

The Shack

In 1952, E.B. White wrote the children's classic *Charlotte's Web*. A heart warming story that lives in the annals of required reading in our schools. My mom read it, my brother read it, I read it and now my son is reading it.

What most people don't know is why the author wrote it. Interestingly enough, in 1948, E.B. White published "Death of a Pig". It was a true account of how he failed to save a sick pig which he intended to raise and perhaps eventually one day send to market.

A wealth of information may be learned about a book by getting to know the author. From this perspective *Charlotte's Web* can be seen as White's attempt to "save" his pig, and bring closure and grant release from a previously undesirable set of circumstances and misfortune.

Sometimes the motives of fictional writers are not so innocent. Some fictional writers use novels as a medium to set forth their severely unhealthy agenda and attempt to present their venomous and hateful beliefs as truth. Take the children's book "The Golden Compass" by author Phillip Pullman, for example. Released last year as a major motion picture, Pullman said he was on a mission to shape the minds of children. And in countless interviews he made that mission known. He said, "*My books are about killing God.*"¹ He said he was "*trying to undermine the basis of Christian belief.*"¹

A few years ago several of my coworkers read Dan Brown's "Da Vinci Code" and believed the historical references Brown made about Christianity were true. Without checking the facts, they championed, "That's exactly why I don't believe in your exalted Jesus and his church." I thought it was strange that people would put that much faith into a work of fiction. Why would they do that? Isn't that intellectual suicide?

Today, everyone knows the Da Vinci Code was a hoax. There is so much historical evidence available to the contrary that the whole premise of the book is destroyed with a simple query on Google. The thinking atheist or agnostic would never use the Da Vinci Code to argue against the beliefs of the church. It just simply is far too lacking. Some sacred rites and secret societies may have been real, but the time periods, purposes and hidden meanings ascribed to them are either grossly exaggerated or total fiction. However, the common lay person doesn't know any better, especially in this anti-intellectual world.

Why should we care so much about fictional films and books? The problem is partly because authors like Dan Brown don't intend their novels to be read as mere fiction. New York Times columnist Russ Douthat put it best when he said, "He's writing thrillers, but he's selling a theology."²

Today Show host Matt Lauer asked him, "How much of this is based on reality in terms of things that actually occurred?" Dan Brown said, "*Absolutely all of it. Obviously, there are - Robert Langdon is fictional, but all of the art, architecture, secret rituals, secret societies, all of that is historical fact.*"³

On "Good Morning America" the interviewer asked "If you were writing it as a nonfiction book, how would it have been different?" Dan Brown responded, "*I don't think it would have. I began the research for The Da Vinci Code as a skeptic. I entirely expected, as I researched the book, to disprove this theory, and after numerous trips to Europe and two years of research, I really became a believer.*"⁴

In another interview labeled "Chronicle" on danbrown.com, Brown told Chronicle's Mary Richardson that he wanted his book to be more than just entertaining, but educational as well: "*I wanted to write a book that while it entertained at the same time, you close that last page and go 'Wow, do you know how much I just learned? That's fascinating.' That is really what I set out to do.*"⁵

And therein lies the problem. And therein lies the common denominator for a number of authors, including **William P. Young, writer of The Shack.**

According to Young, it's somewhat of an autobiography of his turbulent past. In an interview on the 700 Club, Young said that the reason he wrote The Shack was for his kids who are now adults. He wanted to give them a "cut to the chase" method for dealing with their own drama and spare them the long journey of dealing with the tragedies that led to their dad's 38 years of anguish and "processing" that consumed his whole life. He said he wanted his kids to "*understand the big picture on how their dad thinks.*" And that he would love for "*them to be in love with this God that I am [in love with].*"⁷

USA Today (05/28/08) writes: "*Emotionally distant from his missionary parents. Sexually abused by the New Guinea tribe they lived among. Grief-stricken for loved ones who died too young, too suddenly. Frantic to earn God's love, yet cheating on his wife, Kim.*

Young functioned by stuffing all the evil done to him and by him into a 'shack' — his metaphor for an ugly, dark place hidden so deeply within him that it seemed beyond God's healing reach.

His adultery, 15 years ago [with his wife's best friend], finally blew the doors off that shack, forcing him to confront his past. "Kim made it clear," he says. "I had to face every awful thing."⁶

Mack (Young) is the main character in the story, who has many cynical and aberrant thoughts and biases on religion. And Young uses the dialogs between Mack and the Trinity, God the Father, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit to clarify and straighten out Mack's (Young's) muddled thinking.

The book has not been popular because it is a literary masterpiece, but because of its long theological discussion. It must therefore be evaluated on its own terms in view of what it teaches about God's truth. Because of the emotive experience of the brutal murder of Mack's little girl (who Young also identifies with) pulling on your heartstrings, the reader is drawn into its author's flawed theology.

A seriously flawed theology. It is a shame that he found it necessary to spoil it with his own agenda. In his defense Young says, "*I believe the book is quite orthodox theologically.*"⁸ Really? Do you believe any of the following are theologically orthodox?

- Jesus has no desire for people to become Christians. (Pg. 182)
- Jesus is not the only way to heaven, but the best way. (Pg. 182)
- Everyone is going to heaven including Mormons, Buddhists, Muslims, Democrats, Republicans and people who don't go to church. (Pg. 182)
- All institutions are evil (Pg. 181)
- Nobody is held accountable for their sins (Pg. 119)
- God is not male or female, that's a lie taught by the church. (Pg. 93)
- The Father, Son and Holy Spirit all became fully human. (Pg. 99)
- God died on the cross with Jesus, and has the scars to prove it
- The Bible was written by people and is not the inspired Word of God. (Pg. 65)
- The Trinity limits themselves out of respect for humans. (Pg. 106)
- The Holy Spirit is the spirit of Jesus. (Pg. 110)
- God, who is the ground of all being, dwells in, around, and through all things. (Pg. 112)
- God doesn't need to punish people for sin. Sin is its own punishment, devouring you from the inside. (Pg. 120)
- We humans are the ones who determine what is good and what is evil. (Pg. 135)

- The Trinity carefully respects our choices, so they only work within the framework of our understanding.
- The Trinity is in submission to mankind, they always have been and always will be. (Pg. 145)
- You have to release people of their wrongdoing so God can be allowed to redeem them. (Pg. 222)
- God enjoys listening to secular music, so you should, too. (Pg. 90)

(See quotations from the book at the end of this review.)

Now do you see the problem? It is particularly bold for Young to have these thoughts and sayings come from the very mouth of God himself. Mark Driscoll writes, “*Young misses the big E on the eye chart.*” Al Mohler says, “*The Shack contains undiluted heresy.*” Chuck Colson wrote, “*Sadly, the author fails to show that the relationship with God must be built on the truth of who He really is.*” Its anti-institutional, anti-doctrinal perspective, and the emphasis on unconfined personal freedom, all fit nicely in a postmodern mindset.

It is nothing less than astounding to hear how often the message of the cross is presented in terms of felt-needs (i.e., emotional well-being) and as a means to self esteem, or, as in the case with *The Shack*, healing our inner pain and disappointments. The Bible was not written to make us feel good about ourselves. On the contrary, it confronts us with a very grim situation in need of a Savior.

In an interview, Young observes that, “*All over the country, I meet non-religious people who have read the book, bought copies for their religious friends, and told them, ‘I like the God in this a lot more than yours.’*” That raises a critical question: Haven’t sinners always preferred a god in their own image rather than God as He actual is? It is reassuring to consider a God from whom all holiness and righteous judgment has been drained, but what about the recognition that “it is a dreadful thing to fall into the hands of the living God” (Hebrews 10:31).

Young appeals to the success of the book as a means to verify that it has to be of God. He says, “*It’s such a God thing. There’s no question about what’s going on here. It was a gift to my children and God decided to give it as a gift to His children. The fact that the Holy Spirit has decided to do something unusual with it is just phenomenal to me.*”⁹

Since when is appealing to the masses the determining factor on whether the Holy Spirit is moving? What about the popularity of scripturally vacant people like Joel Osteen or Benny Hinn? Paul the apostle said that the

Bereans were more noble because they were known to search the scriptures to see if Paul was really telling the truth. When New Ager Oprah Winfrey loves and promotes the book it ought to send up a fury of flares inside the mind of the thinking Christian.

Eugene Peterson, whose famous endorsement appears on the cover of the book, also promotes contemplative spirituality which publicly welcomes eastern mysticism into Christian experience. In reality, the success of the book merely demonstrates the current plight of the undiscerning Christian.

How come a missionary kid, who went to Christian boarding school, did a few years at seminary and worked in a church came out the other end with his theology more messed up than if he had never gone? Because he shipwrecked his faith. He denied the proper authority of God's Word in his life and allowed harmful teaching and his own experiences to dictate what truth was to him. This is characteristic of unbelievers but not of solidly grounded Christians.

Chuck Colson writes, *"That is my problem. It is the author's low view of Scripture. For example, Mack is tied to a tree by his drunken, abusive father, who 'beats Mack with a belt and Bible verses.' The author reflects derisively in another spot that 'nobody wanted God in a box, just in a book. Especially an expensive one bound in leather with gilt edges, or was that 'guilt' edges."*¹⁰

You can tell a lot about a person just by the company he keeps. And you can tell a lot about a book by learning about the author. Young mentions that one of his influences is Wayne Jacobsen who he sent the rough draft of *The Shack* to. You may recognize Jacobsen who co-authored under a pseudonym "So You Don't Want to Go to Church Anymore". Young says, *"Wayne spent 16 months working on The Shack ripping out theological jargon, and references to universalism."*⁶ This makes Jacobsen a significant influence on the book.

Jacobsen was unable to find a publisher that liked the book, so he, along with Brent Cummings, formed their own publishing company, Windblown Media and became Young's publisher.

In Jacobsen's list of books he calls "Favorite Reading" on his website, he lists authors from the emerging church and contemplative spirituality like Brennon Manning, Larry Crabb, Dallas Willard, Mike Yaconelli, Don Miller, Jim Palmer and Anne Lamott. Jim Palmer on his blog links to the

contemplative Richard Rohr. Rohr's spirituality is consistent with the likes of Matthew Fox who believes in pantheism and panentheism. And Anne Lamott resonates with Oprah's New Age meditation author Elizabeth Gilbert. And Lamott's endorsement of *The Shack* is on the back cover of Oprah's book.

In a nutshell, Pantheism states that God is in everything, where Panentheism says that God is in everything living. For example, in pantheism the tree is God. In panentheism, God would be in the sap that is in the tree.

Further, Young's description of God seems to be borrowed from the writing of Paul Tillich (1886-1965), a pantheist and panentheist. On page 112 he quotes Tillich verbatim, "the ground of all being, that dwells in, around and through all things." Young lists several authors who have influenced him, and among these are at least three universalists. He also cites with approval a universalist at the beginning of chapter 14.

Wayne Jacobsen's own book (*So You Don't Want to Go to Church Anymore*) reveals a lot about Wayne's view of the church. A story about a man named Jake who is an associate pastor at a fast-growing mega-church who encounters a man named John whom he comes to believe may very well be the Apostle John. Overhearing what John teaches he realizes quickly that his Christian faith is almost hopelessly rote and anemic. "Although I had been a Christian for more than two decades, I had no concept of who Jesus was as a person and no idea how I could change that." This is typical of the kind of statements Mack says in *The Shack*. The authors give an exceedingly negative portrayal of the local church. It is a portrayal that includes all the stereotypes so treasured by those who hate Christianity.

In this fictional church, members are hopelessly ignorant, capable of reciting chapter and verse but knowing nothing of the "heart" of Scripture. The book tells us we should abandon church altogether. The whole of the story is framed in a logical fallacy: set up an ugly straw man and then knock it down. There is no alternative but to abandon church altogether and according to Jacobsen, "*meet irregularly with irregular people, because church isn't about an institution it's about relationships.*"

So as you guessed, Wayne Jacobsen does not attend a regular church. Young has also shunned the institutional church, holding church instead in a private home with his family and some friends. He has regularly opposed other institutions associated with the church, such as seminaries and Bible schools, and has opposed the institution of the government.

Dr. James B. DeYounge, ThD., Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Western Seminary, says that he and Young have been friends for over a dozen years. Their families have shared dinners and birthdays together and their kids went to the same schools. He went on to say that about four years ago Young embraced universal reconciliation, and strongly defended his decision. It is on this matter that they parted company. In May, 2007, after writing *The Shack*, Young affirmed that he believes not in universalism but in universal reconciliation.¹¹

Universal Reconciliation says:

- God is unable to carry out justice because God's attribute of love limits his ability to do so. It is unjust and unloving for God to send people who live a short life of perhaps seventy years to an eternal everlasting hell.
- God has already reconciled all creatures—all humanity and all angels—to himself by the atonement of Jesus Christ at the cross. This reconciliation will be applied to all people, either before or after death, and to all the fallen angels, including the Devil. Everyone will make it to heaven and there is no future judgment for anyone.
- All institutions including the church and the government are diabolical systems of hierarchy that use power to control people and are created by the devil.

Of course none of these positions can be defended from Scripture. Why do people believe this? Because they don't know their Bible. Young, like the rest of the world has a warped view of God because they never went to the Bible for answers. Studies show that, more and more, people are free-lancing their faith, trusting their own spiritual experiences over Scripture.

Young doesn't like the God of the Bible, so he projected onto God an image that he preferred. Further, he has a low view of Hell, God, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, salvation, the church and higher education on biblical teaching. In other words, the basic beliefs of Christianity. It's like claiming you're a trekkie but you don't like Capt. Kirk, Spock, Bones, Sulu, Scottie, Uhura, the Enterprise or Gene Roddenberry.

So instead of learning and accepting who God really is, people project this image onto God that they like. And usually the first thing they ditch is His holiness. And then they come to Him on their own terms, convincing themselves all the while that their selected method is actually His. But God

only accepts us through His method of invitation, and not how we choose to invite ourselves.

Young says: *“To me the centrality of the new covenant is not that he has come to give us the Holy Spirit to help us be like him. To me following Jesus, being a Jesus follower is not trying to be like him. It's allowing him to be himself in **the uniqueness of our own personhood.**”*⁷

Why is William P. Young trying to hang on to his “personhood”? We are not the center of the new covenant. Christ is. The Bible is not about us. It’s about Him. No William, you’re way off. It’s called Christianity not Williamanity.

Dr. Jonathan K.L. Chan states in his book *The Moral Status of Persons*, *“We see ourselves as a unique person, having our own experience, life plan, and desires that are separate from those of others. We also believe that our worth is partly derived from this uniqueness of our personhood and that it is partly derived from this uniqueness of personhood that gives the maxim of respect for persons and their rights its moral force. **Loss of uniqueness or identity will undermine an individual's sense of self worth. And to undermine an individual's sense of self-worth is to cause psychological harm to this individual.**”* (Pg. 201)

If you want to hang onto “the uniqueness of your own “personhood”, you disqualify yourself from being able to do what Jesus said, “Deny yourself, pick up your cross and follow me.” The apostle Paul was very clear how he felt about his personhood, “Oh wretched man that I am.” Sanctification is the elimination of personhood.

It’s the uniqueness of Young’s own personhood that caused him to have an affair with his wife’s best friend. It’s his personhood that built this horrific shack that drove him into despair in the first place. It’s the uniqueness of his personhood that kept him from embracing God’s Word wholeheartedly and instead allowed himself to be influenced by the writings of mere men.

In the four gospels Matthew describes the Christ from the point of view as the Messiah, the rightful heir to the throne, and begins his gospel with the Lord’s genealogy. Luke describes him as the God man, and uses the genealogy therein to reflect his humanity. John begins his gospel with a genealogy of Christ’ deity, whose beginnings were from everlasting. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” All four gospels depict the Christ perfectly and in harmony with each other. Yet Mark has no genealogy at all. Why? Because Mark describes

Jesus Christ as a servant. **And nobody cares about the pedigree of a slave.** Likewise, we shouldn't care about the uniqueness of our personhood when it comes to surrendering our lives to God.

James B. DeYounge, who I quoted earlier, wrote an extensive review called "At the Back of the Shack, A Torrent of Universalism". Among other things he demonstrates how Young misquotes Scripture to fit his purpose:

"As an example of this theological error let me cite a phrase from chapter 11. Universal reconciliation relates justice and love in such a way that love limits God's justice. Young affirms that God chose "the way of the cross where mercy triumphs over justice because of love." While this is almost word-for-word from Scripture (James 2:13b), Young makes crucial changes. Young has added "because of love" and assumes that God's mercy is the alternative to justice, as shown by his next sentence:

"Would you prefer he'd chosen justice for everyone?" Yet the context shows that James is not talking about God showing mercy to people at the cross but about believers showing mercy toward the poor. James 2:13 actually says: "mercy triumphs over justice." That's it. Young also fails to quote or use the first part of the same verse ("For judgment will be merciless to the one who has shown no mercy"; 2:13a). Thus God's judgment is "without mercy"—just the opposite of the point that Young tries to make in this chapter, that God will not judge sin in the future.

The context shows that James is dealing with human partiality and that works of impartiality are a necessary evidence of a Christian's faith. Also, the word "triumphs" represents a Greek word meaning "boasts over" or "against" and can be translated also as "be joyfully confident." The idea is that in the future believers' mercy (not God's) expressed in good works will deliver them from the judgment coming on those who show partiality. Even if "God" is assumed into the text, the verse is saying nothing of God judging unbelievers. Finally, this verse and the preceding verse make it very clear that God will judge in the future—an idea that universal reconciliation denies."

Matthew Behringer demonstrates in his review of *The Shack* that within the novel there is a systematic tearing down of truth so Young can inject his own beliefs:

*—During Mack's breakfast with all three Persons, it is revealed to him that **authority in all its forms is man-made and designed only to give one person control over another.***

–After that breakfast, Mack is invited to spend time in the “garden of his soul” with Sarayu (Holy Spirit). They work hard preparing the soil to receive, in a symbolic way, the teachings of the Trinity, and in a more real sense, the remains of Mack’s lost daughter.

It is during this time that Sarayu teaches Mack that mankind has a relativistic view of good and evil and that if there is no absolute good then one might just as well substitute the word good for evil and vice versa. All good theology. At this point, however, **Sarayu concludes her teaching by ‘revealing’ to Mack that evil does not actually exist.**

So Mack’s lessons, as well as the reader’s, have begun with the condemnation of all authority and the removal of evil. Once this has been accomplished, Mr. Young’s God slowly reveals the truths that mankind has gotten all wrong.

–“**..in Jesus you are not under any law. All things are lawful.**” This statement and its subsequent instruction do not accurately reflect Young’s teaching on freedom from the law. The reader is left with only one possible conclusion as to this teaching and that is that **sin does not exist.**

–“**That is why you won’t find the word responsibility in the scriptures.**” Mack is being taught that there is no responsibility, no expectations placed on mankind. The fallacy here, of course, is that we find something more than that word in scripture, we find its meaning spelled out. “Of those to whom much is given, much is required.” “Go and sin no more” “Be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.”

–**Church is redefined as only a personal relationship with Jesus.** Although a personal relationship with Jesus is essential, we are taught that the Church is the body of Christ for the building and edification of the saints through fellowship, the breaking of bread and teaching of The Word.

–**“Christian? Who said anything about being Christian? I’m not a Christian.”** Believe it or not, these are the words of Mr. Young’s Jesus.

--**Religion, politics and economics are the “man-made trinity of errors that ravages the earth and terrorizes those I care about.”** Again, the words of Mr. Young’s Jesus. Instead of listing evils like abortion, euthanasia, terrorism, war, etc, Mr. Young’s Jesus singles out institutions which, at their best, are extremely beneficial, providing us a framework in which to worship, commune, govern and provide order and freedom.

In summary, The Shack suffers from poor theology for the following reasons:

- Its portrayal of the trinity is confused and unbiblical
- It undermines the concept of authority
- It belittles the importance of Scripture
- It belittles the importance of the local church
- It questions certain objective truths in the Christian faith
- It emphasizes God's love at the expense of His holiness
- It is soft on human sin and leaves no room for God's wrath
- It fails to present the cross as the sole basis for redemption
- It is unclear about whether or not all people will be saved

Neither Young nor his publishers take any responsibility for their work. Young says, *"I don't want to enter the Ultimate Fighting ring and duke it out in a cage-match with dogmatists."* That attitude is highly characteristic of the mindset of the western world. It's easy to be reckless with the Word of God when you're never held accountable by your peers. False beliefs flourish in a setting like this. Cults do it all the time. So do TV evangelists.

Imagine if I recklessly produced a cartoon for children about a child who was interesting, friendly and engaging. But during the course of the show his dialog contained some disturbing statements like, "The blue liquids and green powders under the kitchen sink are yummy treats to be enjoyed when mommy is sleeping." Or "Not only is playing with matches fun but smoking is really cool." How about "Lets play a new game called Darting into Traffic" or "Here's 10 ways to get rid of your younger sister." That anger you're feeling demonstrates the importance of responsibility in what we publish.

Folks, the God of the Bible is infinitely greater than the God of Mack at The Shack. Where else in life would you turn to fiction for clarity and understanding of reality? We don't do it with our finances or our careers or in guiding our children. If we wanted to learn more about the curious dark spot on our skin, we wouldn't go to Barnes and Noble and ask the clerk where they keep the novels. So why are we doing it with the things of God? Is it because we don't know our Bible? Or maybe our low view of it keeps us from embracing it wholeheartedly.

"Wrong ideas about God are not only the fountain from which the polluted waters of idolatry flow; they are themselves idolatrous. The idolator simply imagines things about God and acts as if they were true."

A.W. Tozer
The Knowledge of the Holy

Bibliography:

1. <http://www.snopes.com/politics/religion/compass.asp>
2. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/19/opinion/19douthat.html>
3. <http://www.danbrown.com/media/todayshow.htm>
4. http://www.dallasnews.com/.../DN-davincidebate_06rel.ART0.State.Edition1.3db7fc3.html
5. http://www.danbrown.com/media/multimedia/chronicle/large/chronicle_edited.mov
6. http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2008-05-28-the-shack_N.htm
7. http://www.cbn.com/700club/guests/bios/Paul_Young_030708.aspx
8. <http://www.titletrakk.com/author-interviews/william-paul-young-interview.htm>
9. <http://www.newmanmagazine.com/e-magazine/061208/Shack.php>
10. <http://www.breakpoint.org/listingarticle.asp?ID=7830>
11. <http://www.theshackreview.com/content/ReviewofTheShack.pdf>

NOTES:

So who is the Father, Son and Holy Spirit that William P. Young wants you to believe in? And just what is his theology and understanding of Christianity? The following are quotes from the book spoken by God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit to bring clarity to the muddled thinking of the main character, Mack.

Quotes From the Book:

According to Jesus, speaking of people:

“I have no desire to make them Christian.”

Page 182

Jesus Says:

“Those who love me come from every system that exists. They were Buddhists or Mormons, Baptists or Muslims, Democrats, Republicans and many who don’t vote or are not part of any Sunday morning or religious institutions.”

Page 182

God is androgynous

“I am neither male nor female...to help you keep from falling back into your religious conditioning.”

Page 93

The whole trinity died on the cross

“When we three spoke our self into human existence as the Son of God, we became fully human.”

Page 99

The Word of God is mocked:

“It seemed that direct communication with God was something exclusively for the ancients and uncivilized while educated Westerners' access to God was mediated and controlled by the intelligentsia. Nobody wanted God in a box, just in a book. Especially an expensive one bound in leather with gilt edges or was that guilt edges?”

The Holy Spirit says:

“We have limited ourselves out of respect for you.”

(Open Theism)

Page 106

Jesus describes the Holy Spirit:

“She is Creativity; she is Action; she is the Breathing of Life; she is much more. She is my Spirit.”

Page 110

Jesus describes God:

“God, who is the ground of all being, dwells in, around, and through all things.”

God's view of sin:

“I don't need to punish people for sin. Sin is its own punishment, devouring you from the inside. It's not my purpose to punish it; it's my joy to cure it.”

Page 120

The Holy Spirit says:

“It is you who determines good and evil.”

Page 135

The Holy Spirit says:

“We [the Trinity] carefully respect your choices, so we work within your systems.

(“Neither are your ways my ways . . . my ways are higher than your ways.”

Isaiah 55:8-9.)

Jesus says about the God and the Holy Spirit, that they are:

“indeed submitted to one another and have always been so and always will be In fact, we [the Trinity] are submitted to you in the same way.”

What God says about forgiveness:

“Mack, for you to forgive this man is for you to release him to me and allow me to redeem him.”

Jesus says about salvation:

“I am the best way any human can relate to God or the Holy Spirit”

(“I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father but by me.” John 14:6. He is not the best way – He is the only way.)

What God says about redemption:

“And then one day you will pray for [your daughter's killer's] wholeness and give him over to me so that my love will burn from his life every vestige of corruption.”

Page 222

God listens to secular music:

“West Coast Juice, a group called Diatribe and an album that isn't even out yet called Heart Trips. Trust me, it's not [religious]. More like Eurasian funk and blues with a message, and a great beat.”

Page 90

God: “I’m not a bully, not some self-centered demanding little diety insisting on my own way.”

Page 126

God: “I’ve never taken control of your choices or forced you to do anything... To force my will on you,” Jesus replied, “is exactly what love does not do... we are submitted to you in the same way” Page 145

God: “Son, this is not about shaming you. I don’t do humiliation, or guilt, or condemnation. They don’t produce one speck of wholeness or righteousness, and that is why they were nailed into Jesus on the cross.”

Page 223

Mack: “God, the servant,” he chuckled but then felt a welling up again as the thought made him pause. “It is more truly God, my servant.”

Page 236