

ARISE & BUILD

A BI-MONTHLY NEWSLETTER OF THE CHALCEDON FOUNDATION* | NOVEMBER 2023

A STONE CUT WITHOUT HANDS

BY MARTIN G. SELBREDE



In the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king. Are we in danger of following one-eyed men whose roadmaps regarding God's kingdom appear attractive, especially when

they claim that no other useful roadmaps exist? Some one-eyed kings say the roadmap in God's written law is off the table. By default, they become the only game in town.

We are referring to the recent rise of Christian Nationalism. To do justice to this muscularly-argued position, I have read every word (and footnote) in Stephen Wolfe's 478-page book, *The Case for Christian Nationalism*¹ as well as Douglas Wilson's *Mere Christendom*.²

My focus will be Dr. Wolfe's book, as Wilson's volume is (1) comparatively benign and (2) it is needful to focus on *published* works, not social media squabbling. Now that a new Speaker of the House (one that leftists claim gives Wallbuilders' David Barton "access to power"³) has been installed in the U.S. Congress, we can expect even more heat than light in the kitchen.

After our survey, we'll turn to Daniel's "stone cut without hands" (Dan. 2:34-45, 2:44-45) – a stone sent to shatter earthly kingdoms into chaff. Then we will be able to see the situation with two eyes wide open, no longer relying on one-eyed men.

DR. WOLFE AND NATURAL LAW

The *proximity* of God's written law is laid out vividly in Scripture.

For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who

shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it. (Deut. 30:11-14)

On Dr. Wolfe's hypothesis, however, Christians *should* go hunting for God's law, for it is tethered to human reason. We arrive at law for ourselves by going through an intermediate step: appeal to natural law. Then a culturally-appropriate law is intuited by those translating reason into public policy.

Natural law is like the *living jelly* inside a chrysalis. God supposedly shaped that jelly into a caterpillar for Israel, which is perfect for that ancient society. But for us, the caterpillar needs to form a chrysalis so that the jelly can be reorganized into a butterfly: we then label the resulting laws "Christian" since they came from *natural law* jelly.

Every nation can make something suitably different from that amorphous, vague jelly. Man guides the resulting metamorphosis:

Societies need, in other words, an ordering of *reason* – reason expressed as civil law.⁴

*Law is an ordering of reason by an appropriate lawgiver for the good of the community.*⁵

The natural law is an ordering of reason, consisting of moral principles that are innate in rational creatures, given by God, who is the author of nature.⁶

God *doesn't* directly author law in this view (except for ancient Israel), He authors nature (the raw material for caterpillars and butterflies) and man reasons his way to law by an act of will.

VISIT CHALCEDONSTORE.COM TODAY!

... a Christian nationalist must have the strength of will to affirm what is true, even if it doesn't feel good to him. This is the main reason why I emphasized the *will* throughout this book. ... we have to retrain the mind by the strength of will.⁷

In Dr. Wolfe's view, "revealed theology serves to complete politics, but it is not the foundation of politics."⁸ Theology provides capstones, not foundations (contra Luke 6:47-49) because man's "political life is fundamentally natural."⁹ Christianity provides a cosmetic finish to perfect a nation.¹⁰ The concept of the same hands laying the foundation also installing the capstone (Zech. 4:9) is alien to Dr. Wolfe.

Man, as a moral being, is bound only by the natural law (or God's moral law) as the rule for his actions. But the natural law in itself doesn't prescribe specific action. ... Being mediators of God's civil rule, civil rulers issue civil commands – expressed and promulgated as civil law – that are ordinances of God and bind the conscience, though only when they are just ... So civil law is not mere philosophical reflection, nor should it be the rubberstamped Mosaic civil code.¹¹

Thus, all righteous laws are only *potentially* just. ... This is why the magistrate cannot rubberstamp a ready-made divine civil code.¹²

A people need the strength, resolve, and spirit to enact their own laws, and they should not seek some universal "blueprint" they can rubber-stamp into law.¹³

The Mosaic law is not *above* natural law; it is a perfect application of it.¹⁴

Mosaic law ... is not thereby a suitable body of law for *all* nations.¹⁵

Mosaic law .. is a perfect example of law. But it is not a universal body of law.¹⁶

We do not fight for Christian civilization in the abstract or according to a ready-made, universal set of civil laws.¹⁷

Natural law can hide inside a chrysalis to later emerge as a butterfly. For Dr. Wolfe, allegiance to the written Law of God consigns a society to caterpillar status. Whereas Mosaic law may have been a perfect reduction of natural law for pre-Christian Israel, it isn't for us. *We* must draft the blueprints for a butterfly to emerge from the jelly.

For Dr. Wolfe, "the prince mediates

God's divine civil rule ... he makes public judgments in application of God's natural law, effectively creating law (though derivative of natural law)."¹⁸ The prince fills the void left by God's written law, for "the prince is the instrument by which natural law becomes human law."¹⁹ There is an implied vacancy for the position of lawgiver, and secular lawgivers are seen as divinely inspired bakers cooking up new butterflies from the jelly. "Girolamo Zanchi states that 'the laws of Solon, Lycurgus, Romulus, and Numa' were 'divinely inspired.' If this is true of pagans, why exclude Christian civil leaders?"²⁰ As John Owen noted, "the scholastics (in whose eyes Thomas Aquinas is second only to God), have conscientious scruples about disagreeing with Aristotle."²¹

A "vague knowledge"²² is sufficient to start the legislative ball rolling. This veers away from Mosaic law because "the precursor to any Christian nationalism is a people intentionally working their natural good according to man's nature."²³ The path to blessings revealed in Psalm 1, Psalm 19, and Psalm 119 is supplanted by Dr. Wolfe's preferred route.

Dr. Wolfe says that "the magistrate is the living law"²⁴ since otherwise "civil laws have no force."²⁵ The flying scroll of Zech. 5:1-4 certainly puts the lie to such claims: God's law enters into the homes of transgressors and destroys them.

Wilson diverges from Dr. Wolfe, referring to "the end result that we are aiming for — obedience to every word of Christ — including the things He said about the words of Moses."²⁶ In fact, Wilson seems troubled by any alleged inapplicability of Scripture: "What good is an absolutely infallible book that cannot be applied?"²⁷ We would argue that its applicability *has* been laid out in Dr. Rushdoony's *Institutes of Biblical Law*.

In contrast, the Puritans "never wavered in their belief in the supreme authority and necessity of revelation, and they confidently assumed that the dictates of 'right reason' received their full enunciation in the revelation of God's will contained in Scripture."²⁸ The mechanisms Dr. Wolfe invokes are denied to him by Jacques Ellul, who "points out that 'law by itself, as an

autonomous entity, does not exist in the Bible,' ... that the Stoic and Thomist and Rationalist arguments are insufficient to produce a Law at all."²⁹ There's simply no jelly available for making butterflies.

DR. WOLFE'S TWO KINGDOM THEOLOGY

Dr. Wolfe rejects VanDrunen's two-kingdom theology for his own version. "Two-kingdoms theology – keeping the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the outward socio-political order separate – follows logically from Reformed theological anthropology and is necessary for theological coherence."³⁰ In Dr. Wolfe's view, "Christian nationalism is a coherent alternative to modern theonomy,"³¹ so he invites theonomists to adopt *his* version of theonomy.³²

Dr. Wolfe claims, "When the aggressor is the civil ruler, he aggresses *as a man*, not as civil ruler or as God's deputy."³³ This was King Josiah's position regarding Pharaoh Necho's mobilization to smite Charchemish, but Necho actually *was* God's deputy (2 Chron. 35:21) and Josiah died for believing in Dr. Wolfe's error.

Dr. Wolfe cites Cotton Mather's "preaching an ordination sermon for a Baptist in Boston" as evidence of how people "could live together in peace and even cooperate in civil projects."³⁴ Reader, keep your eye on the ball: that was a head feint, for that sermon *was not a civil project*.

There's coercion aplenty in Dr. Wolfe's thesis (inclusive of deportation to "protect" culture). For him, the church's tool is persuasion, supplemented with church discipline. The state has access to the sword, not persuasion. Each operates in its own sphere. But this was achieved by God's division between Judah and Levi and forever altered by Psalm 110 and Zechariah 6:12-13,³⁵ whereby Christ unites kingship and priesthood in His Own Person so that "the counsel of peace shall be between them both."

CHRISTIAN NATIONALISM'S NON-BLUEPRINTS

Dr. Wolfe commends the balancing act his model delivers, whereby "the individual does not collapse into the collective, nor does the collective erode on account of excessive self-interest."³⁶ But the issue of "the one and the many problem" has seen

its most robust analysis at the hands of Dr. Rushdoony, who decisively resolved the matter.³⁷

A false dichotomy now reigns: Will you support Christian nationalism or pagan nationalism?³⁸ No alternatives are considered. In contrast, Wilson asserts that "the central way that Christians are called to transform the world is not to be found in politics."³⁹ Wilson is no friend of halfway measures, criticizing "the desire to 'patch' what we have now — instead of radically transforming what we have now."⁴⁰

As a *critic* of secularist pressure against Christianity, Dr. Wolfe indeed has one good eye and uses it effectively, indicting Christian capitulation to secularism. The problems lie in the alternatives he proposes. Francis Schaeffer, a critic of Christian dereliction, offered no alternatives. Dr. Wolfe offers alternatives, but we must say of them, "Take away her battlements, for they are not the Lord's." (Jer. 5:10)

Dr. Wolfe's volume denies bearing the earmarks of a roadmap "for a true and just revolution."⁴¹ E.g., "this chapter is not a blueprint for action,"⁴² or "this book is not an action-plan."⁴³ It is therefore ironic when Wilson says of secularists, "they hide the blueprints of the building they want to build,"⁴⁴ given that Dr. Wolfe's blueprints appear to be no less vague.

The problem? There *is an existing set of blueprints* already drafted by God, but they've been excluded. David Chilton foresaw this hostility to God's revealed blueprints as voiced by the builders of our age: "Nobody in his right mind wants the City to look like *that!*"⁴⁵

ETHNOCENTRISM

Dr. Wolfe teaches "(1) that each of us has a people-group (i.e., an ethnicity), (2) that each people-group can be conscious of itself, and (3) that each people-group has a right to be *for* itself. These last two elements are essential to *nationalism*."⁴⁶ He opposes this ethnocentrism to more universalistic impulses, and cites Romans 9:3 in support (although ethnic pride alienated Paul's people from Christ). After all, circumcision (the ultimate sign of an *in-group* in Dr. Wolfe's model) *can* become uncircumcision (Rom. 2:25f).

VISIT CHALCEDONSTORE.COM TODAY!

Dr. Wolfe even suggests that governments should regulate language to protect national particularity. What then does he do with the five cities in Egypt that speak the lip of Canaan (Hebrew) in Isa. 19:18 who evidently didn't get the memo?

If women are the property of a race, what's to prevent lethal force from being used to protect that property from "expropriation" – *Romeo and Juliet* writ large? We'd owe modern Israel an apology for their legal prohibitions against evangelizing their people, since that constitutes an act of genocide there.

To exclude an out-group is to recognize a universal good for man – a good made possible only by respecting and conserving difference. Since it is a universal good, you and your people are entitled by nature to a *right* of difference.⁴⁷

The various Western ethnicities ... must stop universalizing their ethics, ways of life, patterns of thought, and sense of what is good and become more exclusive and ethnic-focused.⁴⁸

This is why theonomy is bad: everyone gets a caterpillar, while Dr. Wolfe offers every nation its own butterfly.

DR. WOLFE VERSUS UNIVERSALISM

Dr. Wolfe depicts any deviation from ethnocentrism as unnatural.

The retreat to universality is an expression not of Christianity but of normalized modern liberalism, operating as a background assumption for Christian ethics, exegesis, and theology. It ought to be deconstructed.⁴⁹ ... We ascribe universal thinking to non-Westerners.⁵⁰

That proposed deconstruction is a tall order. It must defang Psalm 87, which casts a multitude of nations as all born in Zion. It must explain what Japheth is doing in Shem's tents in Gen. 9:27, account for the flowing together of nations in Isaiah 2 and the gathering of the peoples to Shiloh in Gen. 49:10. The parable of the Good Samaritan answers the question, *Who is my neighbor?*

Ethnocentrists have pointed to Isaiah 19:18-25 as proof that nations remain discrete nations in the future. This is true, but it is only *part* of what the passage teaches. Yes, Egypt and Assyria are both intact, but

verse 23 says "there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians." Both nations are fully converted at this point in the future, yet their border is remarkably porous.

Dr. Wolfe says, "Try to imagine how you would view the world if you had no comprehension of the concept 'human,' no universalizing concept of man."⁵¹ This is a high price to pay to arrive at ethnocentrism: imagine making "human" an empty, meaningless concept, i.e., *First, dehumanize man.*

Was it truly both natural and good to prefer one's own⁵² and neglect the Grecian widows in Acts 6:1? This is the likely reason Dr. Wolfe drives a wedge splitting reality: a wall of separation to keep the Word of God confined to the church.

THE STONE CUT WITHOUT HANDS

Man simply has no involvement in creating the *stone cut without hands*. But Dr. Wolfe asserts that "the complete Christian nation comes into being *synergistically* – by the grace of God *and* the will of man."⁵³ *That* stone IS cut by human hands. "Restoration is a work of human *will*."⁵⁴ Moreover, it is an act of *political* will. "Whatever role we play, let us trust in but not wait on providence. Let us help ourselves by grace."⁵⁵

The stone cut without hands appearing in Daniel 2 is usually equated either with the Messiah Himself⁵⁶ or His Kingdom, among other possibilities. Of the dominant theories, the *kingdom* is to be preferred, while the preferred timeframe for the stone striking the composite image is in the days of imperial Rome (with "in the days of these kings" referring to the Caesars). This view appears in modern commentaries, including those of R. J. Rushdoony⁵⁷ and Jay Rogers.⁵⁸ The stone's non-human origin is properly emphasized, and its relationship to the kingdoms it crushes into chaff is given full justice.

However, Patrick Fairbairn (1805-1874) points out that we've come to hold positions not supported by the text.

By the "days of these kings" have sometimes been understood the latter

stages of the fourth monarchy, when it becomes subdivided into many separate states. But, while this rent and broken condition is plainly referred to in the vision, it is not described as being distinguished by separate kings or kingdoms; and therefore, the only reference to which the days of the kings can legitimately apply, is the collective period of the kings or kingdoms symbolized by the image.⁵⁹

The only plurality of kings in the vision are those that comprise the entire statue. As a consequence,

The language ... does not indicate at what particular time, or even under which worldly dominion, the kingdom represented by the stone should begin to develop itself on the theater of the world.

But didn't the stone first appear when it collided with the image's feet? Not so fast!

Even here, however, there is an indefiniteness; for, while the stone is spoken of as pressing with irresistible force upon the image first when the history had reached to what is symbolized by the feet, it is not said that the stone then for the first time appeared. On the contrary, before the stone smote the image, we must think of it as taking form in the world; it must be viewed as coming into substantive existence, as being cut out, before it began to act aggressively ...

The moment of the bruising, therefore, is not necessarily, nor even probably the moment of the actual formation of the stone; and a period seems to lie there of indefinite length... it gradually advanced to a distinct organization, and a form, in which it could act extraneously upon the affairs and destinies of the world.⁶⁰

Here the stone represents a *kingdom* consistent with the growth parables of Matthew 13. We will consider a different interpretation of the stone, however.

SYMBOLISM AND THE STONE

James B. Jordan believes the stone is a symbol of an altar, because it was "cut without hands," in keeping with God's Law: "And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it" (Ex. 20:25).⁶¹ He arrives at multiple identities for the stone⁶²

but doesn't adequately deal with the stone pulverizing the statue into chaff carried away by the wind, a well-known image from Psalm 1 describing the destiny of those who reject God's law. The man who meditates upon the law of the Lord is like a tree planted by rivers of waters bringing forth fruit in its season, whose leaf will not wither, but "the ungodly are not so: but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away" (Ps. 1:4).⁶³ Chaff blown by the wind is the destiny of everything and anything decoupled from God's law.

Scripture mentions another stone cut without hands, covenantally delivered as one stone for man⁶⁴ and one stone for God, each with the same words engraved upon them with the finger of God. The original tablets of the law of God are potentially consistent with this passage in Daniel.⁶⁵

The ten commandments *were* cut by God's Own hand. "And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables" (Ex. 32:16). God *made* these tablets (same word used in Gen. 3:21 thus: "the Lord God *made* coats of skins, and clothed them"). Being made by God Himself, "these two tablets were the most valuable material thing on earth at that time."⁶⁶

The pulverizing of a man-made idol is central in both the arrival of the original tablets of the Law *and* the action of Daniel's stone cut without hands. The stones collide with the *foot* of something: the *foot* of mount Sinai (Ex. 32:19) and the *feet* of the statue. The idolatrous elements in both scenarios are turned to powder or chaff. The golden calf's powder is *winnowed* onto the waters,⁶⁷ just as chaff is blown by winnowing fans (Matt. 3:11-12).


Didn't those tablets show up centuries before Daniel 2's "head of gold" existed? Consider the connection of Assyria with Babylon. Lange appeals to "the intimate connection, and even essential identity of the kingdoms of Assyria and Babylon," and references "the continuity of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires and their inseparable connection in point of nationality, religion, and civilization."⁶⁸ Adam Clarke argues that this continuous empire extends backward seventeen centuries:

The *Chaldean* empire, called the *Assyrian* in its commencement, the Chaldean from the country, the *Babylonish* from its chief city. 1. HEAD OF GOLD. This was the first monarchy begun by *Nimrod* ... and ending with the death of Belshazzar ... after having lasted nearly *seventeen hundred years*. In the time of Nebuchadnezzar it extended over *Chaldea, Assyria, Arabia, Syria, and Palestine*. He, Nebuchadnezzar, was *the head of gold*.⁶⁹

So the *stone cut without hands* could well refer to the original tablet given to Moses as man's copy of the law; the other tablet was God's copy. Isaiah 2:3 unites the details between Exodus and Daniel.

THE BOTTOM LINE

Whether the stone cut without hands represents God's kingdom or a specific aspect of it (e.g., the Law of the King, as speculated above), the fact remains that man is NOT the one shaping it. The business of the stone is to destroy all kingdoms assembled by the will of men. We should be wary of all who seize the helm to guide the ship of state, as seen in the choice that Dr. Joseph Boot puts before us: "the rule of Christ or the cult of the expert."⁷⁰

There are limits to what one-eyed men can see, and it appears that they have difficulty seeing a kingdom or a law that isn't man-made. If such men give us a roadmap to a man-made future that steers clear of God's revealed law, those who drive on their route will become part of the chaff of the summer threshing floors "and no place will be found for them." One-eyed men may heap ridicule on the ancient paths laid out by God's blueprints, urging us to use their GPS programs instead, but those who travel on the "highway of holiness ... will not err therein" (Isa. 35:8). 

1. Stephen Wolfe, *The Case for Christian Nationalism* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2022).
2. Douglas Wilson, *Mere Christendom* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2023).
3. See John Fea's commentary for NBC here: <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/rcna122313> One of Fea's books is cited by Dr. Wolfe (Wolfe, p. 398).
4. Wolfe, p. 244.
5. *Ibid*, p. 245.
6. *Ibid*.
7. *Ibid*, p. 455. The individual will expands to a national will: "the Christian nation ... achieves a

- national will for itself." p. 14. Ergo, "my principal interest is a reinvigoration of a collective will that asserts and stands up for itself." p. 135.
8. *Ibid*, p. 19.
9. *Ibid*, p. 18.
10. *Ibid*, p. 26. Dr. Wolfe believes perfecting something "affects the whole of it" (p. 29) but doesn't explain how the *foundations* are affected by the superadded capstone he envisions.
11. *Ibid*, p. 30.
12. *Ibid*, p. 257. The thought is reiterated at p. 314. This brushes shoulders with dispensationalist Dr. Norman Geisler's view that we shouldn't want Mosaic law, we should want good law. Dr. Douglas F. Kelly's measured response to Dr. Geisler makes for valuable reading.
13. *Ibid*, p. 264.
14. *Ibid*, p. 265. Mosaic law "is one possible body of law that 'proceed[s] from the immovable principles and general conclusion' of the natural law." Dr. Wolfe elaborates his views further than we can incorporate here.
15. *Ibid*, p. 265-266. Accordingly, the civil laws of Moses "are dead" (pg. 267).
16. *Ibid*, p. 268. What, then, is going forth into the world in Isaiah 2:3 from Jerusalem? *A vague, innate natural law?*
17. *Ibid*, p. 271.
18. *Ibid*, p. 286.
19. *Ibid*, p. 290.
20. *Ibid*, p. 178, n.4.
21. John Owen, *Biblical Theology* (Pittsburgh, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1994 translation by Stephen P. Westcott, Ph.D. of the 1661 original), p. 7.
22. Wolfe, p. 377
23. *Ibid*, p. 469.
24. *Ibid*, p. 255.
25. *Ibid*, p. 254.
26. Wilson, LOC 1984.
27. *Ibid*, LOC 2420.
28. Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976), p. 55.
29. *Ibid*, p. 57, citing Ellul's *The Theological Foundation of Law* of 1961.
30. Wolfe, p. 107-108.
31. *Ibid*, p. 270.
32. *Ibid*, p. 271.
33. *Ibid*, p. 337.
34. *Ibid*, p. 37.
35. *Ibid*, pp. 310-312.
36. *Ibid*, p. 219.
37. R. J. Rushdoony, *The One and the Many*, Rev. Ed. (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 2007).
38. *Ibid*, p. 381.
39. Wilson, LOC 2399.
40. Wilson, LOC 2312.
41. Wolfe, p. 349.
42. *Ibid*, p. 396.
43. *Ibid*, p. 433.
44. Wilson, LOC 448.
45. David Chilton, "The Case of the Missing Blueprints," *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* Vol. 8, No. 1, Summer 1981 "Symposium on Social Action," Gary North, editor, p. 133.
46. Wolfe, p. 118.

SAVE 30-80% STOREWIDE DURING OUR YEAR-END SALE!

47. Ibid, p. 145.
48. Ibid, p. 459.
49. Ibid, p. 342.
50. Ibid, p. 458.
51. Ibid, p. 457.
52. Ibid, p. 23. We obviously acknowledge the relevance of Gal. 6:10, but it must also be taken in its entirety.
53. Ibid, p. 177.
54. Ibid, p. 196. Dr. Wolfe contrasts a monergistic redemption with a synergistic restoration/renewal.
55. Ibid, p. 468.
56. John Chrysostom argues for this, citing the virgin birth as a fulfillment. See John Goldingay, *Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019 rev. ed.), p. 218.
57. R. J. Rushdoony, *Thy Kingdom Come: Studies in Daniel and Revelation* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books/Chalcedon, 2023 [1970]), p. 16.
58. Jay Rogers, *In the Days of These Kings: The Book of Daniel in Preterist Perspective* (Clermont, FL: Media House International, 2017), p. 51.
59. Patrick Fairbairn, *The Interpretation of Prophecy* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1964 [1856, 1865]), p. 297. There is dismissive opposition to this view.
60. Ibid, p. 297-298.
61. James B. Jordan, *The Handwriting on the Wall: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision Press, 2007), p. 179. Jordan's works merit reader discernment given his idiosyncrasies.
62. Including Altar, Temple, Cornerstone, Messiah, and Church. Cf. *ibid*, p. 179-180. His interpretive maximalism isn't stingy when it comes to making purported connections.
63. I later learned that Hamilton sees Daniel as expositing Psalm 1:4 to Nebuchadnezzar. Cf. James M. Hamilton, Jr., *With the Clouds of Heaven: The Book of Daniel in Biblical Theology* (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), p. 89.
64. This is the stone of the vision; God's copy of it (both tablets had all ten commandments on them) is a covenantal formality since He will not violate its terms.
65. Daniel's mountain likely corresponds with the mountain of Isaiah 2, which grows as the Law goes forth.
66. Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus* (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2006), p. 674. Stuart also notes that "the tablets had no space left for additions." Motyer makes the same observation, cf. J. A. Motyer, *The Message of Exodus* (Downer's Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2005), p. 295. Mackay confirms the supreme value of the original tablets, cf. John L. Mackay, *Exodus* (Ross-Shire, Great Britain: Mentor, 2001), p. 554.
67. The Hebrews, by drinking that water at Moses's command, would convert the idol into human waste, making it impossible to ever reconstitute the calf.
68. John Philip Lange, *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Ezekiel & Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, n.d.), sec. 2, p. 86.
69. Adam Clarke, *Commentary and Critical Notes* (New York, NY: Abingdon Press, n.d.), vol. 4, p. 571.
70. Joseph Boot, *Ruler of Kings* (London: Wilberforce Publications, 2022), p. 15.

"Yea, Hath God Said?"

R. J. Rushdoony

Certain religious people are the church's biggest problem. They can be devout and very faithful, but only up to a point. They are in the church for what they want, not for what God says they need. They go to the Bible, sometimes daily, for personal needs, but not to hear and serve God. They are humanists, and they are themselves the focus of their lives.

We are not told in Genesis 3:1–6 that Eve disbelieved everything God has ever said, only that she rejected God's word at one critical point. When the tempter raised the question, "Yea, hath God said?" Eve was ready to believe that her personal desires or needs could set aside God's law at one point and all would be well. As our Lord's brother, James, says: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (James 2:10).

Obedience is a total fact; the same is true of faith. Either we are faithful or we are not. Adultery is adultery, whether committed once or a hundred times. God does not measure sin by the gross but by the fact that all sin is rebellion against Him. The heart of all sin is to say, "My will be done"—not God's.

Taken from *A Word In Season: Daily Messages on the Faith for All of Life*, Volume 7, p. 103

Humanism is collapsing, but is the Church ready to govern in Christ's name?

Rushdoony predicted the times in which we live which is why he focused the mission of Chalcedon on the great work of Christian Reconstruction. The only remedy to what we face is a return to Christian faith, character, and obedience.

Rushdoony wrote, "The Biblical doctrine of theocracy means the self-government of the Christian man," (*Sovereignty*, p. 31) which means the Christian most needs the resources to equip him for Biblical self-government.

The Chalcedon Foundation is a "think-tank for the self-governing Christian," and our mission is to equip Christian families and churches to apply the faith to every area of life and cultivate faithfulness to God's law and covenant in order that Christ's Kingdom might increase.

Help Support the Mission of Chalcedon

You can help by sending your most generous tax-deductible gift to Chalcedon today. We've enclosed a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope to make it easy, and you can also donate online at: Chalcedon.edu/Give



CHALCEDON
FOUNDATION*

P.O. Box 158 • Vallecito, CA 95251-9989

Phone: (209) 736-4365

Fax: (209) 736-0536

email: info@chalcedon.edu

www.chalcedon.edu

Non-Profit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Sacramento, CA
Permit No. 316