enrolment from 703,332 to 1,677,293 in the same period. The expansion of church plants to provide for these additional people in Sunday school and Training Union caused the value of church property in the Southern Baptist Convention to increase from \$276,089,771.00 in 1945 to \$890,697,339.00 in 1952.

The physical property was greatly increased during the period with the building of the printing plant on Thompson Lane, Nashville, and the completion of the administration building on Ninth Avenue.

In 1946 the Sunday School Board launched the Home Curriculum Department, with a new publication *Home Life*, and by 1953 the circulation had passed the 500,000 per month mark. A publication, *The Braille Baptist*, was also started for blind people in 1946, and is sent without charge.

Other new publications, begun during the period, include *The Church Musician*, which started in October, 1950, and the *Baptist Intermediate Union Quarterly I*, and the *Baptist Intermediate Union Quarterly II*.

The Sunday School Board also offered its facilities for the collection of the Historical Commission, and in February, 1951, the office was moved to Nashville and the historical collection was integrated with the Dargan Library.

The Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Chicago, re-requested the Sunday School Board to serve as the agency for producing audio-visual aids for Southern Baptist Convention agencies and institutions. Broadman Films has now released more than thirty productions.

The number of book stores has increased to forty-seven, and all of the stores are now completely owned by the Board, rather than jointly with the state mission boards.

Dr. T.L. Holcomb retired as executive secretary-treasurer of the Sunday School Board on June 1, 1953, and was succeeded by Dr. James L. Sullivan,

who came to the position from the pastorate of the First Baptist Church, Abilene, Texas.

## **THE RELIEF AND ANNUITY BOARD**

Since 1945 the major change in the Relief and Annuity Board has been the development of the Widows Supplemental Annuity Plan and the strengthening of the Old Annuity Fund as well as the Ministers Retirement Plan. In the same time, the general contingency reserve fund has increased from \$232,000.00 to nearly a million dollars, and \$1,500,000.00 has been put into a capital reserve fund to safeguard the plan.

In 1953 plans were being made to liberalize the Ministers Retirement Plan when adopted by the several states having contracts.

## **SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES**

The number of ministerial students in Southern Baptist theological schools increased from 1,441 in 1946 to 3,192 in 1953. To provide for this large increase in the number of ministerial students, Southern Baptists maintain the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky; the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary at Fort Worth, Texas; the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary at New Orleans, Louisiana. The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary at Wake Forest, North Carolina, and the Golden Gate Theological Seminary at Berkeley, California, were added during this period.

In 1946, Dr. Roland Q. Leavell succeeded Dr. Duke K. McCall as president of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. In 1951, after the death of Dr. Ellis A. Fuller, Dr. McCall was elected president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Dr. Sydnor L. Stealey was elected the first president of South-eastern Baptist Theological Seminary when it opened in 1951. Dr. Harold K. Graves succeeded Dr. B.O. Herring as president of Golden Gate Seminary in 1952; and Dr. J. Howard Williams succeeded Dr. E.D. Head as president of Southwestern Seminary in 1953.

The Southern Baptist Convention co-operates with the National Baptist Convention of U.S. A., Inc., in the support of the American Baptist Theological Seminary, Nashville, Tennessee. In 1949 Dr. L.S. Sedberry was elected executive-secretary of the Commission on American Baptist Theological Seminary. The Commission is made up of members of the trustees of the Seminary and members of the Holding Board, which holds title to and has control of the property. The National Baptist Convention of U.S. A., Inc. elects a majority of the trustees, and the Southern Baptist Convention elects a

majority of the Holding Board under the arrangement between the two conventions. The president of the seminary is Dr. R.W. Riley.

During the period 1946 to 1953, the Woman's Missionary Union Training School was given a new president and a new name. In 1951, Miss Emily K. Lansdell succeeded Dr. Carrie U. Littlejohn as president, and two years later, Woman's Missionary Union voted to change the name of the institution to the Carver School of Missions and Social Work. This school, which is owned and controlled by Woman's Missionary Union, Auxiliary to the South-ern Baptist Convention, has received some of the operating funds from the Cooperative Program; in 1953 and 1954 it will receive \$320,000.00 for the erection of a new wing to provide additional offices, classrooms, and library space.

In 1953, for the first time in its history, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary opened a School of Religious Education.

### **SOUTHERN BAPTIST HOSPITAL**

By vote of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1947, the Southern Baptist Hospital took over the management of the Baptist Hospital in San Antonio, Texas. An agreement was reached four years later to transfer the hospital management to the Texas Baptist Convention. The Southern Baptist Hospital continued its plan to build a hospital in Jacksonville, Florida, and the Convention, in 1953, amended the bylaws of the Southern Baptist Hospital to provide for a local board both in New Orleans, Louisiana, and in Jacksonville, Florida. In 1947 Dr. Frank Tripp succeeded Dr. Louis J. Bristow as secretary-treasurer of the Southern Baptist Hospital.

### **SOUTHERN BAPTIST FOUNDATION**

When the Southern Baptist Foundation was first organized in 1946, Dr. Duke K. McCall served as its executive secretary in addition to his duties with the Executive Committee. In 1949 Dr. Charles H. Bolton was elected as executive secretary of the Foundation and continued until 1953, when Dr. T.L. Holcomb became executive secretary after retiring as executive secretary-treasurer of the Sunday School Board. In 1953, the Foundation held funds valued at more than \$1,000,000.00.

### **BAPTIST BROTHERHOOD COMMISSION**

Dr. Lawson H. Cooke served as executive secretary of the Baptist Brotherhood from 1936 until 1951, when he was succeeded by Dr. George W. Schroeder. The Brotherhood enrolment reported by Southern Baptist churches increased from 71,412 in 1946 to 214,486 in 1952.

## **WOMAN'S MISSIONARY UNION**

The Woman's Missionary Union is auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention and the number enrolled in its organizations increased from 767,521, in 1946, to 1,143,993, in 1952. In 1949, Miss Alma Hunt succeeded Miss Kathleen Mallory as executive secretary of the Union. The W.M.U. also purchased a new head-quarters building in Birmingham, Alabama.

## **EDUCATION COMMISSION**

After the organization of the present Education Commission, Dr. Charles D. Johnson served for twenty-three years in carrying on the statistical function of the Education Commission as well as directing its publications, programs, and promotion.

When the Southern Association of Baptist Colleges and Schools was organized in 1948, it joined with the Education Commission in making plans for an executive secretary, to give full time to a study of Christian education in the Southern Baptist Convention. In 1951 Dr. R. Orin Cornett was elected the first executive secretary. Under his direction, a placement bureau has been established, surveys have been made, and plans developed for assisting Southern Baptist schools and colleges to meet their problems and opportunities. The office of the Education Commission is located in the Baptist Sunday School Board building on Ninth Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee.

## **HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

In the 1936 Convention, at St. Louis, a committee was appointed on the preservation of Baptist history, with Dr. W.O. Carver as chairman. The Southern Baptist Historical Society was organized in Richmond, Virginia, two years later.

In 1947, the Southern Baptist Convention voted to make the Historical Society a Commission, and elected the membership of the Commission according to the plans established by the Convention. After the election of Dr. Norman W. Cox as executive secretary of the Historical Commission in 1951, the Historical Society voted to recharter in Tennessee as the Historical Commission, and its office and collection were moved from the Southern Baptist Seminary to its new quarters in Nashville. The Sunday School Board accepted a proposal from the Commission that the Dargan Memorial Library and the Historical Library be integrated. In late December, 1952, this joint library and collection of basic Baptist historical material were dedicated to a career of united service. By joint action in 1953, it was named the Dargan-Carver Library.

## **RADIO COMMISSION**

In 1946 the Radio Committee became the Baptist Radio Commission and was recognized as an agency of the Southern Baptist Convention, under the direction of Dr. S.F. Lowe, who served as director of the Radio Commission, with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia, until his death in 1952. The Radio Commission has also been making a study of the use of television and has produced several scripts for television presentation. Since 1951, the number of stations carrying the "Baptist Hour" has increased from 150 to 330, covering 28 states and 7 foreign countries. Rev. Paul M. Stevens, pastor, First Baptist Church, Ada, Oklahoma, was elected late in 1953 as the new director of the Radio Commission.

## **SOCIAL SERVICE COMMISSION**

The Social Service Commission has changed its name and its leadership. In 1947, the Southern Baptist Convention voted to provide funds for an executive secretary, and Dr. Hugh A. Brimm was elected, with offices in Louisville, Kentucky. In 1953, Dr. A.C. Miller was elected as executive secretary, Dr. Brimm having accepted a professorship on the faculty of the W.M.U. Training School (now Carver School of Missions and Social Work.) The offices were moved to Nashville, and the name changed to the Christian Life Commission.

## **JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

In 1946, Dr. J.M. Dawson, of Texas, was elected as the first secretary of the joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, which, in 1950, was changed to Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

In the constitution the purpose of this organization is stated as follows:

The purpose of the Joint Conference Committee shall be to act in the field of public relations whenever the interest or rights of the co-operating conventions which constitute the committee call for conference or negotiation with the Government of the United States or with any other Governments, or whenever Baptist principles are endangered through legislative action, or when any of the co-operating conventions or any of their agencies may refer to the Joint Conference Committee any matter of common interest or concern, for discussion and recommendation. The Joint Conference Committee shall be empowered to enunciate, defend, and extend the historic, traditional Baptist principle of religious freedom with particular application to the separation of church and state as embodied in the Constitution of the United States; to communicate and commend to the President, Congress, Courts, and Departments of the Federal Government such declarations as Baptists from time to time officially adopt concerning public matters; to make such contacts

with the various departments of any government as may be found necessary or desirable in the legitimate transaction of legal or other business between such government and the denomination's agencies or approved representatives; and to inform the Baptist constituencies of governmental movements and measures affecting principles held essential to true relations between church and state and the right application of Christianity to the life of the Nation.

Dr. Dawson announced his plans to retire at the end of 1953. As secretary of the Baptist Joint Committee, he rendered distinguished service which won the acclaim of all advocates of religious liberty. His latest book, *America's Way in Church, State, and Society*, is considered the best study available on fundamental principles of our national and international relations.

Late in 1953 Dr. Emanuel Carlson, dean of Bethel College, St. Paul, Minnesota, was elected to succeed Dr. Dawson.

## EPILOGUE

Thus has been the history of the Southern Baptist Convention for over a hundred years. Through all of its vicissitudes two convictions have dominated its life: first, that, from the first, it has been guided by God; and second, that, in spite of its remarkable progress and tremendous accomplishments, it has not yet begun to fulfil the destiny toward which he is ever leading.

In 1879, when writing his *Recollections of a Long Life*, Dr. J.B. Jeter considered in retrospect, from that significant time, the life of the Convention since the first Augusta meeting:

Thirty four years have passed since this memorable meeting, and with them have departed most of the prominent actors in it. A few that took part in the proceedings are still lingering on the shore of time, and many who were then young and vigorous have become old and infirm. The Convention still lives. It has passed, like those who formed it, through many tribulations. By the death and return of its missionaries, by war at home and abroad, and by the great pecuniary distress of the South, its plans have been much thwarted, and its means of usefulness greatly cramped. Its success in the home and foreign fields has been sufficient to call forth the gratitude and inspire the hopes of its friends, but not great enough to encourage their boasting or their self-confidence. Their contributions, labors and sacrifices in the cause of missions have not been commensurate with their numbers, resources and obligations to Christ. <sup>f529</sup>

Years later, at the 1920 Convention, Dr. L.R. Scarborough read the report of the Committee for the Seventy-five Million Campaign, of which he was the general director and Dr. George W. Truett was chairman. The completion of the initial campaign to raise the pledges the previous November had resulted not only in an amazing success financially but in a realization of potential leadership and ability to achieve never before known. In concluding his report, Dr. Scarborough said: <sup>f530</sup>

The victories in the Campaign make tremendous demand on us for the future. We should be as never before an up-standing and forward-looking people. ... We have not won all the victories of the Campaign. We have but made a good start. We have formed a financial program for strengthening our stakes and lengthening our cords. ... The Campaign is a promise and prophecy of what we can do when thoroughly aroused, completely organized and gloriously enlisted. ... We need to commit ourselves unreservedly and afresh to the carrying out of the world-program of Jesus Christ laid down in the New Testament and guaranteed by His enduing Spirit. We believe that a straight path stretches out through the indefinite future to Southern Baptists. That path is plainly set out in the New Testament. In our unswerving stand for the truth

as we see it, we must maintain the spirit of brother-hood and Christ-likeness everywhere. We cannot maintain New Testament orthodoxy in a spirit foreign nor at cross-currents to the spirit of our Master. A sound theology manifested in an unchristian spirit is the most dangerous heresy. At all costs, Southern Baptists should preserve the spirituality, the evangelistic spirit and the missionary zeal of our churches and keep the tides of power running high and deep. ... Our hope is an aggressive conservatism, conservative enough to stay on the track of the truth and aggressive enough to keep up with the Son of God and His advancing Kingdom.

After thirty-three years of unequaled growth, development and achievement, another great leader again focused the vision of Southern Baptists upon the purpose for which the Convention was first formed and for which it still lives. In his last report, April, 1953, to the Foreign Mission Board, Dr. M. Theron Rankin, executive secretary, declared: <sup>f531</sup>

World Christianity is standing today at the open door of missionary advance. We have not yet entered. What we have done thus far has brought us only to the open door through which we can catch sight of the dawn of a new day of opportunity and achievement, provided we have eyes with which to discern what is happening in the world. Through this door, we see a world in commotion. To the ordinary observer, looking through ordinary eyes, it is a world of confusion and human tragedy, a world in which established orders are going to pieces and civilization itself is threatened with collapse. But to him who sees through the eyes of God, it is a world in which God himself is moving to accomplish his purposes of achieving righteousness among men.

The world in which God is moving today is expecting and demanding far more than can be produced by the token services which organized Christianity has become accustomed to render in the name of our God, who is giving all of himself in Christ for the world.

These forces of advance have been stirring among Southern Baptists. Already they have carried us farther than many of us dared to hope when the Foreign Mission Board announced its program of advance in 1948. But it is becoming evident that we have advanced only to the door, where we are seeing the world in a new way. We are becoming conscious of new dimensions.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

## SOUTHERN BAPTIST REPORTS-1845-1952

Year	Membership	Baptisms	S.S. Enrolment	V.B.S. Enrolment	T.U. Enrolment	W.M.U. Enrolment	Brotherhood Enrolment	Church Property	Mission Gifts	Total All Gifts	Churches
1845	351,951	23,222									4,126
1846	377,017	24,062									4,411
1847	376,851	25,629									4,501
1848	385,803	27,412									4,685
1849	404,600	33,497									4,874
1850											
1851	423,507	33,831									5,113
1852	467,334	37,611									5,817
1853	495,945	41,863									6,209
1854	519,210	43,423									6,394
1855	542,336	43,722									6,590
1856	568,973	43,065									6,777
1857	580,296	43,122									7,062
1858	617,723	51,007									7,333
1859	639,240	49,127									7,701
1860	649,518	51,542									
1861-71	No data available										
1872	956,067	68,017	287,658								
1873	1,098,808	50,532									
1874	1,200,106	67,498									
1875	1,249,073	62,679									
1876	1,342,432	69,448									
1877	1,418,296	63,680									
1878	1,483,600	70,568									
1879	1,519,351	53,760									
1880	1,672,631	78,243	377,214								13,455
1881	961,435	47,575	396,359								13,527
1882	915,140	47,886	458,917								13,438
1883	934,817	53,908	502,105								13,513
1884	975,153	62,424	556,715								14,102
1885	1,013,160	65,197	326,003					4,700,593	202,170	1,513,640	14,488
1886	1,071,823	90,877	372,929					6,840,281	209,116	1,605,934	14,346
1887	1,125,892	83,158	448,365					9,140,634	219,282	1,876,290	14,874
1888	1,165,812	73,652	539,083					11,515,881	295,394	2,203,700	15,343
1889	1,194,654	77,507	549,127					13,282,024	396,493	2,287,930	15,894
1890	1,235,908	81,806	577,230					13,382,359	398,916	2,876,927	16,091
1891	1,282,220	84,076	494,845					14,703,508		3,332,716	16,554
1892	1,321,540	82,478						15,600,061		3,945,659	17,710
1893	1,363,351	93,842						17,361,794		3,218,759	17,346
1894	1,431,041	105,190	414,379					17,913,444		2,927,162	17,803
1895	1,468,991	90,877	576,711					18,551,238		2,970,429	18,143
1896	1,520,191	97,857	611,528					18,351,855	425,871	2,547,347	18,678
1897	1,568,906	98,984	611,612					18,681,227	667,190	2,895,080	18,922
1898	1,586,709	77,243	628,002					19,207,537	613,946	2,857,071	18,873
1899	1,608,413	73,335	636,944					19,437,323	701,323	3,068,507	18,963
1900	1,657,996	80,445	670,569					20,025,344	851,219	3,456,014	19,558
1901	1,683,039	85,610	712,012					20,637,619	971,984	4,016,394	19,653
1902	1,737,446	108,517	745,474					21,513,888	1,086,308	4,571,325	19,911

# SOUTHERN BAPTIST REPORTS — 1845-1952 — (CONTINUED)

Year	Membership	Baptisms	S.S. Enrollment	V.B.S. Enrollment	T.U. Enrollment	W.M.U. Enrollment	Brotherhood Enrollment	Church Property	Mission Gifts	Total All Gifts	Churches
1903	1,806,859	103,241	761,059					22,828,672	1,127,794	5,038,253	20,431
1904	1,832,638	103,021	776,440					23,824,590	1,210,134	5,376,081	20,402
1905	1,859,427	105,905	846,640					25,471,209	1,276,630	6,083,860	21,302
1906	1,846,948	124,911	876,682					27,071,149	1,307,130	6,482,887	20,776
1907	2,015,080	129,152	959,795					30,861,438	1,817,656	7,863,416	21,267
1908	2,139,080	146,717	1,055,721					34,637,020	1,907,634	8,522,652	21,886
1909	2,218,911	149,680	1,131,681					37,203,522	2,264,198	9,474,777	22,428
1910	2,332,454	154,440	1,245,116					43,393,809	2,430,907	10,424,468	23,248
1911	2,421,203	132,356	1,282,396		60,700			46,843,897	2,522,161	10,926,406	23,678
1912	2,446,296	123,471	1,329,720		76,665			48,634,360	2,631,976	10,883,092	23,982
1913	2,522,633	137,396	1,491,426		117,695			53,392,785	2,811,315	12,158,587	24,771
1914	2,588,633	151,441	1,705,871		159,932			56,801,492	3,038,044	13,073,040	24,338
1915	2,681,552	138,235	1,708,802		153,071			58,139,688	2,977,667	12,541,890	24,451
1916	2,744,098	160,497	1,784,992		175,540			61,159,186	3,233,011	13,415,884	24,602
1917	2,844,301	148,699	1,835,811		230,540			64,772,860	3,560,963	15,346,158	24,883
1918	2,887,428	113,833	1,759,208		301,816			66,974,092	4,911,035	17,522,929	24,851
1919	2,961,348	123,069	1,835,696		376,682			74,273,728	7,331,266	21,327,446	25,303
1920	3,141,346	173,595	1,926,610		522,011			97,732,990	14,038,661	34,882,082	27,444
1921	3,220,983	233,571	2,147,654		584,215			102,404,038	10,902,725	33,432,746	27,634
1922	3,366,211	224,844	2,220,035		485,166			115,346,960	9,849,857	32,167,978	27,919
1923	3,494,189	195,664	2,381,717		493,149	148,108		127,121,006	10,333,818	34,439,495	27,611
1924	3,574,531	209,675	2,526,553		546,193	269,900		141,737,127	9,863,154	37,559,615	27,517
1925*	3,640,330	234,191	2,601,828	28,167	531,415			165,906,278	8,255,435	39,027,009	24,341
1926*	3,616,694	193,279	2,683,331	38,077	498,429			195,005,216	8,161,411	39,855,829	24,774
1927*	3,673,712	197,155	2,780,943	48,200	480,130	440,000		205,705,944	7,849,533	38,787,237	24,274
1928*	3,705,876	183,020	2,914,669	44,230	500,504	523,736		207,614,545	7,402,785	39,927,100	25,705
1929*	3,770,645	175,631	2,776,065	51,079	510,405	531,394		213,327,088	7,407,330	39,337,149	24,410
1930	3,850,278	168,479	2,839,185	57,983	533,676	624,659		217,979,116	6,763,837	37,489,021	23,731
1931	3,944,506	211,253	2,932,010	66,786	544,948	681,690		217,066,775	5,819,375	35,918,328	24,035
1932	4,067,140	228,835	3,051,669	71,568	583,842	845,830		209,710,089	4,851,011	37,341,488	24,602
1933	4,172,958	211,393	3,009,484	83,600	618,283	581,442		204,376,293	3,850,774	23,289,361	24,270
1934	4,277,532	209,364	3,104,411	100,092	649,773	571,702		203,005,794	4,531,668	24,653,276	24,360
1935	4,389,417	202,047	3,175,458	140,878	662,004	603,776		202,101,914	4,624,515	26,888,567	24,537
1936	4,482,315	191,693	3,173,356	193,153	693,332	595,852		203,469,481	4,800,848	28,188,487	24,671
1937	4,598,602	204,547	3,211,707	264,247	742,201	612,075		206,608,413	5,792,150	32,265,687	24,844
1938	4,770,185	236,814	3,368,551	375,455	805,945	715,402		210,466,838	6,708,529	35,265,340	24,932
1939	4,940,174	209,155	3,523,853	421,377	874,791	747,845		214,724,705	6,267,263	37,136,531	25,018
1940	5,028,132	245,500	3,530,734	541,206	919,688	788,151		221,957,479	6,521,974	39,488,328	25,063
1941	5,235,132	209,939	3,554,677	641,200	954,179	768,676		232,044,415	7,822,340	44,857,607	25,303
1942	5,367,129	209,127	3,490,929	590,114	801,567	748,465	54,588	240,151,184	8,051,772	46,247,622	25,677
1943	5,493,027	202,201	3,332,078	548,707	777,732	715,433	33,009	248,168,495	13,455,640	63,067,085	25,790
1944	5,667,926	218,233	3,372,909	636,947	759,885	719,186	34,750	259,534,009	17,396,860	76,568,615	25,965
1945	5,806,629	256,669	3,516,667	801,218	703,332	739,360	38,638	275,063,771	22,496,211	88,458,425	26,121
1946	6,076,305	253,361	3,738,924	1,055,678	802,599	767,521	71,412	313,058,729	27,340,704	115,226,949	26,401
1947	6,276,819	285,152	4,004,705	1,328,790	829,580	761,907	97,146	366,830,652	28,472,014	132,162,846	26,704
1948	6,480,221	310,226	4,301,490	1,268,171	1,079,024	805,332	119,230	400,489,817	30,605,598	155,574,504	26,882
1949	6,671,265	334,829	4,464,629	1,445,072	1,231,438	943,135	142,412	448,201,694	34,849,811	178,337,307	27,285
1950	6,876,889	376,085	4,604,553	1,542,772	1,440,895	1,033,479	167,744	465,371,741	33,402,224	197,242,154	27,827
1951	7,373,498	373,525	5,253,965	1,770,418	1,554,660	1,087,427	185,587	761,510,838	37,288,172	222,838,109	28,289
1952	7,634,493	384,384	5,491,056	2,059,163	1,677,293	1,143,993	214,486	860,697,339	45,822,830	248,004,289	28,825

B.M.A.'s dropped from list.

## HISTORICAL RECORD OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION SINCE ITS ORGANIZATION

Date	Place of Meeting	Registration	Presidents	Secretaries	Preachers
1845	Augusta, Georgia	236	William B. Johnson, S. C.	Jesse Hartwell, Ala.; James C. Crane, Va.	
1846	Richmond, Virginia	162	William B. Johnson, S. C.	Jesse Hartwell, Ala.; James C. Crane, Va.	Richard Fuller, Md.
1847	Charleston, South Carolina	103	William B. Johnson, S. C.	James C. Crane, Va.; Basil Manly, Jr., Ala.	Sylvester Landrum, Ga.
1851	Nashville, Tennessee	124	R. B. C. Howell, Va.	James C. Crane, Va.; William Carey Crane, Miss.	R. B. Jeter, S. C.
1853	Baltimore, Maryland	154	R. B. C. Howell, Va.	H. K. Elyson, Va.; William Carey Crane, Miss.	J. B. Reynolds, S. C.
1855	Montgomery, Alabama	235	R. B. C. Howell, Va.	William Carey Crane, Miss.; James M. Watts, Ala.	R. B. C. Howell, Va.; S. Baker, Ky.
1857	Louisville, Kentucky	184	Richard Fuller, Md.	William Carey Crane, Miss.; George B. Taylor, Md.	A. D. Sears, Ky.
1859	Richmond, Virginia	580	Richard Fuller, Md.	William Carey Crane, Miss.; George B. Taylor, Md.	William Carey Crane, Miss.
1861	Savannah, Georgia	177	Richard Fuller, Md.	William Carey Crane, Miss.; George B. Taylor, Va.	Duncan R. Campbell, Ky.
1863	Augusta, Georgia	181	P. H. Mell, Ga.	George B. Taylor, Va.; Sylvanus Landrum, Ga.	William H. McCutosh, Ala.
1866	Russellville, Kentucky	244	P. H. Mell, Ga.	George B. Taylor, Va.; W. Pope Yamann, Ky.	J. L. Burrows, Va.
1867	Memphis, Tennessee	250	P. H. Mell, Ga.	A. Fuller Crane, Md.; A. P. Abell, Va.	Richard Fuller, Md.
1868	Baltimore, Maryland	327	P. H. Mell, Ga.	A. P. Abell, Va.; A. F. Crane, Md.	W. T. Brantley, Md.
1869	Macon, Georgia	266	P. H. Mell, Ga.	A. P. Abell, Va.; A. F. Crane, Md.	T. B. Skimmer, Tenn.
1870	Louisville, Kentucky	399	P. H. Mell, Ga.	J. Russell Hawkins, Ky.; E. C. Williams, Md.	E. T. Winkler, S. C.
1871	St. Louis, Missouri	347	P. H. Mell, Ga.	T. C. Cain Williams, Md.; Truman S. Sumner, Ala.	J. L. Burrows, Va.
1872	Raleigh, North Carolina	304	James P. Boyce, S. C.	E. Calvin Williams, Md.; Truman S. Sumner, Ala.	William Williams, S. C.
1873	Mobile, Alabama	259	James P. Boyce, S. C.	M. B. Wharton, Ky.; W. O. Tuggle, Ga.	J. G. Jones, Tenn.
1874	Jefferson, Texas	222	James P. Boyce, Ky.	G. R. McCall, Ga.; W. O. Tuggle, Ga.	E. G. Taylor, La.
1875	Charleston, South Carolina	280	James P. Boyce, Ky.	W. O. Tuggle, Ga.; G. R. McCall, Ga.	T. H. Pritchard, N. C.
1876	Richmond, Virginia	289	James P. Boyce, Ky.	C. C. Briting, Va.; E. Calvin Williams, Md.	George C. Lorimer, Mass.
1877	New Orleans, Louisiana	164	James P. Boyce, Ky.	O. P. Gregory, Ala.; W. E. Tanner, Va.	Henry McDonald, Ky.
1878	Nashville, Tennessee	253	James P. Boyce, Ky.	C. E. W. Dobbs, Ky.; W. E. Tanner, Va.	B. H. Carroll, Texas
1879	Atlanta, Georgia	313	James P. Boyce, Ky.	C. E. W. Dobbs, Ky.; W. E. Tanner, Va.	J. C. Furman, S. C.
1880	Lexington, Kentucky	302	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	C. E. W. Dobbs, Ky.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	P. H. Mell, Ga.
1881	Columbus, Mississippi	270	P. H. Mell, Ga.	C. E. W. Dobbs, Ky.; Lansing Burrows, Ga.	Sylvanus Landrum, Ga.
1882	Greenville, South Carolina	335	P. H. Mell, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ky.; O. F. Gregory, N. C.	T. T. Eaton, Ky.
1883	Waco, Texas	612	P. H. Mell, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ky.; O. F. Gregory, N. C.	John A. Broadus, Ky.
1884	Baltimore, Maryland	637	P. H. Mell, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, N. C.	Lansing Burrows, Va.
1885	Augusta, Georgia	438	P. H. Mell, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, N. C.	Lansing Burrows, Va.
1886	Montgomery, Alabama	487	P. H. Mell, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, N. C.	J. L. Murray, Jr.; J. L. Burrows
1887	Louisville, Kentucky	689	P. H. Mell, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	J. B. Hawthorne, Ga.
1888	Richmond, Virginia	832	James P. Boyce, Ky.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	George Cooper, Va.
1889	Memphis, Tennessee	706	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	Francis M. Ellis, Md.
1890	Fort Worth, Texas	801	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	J. P. Greene, Mo.
1891	Birmingham, Alabama	915	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	J. W. Carter, N. C.
1892	Atlanta, Georgia	978	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	Carter H. Jones, Tenn.
1893	Nashville, Tennessee	772	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	J. B. Gambrell, Miss.
1894	Dallas, Texas	722	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	W. F. Hatcher, Va.
1895	Washington, District of Columbia	870	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	F. H. Kerfoot, Ky.
1896	Chattanooga, Tennessee	819	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	Geo. E. Allen; W. H. Whitsitt, Ky.
1897	Wilmington, North Carolina	824	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	R. A. Venable, Miss.
1898	Norfolk, Virginia	857	Jonathan Haralson, Ala.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	B. L. Whitman, D. C.
1899	Louisville, Kentucky	629	W. J. Northen, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.
1900	Hot Springs, Arkansas	646	W. J. Northen, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	J. J. Taylor, Va.
1901	New Orleans, Louisiana	787	W. J. Northen, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	E. Y. Mullins, Ky.

# HISTORICAL TABLE — (CONTINUED)

Date	Place of Meeting	Registration	Presidents	Secretaries	Preachers
1902	Asheville, North Carolina	1,093	James P. Eagle, Ark.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	F. C. McConnell, Ga.
1903	Savannah, Georgia	1,136	James P. Eagle, Ark.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Ala.	W. J. Williamson, Mo.
1904	Nashville, Tennessee	1,095	James P. Eagle, Ark.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Ala.	W. W. Landrum, Ga.
1905	Kansas City, Missouri	816	E. W. Stephens, Mo.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Ala.	W. H. Felix, Ky.
1906	Chattanooga, Tennessee	1,451	E. W. Stephens, Mo.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	W. R. L. Smith, Va.
1907	Richmond, Virginia	1,411	E. W. Stephens, Mo.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	A. J. Dickinson, Ala.
1908	Hot Springs, Arkansas	1,258	Joshua Levering, Md.	Lansing Burrows, Tenn.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	Henry W. Battle, N. C.
1909	Nashville, Tennessee	1,547	Joshua Levering, Md.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	Edwin C. Dargan, Ga.
1910	Baltimore, Maryland	1,641	Joshua Levering, Md.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	W. L. Pickard, Ga.
1911	Jacksonville, Florida	1,558	Edwin C. Dargan, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	C. S. Gardner, Ky.
1912	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	1,228	Edwin C. Dargan, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Va.	Z. F. Cody, S. C.
1913	Saint Louis, Missouri	1,403	Edwin C. Dargan, Ga.	Lansing Burrows, Ga.; O. F. Gregory, Md.	T. W. O'Kelley, N. C.
1914	Nashville, Tennessee	1,530	Lansing Burrows, Ga.	O. F. Gregory, Md.; Hight C Moore, N. C.	Geo. W. McDaniel, Va.
1915	Houston, Texas	1,408	Lansing Burrows, Ga.	O. F. Gregory, Md.; Hight C Moore, N. C.	J. W. Porter, Ky.
1916	Asheville, North Carolina	2,125	Lansing Burrows, Ga.	O. F. Gregory, Md.; Hight C Moore, N. C.	Chas. W. Daniel, Ga.
1917	New Orleans, Louisiana	1,683	J. B. Gambrell, Texas	O. F. Gregory, Md.; Hight C Moore, N. C.	C. W. Duke, Fla.
1918	Hot Springs, Arkansas	2,043	J. B. Gambrell, Texas	O. F. Gregory, Md.; Hight C Moore, Tenn.	W. H. Geiswert, Mo.
1919	Atlanta, Georgia	4,224	J. B. Gambrell, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	M. E. Dodd, La.
1920	Washington, District of Columbia	8,550	J. B. Gambrell, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	Jno. E. White, S. C.
1921	Chattanooga, Tennessee	5,313	E. Y. Mullins, Ky.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	H. L. Winburn, Ark.
1922	Jacksonville, Florida	4,272	E. Y. Mullins, Ky.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	S. J. Porter, Okla.
1923	Kansas City, Missouri	4,193	E. Y. Mullins, Ky.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Tenn.	R. G. Powers, Texas
1924	Atlanta, Georgia	5,722	Geo. W. McDaniel, Va.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Tenn.	F. F. Gibson, Ky.
1925	Memphis, Tennessee	5,600	Geo. W. McDaniel, Va.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Tenn.	Len. G. Broughton, Fla.
1926	Houston, Texas	4,968	Geo. W. McDaniel, Va.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Tenn.	F. F. Brown, Tenn.
1927	Louisville, Kentucky	4,424	Geo. W. Truett, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Tenn.	Wallace Bassett, Texas
1928	Chattanooga, Tennessee	3,810	Geo. W. Truett, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Tenn.	J. R. Hobbs, Ala.
1929	Memphis, Tennessee	3,939	Geo. W. Truett, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	W. L. Ball, S. C.
1930	New Orleans, Louisiana	3,342	W. J. McGlothlin, S. C.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	Robt. G. Lee, Tenn.
1931	Birmingham, Alabama	3,195	W. J. McGlothlin, S. C.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	John W. Phillips, Ala.
1932	St. Petersburg, Florida	2,178	W. J. McGlothlin, S. C.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	W. Marshall Craig, Texas
1933	Washington, District of Columbia	2,765	F. F. Brown, Tenn.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	T. L. White, Fla.
1934	Fort Worth, Texas	4,435	M. E. Dodd, La.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	T. B. Holcomb, Okla.
1935	Memphis, Tennessee	4,268	M. E. Dodd, La.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	J. B. Weatherspoon, Ky.
1936	Saint Louis, Missouri	3,702	John R. Sempsey, Ky.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	John A. Huff, La.
1937	New Orleans, Louisiana	4,507	John R. Sempsey, Ky.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	Solon B. Cousins, Va.
1938	Richmond, Virginia	5,785	John R. Sempsey, Ky.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, Ga.	E. P. J. Garrett, Ark.
1939	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	4,538	L. R. Scarborough, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, N. C.	Perry F. Webb, Texas
1940	Baltimore, Maryland	3,776	L. R. Scarborough, Texas	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, N. C.	W. R. White, Oklahoma
1941	Birmingham, Alabama	5,884	W. W. Hamilton, La.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, N. C.	J. Clyde Turner, N. C.
1942	San Antonio, Texas	4,774	W. W. Hamilton, La.	Hight C Moore, Tenn.; J. Henry Burnett, N. C.	Ellis A. Fuller, Ga.
1944	Atlanta, Georgia	4,301	Pat M. Neff, Texas	Hight C Moore, N. C.; J. Henry Burnett, N. C.	John H. Burham, Ala.
1946	Miami, Florida	7,973	Pat M. Neff, Texas	Hight C Moore, N. C.; J. Henry Burnett, N. C.	J. W. Storer, Okla.
1947	St. Louis, Missouri	8,508	Louie D. Newton, Georgia	Porter Routh, Tenn.; Joe W. Burton, Tenn.	W. A. Criswell, Texas
1948	Memphis, Tennessee	9,843	Louie D. Newton, Georgia	Porter Routh, Tenn.; Joe W. Burton, Tenn.	W. R. Pettigrew, Kentucky
1949	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	9,583	Robert G. Lee, Tennessee	Porter Routh, Tenn.; Joe W. Burton, Tenn.	Norman W. Cox, Mississippi
1950	Chicago, Illinois	8,151	Robert G. Lee, Tennessee	Porter Routh, Tenn.; Joe W. Burton, Tenn.	R. C. Campbell, North Carolina
1951	San Francisco, Calif.	6,493	Robert G. Lee, Tennessee	Porter Routh, Tenn.; Joe W. Burton, Tenn.	C. Roy Ansell, Florida
1952	Miami, Fla.	10,960	J. D. Grey, La.	Porter Routh, Tenn.; Joe W. Burton, Tenn.	Ramsey Pollard, Tenn.

# APPENDIX B

## SUMMARY OF THE MEETING IN AUGUSTA, 1845

	Actual	Multiple	
Ala.	14	9	23
D. C.	1		1
Ga.	139	19	158
Ky.	1		1
La.	2		2
Md.	2		2
N. C.	2		2
S. C.	102	5	107
Va.	30	1	31
	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
	293	34	327

No. of states represented (including D. C.) 9

No. of Baptist bodies sending representatives:

Churches.....	166
Minister's Conferences.....	1
Associations.....	9
State Conventions.....	1
Ex. Com. of State Con.....	1
Ex. Com. of Associations.....	1
Colleges.....	2
Young Men's Miss. Soc.....	1
Board of State Con.....	1
Individual Representation.....	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>

184

No. of Baptist bodies that named representatives not represented.....	1
No. of representatives named.....	379
No. of representatives present.....	327
No. of representatives not present.....	52
No. of representatives from two or more bodies.....	334
No. of representatives actually present.....	293

## APPENDIX C

### DELEGATES PRESENT AT AUGUSTA, 1845 BY STATES

*Figures in parentheses indicate multiple representation*

#### *Alabama*

Callaway, F. (2)  
Chambliss, A.W. (2)  
Connella, A.A.  
Curtis, T.F. (2)  
Hartwell, J.  
Humphrey, J.R.  
Jones, J.C. (2)  
Jones, W.B. (2)  
Kawthorn, K. (3)  
King, E.D. (2)  
Lee, D.  
Sessions, J.J.  
Talbird, H. (2)  
Travis, A.

#### *District of Columbia*

Sydnor, T.W. (see Va.)

#### *Georgia*

Albritton, A.M.  
Anderson, D.S.  
Anderson, W.S.  
Armstrong, T.C.  
Atkins, A.  
Bacon, E.H.  
Baker, J.S.  
Baker, W.F.  
Baldy, W.H.  
Barnes, J.A.  
Beard, B.W.  
Bledsoe, J.S.  
Bolton, J, N.  
Brantley, B.  
Brantley, W.T.  
Brinson, M.

Brooks, J.L.  
Bunn, H.  
Burks, W.P.  
Burney, T.J. (2)  
Burnley, T.H.  
Butler, D.E.  
Calloway, E.  
Calloway, J.S.  
Campbell, J.H. (2)  
Cartlidge, J.  
Carter, J. (2)  
Carter, J.M.  
Carswell, E.R.  
Caswell, A.  
Chandler, A. (2)  
Chapman, J.  
Cheney, W.O.  
Clark, Z.H.  
Crawford, N.M.  
Crumb, S.  
Dagg, J.F.  
Dagg, J.L.  
Daniel, D.G. (2)  
Darden, A.  
Davis, J. (4)  
Denerent, M.  
Devant, J.  
Durham, S.D.  
Dye, M.M.  
Evans, G.W.  
Evans, S.  
Fielder, J.H.  
Gibbs, T.A.  
Gignelliat, W.K.  
Gilliam, E.M.  
Graves, H.L.  
Graves, J.L.  
Gresham, J.L.  
Handley, W.  
Harley, W.J. (2)  
Harris, W.  
Harris, Wm.

Heart, T.  
Henderson, E.  
Hendrick, J.  
Hill, M.  
Hill, N.  
Hillyer, J.  
Hillyer, J.F.  
Hillyer, J.T.  
Hillyer, S.G.  
Holl, J.M.  
Huff, J.  
Hunter, E.S.  
Irwin, C.M. (2)  
Jackson, J.M.  
Janes, A.  
Jarrell, E.P.  
Jones, J.W.  
Joynor, R.  
Keaton, B.O.  
Keeling, H. (see Va.)  
Kilpatrick, J.H.  
Kirklighter, T.  
Lasetter, J.S.  
Lane, J.S.  
Lumpkin, H.H.  
Lumpkin, W.  
Mallary, C.D. (2)  
Marshall, E.A.  
Mason, J.C.  
Mell, P.H.  
Moore, N.B.  
Morgan, T.R.  
McCall, N.M.  
Mcintosh, W.H.  
McNeil, J.F.  
Neal, J.  
Newson, R.  
Palmer, B.  
Perryman, E.  
Perryman, J.  
Pierce, J.J.  
Polhill, J.

Polhill, M.  
Pope, W.H.  
Posey, H.  
Prior, G.  
Richards, W.  
Robertson, A.  
Robinson, P.  
Sanders, B.M. (2)  
Sanders, W.  
Sanford, V.  
Slack, J.B. (2)  
Smith, M.  
Stapleton, J.W.  
Starke, J.H.  
Starke, W.H.  
Steed, L.  
Steed, W.P.  
Stevens, C.M.  
Stillwell, C.H.  
Stocks, T.  
Stokes, W.H. (3)  
Swanson, J.  
Templeton, A.  
Thomas, J.B.  
Thornton, B. (3)  
Thornton, V.  
Tiller, M.  
Tolfree, R.  
Tucker, W.L.  
Walker, A.M.  
Walker, Geo.  
Walton, P.W.  
Whitlock, J.W.  
Wiggins, A.  
Wilkes, T.U. (2)  
Wilkins, F.W.  
Williams, A.  
Winkler, E.F.  
Winn, J.  
Wotton, H.P.

*Kentucky*

McCoy, Isaac

*Louisiana*

Hinton, I.T.

Holman, R.

*Maryland*

Crane, Wm.

McKean, J.A.

*North Carolina*

Battle, A.J.

McNab, R.

*South Carolina*

Abney, M.M.

Adams, T.

Bailey, H.

Bailey, W.E.

Bannon, L.O.

Blanding, S.

Boyd, J.D.

Boyd, J.J.

Boykin, J.

Breaker, C.M.

Brown, B.H.

Brown, L.M.

Brunson, D.D.

Buckner, B.F.

Burke, A.J.

Butler, S. (2)

Chiles, J. NI.

China, A.

Culpepper, J.

Curry, J. (2)

Curtis, T.

Curtis, W.

Dagan, J.O. B.

Davant, R.J. (2)

Dawson, T.

Debow, J.D.

Dunbar, D.M.

Duncan, H.A.

Duncan, H.D.

Durkins, L.J.

Edwards, R.G.

Fant, J.  
Fort, W.  
Fuller, R.  
Furman, S.  
Furze, J.T.  
Graham, N.  
Gresham, J.  
Hall, W.  
Hard, W.J.  
Haynes, T.W.  
Hickson, L.  
Hobson, A.  
Howe, S.  
Hughson, W.E.  
Johnson, W.B.  
Johnson, W.S.  
Lanneau, C.H.  
Lawton, J.S.  
Lawton, W.S.  
Lenear, S.  
Lide, D.R.  
Lyles, J.  
Mahoney, H.W.  
Marshall, J.F.  
Mays, R.G.  
Mayson, H.  
Mendenhall, M.T.  
Miller, I.  
Miller, J.B.  
Mims, J.  
Mims, J.S.  
Morris, J.  
McBride, B.  
McCully, S.  
Nance, D.  
Nicholas, J.  
Nicholson, J.O.  
Owens, W.A.  
Peebles, D.  
Rambaut, T.W.  
Reynolds, J.L.  
Rice, A.

Riley, W.  
Robert, W.H.  
Sams, L.R. (2)  
Scott, Jr.  
Sheppard, D.  
Simkins, D.  
Smart, A.  
Smith, A.C.  
Smith, B.F.  
Smith, T.P.  
Sparks, A.  
Stancel, W.R.  
Sweat, B.S.  
Timmons, J.M.  
Trapp, J.  
Troul, W.  
Tupper, J.  
Tyler, E.  
Walker, D.J.  
Walker, N.G. W.  
Walker, W.  
Watkins, T.  
Watkins, W.  
Wells, P.H. (2)  
Whilden, B.W.  
Wilkinson, J.G. O.  
Wilson, J.D.  
Wilson, J.F.  
Wilson, J.J.

*Virginia*

Bagby, R.H.  
Ball, E.  
Clopton, J.  
Crane, A.J.  
Crane, J.C.  
Evans, T.J.  
Fleet, Benj.  
Gresham, W.D.  
Grimsley, B.  
Hall, A.  
Herndon, T.D.  
Flume, T.

Jeter, J.B.  
Jones, R.  
Keeling, H. (see Ga.)  
Robinson, E.G.  
Sands, W.  
Smith, A.B.  
Smith, P.P.  
Stringfellow, T.  
Sumner, M.T.  
Sumner, S.S.  
Sydnor, T.W. (see D.E.)  
Taylor, J.B.  
Thomas, A.  
Tinsley, I.S.  
Todd, W.H.  
Turpin, J.O.  
Turpin, NI.  
Walker, Jos.  
Witt, D.

Total 327

Duplicates 34

Actually present 293

J. L. Burrows of Philadelphia was recognized as a corresponding delegate from the American Baptist Publication Society and the Pennsylvania Convention.

## APPENDIX D

### GEORGE WILLIAM ALBERTI, LETTERS CONCERNING THE PRESENT CONDITION OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE IN GREAT BRITAIN

Hannover, 1752-54

#### THE SIXTY-SECOND LETTER

John Smith, of whom I have made mention in a former letter in the account of the history of the Independents, later joined the company of the Anabaptists, and founded a congregation at Amsterdam. Until now these people had rejected pedobaptism only, but had not gone on to immersion. But Smith, about the year 1610, introduced this, and for that purpose immersed himself under the water; wherefore he was called a Se-Baptist. Thomas Crosby, indeed, expressed his doubt concerning the truth of this story; yet the reasons on the other side are more than probable. Smith found supporters in Spilsbury, John Tombes, a learned man, and Henry Lawrence; and although the others did not censure that immersion as baptism, yet they were not willing to let themselves be baptized by Smith in this manner; but they sent one Richard Blount to the Netherlands to John Batte (by whose congregation immersion had already been introduced), in order to receive baptism from him; he (Blount) immersed one Samuel Blacklock, again, by whom the others were baptized after a like manner. And from this time on immersion was introduced by English Baptists and was held necessary.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## HISTORIES

- Allison, W.H. *Baptist Councils in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906.
- Armitage, Thomas. *History of the Baptists*. New York: Bryan, Taylor & Co., 1886.
- Backus, Isaac. *History of Baptists of New England*. 2 vols. Newton: Backus Historical Society, 1871.
- Baker, J.C. *Baptist History of the North Pacific Coast*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1912.
- Baker, Robert A. *Relations Between Northern and Southern Baptists*. Fort Worth: Seminary Hill Press, 1948.
- Barnes, Lemuel C., and Mary C. *Pioneers of Light*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.
- Barnes, William W. *The Southern Baptist Convention: A Study in the Development of Ecclesiology*. Fort Worth: Seminary Hill Press, 1934.
- Benedict, David. *Fifty Years Among the Baptists*. New York: Sheldon and Co., 1859.
- Benedict, David. *A General History of the Baptist Denomination*, 2 vols. Boston: Manning and Loring, 1813.
- Burroughs, Prince E. *Fifty Fruitful Years*. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1941.
- Burton, Joe W. *Epochs of Home Missions*. Atlanta: Home Mission Board, 1945.
- Carroll, B.H., Jr. *The Genesis of American Anti-missionism*. Louisville: Baptist Book Concern, 1902.
- Carver, W.O. *The Course of Christian Missions*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1932.
- Christian, John T. *History of Baptists*. 2 vols. Nashville: Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1922.
- Cook, R.B. *Story of the Baptists*. New York: Willey Bros. & Co., 1886.
- Cox, Mrs. W.J. *Following in His Train*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1938.
- Edwards, Morgan. *Materials Toward a History of the Baptists in the Province of North Carolina*. Chester: American Baptist Historical Society, 1772.

- Also, for Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia, on microfilm with Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention.
- Frost, J.M. *History of the Sunday School Board*. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1914.
- Gwaltney, L.L. *Heralds of Freedom*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1939.
- Haynes, D.C. *The Baptist Denomination*. New York: Sheldon, Blake-man & Co., 1856.
- Held, John A. *Brief History of the Baptist Student Union*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1949.
- Knight, Richard. *History of the General or Six-Principle Baptists in Europe and America*. Providence: Smith and Parmenter, 1827.
- Lambdin, J.E. *The Baptist Training Union Manual*. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board, revised edition, 1951.
- Lunsford, William. *Veterans of the Cross*. Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1921.
- Magruder, Edith C. *A Historical Study of the Educational Agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1945*. New York: Columbia University, 1951.
- Mays, B.E. *The Negro's Church*. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1933.
- Merriam, E.F. *A History of American Baptist Missions*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1900.
- McDaniel, George W. *The People Called Baptists*. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1919.
- McGlothlin, W.J. *Baptist Beginnings*. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1926.
- McGlothlin, W.J. *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911.
- Newman, A.H. *A Century of Baptist Achievement*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1901.
- Newman, A.H. *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898.
- Orchard, G.H. *A Concise History of Foreign Baptists*. Nashville: Graves, Marks & Co., 1838.
- Ray, D.B. *Baptist Succession*. Cincinnati: Stevens & Co., 1871.
- Riley, B.F. *History of Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi River*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898.

- Routh, E.C. *Baptists on the March*. Shawnee: Oklahoma Baptist University Press, 1952.
- Sampey, John R. *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*. Baltimore: Wharton, Barron and Co., 1890.
- Scarborough, L.R. *Marvels of Divine Leadership*. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1920.
- Scarborough, L.R. *Modern School of the Prophets*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1939.
- Smith, J.A. *History of Baptists in the Western States*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896.
- Sweet, W.W. *The Baptists* (in Religion on the American Frontier Series). New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931.
- Torbet, Robert G. *A History of the Baptists*. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1950.
- Tupper, H.A. *The Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1880.
- Vail, A.L. *Morning Hour of American Baptist Missions*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.
- Vail, A.L. *Baptists Mobilized for Missions*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911.
- Vedder, H.C. *A Short History of Baptists*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.
- Vedder, H.C. *A Short History of Baptist Missions*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1927.
- White, Charles L. *A Century of Faith*. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1932.
- Whitley, W.T. *A History of British Baptists*. London: Griffin & Co., 1923.
- Whitsitt, William H. *A Question in Baptist History*. Louisville: Dearing, 1896.
- Wright, Mary Emily. *The Missionary Work of the Southern Baptist Convention*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1902.
- The Missionary Jubilee* (50th), *American Baptist Missionary Union*: New York: Sheldon & Co., 1865.
- Jubilee Meeting* (50th), *Baptist Home Mission Society*. New York: Home Mission Rooms, 1883.

## STATE BAPTIST HISTORIES

### *Alabama*

- Hosea Holcombe. *Baptists in Alabama*. Philadelphia: King and Beard, 1840.

B. F. Riley. *A Memorial History of the Baptists of Alabama*. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1923.

### *Arkansas*

J. S. Rogers. *History of Arkansas*. Little Rock: Executive Board, Arkansas Baptist State Convention, 1948.

### *Florida*

J. L. Rosser, *History of Florida Baptists*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1949.

### *Georgia*

B. D. Ragsdale. *Story of Georgia Baptists*. 3 vols. Atlanta: Foote and Davies, 1938.

### *Illinois*

T. J. Wheeler and Harmon Etter. *History of Illinois Baptist State Association*. Carbondale: State Association, 1940.

### *Kentucky*

F. M. Masters. *A History of Baptists in Kentucky*. Louisville: Kentucky Baptist Historical Society, 1953.

J. H. Spencer. *A History of Kentucky Baptists*. 2 vols. Cincinnati: T.R. Baumes, 1885.

### *Louisiana*

C. Penrose St. Amant. *Short History of Louisiana Baptists*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1948.

John T. Christian. *History of Baptists of Louisiana*. Shreveport: Louisiana Baptist Convention, 1923.

W. E. Paxton. *History of the Baptists of Louisiana*. St. Louis: Barns Publishing Co., 1888.

### *Maine*

H. S. Burrage. *History of the Baptists of Maine*. Portland: Marks Printing House, 1904.

### *Maryland*

J. T. Watts. *The Rise and Progress of Maryland Baptists*. State Mission Board of Maryland Baptist Union Assn., 1945.

### *Michigan*

M. E. Trowbridge. *History of Baptists in Michigan*. Michigan Baptist State Convention, 1909.

### *Mississippi*

- Z. T. Leavell and T.J. Bailey. *A Complete History of Mississippi Baptists*. 2 vols. Jackson: Mississippi Baptist Publishing Co., 1904.
- J. L. Boyd. *A Popular History of Mississippi Baptists*. Jackson: Baptist Press, 1930.

### *Missouri*

- Robert S. Douglass. *History of Missouri Baptists*. Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Co., 1934.
- R. S. Duncan. *History of the Baptists in Missouri*. St. Louis: Scammell and Co., 1882.
- W. Pope Yeaman. *History of the Missouri Baptist General Association*. Columbia: E.W. Stevens, 1889.

### *N. Carolina*

- G. W. Paschal. *History of North Carolina Baptists*. Raleigh: General Board, North Carolina Baptist State Convention, Vol. I, 1930.

### *Oklahoma*

- E. C. Routh. *Story of Oklahoma Baptists*. Shawnee: Oklahoma Baptist University Press, 1932.

### *S. Carolina*

- Leah Townsend. *South Carolina Baptists, 1670-1805*. Florence: Florence Printing Co., 1935.

### *Tennessee*

- J. H. Grime. *History of Middle-Tennessee Baptists*. Nashville: Baptist and Reflector, 1902.

### *Texas*

- L. R. Elliott (ed.). *Centennial Story of Texas Baptists*. Dallas: Executive Board of Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1936.
- J. M. Dawson. *A Century with Texas Baptists*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1947.
- Z. N. Morrell. *Flowers and Fruits in Texas*. Dallas: Baptist Standard, 1882.
- J. M. Carroll. *A History of Texas Baptists*. Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1923.

- B. F. Fuller. *History of Texas Baptists*. Louisville: Baptist Book Concern, 1900.
- B. F. Riley. *A History of the Baptists of Texas*. Dallas: 1907
- John A. Held. *Religion a Factor in Building Texas*. San Antonio: The Naylor Co., 1940.
- J. B. Gambrell. *Ten Years in Texas*. Dallas: Baptist Standard, 1909.

### *Virginia*

- Robert T. Semple. *History of the Baptists in Virginia*. rev. George W. Beale. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1894.
- Lewis Peyton Little. *Imprisoned Preachers and Religious Liberty in Virginia*. Lynchburg: J.P. Bell, 1938.
- R. B.C. Howell. *Early Baptists in. Virginia*, Philadelphia: American Baptist Historical Society, 1857.

## **BIOGRAPHIES**

(arranged by subjects)

- Boyce, James P.: *Memoir of James Petigru Boyce* by John A. Broadus. Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1927.
- Broadus, John A.: *Life and Letters of John A. Broadus* by A.T. Robertson. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1901.
- Brown, A.B.: *Sketch of the Life and Writings of A.B. Brown* by W.E. Hatcher. Baltimore: H.M. Wharton, 1886.
- Bruner, J.W.: *Autobiography*. Dallas: 1951.
- Burleson, Rufus C.: *The Life and Writings of Rufus C. Burleson* by Mrs. Georgia Burleson and Harry Haynes. Waco: 1901.
- Carroll, B.H.: *B.H. Carroll* by Jeff D. Ray. Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1927.
- Cone, Spencer Houghton: *Some Account of the Life of Spencer Houghton Cone* by his sons. New York: Liverman and Rudd, 1856.
- Curry, J.L. M.: *J.L. M. Curry, Southerner, Statesman and Educator* by Jessie Pearl Rice. New York: Kings Crown Press, Columbia University, 1949.
- Furman, Richard: *A Biography of Richard Furman* by H.T. Cook. Greenville: Baptist Courier, 1915.
- Gambrell, J.B.: *J.B. Gambrell* by E.C. Routh. Oklahoma City: 1929.
- Graves, J.R.: *Life, Times and Teachings of J.R. Graves* by O.L. Hailey. Nashville: 1929.

- Gwaltney, L.L.: *Forty of the Twentieth* (autobiography). Birmingham: 1940.
- Hatcher, William E.: *William E. Hatcher* by E.B. Hatcher. Richmond: W.C. Hill, 1915.
- : *Along the Trail of the Friendly Years* (autobiography). New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1910.
- Heck, Fanny E.S.: *Fanny E.S. Heck* by Mrs. W.C. James. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1939.
- Jeter, Jeremiah B.: *Life of J.B. Jeter* by W.E. Hatcher. Baltimore: H.M. Wharton, 1887.
- : *The Recollections of a Long Life* (autobiography) Richmond: Religious Herald Co., 1891.
- Johnson, William B.: *Giant in the Land* by Hortense Woodson. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1950.
- Leavell, Frank H.: *Dr. Frank* by Claude U. Broach, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1950.
- Leavell, Landrum P.: *Landrum P. Leavell: An Unashamed Workman* by Roland Q. Leavell: Nashville: Broadman Press, 1941.
- Mercer, Jesse: *Memoirs of Elder Jesse Mercer* by C.D. Mallery. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1844.
- Morehouse, Henry Lyman: *Henry Lyman Morehouse* by L.A. Crandall. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1919.
- Mott, John R.: *Addresses and Papers*, Vol. V. New York: Association Press, 1947.
- : *Five Decades* (autobiography) New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939.
- Mullins, Edgar Young: *Edgar Young Mullins, An Intimate Biography* by Isla May Mullins. Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1929. McDaniel, George W.: *George W. McDaniel* by Douglass Scarborough  
McDaniel. Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1928.
- Peck, John Mason: *Memoir of John Mason Peck* by Rufus Babcock. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1864.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter: *Walter Rauschenbusch* by D.R. Sharpe. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942.
- Rice, Luther: *Luther Rice, Pioneer in Missions and Education* by Pollard and Stevens. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1928.
- : *Memoir of Luther Rice* by James B. Taylor. Reprinted Nashville: Broadman Press, 1840.
- : *Luther Rice* by Rufus W. Weaver. Washington: Rice Committee, 1936.

- Robertson, A.T.: *A.T. Robertson* by Everett Gill. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943.
- Routh, E.C.: *Adventures in Christian Journalism* (autobiography) Nashville: Broadman Press, 1951.
- Scarborough, Lee Rutland: *Lee Rutland Scarborough* by H.E. Dana. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1942.
- Sherwood, Adiel: *Memoir of Adiel Sherwood* by Julia Sherwood. Philadelphia: Grant and Faires, 1884.
- Spilman, B.W.: *B.W. Spilman, the Sunday School Man* by C.S. Green, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1953.
- Taylor, James B.: *Life and Times of James B. Taylor* by George B. Taylor. Lynchburg: J.P. Bell, 1908.
- Tichenor, Isaac Taylor: *Isaac Taylor Tichenor, the Home Mission Statesman* by J.S. Dill. Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1908.
- Truett, George W.: *George W. Truett, A Biography* by Powhatan James. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939.
- Willingham, Robert J.: *The Life of Robert Josiah Willingham* by Elizabeth Walton Willingham. Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1917.

## GROUP BIOGRAPHIES

- Ramond, John S. (comp.). *Among Southern Baptists*. Kansas City: Western Baptist Publishing Co., 1936.
- Graham, B.J. W. (comp.). *Baptist Biography*, 3 vols., Atlanta: Index Publishing Co., 1917-23.
- Cathcart, William (ed.) *The Baptist Encyclopaedia*. 2 vols., Philadelphia: Louis Everts, 1881.
- Price, J.M. *Baptist Leaders in Religious Education*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1943.
- McDaniel, George W. *A Memorial Wreath*. Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1921.
- Price, J.M. *Southwestern Men and Messages*. Kansas City: Central Seminary Press, 1948.
- : *Ten Men from Baylor*. Kansas City: Central Seminary Press, 1945.

## ANNUAL REPORTS AND HANDBOOKS

- Burnett, J.J. (comp.). *Tennessee's Pioneer Baptist Preachers*. Nashville: Marshall & Bruce, Vol. I, 1919.

*Virginia Baptist Ministers*. 6 vols.: James B. Taylor. I-II. George

Braxton Taylor. III-VI. Lynchburg: J.P. Bell, 1837-1935.

Annual Minutes and Reports of the various state conventions and general associations.

Minutes and Histories of district associations, especially of older associations such as Philadelphia, Charleston, Kehukee, Dover, Union and Ketockton.

Reports of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society (1814-1953), (Triennial Convention until 1845); American Baptist Home Mission Society (1832-1953); American Baptist Publication Society (1840-1953); Northern Baptist Convention (1908-1951); American Baptist Convention (1951-1953).

Southern Baptist Convention Minutes and Annual Reports, 1845-1953. The most valuable source material.

Southern Baptist Handbook, 1921-1953, Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board.

## **NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS**

### *Older, not now published*

Babcock, R., and Choules, J.O. (eds.). *Baptist Memorial*. New York: 1842 —

Smith, Lucius E. (ed.). *Baptist Quarterly*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1867.

*Baptist Quarterly Review*, New York: Baptist Review Association, Vols. VII, VIII, IX, XI, XII 1885-1890.

*Baptist Review*, Cincinnati: 1879-84.

*The Christian Review*. Boston: Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln, 1836-63. Merged in the Bibliotheca Sacra.

*Ford's Christian Repository*; begun in Louisville in 1852; formerly *Western Baptist Review*; resumed in St. Louis in 1871; continued under the editorship of Dr. S.H. Ford until his death in 1905.

*Foreign Mission Journal*. Richmond: Foreign Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1869.

*Home and Foreign Journal*, published several years previous to the War Between the States.

*Home Field*, Atlanta: Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1890.

*The Indian Missionary*. (Indian Territory, 1884-94).

*The Journal and Messenger*. Cincinnati.

*Kind Words*. Greenville: Sunday School Board, 1866-1929.

*Link's Historical and Biographical Magazine*. Texas: 1891-92.

*Southern Baptist Missionary Journal*. Richmond: H.K. Ellyson, 1846

*The Standard of Chicago*; also *The Baptist*. Chicago.

*Texas Baptist*. Texas, 1855-60;

*Texas Baptist and Herald* (founded in 1865 and merged in 1886 with *Texas Baptist*, founded in 1874.)

### ***Baptist State Papers***

*Alabama Baptist*. (1835), <sup>f532</sup> Once known as *Southwestern Baptist*.  
Birmingham.

*Arizona Baptist Beacon*. (1933), Phoenix.

*Arkansas Baptist*. (1902). First known as *Baptist Advance*. Little Rock.

*Baptist and Reflector*. (1835), Nashville.

*Baptist Courier*. (1869), Greenville, S.C.

*Baptist Message*. (1883), formerly *Baptist Chronicle*. Alexandria, La.

*Baptist Messenger*. (1912), Oklahoma City.

*Baptist New Mexican*. (1912), Albuquerque.

*Baptist Record*. (1877), Dr. J.B. Gambrell was editor in early years. Jackson,  
Miss.

*Baptist Standard*. (1888; *Western Baptist*, 1888-92), Dallas.

*Biblical Recorder*. (1833), Raleigh.

*California Southern Baptist*. (1940), Fresno.

*The Christian Index*. (1821), Continuation of *Columbian Star*, founded by  
Luther Rice, Atlanta.

*Florida Baptist Witness*. (1884), Jacksonville.

*Illinois Baptist*. (1905), Carbondale.

*Kansas Southern Baptist Beams*. (1945), Wichita.

*Maryland Baptist*. Baltimore.

*Religious Herald*. (1828), Dr. R.H. Pitt was editor almost fifty years,  
Richmond.

*Western Recorder*. (1825), Continuation of *Baptist Banner and Western  
Pioneer*. Merged in 1919 with *Baptist World*, successor in 1908 to *Baptist  
Argus*, founded in 1897, Louisville.

*Word and Way*. (1896), In 1912, the *Word and Way* and the *Central Baptist*, founded in 1868, were consolidated, Kansas City.

### *Other Publications*

*Baptist Review and Expositor*. Louisville.

*Brotherhood Journal*. Memphis.

*The Chronicle*. Chester, Pa.

*The Commission*. Richmond.

*Missions*. New York.

Quarterly historical periodicals published by various state historical bodies.

*Royal Service*. Birmingham.

*Southern Baptist Home Missions*. Atlanta.

*Watchman Examiner*. New York.

*Unpublished Manuscripts*

Paschal, G.W. "History of Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board." Wake Forest.

Taylor, O.W. "A History of Tennessee Baptists." Nashville.

Maston, T.B. "Isaac Backus." Ft. Worth.

Johnson, M. Kendall. "Isaac Taylor Tichenor." Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Stratton, David. "New Mexico Baptists." University of Colorado.

Gunn, Jack W. "Rufus C. Burleson."

Cox, Joseph Powhatan. "A Study of the Life and Work of Basil Manly, Jr."

Hailey, O.L. "Tennessee Baptists."

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

Thompson, E. Roberts. *Baptists and Disciples of Christ*. London: Carey Kingsgate, 1948.

Slosser, G.J. *Christian Unity, Its History and Challenge in all Communions in All Lands*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1929.

Jones, J. William. *Christ in the Camp*. Richmond: B.F. Johnson, 1887.

Jordan, L.G. *Negro Baptist History*. Nashville: Sunday School Publishing Board, 1930.

Graves, J.R. *Old Landmarkism*. Texarkana: Baptist Sunday School Committee, 1928.

Van Dusen, Henry P. *World Christianity*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury.

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>ft1</sup> R.A. Guild, "The Denominational Work of President Manning," *Baptist Review*, II (1880), 559. This letter from Jones to Manning was the official expression of the Philadelphia Association.
- <sup>ft2</sup> *The Baptist Annual Register*, ed. John Rippon, D.D. (London, 1790-1802), II, 262.
- <sup>ft3</sup> Footnote by the editor of the *Register*: "A similar object in England has, year after year, been matter of conversation among the ministers in London; but no specific plan is yet laid, and perhaps cannot be without previous communications between some of the brethren in town, and in different parts of the country."
- <sup>ft4</sup> Letter from Dr. Basil Manly, Sr., to Dr. J.C. Furman in H.T. Cook, *The Life and Work of James C. Furman* (Greenville: 1926), p. 192.
- <sup>ft5</sup> J.B. Taylor, *Memoir of Luther Rice* (Baltimore: Armstrong and Berry, 2nd ed., 1841), p. 146.
- <sup>ft6</sup> See letter of Rice, Mercer Institute, Georgia, dated January 20, 1835, in which he says that Dr. W.B. Johnson proposed a national meeting of Baptists to lay plans for foreign missions. *Christian Index*, January 27, 1835, p. 3.
- <sup>ft7</sup> Address by Dr. Daniel Sharp, *The Christian Reflector* (Boston), June 18, 1846.
- <sup>ft8</sup> *Ibid.* The long address should be read. The ideology revealed (the society method carried to extreme) played a part in events leading to separation between Baptists, South and North, not hitherto recognized.
- <sup>ft9</sup> The text of the Philadelphia Confession may be found in William Cathcart, *The Baptist Encyclopaedia* (Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1881), II, 1311-1321.
- <sup>ft10</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 154.
- <sup>ft11</sup> See Morgan Edwards, *Notes*.
- <sup>ft12</sup> For a parallel between the aristocracy in the political and social spheres in the South and similar tendencies in Baptist thinking and methods, especially in South Carolina, see H.T. Cook: *A Biography of Richard Furman* (Greenville: Baptist Courier Job Rooms, 1913), pp. 76 f.
- <sup>ft13</sup> The mission work among American Indians, except for the American Indian Mission Association, organized in 1842 and merged in 1855 with the Board of Domestic Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention, remained

under the American Baptist Foreign Mission Agency until 1865 when it was transferred to the Home Mission Society.

<sup>ft14</sup> *Baptist Magazine* (England), February, 1813, p. 83.

<sup>ft15</sup> *Baptist Family Magazine*, July, 1857, pp. 211-212; cf. *Rippon's Register*, II, 313.

<sup>ft16</sup> Rev. Francis Wayland, under the pseudonym "Isaac Backus," November, 1823, pp. 198-202; January, 1824, pp. 242-247; May, 1824, pp. 324-328. See A.L. Vail, *Baptists Mobilized for Missions* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911), pp. 15-17.

<sup>ft17</sup> February 15, 1844, p. 2, cols. 4-5.

<sup>ft18</sup> In state conventions, however, the denominational ideology prevailed.

<sup>ft19</sup> However, President Francis Wayland of Brown University, a vigorous advocate of decentralization [see his *Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches* (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1858), p. 185], led in the formation of the American Baptist Missionary Union, unique in excluding church representation, in order "to devise an organization that would secure the exclusion of (abolitionism) and other alien topics." A.L. Vail, *op. cit.*, chap. 2, especially notes 4-7.

<sup>ft20</sup> After the Battle of Alamance, in 1771, the Sandy Creek church in North Carolina declined in seventeen years from 606 members to 14. See George W. Paschal, *History of North Carolina Baptists, 1663-1805* (Raleigh: The General Board, North Carolina Baptist State Convention, 1930), I, 381.

<sup>ft21</sup> Quoted in the *Baptist Banner*, September 12, 1837, p. 3, cols. 2-4.

<sup>ft22</sup> R.B. C. Howell in *The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, March 21, 1839, p. 3, col. 3.

<sup>ft23</sup> Pp. 101-102.

<sup>ft24</sup> Dr. Mercer was a member of the Foreign Board. Texas, though a foreign country, was within the sphere of the Home Mission Society — "North America for Christ."

<sup>ft25</sup> An examination of the records of the period reveals no foundation for the oft-told story that Huckins was sent in answer to Jesse Mercer's offer of \$2,500.00 if the Society would provide a missionary to Texas. By his second marriage, Dr. Mercer became quite wealthy [David Benedict, *Fifty Years Among the Baptists* (New York: Sheldon and Co., 1860), p. 52]. His will, written after the death of his wife, Nancy, began with these words: "As it has pleased God to take my be-loved wife, Nancy Mercer, to Himself, I now proceed to make such distribution of the property now left in my hands, as voluntarily and mutually agreed upon when we first came together in marriage. ..." In the body of that will is the following

provision: "I give and devise to the American Baptist Home Mission Society, chiefly to aid in their operations in Texas, twenty-five shares of the capital stock in the Bank of the State of Georgia." [Mallery, *Memoirs of Jesse Mercer* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1844), pp. 241-242.] This amount could not have been given for the purpose of sending James Huckins to Texas (as stated in some books) since Huckins had begun work in Galveston, Texas, in January, 1840, almost a year and a half before this provision was written into Mercer's will. Link's *Historical and Biographical Magazine*, 1891, in the sketch of Huckins, expresses the opinion: "It is probable that under his (Huckins) influence Jesse Mercer was led to give \$2,500 to the Home Mission Society. ..." The will was contested by relatives, and finally, in 1846, the Home Mission Society received under the will \$1,331.87. [W. W. Barnes, "Dr. Jesse Mercer and the Texas Mission," *The Chronicle* (Scottsdale, Pa.), January, 1953, p. 43.]

<sup>ft26</sup> P. 3, cols. 3-4.

<sup>ft27</sup> Louisville, June 26, 1845, p. 2, cols. 1-2.

<sup>ft28</sup> August 11, 1837, p. 3, cols. 2-3.

<sup>ft29</sup> One notices here and in the next reference the preference in the South for denominational action rather than action by individuals gathered in a society.

<sup>ft30</sup> *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, March 21, 1839, p. 3, col. 3; April 4, 1839, p. 2, col. 2.

<sup>ft31</sup> *Ibid.*, July 27, 1843, p. 2, cols. 3-4; August 3, 1843, p. 2, cols. 2-3.

<sup>ft32</sup> *Ibid.*, August 10, 1843, p. 2, cols. 2-8.

<sup>ft33</sup> Nehemiah Adams, *South-side of Slavery, or Three Months at the South* (Boston, 1854), p. 101.

<sup>ft34</sup> The probability is that these and other states would have freed the slaves had not abolitionists fomented slave rebellions, such as Nat Turner's rebellion in Virginia, 1831.

<sup>ft35</sup> *Cross and Journal*, March 27, 1835, quoted from *Baptist Magazine* (London), January, 1835, p. 11.

<sup>ft36</sup> *Christian Index*, March 24, 1835, p. 4, col. 4; quoted from the *American Baptist*.

<sup>ft37</sup> *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, October 14, 1841, p. 1, col. 4.

<sup>ft38</sup> *Ibid.*, October 6, 1842, p. 1, col. 1.

<sup>ft39</sup> See R.A. Baker, *Relations Between Northern and Southern Baptists* (Fort Worth: Seminary Hill Press, 1948), chap. 3, pp. 43-71, for discussion and citation of source material.

- <sup>ft40</sup> *Baptist Missionary Magazine*, October, 1844, p. 310. Albert H. Newman, *History Baptist Churches in the United States* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898), p. 445.
- <sup>ft41</sup> *The Baptist* (Nashville), April 5, 1845, p. 514, col. 1, quoted from the *Christian Index*. Rev. E.A. Stevens of Georgia also was from a slaveholding family. He received special contributions in kind from Georgia Baptists. Upon division, he chose to remain in Burma under the Northern Board.
- <sup>ft42</sup> *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, November 26, 1840, p. 3, col. 3.
- <sup>ft43</sup> *Baptist Missionary Magazine*, December, 1840, pp. 281 f.
- <sup>ft44</sup> *Christian Index*, February 12, 1841, p. 105, col. 2.
- <sup>ft45</sup> The Rev. Baron Stow, recording secretary of the Board, introduced the anti-slavery resolution in the Boston Association (*Baptist Banner*, October 24, 1844, p. 2, col. 4). This was later denied.
- <sup>ft46</sup> Introduced by Dr. Basil Manly, president of the University of Alabama.
- <sup>ft47</sup> David Benedict, *Fifty Years Among the Baptists*, pp. 217-221, reviews the conditions preceding the formation of the Southern Convention. He reports the conference that he, Treasurer H. Lincoln of the Boston Board, and others had with Georgia leaders. His views agreed with those expressed in the *Baptist Register*.
- <sup>ft48</sup> *Religious Herald*, April 10, 1845, p. 2, cols. 3-4.  
In the *Life and Times of James B. Taylor*, by George B. Taylor (Philadelphia: The Bible and Publication Society, 1872), pp. 151-152, is a letter by James B. Taylor, dated March 8, 1845, referring to the decision of the Board of the Virginia Foreign Mission Society, the preceding day, to recommend such a call.
- <sup>ft49</sup> Dr. J.B. Taylor and Dr. J.B. Jeter, leaders in the movement to separate, were not slaveowners.
- <sup>ft50</sup> Minutes of the special session, full text of the address in the *Edgefield Advertiser*, May 7, 1845. Reprinted, *ibid.*, September 6, 1944.
- <sup>ft51</sup> *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, March 27, 1845, p. 2, cols. 2-3.
- <sup>ft52</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1, 1845, p. 2, cols. 1-3.
- <sup>ft53</sup> *The Baptist* (Nashville), April 26, 1845, pp. 563-564.
- <sup>ft54</sup> There were thirty-four messengers who represented two or more constituencies, leaving a net enrolment of two hundred ninety-three. There are other names so nearly alike that they may be the same, suggesting other multiple representations. See Appendix C.

- <sup>ft55</sup> In his *Recollections of a Long Life* (Richmond: Religious Herald Co., 1891), p. 234, Dr. J.B. Jeter describes the trip of the Virginia delegates to Augusta — by rail to Wilmington, North Carolina, thence by steamship down Cape Fear River and the Atlantic Coast to Charleston, South Carolina. Referring to a terrific storm during the sea voyage, Dr. Jeter wrote: “The destruction of that living cargo would have been a great calamity to the Baptists of Virginia.”
- <sup>ft56</sup> Some at Augusta expected that Baptists in the North, opposed to abolitionism, would co-operate with the new Convention. The constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention has been nation-wide in scope from the beginning.
- <sup>ft57</sup> Prior to 1850, it was not unusual for many of our Baptist leaders to refer to the denomination as “the Baptist Church,” or “the Church.” Thus, the expression is used here.
- <sup>ft58</sup> *Daily Chronicle and Sentinel* (Augusta), May 10, 1845. This periodical reported the proceedings daily. File in the Public Library, Augusta. The reporter was James C. Crane, secretary of the Conventions. See *Christian Index*, May 23, 1845, p. 1, col. 1.
- <sup>ft59</sup> See biography of Dr. W.B. Johnson, by Hortense Woodson, *Giant in the Land* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1950), pp. 110-129, for account of the new Convention.
- <sup>ft60</sup> *Daily Chronicle and Sentinel*, May 12, 1845.
- <sup>ft61</sup> George B. Taylor, *Life and Times of James B. Taylor*, p. 155. The custom of denominational communion was passing out in the thirties and forties. The custom of limiting participation to the members of the church observing the Supper had not yet become emphasized.
- <sup>ft62</sup> See Appendix B for the numerical listings of the delegates at the Augusta Convention; Appendix C for the list of the names of those present and members of the Convention.
- <sup>ft63</sup> The society method had been followed so long in England and America and was so prevalent that even among Baptists in the South there were state and association “societies.” The presence of anti-missionism forced those in favor of missions and education to follow this method even though they preferred a “convention.” Cf. the story in Virginia and Tennessee.
- <sup>ft64</sup> Rev. Joseph Walker, “Southern Baptist Seminary,” *Religious Herald*, December 29, 1892, p. 1, col. 8.
- <sup>ft65</sup> *Christian Index*, May 16, 1845, p. 3, col. 1. *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1871, Appendix D, p. 5.

- <sup>ft66</sup> *N.Y. Journal of Commerce*, quoted in the *Southern Advocate* (Huntsville, Alabama) May 30, 1845.
- <sup>ft67</sup> See chapters XI and XVII.
- <sup>ft68</sup> “The Herald — the Index — the Recorder,” *Religious Herald*, August 12, 1847, p. 2, col. 5.
- <sup>ft69</sup> William E. Hatcher, *Life of J.B. Jeter* (Baltimore: H.M. Wharton and Co., 1887), p. 220.
- <sup>ft70</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1845, p. 18.
- <sup>ft71</sup> The meetings were made biennial in 1849 by constitutional change.
- <sup>ft72</sup> One of Commodore Perry’s sailors returned home and became a Baptist preacher and missionary of the Free Baptists to Japan — Jeremiah Goble. He was the inventor of the jinricksha.
- <sup>ft73</sup> Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1846, pp. 29-30.
- <sup>ft74</sup> *Christian Index*, April 8, 1847, p. 4, col. 2.
- <sup>ft75</sup> Letter of Elder Z. Rose ( Primitive) to J.R. Graves, *Tennessee Baptist*, May 2, 1857, p. 2, col. 3.
- <sup>ft76</sup> “Prospect and Retrospect of the Southern Baptist Convention,” *Religious Herald*, May 11, 1876, p. 2, col. 2.
- <sup>ft77</sup> New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1910.
- <sup>ft78</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1861, pp. 62 f.
- <sup>ft79</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1861, pp. 63-64.
- <sup>ft80</sup> *Ibid.*, 1863, pp. 54-55.
- <sup>ft81</sup> *Western Recorder*, July 13, 1861, p. 82. (These sentences were apparently picked out of this issue and printed in this form elsewhere.)
- <sup>ft82</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1863, pp. 34-35.
- <sup>ft83</sup> *Ibid.*, 1861, p. 29.
- <sup>ft84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- <sup>ft85</sup> *Religious Herald*, quoted in *South Western Baptist*, August 22, 1861, p. 1, col. 7.
- <sup>ft86</sup> *Christian Index*, quoted in *South Western Baptist*, February 5, 1863, p. 2, col. 6.
- <sup>ft87</sup> See J. William Jones, *Christ in the Camp* (Richmond: B.F. Johnson and Co., 1887), for the detailed story of that work.
- <sup>ft88</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1863, p. 35.
- <sup>ft89</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

- <sup>ft90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- <sup>ft91</sup> *Ibid.*, 1866, p. 40.
- <sup>ft92</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.
- <sup>ft93</sup> *Minutes of the American Baptist Home Mission Society*, 1864, p. 15.
- <sup>ft94</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16, 21.
- <sup>ft95</sup> Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1866, p. 50.
- <sup>ft96</sup> *Minutes of the Maryland Baptist Association*, 1861, p. 11.
- <sup>ft97</sup> *South Western Baptist*, February 27, 1862. A.F. Crane in *Christian Index* and *South Western Baptist*, July 19, 1866. *Western Recorder*, July 16, 1864. *Religious Herald*, February 11 and May 12, 1864.
- <sup>ft98</sup> *Christian Index*, March 9, 1863, p. 4, col. 2. Written from Richmond. Anon.
- <sup>ft99</sup> "Funds for Foreign Missions," *Religious Herald*, February 26, 1863, p. 1, col. 3.
- <sup>ft100</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1863, p. 23. In the report to the Convention (*ibid.*, 1866, p. 56) for the year 1864 the Foreign Board said: "We have also sent funds in the shape of cotton."
- <sup>ft101</sup> W.C. Crane Papers (Waco: Baylor University Library).
- <sup>ft102</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1866, p. 67.
- <sup>ft103</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1867, pp. 56 f.
- <sup>ft104</sup> *Ibid.*, 1869, p. 54.
- <sup>ft105</sup> The sessions henceforth have been annual.
- <sup>ft106</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1866, p. 87.
- <sup>ft107</sup> W.C. Crane Papers.
- <sup>ft108</sup> Concord Association (Tenn.); *The Baptist*, August 30, 1845. Alabama Association; *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, April 15, 1841.
- <sup>ft109</sup> In Howard College Library.
- <sup>ft110</sup> "A Great Work to be Done," *Religious Herald*, June 25, 1868, p. 2, col. 1.
- <sup>ft111</sup> *Western Recorder*, July 22, 1865, p. 1, cols. 1-2.
- <sup>ft112</sup> *Ibid.*, September 30, 1865, p. 2, col. 1.
- <sup>ft113</sup> *Ibid.*, December 2, 1865, p. 2, col. 3.
- <sup>ft114</sup> Quoted in *Western Recorder*, March 14, 1868, p. 1, col. 3.
- <sup>ft115</sup> *Religious Herald*, October 19, 1865, p. 1, cols. 3-4.
- <sup>ft116</sup> "The Temper of Northern Baptists," p. 1. col. 2.

- ft117 P. 1, col. 4.
- ft118 Domestic and Indian Mission Board Report, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1866, p. 45.
- ft119 *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ft120 *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.
- ft121 In Howard College Library.
- ft122 *Op. cit.*, 1867, p. 36.
- ft123 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1869, p. 38.
- ft124 *Ibid*, 1866, pp. 78-79, 83.
- ft125 P. 2, col. 1.
- ft126 *Op cit.*, 1868, pp. 15, 17, 20.
- ft127 Report of the Sunday School Board, *ibid.*, 1870, pp. 35-36.
- ft128 *Loc. cit.*
- ft129 *Op. cit.*, 1871, p. 19.
- ft130 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1875, Appendix G, pp. 73-74.
- ft131 *Ibid.*, 1879, p. 14.
- ft132 *Ibid.*, p. 26.
- ft133 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- ft134 *Annual Report*, American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1882, pp. 48-49.
- ft135 See *Minutes*, Texas Baptist State Convention, 1881, pp. 6-8, for the contract.
- ft136 Chattanooga, August 23, 1882. Copied in the *Baptist Home Mission Monthly*, October, 1882; *The Texas Baptist*, May 10, 1883.
- ft137 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1880, p. 15. *Texas Baptist Herald*, October 27, 1881.
- ft138 Among the missionaries appointed at that time were S.G. Mullins, father of Dr. E.Y. Mullins, the Board's representative at Corsicana, Texas, and E.L. Compere, missionary in Arkansas, See Amy Hickerson, *The Westward Way* (Atlanta: Home Mission Board, S.B.C., 1945), p. 108.
- ft139 Dr. J.M. Frost, *The Sunday School Board* (Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1914), pp. 9-10.
- ft140 Home Board Report, *op. cit.*, 1883.
- ft141 B.D. Gray, *Home and Foreign Fields*, April, 1936, p. 6.

- ft142 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1892, Appendix A, pp. 10-11.
- ft143 *Ibid.*, 1893, Appendix B, p. LXX.
- ft144 *Ibid.*, 1895, p. 16. See also Charles L. White, *A Century of Faith* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1932), pp. 116-117.
- ft145 *Southern Baptist*, August 29, 1855, p. 3, col. 2.
- ft146 *Ibid.*, August 15, 1855, p. 2, cols. 4-5; *Christian Index*, June 6, p. 1, col. 3; August 29, p. 1, col. 3; September 19, 1845, p. 1, cols. 1-3.
- ft147 “Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Publication Convention,” *Religious Herald*, May 20, 1847, p. 3, col. 1; *Southern Baptist*, June 20, 1855, p. 2, cols. 5-6.
- ft148 *Western Baptist Review*, May, 1846, pp. 346-356; September, 1846, pp. 32-36; *Christian Index*, August 14, 1846, p. 3, cols. 1-2. Cf. Editorial, *ibid.*, June 6, p. 2, cols. 1-3, and July 4, 1845, p. 2, cols. 2-4.
- ft149 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1846, p. 14.
- ft150 “The Southern Baptist Sunday School Convention,” *Religious Herald*, August 20, 1857, p. 1, col. 3.
- ft151 *Christian Index*, September 30, 1857, p. 1, col. 1.
- ft152 *Ibid.*, November 25, 1857, p. 1, col. 5.
- ft153 *Tennessee Baptist*, April 3, 1858.
- ft154 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1861, p. 16.
- ft155 *Ibid.*, 1863, Appendix H, p. 51.
- ft156 *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- ft157 *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
- ft158 Editorial, *Western Recorder*, July 25, 1868, p. 2, col. 2.
- ft159 Report of Southern Baptist Convention, *ibid.*, May 23, 1868, p. 1, cols. 3-8.
- ft160 Home Mission Board Report, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1885, p. 7.
- ft161 *Ibid.* p. 25.
- ft162 J.M. Frost, *The Sunday School Board*, p. 11.
- ft163 Home Mission Board Report, *op. cit.*, p. xii.
- ft164 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1887, p. 27.
- ft165 *Ibid.*, 1888, p. 28.
- ft166 *Ibid.*, 1889, pp. 10 f.

ft167 *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

ft168 Home Mission Board Report, *ibid.*, p. 50.

ft169 *Ibid.*, 1890, pp. 6-7.

ft170 *Ibid.*, p. 23.

ft171 *Ibid.*, 1891, p. 23.

ft172 Home Mission Board Report, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1891, p. xlii.

ft173 E.g., Dr. W.E. Hatcher, of Virginia, and Dr. Gambrell, of Mississippi.

ft174 Editorial, *Baptist Standard*, March 31, 1892, p. 7, col. 4.

ft175 *Ibid.*, October 20, November 17, 1892.

ft176 *Ibid.*, February 2, 1893.

ft177 *Ibid.*, April 16, 1896, p. 5, col. 1. For full correspondence see also April 9, p. 5, col. 2; April 23.

ft178 Frost, *Sunday School Board*, p. 81.

ft179 Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 82; *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1897, p. 21; and "A Card From Dr. Rowland," *Baptist Standard*, February 3, 1898, p. 11, col. 3.

See also *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1914, pp. 359-371, story of Sunday School Board, by Dr. J.M. Frost, closing with graphic recital of Wilmington experience.

ft180 Report, The Sunday School Board, p. 256.

ft181 Wayland, *Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches*, p. 185.

ft182 *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, February 9, 1843, p. 2, cols. 1-2. W.B. Johnson, "Presidential Address," South Carolina Convention, 1845, May 3 (special session), *Edge field Advertiser*, May 7, 1845. Reprinted, *ibid.*, September 6, 1944.

ft183 J.M. Peck to R.B. C. Howell, in *The Baptist* (Nashville), December 6, 1845, pp. 242-243. Albert L. Vail, *Baptists Mobilized for Missions* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911), pp. 28-45, 80-88.

ft184 See James Ross, *Life and Times of Elder Reuben Ross* (Philadelphia: Grant, Faires & Rodgers, 1882), pp. 233-241.

ft185 Graves himself refers to the position opposed to his as "low church practices," thus indirectly calling his own position "high church." S.H. Ford's quotation (*Western Recorder*, April 25, 1855, p. 2, cols. 5-6.) from Graves in the *Tennessee Baptist*.

- ft186 Editorial, “Baptismal ‘Succession,’” *Religious Herald*, February 18, 1858, p. 2, col. 1.
- ft187 J.R. Graves, *Old Landmarkism: What Is It?* (Texarkana: Baptist Sunday School Committee, 1928), pp. 29-30, 121-123.
- ft188 *Ibid.*, p. 123.
- ft189 See footnote 11, p. 103.
- ft190 *Western Baptist Review*, III, March 1843, pp. 276 ff.
- ft191 Dr. O.L. Halley, son-in-law of Dr. J.R. Graves, wrote on the margin of the *Tennessee Baptist*, June 29, 1848, p. 2, col. 4: “Mr. Fidus is J.R. Graves. O.L. H. 7/27/91.” Copy of the paper in the library of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- ft192 *Tennessee Baptist*, May 25, p. 2, cols. 3-6; June 1, p. 2, cols. 1-4; July 6, 1848, p. 2, cols. 2-4.
- ft193 *Ibid.*, June 19, 1851.
- ft194 Graves in the *Southern Baptist Review*, II, September-October, 1856, Footnote. He admitted that this “landmark” was new in Baptist teaching.
- ft195 J R. Graves, *Old Landmarkism: What Is It?*, p. 33.
- ft196 The *Christian Index*, March 29, 1855, p. 3, cols. 1-2, in an editorial review, insisted that Orchard misquoted Mosheim and others concerning the Novatians, Donatists and Paulicians.
- ft197 John A. Broadus, *Memoir of James Petigru Boyce* (New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son, 1893), pp. 98-99.
- ft198 *Tennessee Baptist*, September 1, 1855, p. 3, col. 1.
- ft199 See the references previously given in this chapter.
- ft200 See the files of the *Tennessee Baptist*, the *Southern Baptist Review*, the *Western Recorder*, especially, and other Baptist papers.
- ft201 Cf. the files of the *Western Recorder* from 1868 onward; the *Religious Herald*, in the 1870’s, and other papers. See especially Richard Fuller in the *Religious Herald*, April 1, 1875, p. 2, cols. 2-3, on the approaching meeting of the Convention.
- ft202 September 21, 1872, p. 4, col. 1.
- ft203 *Ibid.*, June 20, 1874, p. 2, cols. 1-3. See *Review and Expositor*, January, 1944, p. 24. See also John A. Broadus, *op. cit.*, pp. 267-268.
- ft204 There are many Baptists, not only in the Southwest but in the Middle States, who hold Landmark views with reference to the ordinances but do not subscribe to certain other views and practices and spirit of the Landmarkers of those days.

- ft205 *Tennessee Baptist*, February 5, 1859, p. 2, col. 4.
- ft206 Editorial review, *South Western Baptist*, September 22, 1859.
- ft207 Charles E. Taylor, president of Wake Forest College, “My Most Memorable Convention,” *Religious Herald*, May 8, 1902, p. 2, col. 3.
- ft208 George Braxton Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers* (Lynchburg: J.P. Bell Company, Inc., 1912), Third Series, p. 159.
- ft209 Editorial signed P, *Tennessee Baptist*, May 21, 1859. In the May 28 issue, p. 2, col. 1, this is said to represent the views of the three editors — Graves, Pendleton, and Dayton.
- ft210 *South Western Baptist*, September 29, October 6, 13, 20, 1859.
- ft211 Report of the Southern Baptist Convention, *Religious Herald*, May 17, 1888, p. 2, col. 6.
- ft212 *Foreign Mission Journal*, May, 1892, pp. 291-292.
- ft213 Cf. Crawford’s tract, *Churches, To the Front!* (China, 1892), pp. 14 f., with the writings of J.R. Graves and other Landmarkers, against the Board method.
- ft214 *Western Recorder*, July 8, 1897, p. 5, col. 1.
- ft215 *Foreign Mission Journal*, May, 1892, p. 292. Mr. Bostick took service under the Regular Baptists and was supported by them for about ten years.
- ft216 *Ibid.*, July, 1892, p. 358. For a statement of Mr. Herring’s views and the Convention’s reaction thereto, see *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1893, p. 44.
- ft217 “The Wreckers,” *Religious Herald*, June 18, 1896, p. 2, cols. 1-2.
- ft218 For a fuller view, see T.P. Crawford, *The Evolution of My Missionary Ideas*.
- ft219 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1905, pp. 42-44.
- ft220 See next chapter, pp. 136-139.
- ft221 W.J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911), pp. 298-301, also pp. 293 ff.
- ft222 Lemuel C. Barnes, *Pioneers of Light* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1924), p. 56; W.J. McGlothlin, *ibid.*, pp. 300-301.
- ft223 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1925, pp. 71-76.
- ft224 *Ibid.*, 1949, p. 43.
- ft225 Report, Committee on Common Problems with Northern Baptists, *ibid.*, 1950, p. 37.

- ft226 See letters to Dr. R.B. C. Howell, *Religious Herald*, April 19, 1849, p. 3, col. 1-3; November 15, 1849, p. 1, col. 1-2.
- ft227 *Religious Herald*, January 11, 1872, p. 2, col. 2.
- ft228 *Southern Baptist and General Intelligencer*, March 13, 1835, p. 172, col. 1.
- ft229 Editorial, *ibid.*, July 31, 1935, p. 72, col. 1-p. 73, col. 1.
- ft230 R.R. Moore, "History of Baptist Theological Education in South Carolina and Georgia" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary).
- ft231 Minutes, South Carolina Convention, 1841, pp. 4-5.
- ft232 George B. Taylor, *Life and Times of James B. Taylor*, p. 155.
- ft233 *Proceedings of the Baptist General Association of Virginia*, 1845, p. 21.
- ft234 *Ibid.*, 1846, p. 17.
- ft235 See also J.A. Broadus, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-143.
- ft236 *Christian Index*, December 19, 1839, p. 815, col. 1.
- ft237 For the full story see W.C. James, *Western Baptist Theological Institute*, Kentucky Baptist Historical Society Papers, No. 1, pp. 31-100.
- ft238 Letter from W.C. Crane, *Religious Herald*, March 4, 1875, p. 1, col. 5.
- ft239 Among the graduates of the Covington seminary was Rufus C. Burleson, who was to do a notable work in Texas. On the day of his graduation, June 8, 1847, he said, "This day I consecrate my life to Texas." (Harry Haynes and Mrs. Burleson, *The Life of Dr. Rufus C. Burleson*, 1901, p. 57.) Another graduate was William Ashmore, for years a missionary in China. (George H. Waters, "Missionary States-men, The William Ashmores," *The Chronicle*, January, 1951, p. 40.)
- ft240 *The Baptist*, September 13, 1845, p. 50, col. 2-p. 51, col. 1. Throughout the discussion Dr. Howell reflects his preference for the denominational rather than the society method.
- ft241 *The Baptist*, October 18, 1845, p. 129, col. 2.
- ft242 *Western Baptist Review*, January, 1846, pp. 180-181.
- ft243 *The Baptist*, February 14, 1846, p. 387, cols. 1-2-p. 388, col. 1.
- ft244 *Ibid.*, September 4, 1847, p. 2, col. 2.
- ft245 *Southern Baptist*, January 19, 1848, p. 354, cols. 3-4. *Christian Index*, January 13, 1848, p. 11, col. 3.
- ft246 Apparently Dr. R.B. C. Howell, not present at Augusta, agreed with Dr. Johnson.

ft247 “Central Theological School,” *Religious Herald*, March 15, 1849, p. 3, col. 1.

ft248 Report of the Mississippi Convention, *The Baptist*, July 12, 1845, p. 741, col. 1.

ft249 Editor Howell refers to the triennial meetings of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1846 and 1849.

ft250 *Tennessee Baptist*, March 29, 1849, p. 2, col. 1.

ft251 *Tennessee Baptist*, June 7, 1849, p. 3, cols. 3-6.

ft252 *History of the Establishment and Organization of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary* (Greenville), p. 6 to which is appended the first annual catalogue, 1859-1860.

ft253 Broadus, *Memoir of James Pettigru Boyce*, p. 119-121. In his inaugural address, on July 31, 1856, as theological professor in Furman University, Professor Boyce proposed three significant changes in Baptist theological schools: (1) Not only college graduates, but men with less general education, even with what was called a common English education, should be offered such opportunities of theological study as he was prepared for and desired; (2) special courses should be provided, so that the ablest and most aspiring students might be prepared for service as instructors and original authors; (3) there should be prepared an Abstract of Principles, or careful statement of theological belief, which every professor in such an institution must sign when inaugurated so as to guard against the vise of erroneous and injurious instruction.

These suggested changes were later embraced in the plan on which the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary was constructed.

ft254 Minutes, South Carolina Convention, 1856, pp. 18-19.

ft255 Article by Dr. Charles M. Manly, *Review and Expositor*, XII (1915), 246-59.

ft256 See chapter VIII.

ft257 Dr. J.P. Boyce in *Western Recorder*, June 20, 1874, p. 2, cols. 1-2, republished in *Review and Expositor*, January, 1944, pp. 20-22.

ft258 In 1953, a marker was placed in the street pavement to locate this site.

ft259 A.T. Robertson, *Life and Letters of John A. Broadus* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1909), p. 196.

ft260 J.A. Broadus, *ibid.*, pp. 272-273.

ft261 W.H. Whitsitt, “John Albert Broadus,” *Review and Expositor*, July, 1907, p. 343.

ft262 *Op. cit.*, pp. 263-264.

- ft263 J.A. Broadus, *Memoir of James Pettigru Boyce*, p. 309.
- ft264 His early surroundings were Landmark. Dr. Graves conducted his examination for ordination and was pleased with his answers. W.H. Whitsitt in *Baptist Argus*, June 29, 1899, p. 4, cols. 1-2.
- ft265 *Texas Baptist*, May 3, 1883, p. 1, cols. 2-4. *Alabama Baptist*, March 22, 1883.
- ft266 “You ask whether the *Old Landmark* was endorsed at our General Association. I answer, *No No*. If it had been brought up I should have opposed it most vigorously. Did you read my articles against it in the Tennessee Baptist signed ‘Sustasis’?” J.H. Eaton to W.C. Crane. January 17, 1856, Crane papers, Baptist Bible Institute.
- ft267 The so-called Kiffen or Gould Manuscript, the authority for this story, has been proved authentic by Dr. G.A. Lofton and by C. Burrage. An interesting confirmation of the story is found in the *Letters on Religion and Science*, written from England by a German scholar, Georg Wilhelm Alberti, near the middle of the eighteenth century. See Appendix D for translation of the German text of Alberti’s letter.
- ft268 See footnote, p. 100.
- ft269 R.W. Weaver, “Life and Times of William Heth Whitsitt,” *Review and Expositor*, April, 1940, p. 130.
- ft270 See chapter X, pp. 161-164.
- ft271 *Foreign Mission Journal*, May, 1885, p. 1, cols. 1-2.
- ft272 J.S. Dill in *Foreign Mission Journal*, November, 1911.
- ft273 Mrs. E.D. Poe, *From Strength to Strength* (Richmond: Woman’s Missionary Union of Virginia, 1950), p. 187.
- ft274 O.L. Hailey, *History of Tennessee Baptists* (unpublished).
- ft275 *Christian Index*, February 9, 1837.
- ft276 *Ibid.*, June 28, 1838.
- ft277 Mrs. Eugene Levering, in *Royal Service*, February, 1928.
- ft278 Ethlene Boone Cox, *Following in His Train* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1938), p. 43. (Three ref.)
- ft279 Mrs. H.M. Wharton, in *Minutes*, Woman’s Missionary Union, 1938, p. 155.
- ft280 *Royal Service*, February, 1928, p. 42.
- ft281 Mrs. Eugene Levering and Mrs. H.M. Wharton, in *Royal Service*, February, 1928.
- ft282 *Foreign Mission Journal*, May, 1885, p. 1, col. 2.

- ft283 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1875, p. 71.
- ft284 *Ibid.*, 1876, p. 16.
- ft285 *Ibid.*, 1877, pp. 59, 22.
- ft286 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- ft287 *Ibid.*, 1879, p. 37.
- ft288 *Ibid.*, 1881, p. 22.
- ft289 *Ibid.*, 1882, pp. 25, 38, 54.
- ft290 *Foreign Mission Journal*, May, 1885.
- ft291 Report of the Southern Baptist Convention, *Religious Herald*, May 15, 1884, p. 3, cols. 2-3; *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, p. 17.
- ft292 “After It Is Over,” *Religious Herald*, May 22, 1884, p. 2, col. 1.
- ft293 One wonders why the Committee on Credentials enrolled her as “M. E. Graves?” Did they wish to hide the fact that she was a woman?
- ft294 Miss Alice Armstrong, “Woman’s Missionary Union,” *Baptist Standard*, May 10, 1894, p. 2, cols. 3-4.
- ft295 *Texas Baptist Herald*, May 21, 1885. Report of the Convention. Cf. *Religious Herald*, May 14, 1885, and the Minutes of the Convention.
- ft296 And “brethren” remained in Article III until 1918.
- ft297 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1885, p. 34.
- ft298 See his ten years’ review, Home Mission Board Report, *ibid.*, 1892, p. 8.
- ft299 Miss Alice Armstrong, *op. cit.*
- ft300 Miss Alice Armstrong, *ibid.*
- ft301 Ethlene Boone Cox, *Following in His Train* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1938), p. 64.
- ft302 “The Woman’s Meeting,” *Religious Herald*, May 24, 1888, p. 1, col. 7.
- ft303 Ethlene Boone Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 67-68.
- ft304 *Ibid.*, p. 106, quoting letter from Miss Moon in the *Foreign Missions Journal*.
- ft305 *Minutes*, Woman’s Missionary Union, 1908, p. 64. Cox, *Following in His Train*, pp. 163-164. *The Biblical Recorder*, June 3, 1908.
- ft306 Cox, *ibid.*
- ft307 Miss Alice Huey, one of the four, in *Baptist Argus*, August 24, 1905. Mrs. George B. Eager, a member of the committee, *Baptist World*, January 18, 1917.

- ft308 Mrs. George B. Eager, in *Baptist Argus*, May 25, 1905. *Minutes*, Woman's Missionary Union, 1905, pp. 28 f.
- ft309 *Minutes*, Woman's Missionary Union, 1905, pp. 40 f.
- ft310 *Ibid.*, 1907, pp. 44 46.
- ft311 *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 39 f.
- ft312 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1913, pp. 14, 64-67. Note comment (p. 14) that women "were admitted to the floor on their badges." There-after, this was the method followed, and later the W.M.U. president or secretary was allowed to read the report and the W.M.U. was accorded a place on the program.
- ft313 A proposal to establish a quasi-board in Baltimore.
- ft314 Quoted in the *Baptist Argus*, May 30, 1901.
- ft315 "The Greatest of Conventions," May 23, 1907, p. 12, col. 1.
- ft316 Home Mission Board Report, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1898, LXVI, pp. 35.
- ft317 *Baptist Standard*, June 14, 1900, p. 3. A valuable summary of Baptist achievements in the nineteenth century is found in *A Century of Baptist Achievement in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. A.H. Newman (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1901).
- ft318 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1899, pp. 81 f.
- ft319 *Ibid.*, 1900, pp. 19-25.
- ft320 Editorial, *Religious Herald*, June 28, 1900, p. 8, cols. 1-2; and other papers.
- ft321 *Op. cit.*, 1901, pp. 179-88,
- ft322 Baltimore churches had made a financial offer to the Convention, on condition that the Committee on Co-operation be located there. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 33 f.
- ft323 *Baptist Standard*, May 28, 1903.
- ft324 *Baptist Standard*, June 13, July, 1901, and the current number of the *Religious Herald*.
- ft325 "The Convention," *Religious Herald*, May 20, 1909, p. 10, col. 1.
- ft326 Kansas City, Kansas.
- ft327 This he did, though it cut across his theory that conventions are not denominational bodies but voluntary organizations.
- ft328 "Nationalization of the Southern Spirit," *Baptist Standard*, March 25, 1909.
- ft329 "Future of the Southern Baptist Convention," *Baptist Standard*, July 9, August 20, 1908.

- ft330 *Baptist Courier*, May 4, 1916.
- ft331 *Religious Herald*, May 11, 1916, p. 10, col. 1.
- ft332 For an official statement of this theory by the Southern Baptist Convention, see the *Annual*, 1928, p. 32.
- ft333 In 1931, Article III of the Southern Baptist Convention Constitution was so amended as to require that all messengers to the Southern Convention should be named by the churches themselves.
- ft334 May 25, 1916, p. 6.
- ft335 *LOC. cit.*
- ft336 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1913, pp. 69 f.
- ft337 *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 69 f.
- ft338 *Ibid.*, 1915, pp. 22 if. and 43.
- ft339 *Ibid.*, 1916, pp. 18, 57.
- ft340 *Baptist Standard*, January 25, 1917.
- ft341 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1917, pp. 33 f.
- ft342 See *History of the Young People's Baptist Union of Brooklyn*, 1877-1899, for a detailed, year by year story.
- ft343 F.E. Clark, *The Christian Endeavor Manual*, pp. 12 f.
- ft344 For a fuller discussion, see A.J. Rowland, "The Baptist Young People's Union," *Seminary Magazine* (Louisville ), February, 1893.
- ft345 The Northern Baptist Convention was not organized until 1907-1908.
- ft346 The first Baptist Young People's Union organization in Texas, the Christian Co-Laborers Society, was set up in the Broadway Baptist Church, Fort Worth, in 1888. Other churches in Texas formed similar organizations the same year (see *Centennial Story of Texas Baptists*, p. 323).
- ft347 Home Mission Board Report, *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1892.
- ft348 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, pp. 44 f.
- ft349 See Roland Q. Leavell, *An Unashamed Workman* (Nashville: Sunday School Board, 1932), p. 88.
- ft350 "Suggestions About Young People's Societies," *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1894, pp. 36-37.
- ft351 In the area dominated by Landmarkism.
- ft352 *Texas Baptist and Herald*, April 11, 1895, and other papers of current date.

- ft353 The fourth attitude was not seen by Dr. J.M. Frost in his preview in the *Western Recorder*, April 18, 1895, nor by Dr. J.B. Gambrell in his review in the *Texas Baptist Standard*, May 30, 1895. For the fourth attitude, see report of the meeting in Washington in the *Texas Baptist Standard*, May 16, 1895, and the re-marks attributed to Dr. A.E. Owen.
- ft354 Dr. Gambrell had been on the program of Baptist Young People's Union of America Conventions in Indianapolis and Toronto.
- ft355 *Baptist Standard*, October 3, 1895.
- ft356 "Young People's Work," *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1896, p. 44.
- Note that the Southern Convention did not organize the B.Y.P.U. It was a body separate from, but auxiliary to, the Southern Convention. Cf. Woman's Missionary Union, Auxiliary to the Southern Baptist Convention.
- ft357 In 1907, the first Southwide Baptist Young People's Union secretary, Landrum Pinson Leavell, was appointed by the Sunday School Board.
- ft358 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, p. 11, 45-46.
- ft359 See page 186.
- ft360 See *op. cit.*, 1935, p. 332.
- ft361 *Ibid.*, 1929, p. 378.
- ft362 *Op. cit.*
- ft363 *Ibid.*, 1936, p. 299.
- ft364 *Ibid.*, 1937, p. 337.
- ft365 Only one of these (the Sunday School Board) was within the circumference of the Convention. The others (Woman's Missionary Union and the B.Y.P.U.) were around the perimeter.
- ft366 *Minutes* of the Faculty of the Southwestern Seminary, January 14, 1915.
- ft367 See report of the special committee on the Baptist Student Movement, *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1916, pp. 36-37.
- ft368 The plans for the third convention in the winter of 1918-1919 did not materialize, due to war conditions and the course of Southern Baptist history in the immediate postwar years.
- ft369 "The Baptist Student Convention," (Nashville: Sunday School Board), p. 4. A book of 154 pages was published by the Sunday School Board in 1917. This gives a survey of the convention, officers, addresses and conference papers.
- ft370 "The Baptist Student Missionary Movement," p. 13.

- ft371 Attention is called to this first effort to train the future leadership of the churches and the denomination. The proposal was expanded in the Baptist Student Union, created by action of the executive board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, April, 1920. See Frank E. Burkhalter, "Making Our Schools Count for Christ," *Home and Foreign Fields*, September, 1921, p. 12.
- ft372 See the files of the *Baptist Student*, from January, 1918, onward for the programs.
- ft373 *Minutes*, p. 92.
- ft374 *Minutes*, p. 16.
- ft375 "Facing the Future in Baptist Education," *Home and Foreign Fields*, May, 1920, p. 8.
- ft376 C.T. Ball, "Baptist Student Situation in the South," *Baptist Standard*, September 1, 1921, p. 6.
- ft377 See C.T. Ball, *ibid.* Cf, resolution by J.L. White, *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1921, p. 40.
- ft378 *Annual*, p. 205.
- ft379 Frank H. Leavell, "The New Work in the Colleges," *Home and Foreign Fields*, April, 1922, p. 9.
- ft380 Not to be confused with the magazine under the same title which had been published by the Baptist Student Missionary Movement.
- ft381 Mrs. Georgia J. Burleson, *Life and Writings of Rufus C. Burleson*, p. 186.
- ft382 Catalogue of 1882-1883, quoted by Ledlow, "History of Denominational Education in Texas" (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of Texas), chapters on Baptist schools.
- ft383 J.M. Carroll, *A History of Texas Baptists* (Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1923), p. 524.
- ft384 *Ibid.*, p. 409.
- ft385 *Ibid.*, p. 649.
- ft386 *First Annual Catalogue*, Southwestern Theological Seminary (Waco) 1908, pp. 5-6.
- ft387 *Loc. cit.*
- ft388 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1923, pp. 38-41.
- ft389 *Ibid.*, 1924, pp. 42-47.
- ft390 *Ibid.*, 1925, pp. 53-64.
- ft391 *Ibid.*, 1926, pp. 58-59.

- ft392 “Shall the Atlanta Board Be Instructed to Employ Evangelists,” *Baptist Standard*, May 31, 1906, p. 2. Nineteen years later, May 21, 1925, Dr. Len G. Broughton, who had offered the resolution in 1906, urged the Convention to adopt a similar resolution which led to the re-establishment of the department of evangelism in the Home Mission Board (*Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1925, pp. 70, 102).
- ft393 See Howell in the current issues of the *Tennessee Baptist*. The records of the Society, however, show that the charge of neglect of the Southwest was not well-founded.
- ft394 Dr. Charles Manly, “The Rise of Seminary Sentiments Among Southern Baptists,” *The Review and Expositor*, April, 1915, XII, 252-253.
- ft395 That is, the Southern Baptist Convention, Houston, 1915.
- ft396 *Annual*, Louisiana Convention, 1915, p. 46; *Annual*, Mississippi Convention, 1915, p. 58.
- ft397 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1918, pp. 35-36, passim.
- ft398 *Ibid.*, 1916, pp. 50-56.
- ft399 *Ibid.*, 1919, pp. 82, 83, 102.
- ft400 *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 100.
- ft401 See chapter XIV, pp. 222-223.
- ft402 *Ibid.*, 1918, pp. 91-103; 1919, p. 41.
- ft403 *Ibid.*, 1928, pp. 52-56, 93; 1929, p. 65.
- ft404 *Ibid.*, p. 377.
- ft405 *Ibid.*, p. 378; 1922, pp. 485-486.
- ft406 *Ibid.*, 1924, p. 31.
- ft407 *Ibid.*, 1925, p. 45; 1926, p. 393; 1927, pp. 30, 108.
- ft408 *Ibid.*, 1929, p. 87.
- ft409 *Ibid.*, 1930, p. 84.
- ft410 *Ibid.*, 1938, p. 39.
- ft411 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1913, p. 21.
- ft412 *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 25-27.
- ft413 *Annual*, 1917, p. 86; 1918, pp. 57, 66, 70.
- ft414 *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 118.
- ft415 *Ibid.*, 1922, p. 72.
- ft416 *Ibid.*, 1932, p. 106; 1935, p. 42.
- ft417 *Ibid.*, 1937, p. 90; 1938, p. 98.

- ft418 *Ibid.*, 1930, pp. 108-110.
- ft419 *Ibid.*, 1934, p. 81.
- ft420 *Ibid.*, 1938, p. 21.
- ft421 Charles L. White, *A Century of Faith*, (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1932), pp. 104-119, 232, 236, 241.
- ft422 *Op. cit.*, p. 21 f.
- ft423 *Annual*, 1949, pp. 366-374; 1950, pp. 405-406; 1951, pp. 456-457; 1952, pp. 444-460.
- ft424 *Ibid.*, 1920, p. 373; 1921, pp. 454, 457.
- ft425 *Ibid.*, 1924, p. 268. 46
- ft426 *Ibid.*, 1938, p. 268.
- ft427 *Baptist Standard*, May 23, 1912.
- ft428 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1916. Cf. J.F. Brownlaw, "On Consolidating the Boards," *Baptist Standard*, January 25, 1917, p. 4. The process of consolidation did take place in the state conventions, 1914-1926.
- ft429 "The Last Southern Baptist Convention," *Baptist Standard*, May 31, 1917, p. 6.
- ft430 *Baptist World*, February 1, 1917.
- ft431 *Op. cit.*, 1919, p. 32.
- ft432 *Annual*, 1919, p. 74.
- ft433 *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 500.
- ft434 The "spring round-up" and the "fall round-up" — the idiom of the cattle country.
- ft435 *Annual*, 1926, pp. 19, 26-27.
- ft436 *Ibid.*, 1952, p. 25.
- ft437 *Ibid.*, 1943, pp. 33-34.
- ft438 *Ibid.*, 1925, p. 28.
- ft439 *Ibid.*, 1939, p. 28-29.
- ft440 Report of the Executive Committee, *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1942, p. 64.
- ft441 *Ibid.*, 1933, pp. 65-66.
- ft442 *Ibid.*, 1938, pp. 43 ff; 1939, pp. 41 ff.
- ft443 *Ibid.*, 1921, p. 28.
- ft444 *Ibid.*, p. 71.

- ft445 *Ibid.*, p. 33.
- ft446 *Ibid.*, 1930, p.114.
- ft447 J.T. Henderson, in the *Baptist World*, May 5, 1909.
- ft448 John R. Mott, *Five Decades and a Forward View*, pp. 31 ff. 8
- ft449 *Op. cit.*, May 6, 1909.
- ft450 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, p. 28.
- ft451 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1941, pp. 139.
- ft452 *Loc. cit.*
- ft453 *Op. cit.*, 1938, p. 75.
- ft454 D.R. Sharpe, *Walter Rauschenbusch* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942), pp. 10, 12.
- ft455 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1923, p. 101.
- ft456 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1944, pp. 129 f.
- ft457 One of our trusted leaders, still with us, writes that he heard that discussion and had the feeling that the Convention sustained Dr. Boyce out of personal sentiment. He was already in frail health and died the following December.
- ft458 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1913, p. 75.
- ft459 *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 37-38.
- ft460 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, pp. 130-131.
- ft461 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1926, p. 20.
- ft462 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1853, p. 11.
- ft463 *Ibid.*, 1867, p. 36.
- ft464 *Ibid.*, 1869, p. 38.
- ft465 *Ibid.*, 1881, p. 17.
- ft466 Probably so stated because what is now West Virginia was a part of Virginia until the outbreak of the War Between the States when forty Western counties of Virginia voted against secession. For Baptist beginnings in West Virginia see *The Chronicle*, January, 1950, pp. 33-37.
- ft467 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1901, pp. 37-38.
- ft468 *Ibid.*, 1912, pp. 44 f. This does not agree with Dr. Gambrell's ecclesiology when he was in the midst of the controversy in Texas at the turn of the century.
- ft469 May 20, 1926.

- <sup>ft470</sup> See *Religious Herald*: “Get Together,” May 27, 1926, p. 10, cols. 1-2; Editorial, June 3, 1926, p. 10, col. 1; “Finally, Brethren,” June 10, 1926, p. 10, cols. 1-2; “Time For Plain Speech,” December 30, 1926, p. 10, cols. 1-2; “Dr. Tull and His Resolution,” January 13, 1927, p. 10, cols. 1-2. President Scarborough and the Board of Trustees recognized that the Board did not have such authority; in so far as the Southwestern Seminary was concerned the faculty adopted a statement which it had prepared in accord with the McDaniel statement. See L.R. Scarborough, *Modern School of the Prophets*, pp. 154, 160; also *Life and Works of J.W. Bruner*, p. 75. Correspondence relating to the settlement of this issue, with detailed statements signed by the faculties of both seminaries, and by Secretary J.B. Rounds and Pastor C.C. Morris, may be found in the *Baptist Messenger*, March 28, 1928, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>ft471</sup> *Annual*, 1927, pp. 70-71.
- <sup>ft472</sup> *Ibid.*, 1928, pp. 32-33.
- <sup>ft473</sup> This is not in exact accord with the ecclesiological ideas of Dr. W.B. Johnson, reflected in the original constitution of 1845.
- <sup>ft474</sup> This sentence points to the current circumstances that called forth this declaration by the Convention. Cf. the Oklahoma State Convention *Minutes*, 1926.
- <sup>ft475</sup> Baptists were weak in all the Southern centers of population in 1845.
- <sup>ft476</sup> *Minutes*, Baptist State Convention of Tennessee, 1943, pp. 38 f.
- <sup>ft477</sup> *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1944, pp. 29, 47 f., 279.
- <sup>ft478</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, p. 72.
- <sup>ft479</sup> For the text of the communications between the Northern and Southern Conventions see *the Annual* of the Northern Baptist Convention, 1911, pp. 53-58. *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1911, pp. 8, 36 ff. give the Southern reply only.
- <sup>ft480</sup> For the text of the agreement see *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1912, pp. 46-54; *Annual* of the Northern Baptist Convention, 1912, pp. 93-101.
- <sup>ft481</sup> *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1845, p. 15.
- <sup>ft482</sup> *Ibid.*, 1905, p. 181.
- <sup>ft483</sup> Home Mission Board Report, *ibid.*, 1900, pp. cxxvi-cxvii.
- <sup>ft484</sup> *Ibid.*, 1901, p. 144.
- <sup>ft485</sup> See the reports of the Home Board to the Southern Convention from 1904 onward.

- ft486 Richard Knight, *History of the General or Six Principle Baptists in Europe and America* (Providence: Smith and Parmentor, 1827), p. 120.
- ft487 *American Baptist Magazine*, May, 1824, p. 327. "Backus" was Francis Way-land, young pastor in Boston, later president of Brown University. See Vail, *Baptists Mobilized for Missions*, p. 15.
- ft488 See J. Wm. Jones, *Christ in the Camp; Religion in the Army (C.S.A.)*, in *South Western Baptist*, October 2, 1862; Reverend Frederick Denison, eight articles, "Religion in the Army," *Religious Herald*, February 10, 1887, ff.
- ft489 For a history of the efforts to achieve Christian union see G.J. Slosser, *Christian Unity, Its History and Challenge in All Communions, In All Lands*, 1929. For the efforts during the century of the Southern Baptist Convention, see pp. 279-374.
- ft490 Minutes of the General Missionary Convention, 1890, p. 209.
- ft491 *Ibid.*, 1891, pp. 28.
- ft492 It is to be regretted that the Southern Convention minutes (1895, p. 36) do not give the text of the reply. The minutes are full of such omissions! The reply is found in the minutes of the General Convention of Disciples, 1894, pp. 343-346.
- ft493 This doctrinal statement has not been found.
- ft494 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, p. 203.
- ft495 Dr. Ray served for several years as a member of the committee on reference and counsel, actually the executive committee of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. He resigned upon the election of Dr. J.F. Love as secretary of the Foreign Board, so that Dr. Love might hold the place, but the latter declined and led in taking the Foreign Mission Board out of the Conference for a time.
- ft496 *The Commission*, May 1950, p. 18.
- ft497 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1911, p. 38 f.
- ft498 *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention*, pp. 13-14.
- ft499 *Ibid.*, p. 69.
- ft500 *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 73 f.
- ft501 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1919, p. 19-23.
- ft502 *Baptist Standard*, Report of 1919 Convention.
- ft503 *Ibid.*, May 22, 1918, p. 8.
- ft504 V, 748-749
- ft505 *Baptist Standard*, May 27, 1920, p. 8.

- ft506 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1932, pp. 64, 71.
- ft507 As already indicated (p. 277, this book) the Committee on Faith and Order, headed usually by Dr. Dargan had reported to the Convention several years, beginning in 1912.
- ft508 *Ibid.*, 1937, p. 39.
- ft509 *Ibid.*, p. 70.
- ft510 *Ibid.*, 1938, pp. 35 f.
- ft511 *Memoirs of John R. Sampey* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1947), pp. 251-252.
- ft512 *Op. cit.*, 1939, p. 90.
- ft513 *Op. cit.*, 1940, p. 99.
- ft514 *Annual*, 1936, p. 103.
- ft515 *Annual*, Southern Baptist Convention, 1946, pp. 48, 75.
- ft516 *Ibid.*, pp. 46-48.
- ft517 *Ibid.*, 1947, pp. 31, 34.
- ft518 *Ibid.*, 1949, p. 44.
- ft519 *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ft520 *Ibid.*, 1950, pp. 38-39, 407-417.
- ft521 *Op. cit.*, p. 43.
- ft522 *Op. cit.*, pp. 41, 42.
- ft523 *Ibid.*, 1948, pp. 54, 385 f.
- ft524 *Ibid.*, 1949, pp. 49, 374 f.
- ft525 See *ibid.*, 1947, p. 45; 1948, pp. 54, 386, for beginning.
- ft526 *Op. cit.*, pp. 53, 376 f.
- ft527 *Annual*, 1951, p. 461
- ft528 *Ibid.*, 1947, p. 38.
- ft529 Richmond: Religious Herald Co., 1891.
- ft530 *Annual*, 1920, pp. 57.
- ft531 "Do Southern Baptists Dare to Follow God?" *The Commission*, July 1953, pp. 8-9.
- ft532 Years in parentheses indicate date of beginning of publication. (See state Baptist histories; 1945 *Southern Baptist Handbook*, pp. 75-79; *Annual*, 1953; Newman, *Century of Baptist Achievement*, pp. 262-279.)