**ALEXANDER CAMPBELL’S RESTORATION GOALS**

In the Preface to *The Sage of Bethany,* James B. North writes: “[Alexander] Campbell was a Renaissance man, with gifts in numerous fields and areas of human endeavor.”1 He means that Campbell was highly cultivated, being well-versed in the arts and sciences. Louis Cochran, author of *The Fool of God*, expressed it more explicitly, saying: “He lived many lives in one: he was a religious reformer in the great succession of Luther and Knox, Calvin and Wesley, publisher, preacher, reformer, statesman, editor, educator, farmer, and business-man as well as patriarch to a swarming host of relatives and relatives-in-law. The world called him eminent in all his lines.”2 This being true, Campbell undoubtedly had a multiplicity of life goals, but it is his goals as a reformer that is addressed here.

However, these goals were not born full grown, but progressively developed, ma-tured, and crystallized with Campbell’s spiritual advancement. It is neither his ideas as a young immigrant to America, nor as a patriarch tottering on the verge of eternity that is of special concern here. In the first, his goals were mainly undeveloped, and in the latter, they had run their course. We are thinking of his spiritual goals during his most dynamic years. Key events of this period range from his “Sermon on the Law” to his debate with Nathan L. Rice. It covers his debates, editorship of the *Christian Baptist* and the earlier years of the *Millennial Harbinger*, the dissolution of the Mahoning Association, the uniting of the “Christians” and “Refomers,” and the founding of Bethany College.

It was between 1815 and 1845 that Campbell’s Restoration goals flourished and carried their greatest influence. Regrettably, this was also the time when he modified his thinking enough to leave a heritage of uncertainty, if not inconsistency, in some facets of his goals. Campbell is one of those Restoration pioneers that Ed Harrell describes as “contradictory figures of the past from whom, curiously enough, we all [liberals and conservatives] learned our lessons.”3 Nevertheless, this was the period when Campbell did his most mature thinking and had his maximum impact on subsequent history.

**The Bible Alone**

Each of Campbell’s Restoration goals sprang from his first and most fundamental goal, which he adopted in 1808. He spent ten months in Scotland awaiting renewal of the family’s shipwrecked interruption of their passage to America. As he describes it: “My faith in creeds and confessions of human device was considerably shaken while in Scot-land and I commenced my career in this country under the conviction that nothing that was not as old as the New Testament should be made an article of faith, a rule of practice, or a term of communion amongst Christians…. This has been the pole-star of my course ever since, and I thank God that he has enabled me so far to prosecute it, and to make all my prejudices and ambitions bow to this emancipating principle.”4

After his death in 1866, D.S. Burnet spoke at Bethany College in a sort of eulogy of Campbell. He told about a time when he and the reformer were crossing the Ohio River at Cincinnati in a skiff. Burnet said Campbell took out his New Testament while they were in the middle of the river. He held it up and said: “Brother Burnet, what I desire more than anything else in this world is to understand this book and to teach it to everybody that I can.”5 Each of Campbell’s other Restoration goals grew out of this basic aspiration.

In 1829, Campbell was a delegate from Brook County to the Virginia Consti-tutional Convention, serving, among others, with James Monroe, James Madison, John Marshall, and John Randolph. He participated in the debates and it was soon apparent that he was the most radical of the Democrats, while the most radical of the opposing conservatives was John Randolph. Both were known for their wit and Randolph always did his homework on opponents. The year before the convention, Campbell published a translation of the New Testament by three Scottish scholars to which he made some “emendations,” added a preface and a hundred pages of critical notes, and published it all on his own press. This, of course, was well known to Randolph. “At one point, Randolph become so outraged at some Democratic outburst from Campbell that he rose to his feet, pointed his finger in the direction of Campbell and said in front of the convention, ‘How can you possible hope to please this reverend gentleman from Brook, because not ever God Almighty can please him and he had to go and write a Bible of his own.’”6

But it was not an attempt to re-write the Bible that prompted the “Living Oracles” New Testament. It was Campbell’s desire to know exactly what the Spirit revealed, which the common versions often obscured. In rejecting human creeds for the Bible alone, he saw the latter as useless unless the Bible is understood. In discussing the chaos caused by creeds and their worthlessness for unity, Campbell wrote: “But the Bible will do no better if men approach it with a set of opinions or a human symbol in their minds. For then it is not the Bible, but the opinions in the mind, that form the bond of union. Men, indeed, had better have a *written* than an *unwritten* standard of orthodoxy, if they will not abandon speculation and abstract notions as any part of Christian faith or duty.”

“But all these modes of faith and worship are based upon a mistake of the true character of Revelation, which it has long been our effort to correct. With us Revelation has nothing to do with opinions or abstract reasonings; for it is founded wholly and entirely upon facts. There is not one abstract opinion, not one speculative view, asserted or communicated in the Old Testament or New. Moses begins with asserting facts that had transpired in creation and providence; and John ends with asserting prophetic and prospective facts in the future display of providence and redemption. Facts, then, are the *Alpha* and the *Omega* of both Jewish and Christian revelations.”

“*Let* The Bible *be substituted for all human creeds;* Facts, *for definitions*; THINGS*, for words*; FAITH, *for speculation*; UNITY OF FAITH, *for unity of opinion*; THE POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD*, for human legislation and tradition*; PIETY, *for ceremony*; MORALITY, *for partisan zeal*; THE PRACTICE OF RELIGION*, for the mere profession of it*; and the work is done.”7 This is what Campbell meant by taking “the Bible alone” as his guide.

**The Salvation of the World**

Another basic objective of Campbell is expressed in John 17:20-21, with which he begins his critical discussion of the foundation of Christian union in *The Christian System*. He quotes Jesus saying: “I pray … for those who shall believe on me through their teaching, *that all may be one*; that as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that *they also may be one in us, that the world may believe* that thou hast sent me.” Campbell emphasized the unity phrases in the passage and underscored “that the world may believe.” He stressed the Bible alone as “the pole star” in his course and the unity of Christians as the desired end, but the salvation of the world was the motivating force. What he said to David Burnet in the middle of the Ohio River indicates both aspects of these goals. “Brother Burnet, what I desire more than anything else in the world is to understand this book and to teach it to everybody that I can.”

Thomas Campbell began the “Address” portion of *Declaration and Address*: “That it is the grand design and native tendency of our holy religion to reconcile and unite men to God, and to each other, in truth and love, to the glory of God, and *their own present and eternal good*, will not, we presume, be denied by any of the genuine subjects of Christianity [emphasis added].” While he does not dwell on this phase of unity, its presupposition is apparent throughout the document. Speaking specifically of “our return to primitive unity and love,” he closes the treatise with a prayerful plea and benediction. “To this may the God of mercy speedily restore us, both for your sakes and our own, that *his way* may be known upon earth, and his saving health among all nations.”8

Commenting on the elder Campbell’s crusade against human creeds a quarter century before, Alexander Campbell wrote: “[T]his enterprise, so far as it was hostile to those creeds, warred against them, not because of their hostility to any private or favorite opinions which were desired to be substituted for them but because those human institutions supplanted the Bible, made the word of God of none effect, were fatal to the intelligence, union, purity, holiness, and happiness of the disciples of Christ, and *hostile to the salvation of the world* [emphasis added].” Campbell substantially repeats this as the basis of opposing human creeds, but with the whole sentence emphasized: “*[O]ur opposition to creeds arose from a conviction that, whether the opinion in them were true or false, they were hostile to the union, peace, harmony, purity, and joy of Christians, and adverse to the conversion of the world to Jesus Christ*.”9

Campbell follows with a clear declaration that the salvation of the world was a *primary* goal of the Restoration Movement equal to and interrelated with its goal of unity on the word of God. “Next to our personal salvation, two objects constituted the *summum bonum*, the supreme good, worthy of the sacrifice of all temporalities. The first was the union, peace, purity, and harmonious cooperation of Christians, guided by an understanding enlightened by the Holy Scriptures; the other, the conversion of sinners to God. Our predilections and antipathies on all religious questions arose from, and were controlled by, those all-absorbing interests.”10

However, as important as evangelism was to Campbell’s restoration ideals, he was slow to encourage it in the beginning. This may have been due to the strong opposition the movement initially faced. He said every inch of ground “was debated, argued, canvassed for several years … On this bottom we put to sea, with scarcely hands enough to man the ship. We had head winds and rough seas for the first seven years.”11 While Campbell strongly opposed what Dwight Stevenson describes as “the mass psychology of revivalistic epidemics which spasmodically swept the frontier,” he was not opposed to revivalism. But, like Barton W. Stone, he “objected more to the content of the preaching and to the theology of conversion employed in the meetings than to revivals as a form of ministry.” The word “revival” “stood for a particular kind of evangelism in Campbell’s eyes. It was for him a pejorative term; and he repudiated what it stood for ... Nevertheless, Campbell did favor evangelistic meetings lasting over several days or weeks. These he called ‘protracted meetings.”12

Contrasting the work of Campbell and Stone in methods of wining converts, W.E. Garrison writes: “The Reformers had not been notably zealous or effective in evangel-ism during the first fifteen years following the *Declaration and Address*. The ideas of reform expressed in that document and in the ‘Sermon on the Law,’ Campbell’s first two debates, and the early volumes of the *Christian Baptist* had permeated several Baptist associations and led to the reordering of some Baptist churches. Their effective presenta-tion of the gospel to sinners began with the evangelistic campaigns of John Smith and some other ‘New Testament Baptists’ in Kentucky and Walter Scott’s formulation and proclamation of ‘the Gospel Restored’ in Ohio in 1827.”13 But while Campbell’s evangelism developed slowly, its prairie fire speed after 1827 rested squarely upon the idea that unity on the word of God was essential to saving sinners, which was a clearly announced goal from the beginning.

Perhaps the slowness Campbell to become actively involved in evangelism has caused the conversion of sinners to be minimized as one of his restoration goals. But from the outset, it was an important, if understated, goal of Thomas Campbell’s *Declara-tion and Address* and the concurring ministry of Alexander Campbell. This is never more apparent than in Campbell’s statement in *The Christian System* that “the conversion of sinners to God” was one of the two main objectives of the movement from the beginning.

**The Unity of Christians**

Each of Campbell’s restoration goals is so closely connected with the others as to be practically inseparable. The unity he proposed rested on the Scriptures alone, which in turn was motivated by a desire to convert the world to Christ. Thus his goals were inter-locking, overlapping, and interdependent. Further, each goal is so Bible-based as to be unaffected by changing times. These goals are as valid today as they were then. While Campbell’s thinking naturally underwent some adjustment, there is no indication that he ever changed his fundamental ideals during the most productive and effective years of his life. The difference in Campbell’s pursuit of these goals before and after 1830, were more in temperament, approach, and emphasis than in substance.

Alexander Campbell’s first move toward restoration after coming to America was to embrace his father’s *Declaration and Address.* The underlying aim of that document was the unity of Christians predicated upon “a complete conformity to the apostolic church.” The younger Campbell fully accepted this concept. However, it is a mistake to interpret his unity goal as an attempt to unite all evangelical denominations, or to claim that his formula for unity was to create another denomination to which all must submit. The unity he sought precluded denominationalism. It required the destruction of creeds, names, and ecclesiastical bodies that foster denominations. The Restoration Movement was unique in that it sought to “unit and build upon the Bible alone.”14 This set it apart from the sixteenth century Reformation.

Based on a desire for unity and the inability of human creeds to achieve it, Camp-bell’s goal was “to reflect upon the ways and means to restore primitive Christianity.” So the means of restoration was the fundamental focus of Campbell’s work. The negative aspects of his unity goal, refutes revisionists, such as Yale professor Roland Bainton, who said: “He sought to unite the evangelical churches and instead founded one more.”15 Regarding the means of achieving unity through restoration, Campbell said: “This led to a careful, most conscientious and prayerful examination of the grounds and reasons of the present state of things in all the Protestant sects. On examination of the history of all the platforms and constitutions of all these sects, it appeared evident as mathematical demonstration itself that neither the Augsburg articles of faith and opinion, nor the Westminster, nor the Wesleyan, nor those of any state creed or dissenting establishment, could ever improve the condition of things, restore union to the church, peace to the world, or success to the gospel of Christ.”16

After eliminating denominationalism as a means to unity, Campbell concentrated on the Bible alone as the means. However, the problem here was not with the concept, but its practicality. The Bible alone was the claim of Protestants since the Reformation. Why, then, had it failed to attain unity? Campbell answered: “As the Bible was said and constantly affirmed to be the religion of Protestants, it was for some time a mysterious problem why the Bible alone, confessed and acknowledged, should work no happier results than the strifes, divisions, and retaliatory excommunications of rival Protestant sects. It appeared, however, in this case, after a more intimate acquaintance with the details of the inner temple of sectarian Christianity, as in many similar cases, that it is not the acknowledgement of a good rule, but walking by it, that secures the happiness of society. The Bible in the lips, and the creed in the head and in the heart, will not save the church from strife, emulation, and schism. There is no moral, ecclesiastical, or political good, by simply acknowledging it in word. It must be obeyed.”`17

**The Restoration of Apostolic Practice**

In Campbell’s spiritual crucible, unity and restoration were fused into an insep-arable remedy for religious division and its consequent evils. It is this Bible-based antidote for religious chaos that ecumenical alchemists have been trying for more than a hundred years to dissolve so as to create an elixir for unity without the Bible alone as the essential ingredient. Campbell said: “The Bible alone is the Bible only, in word and deed, in profession and practice; and this alone can reform the world and save the church. Judging others as we once judged ourselves, there are not a few who are advocating the Bible alone, and preaching their own opinions. Before we applied the Bible alone to our views, or brought our views and religious practice to the Bible, we plead the old theme,—‘The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.’ But we found it an arduous task, one of twenty years’ labor, to correct our diction and purify our speech according to the Bible alone; and even yet we have not wholly practically repudiated the language of Ashdod. We only profess to work and walk by the rules which will inevitably issue in a pure speech, and in right conceptions of that pure, and holy, and celestial thing called Christianity,—in faith, in sentiment, and in practice.”18

Roland Bainton, writing of Campbell’s search for unity, says: “When one surveys Campbell’s life work now, it may seem pathetic because he decried the haggling of the sects and yet set up such conditions for Christian unity that none could unite save those who adopted a system different from that of all the rest…. Consequently, we cannot go back to Alexander Campbell for a specific scheme of church unity.”19 Bainton thinks it pathetic that Campbell should adopt conditions for unity that require all Christians to follow the Bible, which he thinks impossible, and which, therefore, makes going back to Campbell unfeasible. The real problem with the professor’s diagnosis and dismissal of Campbell’s unity goal is that it requires the acceptance of the Bible alone, which Bainton dismisses out of hand. But it is not that people cannot go back to Campbell’s restoration scheme, which in truth is the Bible remedy, but that they will not do so because it does not fit the modern ecumenical program of unity.

Reviewing his “unity scheme” a quarter century after the *Declaration and Address*, Campbell wrote: “A deep and an abiding impression that the power, the consolations, and joys—the holiness and happiness—of Christ’s religion were lost in the forms and ceremonies, in the speculations and conjectures, in the feuds and bickerings of sects and schism, originated a project many years ago for uniting the sects, or rather the *Christians* in the sects, upon a clear and scriptural bond of union,—upon having a ‘*Thus saith the Lord*,’ either in express terms or in approved precedent, ‘for every article of faith, and item of religious practice’.… It was first tendered to the parties that confessed the Westminster creed; but equally submitted to the Protestants of every name, making faith in Christ and obedience to him the only *test* of Christian character, and the only *bond* of church union, communion, and co-operation. It was indeed approved by all; but adopted and practiced by none, except the few, or part of the few, who made the future.”

“We flatter ourselves that the principles are now clearly and fully developed by the united efforts of a few devoted and ardent minds, who set out determined to sacrifice everything to truth, and follow her wherever she might lead the way: I say, the principles on which the church of Jesus Christ—all believers in Jesus as the Messiah—can be united with honor to themselves, and with blessings to the world; on which the gospel and its ordinances can be restored in all their primitive simplicity, excellency, and power, and the church shine as a lamp that burneth to the conviction and salvation of the world:—I say, the *principles* by which these things can be done are now developed, as well as the *principles* themselves, which together constitute *the original gospel and order of things* established by the Apostles.”20

**The Plan of Salvation**

About three years after adopting Thomas Campbell’s restoration goals and following an extended study of the subject, Alexander Campbell first saw the nature of Bible baptism. “Abandoning, then, all uninspired authorities, he applied himself to the Scriptures, and searching out critically the significance of the words rendered *baptism* and *baptize* in the original Greek, he soon became satisfied that they could mean only *immersion* and *immerse*. From his further investigations, he was led finally to the clear conviction that believers, and believers only, were the proper subjects of the ordinance.”21 The subject was discussed with others and on June 12, 1812, eight persons were immersed in Buffalo Creek. At Thomas Campbell’s urging, the baptism was announced and a large group assembled at the home of David Bryant, near the place of the baptizing. Thomas Campbell made “a very long address,” and the entire service lasted seven hours. Joseph Bryant left the meeting to attend a muster of volunteers for the War of 1812 and returned in time to hear an hour’s preaching and to witness the baptizing.

Campbell had stipulated with Matthias Luce, the Baptist preacher who had agreed to perform the immersions, that the ceremony should be precisely according to the pattern in the New Testament. There would be no “religious experience” related by the candi-dates, nor any Baptist forms of receiving persons into the church. “All were, therefore, admitted to immersion upon making the simple confession of Christ required of the converts in the apostolic times.”22 This was an important step in the progress of the Restoration Movement. At the next meeting of the Brush Run church, thirteen other members requested immersion and within a few weeks, the church consisted of immersed believers and thereafter immersion was required for membership.

In addition to being itself an important milestone, Campbell’s acceptance of believers’ immersion bore significant consequences. It became what Robert Richardson calls “an apt emblem of separation from the world.” It also separated the reformers from the pedobaptists and made them favorable to the Baptists. This led to a union with the latter in 1815, when the Brush Run church joined the Redstone Association. Campbell’s affiliation with the Baptists continued until the disbanding of the Mahoning Association in 1830 that paved the way for the merging of the Campbell and Stone movements. Campbell’s lead in adopting believers’ immersion also resulted in his becoming the leader of the struggling Reformers. “From the moment that Thomas Campbell concluded to follow the example of his son in relation to baptism, he conceded to him in effect the guidance of the whole religions movement.” 23

Another outcome of Campbell making immersion a term of fellowship was a purging of the Brush Run church. “On subsequent occasions, some others came forward in like manner [to be immersed], so that the great majority of the church speedily consisted of immersed believers, upon which, the other individuals who had been in the Association abandoned the cause, being unwilling to follow the reformatory movement any further.”24 It was here that “the goals for unity and restoration began to diverge, because of immersion, a practice that not all accepted.”25 It was about this time that Campbell began to place more emphasis on restoration and less on unity. He by no means abandoned his unity goal, but as a practical matter, he put greater emphasis on the means than the end.

The reformers’ association with the Baptists traveled a rocky road. Campbell made no secret of his goals and advanced them at every opportunity. Naturally, this led to some dissatisfaction with him. The attitude of many Baptists was so unfavorable that when the association met in 1816, Campbell did not expect to be asked to speak. In fact, John Pritchard, the host preacher, arranged to have Campbell excluded, even though many wanted hear him. But when the preacher chosen to take Campbell’s place became ill, Campbell was asked to speak and delivered his historic “Sermon on the Law.” He drew a clear distinction between the old and new covenants, which aroused even stronger Baptist opposition. While this did not directly affect his teaching on baptism, it became a wedge between him and the Baptists, but it was not until the early 1820s that Campbell clearly saw that baptism is for the remission of sins.

In his debate with John Walker in 1820, Campbell cited Acts 2:38 against infant baptism. He argued that since baptism is for the remission of sins, it excludes infants. But he did not then see the broader implications of the passage, which became apparent in his debate with W.L. Maccalla three years later. This discovery became practical in the movement particularly through the work of Walter Scott on the Western Reserve in the latter years of the decade. But at least from the early 1820s, baptism for the remissions of sins was emerging as one of the elemental truths of the Restoration.

Baptism for the remission of sins thus became one of Campbell’s restoration goals. In *The Christian System*, he writes chapters on, “Faith in Christ,” “Repentance,” and “Baptism,” in which he quotes verses that show the importance of baptism. He concludes: “Baptism is, then, designed to introduce the subjects of it into the participation of the blessings of the death and resurrection of Christ; who ‘died for our sins,’ and ‘rose again for our justification.’ But it has no abstract efficacy. Without previous faith in the blood of Christ, and deep and unfeigned repentance before God, neither immersion in water, nor any other action, can secure to us the blessings of peace and pardon. It means nothing. Still to the believing penitent it is the *means* of receiving a formal, distinct, and specific absolution, or release from guilt. Therefore, none but those who have first believed the testimony of God and have repented of their sins, and that have been intelligently immersed into his death, have the full and explicit testimony of God, assuring them of pardon. To such only as are truly penitent, dare we say, ‘Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord,’ and to such only can we say with assurance, ‘You are washed, you are justified, you are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God.’”26

The preface to the first edition of *The Christian System* is dated January 2, 1835, and that to the second edition is June 13, 1839. In between, we find Campbell’s reply to the “Lunenberg Letter.” This letter from a Christian sister in Virginia and Campbell’s reply appeared in the *Millennial Harbinger*, September 1837. It created a storm that has reverberated through Restoration history to the present. We have neither the time nor inclination to evaluate the controversy, other than to make two points. First, it does not alter one iota the truth Campbell taught on baptism for the remission of sins before and after the “Lunenburg Letter.” The terms of salvation—faith, repentance, and baptism—remained a restoration goal as long a he lived. Second, what Campbell said about there being Christians among the denominations who had not been baptized for the remission of sins was expressly held by him as an *opinion*, not as a matter of *faith*.

Campbell thought some brethren were developing an attitude toward baptism that led them to “denouncing the sects and representing them *en masse* as wholly aliens from the possibility of salvation—as wholly antichristian and corrupt.” He said, “I felt constrained to rebuke them over the shoulders of this inquisitive lady.” He was not only faced with this problem, but with the belief that there were Christians among the sects. After discussing baptism’s relation to the “outward” and “inward” man, Campbell wrote: “Now the nice point of opinion on which some brethren differ, is this: Can a person who simply, not perversely, *mistakes* the outward baptism, have the inward? We all agree that he who willfully or negligently perverts the outward, cannot have the inward. But can he who, through a simple mistake, involving no perversity of mind, has misapprehended the outward baptism, yet submitting to it according to his view of it, have the inward baptism which changes his state and has praise of God, though not of all men? is the precise question. To which I answer, that, in my opinion, *it is possible*. Farther than this I do not affirm.”27

**Conclusion**

Alexander Campbell’s Restoration goals embrace five basic and interactive components. First, he took the Bible alone as the standard of all religious service. Second, he aimed for the unity of all Christians. Third, he sought unity through a restoration of the expressed commands and precedents of the New Testament. Fourth, he saw the unity of Christians as essential to the conversion of the world. Fifth, he taught that conversion consists in the immersion of penitent believers for the remission of sins. These basic restoration goals, provide the only valid course for Christians then and now because they are anchored in the word of God. Not one has been invalidated by Scripture. Campbell may sometimes have missed the mark in *applying* these goals, but he never abandoned them. He never played one against another, nor muted one for the sake of expediency.

Each of Campbell’s goals is essential to the restoration of New Testament Christianity. But these were right goals before Campbell discovered them and they are right goals if he had not discovered them. F.B. Srygley perhaps put this in perspective in when he said: “We do not have to go back to Alexander Campbell or to any other man to get right on the question of Christianity; but we have to go to the word of God, both ‘in doctrine and practice,’ to be right with God.”28 He was also on target in saying: “All the movement that the Campbell’s or Barton Stone started that was worth anything was how to get back to the Bible.”30 The great debt we owe them for that is beyond human measure.

Campbell’s restoration goals rested on one essential principle of truth: “To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” (Isaiah 8:20.)
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