

Then Carnell went and got seminary training, took advanced training at Harvard, eventually became a professor at Fuller and eventually became President of Fuller. While he was president of Fuller Seminary (in what's the date in this? just says, O yes, MCMLIXX (Laughter) They put copyright in Roman numerals. In 1959 he wrote this book - The Case for Orthodox Theology. The Westminster Press published three books, The Case for Liberal Orthodoxy, The Case for New Reformation Orthodoxy which was so-called neo-orthodoxy or Barthianism, and the Case for Orthodox Theology by Edward John Carnell who was then president of Fuller.

The book is a very strange book. As you read it you see how Carnell had taken over attitudes of reaction very strongly against his background. He tried to represent Warfield of Princeton and James Orr of Scotland, two great defenders of the faith, as opposed on the matter of inerrancy, quoting a statement from one and a statement from the other which sounds a little bit contradictory and he talks about it as a great debate. It wasn't at all because they were both standing strictly for the Bible. All through the Bible he attacks fundamentalism though claiming to stand for orthodoxy. He says all sorts of very strong statements about fundamentalism such as this: **Since the task of general charity is apparently unconnected with its work of saving souls, it rates low on the scale of fundamentalism, Handing out tracts is much more important than founding a hospital. As a result unbelievers are often more sensitive to mercy and bear a heavier load of justice than those who come in the name of Christ. The fundamentalist is not disturbed by this, of course, for he is busy painting Jesus Saves on rocks in a public park.**

Then on the page before he says, **The fundamentalists' quest for souls is subtly interlarded with the quest for status in the cult where the soul winner belongs to a new high priestly cast. He can rise in prayer meeting and discourse on his accomplishments in the kingdom; ordinary human kindness does not have this cash value.**

It is really an amazing book billed with statements like that about how terrible fundamentalism is while the title of it is The Case for Orthodox Theology. Shortly after the book came out I wrote a statement pointing out something ~~xxx~~ of the attitude that the book took, and lamenting the fact that Fuller Seminary in so few years (12 yrs. after it had been founded) had so changed from the purpose for which it had been founded. The faculty there when they heard of the resolution I had written did not like it. One of them even threatened to resign from the committee of the Schfield Bible as long as I was kept on it. Eventually they persuaded him to remain on it. But the case of Carnell is a sad one because Carnell after having followed that trend and probably having been responsible for quite an extent for arousing this attitude among others at Fuller then when they went to the extent of their turning against inerrancy Carnell swing back in a conservative direction. Some of his latter writings have some very good material in defense of Great Christian doctrines. And when the great struggle was going on which ended in Fuller taking its strong stand against inerrancy, when they were in that struggle Carnell was standing with Lindsell and the others who were resisting the trend.