

**General Topics :: The Shack**

**The Shack - posted by Mattie, on: 2010/1/4 10:37**

Why the Shack Is Not Heretical

I am not really into posting my thoughts on books, but this a book that has become exceptionally well-known across the world.

Some are saying the book has been very edifying in their walk with God and has deepened their love for Him as well as seeing the Scriptures with new eyes.

Others are saying the book gives us a distortion of God, is false teaching, Paul Young isn't saved, & it is goddess worship.

Interestingly enough - both camps that profess this claim to be Christian. Confusing eh?

Some say it helped them walk with Jesus. The others who comment on such statements say it's "another Jesus", one of their own making.

A tree is always known by its fruit. Wisdom is justified by her children. That's what Jesus said.

So ask yourself - what is the fruit that is coming out of the message of this book? Is it sinful living? Is it abuse of God's grace?

Or maybe, just maybe, people are walking closer with God, having a desire to understand His nature, and love people in a way that brings Him glory.

The book is fiction. It's not a systematic theology book. So don't make it that - the same way people didn't make Chronicles of Narnia literal, or any other fiction book. We shouldn't do that with this either.

Fiction, like parables, are not to be literal. They do have a message, however. So let's look for the message rather than the side issues.

I encourage everyone to give the book a chance and read it start to finish before making conclusions

**Re: The Shack - posted by sojourner7 (), on: 2010/1/4 11:43**

I'm sorry; but this book is not worth the time to read. It is a work of fiction, and the way GOD and Jesus are portrayed in this book is a disgrace to GOD'S true nature and character as revealed in scripture!!

**Re: The Shack....A LIE, on: 2010/1/4 12:10**

The Shack is an allegory about a man's journey to seek healing from sexual abuse and extreme rejection. The "SHACK", is that secret place in his soul where all of the horror of those painful experiences are hidden. It is written by Paul Young, and his alter ego is Mack... and is like a guided imagery session into Hindu LA-LA land; where....

"Mack's secrets, lies, pain and fears are swept away in a 48-hour encounter in the woods with a sassy black woman who embodies God the creator. Jesus is portrayed as a big-nosed carpenter in a plaid shirt; the Holy Spirit is an Asian sylph called Sarayu.

They tell Mack they live in a loving relationship without hierarchy, guilt or shame, all fully human, all divine. They say that through Jesus' death, God is "fully reconciled" to the whole world, so that all might discover God's love."..USA today : religion

USA today: religion

If this wasn't weird enough, the doctrine, or ideas about redemption surely are. It is a morph of the new age idea, that "God" heals everyone, and we're meant to love everyone, and if we just want it, and try, we'll be OK, and better.

It shrugs of the apparently minor details of repentance from dead works, forgiveness through the blood alone, Jesus being the one and only way, and that you must be born again. Sorry Mattie. This IS deception, in a big way. Please seek Christian counselling from a mature Christian, so that you may understand this, and try to get grounded in the Bible, and His Spirit.

sincerely: Brothertom

**Re: - posted by Mattie, on: 2010/1/4 12:19**

Have you guys read the book to make those observations? Or have you listened to messages and articles ABOUT the book?

Big difference between the two.

Remember, the Pharisees were extremely learned in the Torah and the Prophets yet missed the Word made flesh among them.

Be open to the possibility that your religious mindsets being challenged could be God. Nothing Paul says in the Shack denies the nature of Jesus Christ, the good news being by grace alone and not of works, etc etc.

People called Jesus 'a prince of demons' yet He was the Truth.

Sometimes the things we condemn as false and evil could be dealing with our religious perceptions that we've learned from our church/traditional upbringing rather than what is revealed by God Himself in Scripture.

**Re: - posted by Mattie, on: 2010/1/4 12:19**

Have you guys read the book to make those observations? Or have you listened to messages and articles ABOUT the book?

Big difference between the two.

Remember, the Pharisees were extremely learned in the Torah and the Prophets yet missed the Word made flesh among them.

Be open to the possibility that your religious mindsets being challenged could be God. Nothing Paul says in the Shack denies the nature of Jesus Christ, the good news being by grace alone and not of works, etc etc.

People called Jesus 'a prince of demons' yet He was the Truth.

Sometimes the things we condemn as false and evil could be dealing with our religious perceptions that we've learned from our church/traditional upbringing rather than what is revealed by God Himself in Scripture.

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/1/4 13:32**

I have read the book from front to back. The book is a complete waste of time in my opinion. It is filled full of heresy.

Quote:

-----Nothing Paul says in the Shack denies the nature of Jesus Christ  
-----

In essence, the book spouts 4 gods. A female god. Jesus is picked on by the "other two" (i.e. Holy Spirit and Father (or in the case of the book mother) God?) and is made out to be pretty much a clown.

Quote:

-----Sometimes the things we condemn as false and evil could be dealing with our religious perceptions that we've learned from our church/traditional upbringing rather than what is revealed by God Himself in Scripture.  
-----

Is Mother God ok to substitute for Father God in your opinion? Please explain where any of the above examples that I have stated fit under what you wrote and explained as...

Quote:

-----"learned from our church/traditional upbringing rather than what is revealed by God Himself in Scripture"  
-----

How does anything written in "The Shake" fit under what has been revealed by God Himself? Where is scripture that has come to be?

Thanks

**Re: - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/1/4 13:48**

In this book... what is the focus?

Is it the ultimate happiness of man?

Or is it the glory of God that has been disgraced and thus making man worthy of eternal hell?

Where is the need for the cross?

Without the cross, there is no gospel.

The reason any book sells millions, is because they bypass the scandal of the Calvary. Whether it is the Purpose Drive Life, Your Best Life Now, Becoming a Better You... blah blah blah.

Who wants to read about their depravity and unsaved condition? Who wants to read about a holy God who will judge the world in righteous judgment?

**Re: - posted by Mattie, on: 2010/1/4 14:45**

Micah...to answer your question...

Is mother God an ok substitute for the Father? & Where is all this in Scripture?

First of all, the author is not intending to say that God is our mother (hence, the name is still Papa in the book). At the end of the book, if you've read the entire thing, you will see the character (Mack) was finally able to see God as His Father. Certain things needed to be dealt with in his own life before he could finally say that (I would call that the grace of God)

The point of that was not to say God is a woman, but to say God will reveal Himself to man where he is at. Does God expect us to understand Him where He is at, or does He reveal Himself to us where WE are at? I would say the latter. Jesus used parables a lot for that very purpose. He uses word pictures to give us a glimpse into the character and nature of God. The parables saw Jesus as many things: 1. a landowner 2. a woman who found a pearl 3. a shepherd who found his sheep 4. a father who kisses and throws a party for his son - the list goes on.

Scripture uses the term 'Father' as imagery to speak to us in human words. Let's remember - God is neither male nor female. He is Spirit (John 4:23-24). He is not like us at all. He made male and female in His own image (Genesis 1:26). He has chosen in His sovereignty to use the imagery of Father to give mankind an intimate understanding of Him. The author has not diminished that.

Does that mean God is literally those things? Absolutely not. They are images meant to convey spiritual truth about God.

So I see this as very Scriptural. If you listen to interviews of the author, Paul Young, you will find his views to be very Scriptural and believing the same Christian faith that you and I do.

**Re: - posted by Mattie, on: 2010/1/4 14:50**

IWantAnguish... to answer your questions...

The glory of God is not separated from His love for man. Genesis 1:26 when God said 'Let Us make man in Our image', that is how He is glorified.

Religion tends to put a lot of focus on glorifying God yet separating Him as a Person Who desires fellowship with man. Everything that you see in the Person of Jesus Christ is the glory of God. His eating with tax collectors, hugging the little children, challenging the Pharisees, healing the lepers, discipling the apostles, etc. - all this is the revelation of the Father.

So you can't separate God's glory from His purpose for man. They are two sides of the same coin. John Piper said it best 'God is most glorified in us when we are most satisfied in Him' I highly agree with that.

Secondly, I disagree with you that just because a book is sold by millions it needs to be immediately labeled as a bypass of Calvary. The book explicitly talks about the cross first of all. Second of all, I guess the Bible then shouldn't be embraced - because it's sold way more than millions? Just because many will reject the gospel doesn't mean that there are millions who will not embrace it.

**Re: , on: 2010/1/4 16:46**

"Shack Author William P. Young Denies Penal Substitution (MP3)  
Mar 10th, 2009 by David Westerfield.

Interview conducted by Kendall Adams with William P. Young, author of The Shack: <http://rock-life.com/files/shackcomp.mp3>

(To hear the specific denial, fast-forward 16 minutes into the audio)"

**Re: - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/1/4 19:03**

I hope you are not somehow implying that the glory of God would be somewhat diminished if God had never created man.

God doesn't need you, or me.

God was completely satisfied in His own beauty and glory in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

God created out of the over-abundance, and overflowing mercy and grace upon grace.

Please do not tie the glory of God down to the happiness of man.

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/1/4 23:51**

Quote:  
-----Scripture uses the term 'Father' as imagery to speak to us in human words. Let's remember - God is neither male nor female. He is Spirit (John 4:23-24). He is not like us at all. He made male and female in His own image (Genesis 1:26). He has chosen in His sovereignty to use the imagery of Father to give mankind an intimate understanding of Him  
-----

Mattie,

You are butchering scripture. I will agree that it is possible that we have different understandings of scripture.

In stating this, please show me in scripture... where the Lord said that He is neither male nor female? The scripture that you quoted is speaking about Spirit, not sex.