

away with corruption in government, and of getting universal peace was something that was going to bring in the kingdom of God. This was the great social gospel, preached then and advocated today by the NCC and WCC who give large sums of money to revolutionary movements in many parts of the world thinking that thereby they are going to bring in the kingdom of God. We will not need to linger over that in this class. It certainly does not fit the picture. It has no correspondence with the picture in Daniel of the stone cut without hands hitting the image and completely demolishing it and growing until it fills the whole earth.

6. A view today which is quite a widespread and widespread among many earnest Christians is a view which considers that the church is the stone. The church is actually the stone which is going to grow until it fills the whole earth. This does not exactly fit the picture. Yet we must not insist on the symbolism being absolutely exact.

For instance the stone is cut without hands. The picture naturally seems as if it is cut and strikes the image right away. But it might conceivably be cut out and then might hit 1000 years later. That would not be really stretching the symbolism too far.

As we look at the picture it seems as if the stone hits the statue on the feet and it immediately falls and breaks into pieces. Then that little stone grows to fill the whole earth. But it is not inconceivable that that might represent a situation in which the little stone grew to quite an extent before it actually knocked over the statue! That is to say, we must not insist on too rigid adherence to precise similarity to the picture. But the figure that through the preaching of the gospel people are going to be converted sufficiently to make this world truly a thoroughly Christian world in which most everybody is Christian and in which Christian principles will rule in the government of all our nations, is so far from the picture that it is pretty hard to fit it with this picture. So we can safely say it does not fit the picture.

I want to call your attention to four difficulties.

1. The time of origin. It is conceivable that the stone cut without hands represents the eternal pre-existence of Christ who existed from all eternity as the stone cut without hands. That's conceivable. It is also conceivable that a feature of Christ's power--the fact he was born of a virgin occurred quite a time before the actual smiting of the statue. But if it is the church that is going to destroy the statue then we certainly must say the church began in the very early days of the Roman empire and when it so explicitly says that it strikes the statue on its feet that were of iron and clay, this is a pretty big change from the picture Daniel describes. I think the time of origin is very much against this idea.

2. The NT commands and promises which we looked at in the views of early Christians. They were commanded to witness. They were told to look for the coming of Christ. They were not promised the victory. We used to have a great many hymns-- I have not heard them so much recently-- like Jesus shall reign where'er the sun