

HEALING THE HOMOSEXUAL PAIN?
A Critique of *The Broken Image and Crisis in Masculinity*
by Leanne Payne

In today's psychological culture, there seems to be a flood of voices crying out for the healing of past painful memories. Do we really need another critique on this issue? This topic appears to have been adequately examined in papers regarding John Bradshaw, David Seamands, Steve Arterburn, and various Minirth-Meier authors. There are numerous variations on this theme. What makes Payne somewhat unique is her emphasis on gender and her particular application to homosexuality, a current and highly controversial topic. Although Payne doesn't buy into the lie that homosexuality is merely an "alternate lifestyle," but truly a *sin*, her explanations and methods draw heavily from the errors of ungodly theorists such as Freud and Jung. Her view of *revelation* is so thoroughly subjective that she opens the door to just about any "revelation" a person may claim to have received from God. Her *explanations* of man's fallen condition, while acknowledging sin, weigh heavily in favor of shifting blame onto the sins of others. Her solution involves an "integration" or reconciliation with self, rather than man being reconciled to God.

Payne's choice of methods promises quick results, as she assures readers that "listening prayer" yields inner healing without years of counseling sessions (51 BI). She claims that one young lady she counseled "was like a new person from this day on" (21 BI). This woman later claimed that as a result of this healing prayer, she lost the desire for cigarettes, overeating, and pills, allegedly the *result* of being forced to engage in oral sex with her father (26 BI). In a letter to Payne she stated:

"My healing was truly like being 'born again,' and I definitely feel like my true life didn't really begin until that point of healing." (27)

However, this "listening prayer" is focused primarily on *experience* and *feelings*, rather than progressive growth in righteous living. The goal is "healing" of memories, most of them centered on the *sins of others*, rather than seeking forgiveness and cleansing for *our own sins*. Such methods may

bring temporary emotional relief but are not centered in living to glorify God.

Psychological "Wisdom"

Payne's methods are grounded in the assumption that modern psychology can be successfully integrated with biblical truth, even though she notes that many secular psychiatrists offer treatment for Christianity as a "disease" (47 CM). Her belief in the validity of modern psychology is evident when she warns readers about the dangers of feminist philosophies:

"The [feminist] rhetoric of the day, along with the **absence of the power to heal**, seems to take its toll even on the reasoning power of some clergy. How much more, then, is the confusion of the layman, whose reasoning powers are **untutored in the psychology of man** and who has no theological and philosophical background with which to contrast and discern the false ideologies of the day."
(108 BI, emphasis added)

Apparently Payne believes it necessary to be educated about "the psychology of man" in order to confront the erroneous teachings of our time. What she fails to recognize is that modern psychology *is* one of the "false ideologies of the day," one of the *most dangerous*.

In her teachings about "healing prayer," Payne draws heavily on the theories and methods of Freud and Jung, enemies of the gospel. She acknowledges that there are dangers inherent in their teachings, yet forges ahead with her attempt to integrate their psychologies with Christianity. At one point, for example, Payne warns about the "philosophical presuppositions" that underlie existing writings about dreams, such as those of Freud (178 BI). Freud, she says, held a "biological view of man and his mind" and therefore focused on sex drives (178 BI). He saw the "unconscious" as a container of "repressed material" rather than "the creative imagination and the gifts of the Holy Spirit" (178-179 BI). By redefining the Freudian "unconscious" to fit her own agenda, Payne believes she can make use of Freud's speculations. Freud, however, rejected and hated God. He would never have defined the "unconscious" as a reservoir for "gifts of the Holy Spirit." Any alliance with Freud and his theories is a dangerous venture.

Payne also notes that others hold a humanist or supernaturalist view that also contrasts with the Christian faith (179 BI). She mentions Jung and acknowledges his gnostic presuppositions (179 BI). However, she nevertheless considers his "insights" helpful and claims that he "probably knew more about man's 'unconscious' ways of knowing than any other psychologist or philosopher of modern times" (179 BI). Despite this praise of Jung, Payne warns her readers that:

"The Christian who *uncritically* introduces Jungian thought into Christian counseling and healing does a great disservice to the Body of Christ, for gnosticism is and always has been the worst enemy of Christianity." (179 BI)

This statement would be accurate if the word "uncritically" were simply removed! Payne goes on to admit that Jung's interpretive system is one of "subjective revelation" that "denies the Incarnation" and leads to "an erroneous view of God" (179 BI). Jung, she correctly notes, "deemed God to be both good and evil" (179 BI). However, because of the indwelling Spirit in believers, Payne insists that:

"Our ways of knowing, conscious and unconscious, are thus wondrously gifted with the power of discernment. We can draw a line between revelation that is spiritual and true, and that which is merely psychic or 'soulish.'" (180 BI)

Payne's warnings are insufficient to alert believers to the *serious* dangers of Freud and Jung. As we will see, her view of revelation is faulty. God has given believers His Word, which is sufficient for life and godliness (2 Peter 1:3-4). He does not provide ongoing revelation through the human "unconscious" or dreams as Payne alleges. Her teachings do not properly acknowledge the impact of sin on the human mind and lead easily into all sorts of error. Christians are to exercise discernment by testing what they hear against the Scripture. Freud and Jung both vigorously attacked the historic Christian faith, pitting their theories *against* God. Their teachings are fatally flawed, wholly lacking biblical truth about either God and man.

Revelation and Dreams

Payne's view about dreams and revelation is borrowed heavily from Freud. Freud's teaching is sugar coated with Christian terminology, obscuring its deadly nature. The door is

opened to any and every sort of "revelation" that might be claimed. It is important to understand that the foundation for Payne's entire methodology is *not Scripture*, but a highly subjective form of "revelation" that cannot be verified yet must be tested against God's Word. She wanders far afield from biblical revelation, engaging in speculation that she asserts as absolute truth.

Dreams. Payne equates the "Judeo-Christian understanding of the deep heart" with "the unconscious mind and its ways of knowing" (177 BI). She blames Aristotle's epistemology, which entered the church primarily through Thomas Aquinas, for ruling out "Plato's third way of knowing, which included the ways of divine inspiration" (177 BI). According to Payne, this is a real loss that has "mightily suppressed our understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit" (177 BI). She asserts that we "moderns" fail to understand our dreams because:

"We do not understand our two minds (our rational heads and our intuitive hearts) and their differing ways of *knowing*."
(177 BI)

Payne insists that dreams are "an intuitive way of knowing...a vehicle of *revelation*" (177 BI). Payne warns, however, about interpreting dreams too literally, through the rational, conscious mind (175 BI). She says that the heart--and dreams--"speak to us in a symbolic language" (175 BI):

"What is from the heart of God can via the dream be made known to our hearts and heads. The most important factor in dream interpretation, therefore, in its attempt to comprehend the symbolic language of the unconscious, is a complete dependence upon the Holy Spirit and the Word of God, and that in the company of others who are thus Spirit-led." (178 BI)

Later, we will see how Payne defines man's fundamental problems in terms of a *split within the self*, rather than separation from God due to sin. She believes that dreams provide important revelation to solve this alleged estrangement:

"Dreams, once we learn to read their symbolic messages, can help us recognize that part from which we are estranged."
(167 BI)

As an example, Payne relates her own experience, claiming that God once healed her of a "writer's block" that prevented her from being able to write a book for publication (168 BI). She claims that she needed healing "to accept that part of me who is a writer, a part of 'who I am'" (169 BI). The "block" was allegedly "healed" through a series of six dreams involving a female figure attempting to cross a dangerous river (169 BI). The "root," Payne claims, concerned a fear of exposure that followed her father's sudden death when she was three, with feelings of rejection, inadequacy and inferiority (170 BI).

Another example is provided in the first chapter of *Broken Image*, where a young woman revealed to Payne a dream in which she saw a "black cancerous mass" (16 BI). Payne quickly interpreted the dream, claiming that it "graphically revealed how Lisa perceived her inner self" (16 BI). Her interpretation of the "mass" is that it symbolized a painful memory from the woman's past:

"Her dream of looking down through the pores of her skin and seeing a black cancerous mass was a recurrent witness to the presence of this buried and unhealed memory." (21 BI)

Payne explains and cautions that:

"Some dreams indicate particularly dangerous 'material' in the deep mind, and when these are told on the psychoanalyst's couch, he knows to proceed with caution. So also does the minister who would pray for the healing of memories for such a one." (16 BI)

Note the parallel drawn between the psychoanalyst and the minister. What Payne does in her books is to develop a "baptized" form of Freudian psychoanalysis. By replacing the psychoanalyst with the minister, redefining the "unconscious" in terms of the Holy Spirit, and adding a few Christian terms, Payne creates a "therapy" that appears Christian but which remains essentially Freudian. As we will see, her methods rest on faulty views of God (including Christ), man, sin, and other key counseling concepts.

Payne believes that she has derived her perspective on dreams from the Bible:

"The Scriptures repeatedly testify to the importance of the dream both as a revealer of the heart of man, and as a message-bearer with a word from God to that heart." (176 BI)

There are certain places in Scripture where God used dreams in the process of giving His once-for-all revelation. An exhaustive study is beyond the scope of this paper. However, there is not even one example in Scripture where a personal dream reveals a painful "unhealed" childhood memory. In Daniel 2, what we do see is how God used a faithful servant to interpret the dream of a pagan king and thus demonstrate His power. God's wisdom, as revealed through Daniel, destroys the "wisdom" of the Babylonian wise men. Through it all, Daniel gives glory to God (see Daniel 2:21-23). God also uses Daniel's night vision to save the lives of Daniel and his friends, who otherwise would have been destroyed with the wise men of Babylon. This biblical account is not even close, in either purpose or manner, to the type of dream interpretation proposed by Payne in her therapy. Payne's approach to dreams and revelation is *not* biblically grounded as claimed.

Revelation. Payne alleges that modern man is in desperate need of direct divine revelation as a supplement to what can be known through scientific methods of observation:

"Our ways of knowing should include intuition, or *direct knowledge*, which complements empirical or scientific knowledge, the only knowledge that modern man for all practical purposes acknowledges." (84 CM)

She insists that the human heart has the capacity to know what is "true and real," but this ability is not well understood by modern man:

"The heart's capacity to see that which is true and real though invisible to the physical eye is not well understood in a day when the conscious and analytical ways of knowing are valued to the exclusion of the other. Both ways of knowing are important and complementary one to the other." (160 BI)

At times Payne proclaims a high view of the Scripture:

"We can never finish plumbing the depths of the treasures God has given us in the Sacred Writings." (146 BI)

"Any other word coming to us, from whatever direction, is tried by the Scriptures." (147 BI)

Unfortunately, Payne is never clear as to how we might accurately test the "revelations" that arise out of the unconscious mind or through dreams. Some such "revelations" are very personalized and not easily subjected to such testing. Sometimes the "revelation" is very general and seems unobjectionable. For example, Payne claims that the following special revelation was "spoken" in exactly these words to her heart:

"Keep Me with you all through the day. Do not delegate Me to a portion of your day. I created you, I died for you. Persevere with Me as I have persevered with you." (144 BI)

Other times, her "revelations" are more specific concerning important doctrines such as the nature of man. For example, Payne's prayers with numerous individuals suffering from a weak, passive *will* convinced her that the human will is "a masculine part of our being" (91 CM) and that "masculinity is the *power* to do good" (94 CM). Such "masculinity," she alleges, "is apprehended and known, like all our knowledge of spiritual reality, by an experience of the heart--the heart's way of knowing" (85 CM).

Where is any of this in Scripture? Payne takes all of these "revelations" somewhat uncritically as truth, failing to explain exactly how they square with Scripture. She also believes we can "listen" in prayer and obtain revelation about how the events of our past have shaped our current living:

"In this *listening prayer* new light is shed on one's past, and we gather insight into the *whys* of our particular weaknesses." (71 BI, emphasis in original)

"The next step in prayer [after meditation on the Scriptures] is exceedingly valuable to our spiritual growth, but it is the **most neglected aspect of prayer in our day**. It is the prayer of quiet listening for His voice, for His response to the cry of our hearts that has

burst forth in speech toward Him." (148 BI, emphasis added)

According to Payne, when counselors pray this type of prayer:

"He sends us that 'word of knowledge,' that 'word of wisdom,' that supernatural faith, and so on that is needed to see the person cleansed and healed." (164 BI)

Only time will tell whether the "revelations" were actually true or false:

"Those of us who listen closely for such directions [from the Holy Spirit during healing prayer] know that **we are quite fallible**, and the leadings we get must be finally judged by the fruit of such prayer, as indeed are prophecy, preaching, or teaching likewise judged."

(90 CM, emphasis added)

Payne's counseling rests on quite a shaky foundation. Preaching and teaching, public or private, should be judged by the eternal truth God has given in His Word. There is indeed good fruit to be seen over a period of time, but that is not the basis for judging the subjective "revelations" that Payne advocates. As one example of the "fruit" to be observed by Payne's methods, we might consider her account of the results of attempting to teach "listening prayer" to college students. The young men tended to "hear" a "drive toward power" and develop rather grandiose notions, while the young women "heard" revelations centered around their romantic hopes (101 CM). These admissions reveal some of the very serious problems that surround her view of revelation. These students, like others, tend to "hear" what is in their own sinful hearts rather than true revelation from God.

It is disturbing to note Payne's claim to have *seen* the Lord standing over the waters at a Sunday Eucharist (143 BI), even though Scripture says that no man has ever seen God (1 Timothy 6:16). She appears to be seeking an *experience with* God while demeaning "abstract" knowledge that believers acquire *about* Him (144-145 BI). However, such "abstract" knowledge--about God's majesty, glory, power, eternity, love, grace, mercy, justice, sovereignty--is a wonderful source of comfort and hope to Christians. We are limited because we are finite, and our knowledge is often marred because of our sin. However, in His Word, God has given us true knowledge about Himself that is

enormously reassuring in the midst of a sinful, chaotic world. We must cling faithfully to that Word, for knowledge of God and His plans, as well as truth about our sinful condition and God's redemption. Revelation through dreams or "listening prayer" opens the door to serious doctrinal errors and to grave mistakes about God's will for our lives.

The Nature of Man

Male and female/creation. Payne holds a flawed view of human nature, beginning with her unusual perspective on the creation narrative in Genesis. Much of her writing concerns gender, with the problem of homosexuality a particular focus. While acknowledging that God created man in His image, Payne holds a confused view of what occurred:

"The Judaic creation account states that *before* Eve was taken from Adam's body, Adam was created both *male and female* in the image of God (Genesis 1:27). The two, taken together, compose God's image. (The marriage state, in the Judeo-Christian tradition, is a symbolic restitution of this, the bipolar nature of man.)" (19 CM; similar claims on 98 CM)

Citing the Hebrew words for woman (*ish shah*) and man (*ish*), Payne concludes that "woman too is man--*she man*, *womb-man*, or *female man*" (98 CM). Actually, the Hebrew "*ish*" is often used to describe a husband, and "*ish shah*" a wife. Both are persons created in God's image. Payne is reading her own thoughts onto the text by suggesting that a woman is also a man!

Meanwhile, Payne's interpretation of Genesis isn't possible. Verse 27 says that God created *them* (plural). In verse 28, God blessed *them* (plural) and He said to *them* (plural), "Be fruitful and multiply." Adam, alone, could not "be fruitful and multiply"! The account of Eve's creation is provided in Genesis 2, but a close reading indicates that chapter 2 "zooms in" on man's creation specifically, while Genesis 1 gives an overview of the entire six day creation. That overview, while brief, is complete, as we note the ending in verse 31: God saw all that He had made and it was "very good." Payne reads onto the text what she wants it to say. Her erroneous reading of Genesis leads to additional problems. She evidently believes that men and woman are both male *and* female:

"Masculinity and femininity are attributes of God, and we, in His image, are most surely--in our spiritual, psychological, and physical being--bipolar creatures."

(98 CM)

Later, we will examine Payne's treatment of homosexuality. For now, we must note that her view of creation, merging male and female, fails to provide the foundation needed to see homosexuality as a sin. Homosexuality blurs the distinction between the sexes, asserting that it doesn't matter whether partners are both male, both female, or one of each. Payne's assertions add no clarity to the matter, but merely confuse the issue even further.

Animal and "diabolical" selves. Payne proposes the existence of an "animal self" and/or a "diabolical self" that threaten godly living. She speaks of the importance of parenting in "taking authority" over the "animal self" and "diabolical self," so that "the child learns to curb the animal and diabolical selves as he learns to *will* that which is right and good" (99 BI). If the "animal" or "diabolical" self exerts control over a period of time, Payne believes that the person's will is seriously weakened:

"When the animal or the diabolical self has long ruled a life, I call the *will* of that person to the fore, helping him or her to get in touch with this faculty of their personality. And I pray specifically for the healing of a will that has never developed or has atrophied through disease. I call these persons to choices." (99 BI)

This inner dichotomy is part of Payne's explanation for homosexuality:

"Concupiscence and rebellion are elements finally to be found in all homosexual behavior, but in certain cases these appear as chief conditions to be dealt with and healed. In one the animal self dominates; in the other the diabolical rules in concert with the animal self." (96 BI)

This reflects a flawed view of man's original righteousness, prior to the fall. The term "concupiscence," used in Roman Catholic theology, is used to assert that the potential for sin existed in the physical body at the time of creation. According to this view, there was a built-in tension between soul and body

from the beginning. "Higher" desires in the soul (reason, conscience, will) allegedly compete with "lower" desires of the body. Man thus has a dual nature with two kinds of appetites, the sensual and the rational/intellectual/spiritual. This tendency toward conflict created the necessity for the addition of gifts by which man was exalted above human nature and made a participant in the nature of God. Scripture, however, asserts that man was created without sin, in a state of original righteousness. When sin did enter, it had nothing to do with "lower" desires of the body, but rather with the spiritual desire to "be like God." Sin arises from the heart, not the physical body. Some sins involve the body, while others do not. Payne has invented a "diabolical self" and an "animal self" never taught in the Bible. We will see later that her splitting of the inner man leads to all sorts of error.

The human will. Payne asserts an excessive freedom of man's will but simultaneously proposes a binding of that will. The will, which is allegedly masculine in nature, is defined as follows:

"The *will* is that in man which chooses whether to be or not to be. It is with the will that we choose the heaven of becoming or the hell of failure to become." (91 CM)

An extreme view of free will emerges when Payne insists that even God does not overrule the will of man:

"Our Lord never transgressed a person's will. He did show them in every way possible the wholeness and the freedom he saw within them and that was their inheritance as the children of God." (111 BI)

However, the will is not beyond being bound:

"It is with this masculine, active will that we responsibly and decisively choose. When a man or a woman is cut off from the masculine within, his or her capacity to choose wholeness and heaven is in jeopardy." (93 CM)

Payne explains the fall in terms of a division of the inner man:

"As a result of the Fall, each man's personality is divided within him and needs to become one before he can know who he is." (92 CM)

It is the human will, according to Payne, that "determines whether or not our personality is made one" (92 CM), thus overcoming the effects of the fall (as she sees them). The will is thus bound by an inner split and cutting off of the "masculine," yet bears the burden of salvation. Such a view of the will is not biblical. (Payne's erroneous view of the fall will be covered later. The fall is not a split within the inner man as she claims.) Numerous Scriptures speak to man's utter inability to save himself, starting with the biblical description of the unregenerate person as spiritually dead in sins and trespasses (Ephesians 2:1). The will is in bondage to sin, apart from the regeneration of the Holy Spirit.

Desire. Payne believes that both "dark things" and "radiant things" will surface in the presence of God (151 BI). One of the "radiant things" is *desire*. She claims that:

"I have seen many a depressed person's healing begin as we quieten ourselves in His Presence and ask Him to bring up the deepest desire of the heart, that one the sufferer has been too fearful ever to acknowledge before." (152 BI)

There are beautiful passages, such as Psalm 37:4, where God promises to give the desires of the heart to those who delight and trust in Him. However, Scripture also points to human desires (lusts) as the root of sin and death (James 1:14-15). Desire, per se, as not "radiant." Those who delight in the Lord are those whose hearts and desires have been radiantly transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit. Payne holds a view of human nature that is far too high when she endorses desire without qualification.

Relationships, reconciliation, and forgiveness. Payne recognizes the need for reconciliation between God and man, as well as in human relations. Unfortunately, she holds up reconciliation with self as equally important:

"The truth that wholeness (healing) has to do with mended relationships (between oneself and God, oneself and others, and **oneself and one's innermost being**) has, I trust, been adequately pointed up and emphasized." (65 BI, emphasis added)

The forgiveness highlighted in Payne's writings is centered on the benefits to the person who forgives. This is common to psychologized views of forgiveness. Payne, however, while ignoring real relationships in the present, speculates about potential benefits to people who are dead:

"Can it be that there is something about forgiving that releases not only the living, but the dead as well? Can the dead know when they are released from another's unforgiveness? This is wonderful to speculate on, and of course we can only speculate." (84 BI)

This is ridiculous to speculate on!

Forgiveness of parents (and ancestors) is a significant subject for Payne. She notes that some men have "cut off their fathers" and in the process also "cut themselves off from their own masculine side" (61 CM). An account is given of a family who had rejected an ancestor; the community had refused to grant him a Christian burial because he was an Indian (59 CM). This rejection was allegedly the root cause of several children in the family being suicidal. Payne explains that:

"To be separated from a father hurts, no matter how wounded and sinful he may have been, and to reject ourselves in rejecting him certainly compounds the pain." (62 CM)

Payne's "healing" process involves confession of the sins of *others*:

"We confessed all the sins, known and unknown against his grandfather, by the family and by the community." (62 CM)

An "atonement" prayer is recommended. This involves confession of "the sins of a family, people, nations, or given situation" (62 CM). Payne explains that "Christ has made the perfect atonement for all sin, and by our confession and repentance of sin, known and unknown, we bring it under the power of His blood" (63 CM). She does acknowledge that such a prayer doesn't guarantee the actual forgiveness of such persons, but rather "we break the power of the sins of others in the past or the present over the living" (63 CM). Forgiveness of parents is particularly critical, but the motives again are wholly self-focused:

"To fail to fully forgive a parent is to fail to be blessed within our very own spirits, souls, and bodies." (65 CM)

"Apart from accepting and forgiving our parents, as *they are*, we cannot get our identities separated from them and go on to accept ourselves. We are therefore in danger of becoming more and more like them." (72-73 CM)

However, Payne warns that "a child can seldom differentiate between its parents as persons and their sinfulness, sickness, or weakness" (65 CM). Therefore, "the gift of divine objectivity" is needed to separate the sin from the sinner (65 CM). It is alleged that facing the "darkness in one's own parents" is the *only* way that persons "can begin to get their identities separated from both their parents and their past situations, and go on to truly forgive" (66 CM). *Then* confession and repentance of one's own sins is possible (66 CM). In addition, Payne's methods calls for a mystical type of "acceptance" of the parent within self:

"After prayers for enablement to accept a parent, I am often led to lay hands on the son or daughter and to pray for the father or mother as he or she has been inherited (genetically, biologically, psychologically, or however) within the very cells of the son or daughter's being."
(69 CM)

For example, in the case of the family who had rejected an Indian ancestor:

"I prayed for God to bless the Indian within Pastor David, and it was as if he integrated with a long lost part of himself." (69 CM)

Later, we will discuss more fully the alleged separation within self that Payne cites as a fundamental issue. For now, we simply note that her view of forgiveness is centered in the benefits to self. Nothing is said about true reconciliation with a *living* offender or compassion for that person, although Payne speculates about how forgiveness might affect those who are *dead*.

Other issues about the nature of man are so critical to this analysis that we must consider them as separate sections: gender, love of self, "identity," and separation within self.

Gender

God and gender. Payne views gender as ultimately rooted in the character of God. She discusses the "mystical marriage" between God and man (40ff CM), wherein God is the masculine:

"God is so masculine that we are all (men and women alike) feminine in relation to Him." (40 CM)

However, both genders are found in God:

"To think on the transcendent nature of gender is awe-inspiring, for sexuality and gender are grounded in the Being of God and His creation. Masculinity and femininity, rooted in God, have utterly transcendent dimensions."
(80 CM)

Payne has a section entitled "God as Masculine and Feminine" (81ff). She cites Isaiah 66:13 and Luke 13:34 as evidence of God's feminine qualities (81 CM). In praying about the transcendence of gender, Payne claims to have been given a "picture" of "God as 'Mother,' pregnant with creativity, ready to give birth" (82 CM). Yet this "pregnancy" is such that God is actually masculine in relation to humanity:

"The God who is pregnant with all that is *real*, out of whose uncreated womb all *creating* is birthed, He is the One so masculine that we all, men and women alike, are feminine in relation to Him." (83 CM)

Payne compares the two sexes to the relationship between God and man:

"The polarity of the sexes...and their union in marriage corresponds to, and is analogous to, the union between God and man." (83 CM)

However, she also views gender differences as corresponding to different avenues of revelation:

"On yet another level, the polarity of the sexes corresponds to a polarity in the human ways of *knowing*, that of the masculine discursive reason and of the feminine intuitive mind." (84 CM)

As we have seen, Payne holds up an intuitive, subjective form of revelation that endangers the sufficiency of Scripture and all too easily adds error to its pages.

Biblically, the relationship of God and man is analogous to the male-female marital union. In the Old Testament, God describes Himself many times as the husband of Israel. In the New Testament, exhortations to husbands and wives are grounded in a similar analogy (Ephesians 5:22-33). Although Payne recognizes that analogy, she diverges from biblical truth by appealing to other religions and borrowing from their erroneous philosophies:

"As a matter of fact, in ancient religions and philosophies, sexual polarity and complementariness did not stop at the psychological. Human duality and human mating expressed an antithesis at the very heart of things, an antithesis striving for synthesis unceasingly, eternally--in an act of anticipation and restitution of unity." (104 CM)

Payne sees this "duality" expressed in the yin-yang principles of Taoism as well as in "the rich erotic mysticism of the Kabbala" (104 CM). However, "the most famous presentation of this idea," that man is "male-female in origin and his final destination," allegedly occurs in Genesis (105 CM). Here again, Payne asserts that Adam, alone, was created male *and female* prior to the creation of Eve (105 CM). This fundamental error of interpretation (see earlier discussion) leads Payne way off the biblical track. Her speculations go far astray:

"This, according to Christian tradition, indicates the androgynous nature of the Godhead Himself--meaning, again, that here *polarity in union* is the expression of fullness of being." (105 CM)

Payne sees the same idea expressed in pagan Greek philosophy, citing the speech of Aristophanes in *Plato's Symposium*, claiming that Greeks and Jews agreed on this issue even before the Christian epoch (105 CM).

The Bible affirms that both men and women are created in God's image. Scripture also attributes to God certain maternal, or feminine, qualities in a few texts, such as the lament over

Jerusalem in Matthew 23:37 (also Luke 13:34). However, Payne engages in much extra-biblical speculation based on pagan concepts of both dualism and unity. Rather than concentrating on reconciliation between God and man, she wants to unify the masculine and feminine in a mystical manner.

Gender imbalance. Payne views man's fundamental problem primarily in terms of a separation within the self, described at times as a masculine-feminine imbalance:

"The masculine and feminine within man and within woman...seek recognition, affirmation, and proper balance. Much that is called emotional illness or instability today...is merely the masculine and/or the feminine unaffirmed and out of balance within the personality."
(109 CM)

Payne believes that Christians can correct this alleged imbalance and "get in touch with" masculinity as an attribute of God:

"Ultimately masculinity descends to us through the way of love--the way of divine revelation and incarnation. Ultimately masculinity is an attribute of God. Because it is resident in Him, we as Christians can get in touch with it as we abide in Him." (86 CM)

Affirmation. Payne proposes a widespread "crisis in masculinity" that she describes as a "cultural malady, already epidemic in proportions" (11 CM). She places enormous emphasis on the affirmation of masculinity as well as femininity. She believes that in years past, men were adequately affirmed by their fathers and other men, such that it was rare to find a man "seriously split off from his masculine side and identity" (12 CM). Today, however, such splits are common (13 CM). (How would Payne account for the widespread presence of *sin* in past centuries?!)

Payne insists that women, too, need to "affirm" the masculinity in themselves, but "the major crisis today... is with men" (13 CM). She believes that if men are "healed" of this malady, the "healing" of women will naturally follow, because it is fathers who allegedly affirm both sons and daughters in their sexual identities and as *persons* (13 CM). In addition, separation from the identity of one's mother is

something Payne believes must be achieved through masculine affirmation:

"It is the strong, masculine love and affirmation coming through that [masculine] voice that convinces us that we are truly and finally separate from our mothers. We were born not knowing ourselves as separate from her." (15 CM)

However, the pervasive "crisis" allegedly prevents the needed affirmation from flowing to younger generations:

"We cannot pass on to the next generation what we do not ourselves possess. Unaffirmed men are unable adequately to affirm their sons and daughters as male and female and therefore as persons." (16 CM)

In one chapter, Payne describes various men who, while not suffering from a "neurosis," have not had their "masculine identity" properly affirmed (48-49 CM):

"But God found the unaffirmed little boy within each one of them and pronounced him a man." (50 CM)

She alleges that a similar problem among priests is what drives them to Mary instead of Christ:

"This same problem is that of the priest or the monk who fears getting alone with God the Father and God the Son, fearful of what the Eternal Masculine will do to him if he draws too close and yields up to Him the deprivations and sin he senses at the base of his soul. His full imagination is therefore fastened on the Virgin, the feminine and maternal, and turned from the One who imparts the masculinity and wholeness he needs." (49-50 CM)

Coming into "the Presence" is Payne's solution to finding affirmation of a man's masculinity (50 CM). Both men and women, she claims, must experience "masculine" affirmation:

"Whether we are men or women, it is to the Masculine that we must look for the strong, fatherly affirmation of our sexual identity and of ourselves as persons." (50 CM)

However, Payne cautions about possible "repression" of the need for affirmation. She has this comment regarding one man she prayed with, explaining away his sin:

"His need for masculine approval and love had been so great...that he had had to repress it, and rankling as it did, deep in his unconscious, it began to erupt as fear, guilt, odd thoughts, genital responses, impotency with his wife, and finally, as time went on, to an unhealthy fantasy life in order to perform sexually." (75 CM)

In counseling women, Payne's prayers include asking the Lord to "affirm the beautiful woman within" (130 CM). However, both femininity and masculinity allegedly must be affirmed:

"To be whole, not only must her femininity be affirmed, but the masculine side within her needs to be recognized, balanced, and strengthened when necessary." (98 CM)

Through Payne's writings, gender is a major emphasis. She asserts the presence of both masculinity and femininity in all persons, male and female alike, and insists on "affirmation" of both genders. Sin is explained as an "imbalance." Meanwhile, no passages of Scripture ever suggest such an imbalance or the need for affirmation. The Bible teaches about men and women being created in the image of God, with different functions in the home and church. However, our salvation and sanctification are not dependent on the type of gender affirmation that Payne proposes. Her teaching imposes a burden that cannot be confirmed in Scripture.

Love and Acceptance of Self

Payne claims that "we all have the basic need of being loved and accepted" (42 BI). She prizes the love and acceptance of *self*, listing three major "barriers to inner healing" (48 BI) as:

1. Failure to forgive others;
2. Failure to receive forgiveness; and
3. "Failure to **accept and love ourselves** aright" (emphasis added).

Payne insists that "we cannot love God and others while hating ourselves, while failing to exercise patience and charity toward

ourselves" (49 BI). She echoes many modern voices when she makes self-acceptance and self-love a prerequisite to the ability to love God and others:

"Whoever does not accept himself (love himself aright) is necessarily turned inward upon himself. To be free to turn outward and love others, I must accept myself." (89 CM)

The command in 2 Corinthians 10:5, to take every thought captive in obedience to Christ, is understood by Payne to mean forsaking of unloving, unaccepting attitudes toward *self* (69 BI). Meanwhile, she considers "the Fall in every individual life" to mean being "stuck in some diseased form of self-love" (55 BI), agreeing with psychologists that if a person misses one step of "psycho-social development," he's in trouble (54 BI). One such failure is the step between the "narcissistic period of puberty," where allegedly self-centeredness is normal and acceptable, to a level of self-acceptance that facilitates concern for others (55 BI). When this "step" is missed, the individual supposedly remains stuck in the "wrong kind of self-love" and "failing to love himself aright, he will love himself amiss" (55 BI). Payne explains further that:

"Inherent in the healing of every Christian is the ongoing deliverance from inordinate love of the self. This, the affliction of all, is the Fall in every life. It is pride." (97 BI)

She equates an "inferiority complex" with "pride lurking within" that needs to be confessed, rather than trying to work out one's own salvation (70 BI). She carefully distinguishes between rejecting of sinful behavior and acceptance of the self (71 BI).

Failure to affirm masculinity is claimed to result in the plague of low self-esteem, and a failure to emerge from the "narcissistic stage" of childhood:

"An automatic and serious consequence of a man's failure to be affirmed in his masculine side is that he will suffer from low self-esteem." (14 CM)

"Whether or not we come out of the narcissistic stage and accept ourselves depends upon the affirmation that comes from the masculine." (90 CM)

Payne believes that the teenage years of a male's life are critical to the needed affirmation:

"The step to self-acceptance ideally comes just after puberty. The key to taking this step...lies in the love and affirmation of a whole father." (15 CM)

Failure to achieve self-acceptance, according to Payne, makes it impossible even for a believer to "abide in Christ." She sees a split taking place *within self*:

"Although David [a minister] had most truly come to Christ, **because he yet hated himself he could not abide in Christ.** To hate oneself is *to walk alongside oneself.*" (56 CM, bold emphasis added; italics in original)

One of the main goals of "healing prayer" is to boost self-love and acceptance:

"In listening prayer we gain the hallowed space and time needed to befriend our emotions, those jaded or stunted in the past, or those feared and rejected and therefore repressed." (152 BI)

With time plus "healing of memories," Payne believes that the necessary acceptance of self will occur:

"In short, when we have failed to accept ourselves, a healing and learning process is required that takes a little time. But the healing of memories, the removal of the first two barriers [giving and receiving forgiveness], is an instantaneous thing, even as the psalmist knew." (36 CM)

Payne illustrates her theories by giving an account of individuals she has counseled. One young man, Matthew, failed to receive parental love and affirmation (42 BI) and therefore "had not known affirmation of himself as a *person*, as a *man*, as a *being of worth*" (48 BI). Payne believes that "having been insufficiently loved, he [Matthew] could not love and accept himself" (43 BI). She explains that it was "too late" to receive such affirmation from either parents or a substitute person. Rather, "he needed to *face the inner loneliness with God*" (48 BI).

"In this two-way conversation between himself and God, his full affirmation would come. My part was to invoke the Presence, to call him into it, to see always the real Matthew and appeal only to the man God was calling forth."
(48 BI)

Modern psychology has brought self-esteem, self-love, self-acceptance, self-worth, and other such concepts into both the world and the church. Self-love is commonly accepted as a basic need. Scripture, however, does not support this analysis. Jesus specifically stated that the TWO greatest commandments were to (1) love God, and (2) love your neighbor as yourself, i.e., as much as you already naturally love yourself. No one ever hated his own flesh (Ephesians 5:29). Love of self is never asserted in Scripture as a requirement to loving God and others. Self-love is part of the problem, not the solution. Sinful man loves himself already. Payne identifies a wrong *kind* of self-love but fails to discern that failure to love and/or accept self is simply *not the problem*. When the prophet Isaiah, righteous by human standards, found himself in the presence of a holy God, he was undone! God didn't counsel him to love or accept himself, but provided cleansing for his sin (a burning coal!), then called him to be a prophet. Self-esteem theology is a modern heresy that is harming the body of Christ.

Identity

Payne devotes an enormous amount of attention to the question of identity and to what we might call an "identity crisis" in man. Significant discussion is focused on gender as a key aspect of identity and the idea that each person has a "true self" or "higher self." Identity, according to Payne, must be rooted in God:

"He lives in us. This is *glory*, fullness of *being*. This is identity." (141 BI)

Even heaven and hell are defined in terms of identity:

"We choose either the heaven of the realized identity in God, or the hell of the self-in-separation." (142 BI)

Payne insists that we are "becoming" persons, constantly involved in a process of change:

"We are *becoming* persons. You are not who you will be. I am not, by the grace of God, who I will be." (137 BI)

Through "becoming" supposedly occurs through listening and obedience:

"As I listen and obey, I *become*." (150 BI)

If Payne would connect this concept of "becoming" with progressive sanctification, a work of God's grace through His Holy Spirit, her comments would be helpful. As we listen to God's Word and obey, we become conformed to the image of Christ.

The "true self" or "higher self." It is highly disturbing to read Payne's teachings about the "true self." Payne speaks of a "resurrection of the true self...the Presence calling forth the true self out of the hell of the false self" that occurs during inner healing (42 CM; almost identical wording on 50 BI). As a supposedly biblical example, she claims that "Christ pointed to his [Peter's] higher identity" when He proclaimed this disciple to be "Peter, the Rock" in Matthew 16:13-19 (137 BI).

Payne seriously confuses matters when she alleges that the biblical term "old man" refers to something that is *not real*:

"In the Presence, conversing with Him, we find that the 'old man'--the sinful, the neurotic, the sickly compulsive, the seedy old actor within--is not *the Real*, but that these are simply the false selves that can never be rooted in God." (149 BI)

Allegedly, God:

"...calls the real 'I' forward, separating us from our sicknesses and sins. We then no longer define ourselves by our sins, neuroses, and deprivations, but by Him whose healing life cleanses and indwells us." (150 BI)

Payne urges the reader to search for the "true self" in Christ by the putting off of "false" selves:

"In the Presence, listening, I unmask, I take off my many false faces and my true self comes face to face with Jesus. If I look for me, I will never find me--only my many

fragmented selves. But if I look for Him, I will eventually find that the whole of me is united in Jesus."
(150 BI)

In spite of the warning not to "look for me," finding of the "true self" appears to be the final goal. This conclusion is confirmed elsewhere, when Payne warns that an adult may relive infantile trauma because "the hurting 'infant' within the full-grown person is still fearful of being outside the womb, a condition that represses the true self, and with it, true masculinity" (80).

Payne goes so far as to view man as having two identities, one as a child of God and the other sinner:

"In listening prayer we remain keenly aware not only of our prime identity, that of child of God, but also of our secondary identity, that of sinner.... The true self, thereby continuing to recognize its secondary identity as sinner, remains free to move always from that center within where Christ dwells--that is, out of its prime identity."
(154 BI)

Considering her comments as a whole, it appears that the "sinner" might be identified with the "false self," while the "true self" is a child of God. Scripture does not suggest this type of dichotomy. We are whole persons before God. We are redeemed sinners who are being progressively sanctified by the work of the Spirit. We are genuinely new, but not yet completely new. In eternity, we will one day be glorified, finally and completely free of the power of sin.

The Bible does speak about regeneration in the imagery of resurrection, but not in terms of any "true self" existing prior to the Spirit's work. Prior to regeneration, man is described as spiritually dead in sins and trespasses. There is no "true self" to "call forth." Instead, God creates a new self in Christ (2 Corinthians 5:17).

Payne speaks of a separation within the self, a fear of the "higher" self:

"We are often very much afraid of the part of ourselves we are estranged from. Indeed, we are often afraid of the

higher self *in toto* until we are enabled to accept it; until then we tend to run from it altogether." (110 BI)

She further insists that counselors must seek to enable a person to hear both God *and* the "true self":

"Our pastoral task is to help every needy one face his inner loneliness, and there begin to hear God and his own true self." (156 BI)

We do, of course, need to hear God speaking in His Word. We do not, however, have any biblical warrant to look to the "true self" for wisdom.

Gender is allegedly a key to understanding the "true self":

"Masculine and feminine have utterly transcendent as well as psychological dimensions. Gender, a vital part of the true self and of personhood, is finally rooted in God." (12 CM)

Listening and obedience are claimed to bring forth the "true self," including masculinity:

"To listen is to obey. In learning obedience, one's true self--masculinity and all--comes forward. As Stan made his will one with Christ's he found and accepted his full masculine identity." (72 BI)

Similar counsel is given to women concerning femininity:

"By simply *seeing* and affirming the 'woman within,' we show it to be (though paralyzed within her) the 'terrible good' that it truly is." (110 BI)

Payne speaks of the "powerful privilege of taking authority over our own souls and bodies," advising women to "put on" femininity in external ways, such as flowing skirts (112 BI). Biblically, however, there is no such "privilege." Our souls and bodies belong wholly to Christ, who purchased us with His own blood (1 Corinthians 6:19-20).

The "true self" or "higher self" is a concept found in modern psychology as well as New Age theology, but nowhere in

Scripture. Payne fails to understand the gravity of sin and man's fallen condition.

Identity and gender. As we have seen, Payne places a high emphasis on masculinity and femininity. Payne calls masculinity and femininity "two complementary poles within each human psyche" that "seek recognition, affirmation, and a proper balance" (12 CM). Failure to achieve such affirmation, according to Payne, accounts for "much that is called emotional illness or instability today" (12 CM). In *The Broken Image*, Payne writes about "repressed or unaffirmed masculinity as it appears in the homosexual" (11 CM). *Crisis in Masculinity* expands the concept, as Payne claims that "the homosexual neurosis is only one of the ways in which this many-faceted and widespread problem in masculine identity manifests itself" (11 CM). Restoration of "true masculinity" is allegedly what "all creation waits for" (51 BI). In describing her work with a homosexual young man, Payne claims that his abusive father caused a "severe suppression of masculinity" in him (45 BI):

"The overall effect was that of forcing him to put the *real self* to death, that self for whom Christ died that it might freely *become* to the glory of God." (45 BI)

Here we see the "real self" identified with masculinity. Also, this quote implies that Christ died for some "real self" buried within (but not for the "false self"). This blurs the reality that we are wholly new creations in Christ.

In addition, Payne discusses the need for children to separate from the sexual identities of their parents. She believes it is more difficult for a girl to achieve "the unnatural task of separating her sexual identity from that of her father" than for a boy to complete the "natural task" of separating from his mother (109 BI). Sometimes, she claims, a girl becomes homosexual because her father wanted a boy and has treated her as if she were the desired son (108 BI).

In later life, Payne counsels women to be "in touch" with the "masculine side" in order to hear God and men, similarly, to be "in touch" with the "feminine principle":

"For a woman to be free to initiate--free, that is, to hear the word of the Lord and do what she hears Him say--is for her to be in touch with her masculine side.... She is a

balanced feminine *maker* in the image of her Creator Father.... Likewise, for a man to fully function as a masculine *maker*, he must be in touch with the feminine principle in him." (99 CM)

God created man, both male and female, in His image. Gender is indeed part of the nature of man. God has ordained differences between men and women, as we see throughout the Scripture. These differences are often blurred or treated with contempt by modern philosophies of feminism and homosexual rights groups. However, Scripture doesn't speak of the necessity to "affirm" masculinity or femininity in the manner proclaimed by Payne. She reads more into our gender than is biblically warranted and builds much of her counseling on her assertions about this aspect of human nature.

Identity and "being." An infant's "failure to achieve an adequate sense of being" is alleged to be the most severe "identity problem" of all (121 BI). Often, "the sufferer will posit his identity in an object or fetish" (121 BI). Homosexuality is then explained as an "attempt to find his missing being or to posit his very frail sense of being and identity in another person" (121 BI).

The "true self" is equated with "being" and with the two human genders:

"To disregard their complementariness, out of which issues fullness of being on the natural plane, is finally to strike a blow at the true self in every man--indeed, at *being* itself." (109 CM)

"Gender participates in the mystery of *being* itself. And in the anguish of the human person--stretched to whatever degree between being and nonbeing--his or her masculine or feminine identity and the balance with its polar opposite are always to be reckoned with." (110 CM)

Payne's solution is to find "being" in the resurrected Lord:

"Born anew, we take our place in His resurrected Being. In the cross there is healing; in His resurrected body and life there is *identity* and *being*." (126 BI)

It almost seems as if a troubled person, not in touch with the "true self," is *unreal*. This is troublesome. The unregenerate person, dead in sin, nevertheless does exist. There is no deficiency in "being itself." Such an analysis is similar to heretical modern theologies, such as found in the writings of Paul Tillich, wherein God is viewed as "the ground of being" rather than the personal Creator.

Identity and idolatry. Payne defines idolatry in terms of finding identity in all the wrong places. She views idolatry (the worship of false gods) as seeing one's identity in the creature rather than the Creator:

"But looking to Him, I begin to know **who I am**. Listening to Him, I begin to die to the old self-centered and self-conscious self." (31, emphasis added)

Furthermore, she sees problems of idolatry whenever a person attempts to find identity in sexuality, whether as a homosexual or heterosexual, noting that psychiatrists often wrongly recommend sexual intimacy as a remedy (34 BI).

Payne alleges that pastors too often see a woman "in a class, not as a person" and unwittingly force her "back into the 'fallen position,' that of attempting to find her identity in a role or in a creature (her husband or children) rather than in Christ" (135 CM). In seeking help for women in churches, Payne says that:

"Most often when such as these seek help they are shunted into what turns out to be equally binding intellectual and spiritual ideologies (i.e., the pop psychologies, philosophies, or theologies of the day). Or, as an easy way out, their *roles as woman* in the home or in the church rather than their identity as *persons in Christ* are emphasized as the way to wholeness." (123 CM)

Besides female roles, Payne faults attempts to find identity in men. Citing Genesis 3:16, which speaks of the pain women would experience in childbirth, she claims:

"I saw very clearly that woman is bent toward man by reason of the Fall, and *wants* to find her identity in him."
(132 CM)

Instead, Payne says that identity is to be found in God. However, she confuses the entire matter of idolatry, which has to do with the *worship* of created things rather than the Creator. Idolatry is not a problem of the mistaken identity of *self*, except perhaps in the sense of confusing self with God. It does involve placing self, and the desires of self, ahead of the true God.

"Psychological healing." Payne distinguishes the psychological from the spiritual yet acknowledges their interdependence. It seems, however, that "psychological wholeness" is required *before* spiritual concerns about sin can be addressed:

"The wholeness and resulting maturity and freedom of the essential self or spirit is dependent in large part upon a person's achievement of psychological wholeness. Indeed, our spiritual wholeness is interwoven with the psychological, for we cannot fully confess our sins of pride and unlove until we are enabled to recognize them."
(175 BI)

Payne describes the problem of identity in terms of a need for psychological healing:

"False humility, actual sin, or need for psychological healing bars us from living out from the center, a position of knowing who we are in Him. This position is one of authority, and one by which we the redeemed, even as the unfallen Adam, are *namers* of all that is created." (51 BI, bold emphasis added)

She says that "we must take care to pray for the healing of the psychological factor as well as the spiritual" (67 BI). This "psychological factor" is perceived in terms of the failure to secure one's sexual identity (67 BI). Note the line drawn between the *psychological* and the *spiritual*. One of the major problems with modern psychology is the attempt to split the inner man, leaving the spiritual to the pastor and the psychological to counselors outside the church using theories that conflict with Scripture.

In this search for "psychological healing," Payne recognizes the inability of fallen man to know himself rightly:

"The fallen self cannot know itself. As we have seen, we do not know who we are and will search for our identity in someone or something other than God until we find ourselves in Him." (149 BI)

Knowing *self* is claimed a prerequisite to "healing" the impact of sin:

"To know ourselves at all is to begin to be healed of the effects of the Fall, for it involves coming into a listening-speaking relationship to God. It is to recapture at least to some extent the Edenic situation. It is to realize more perfectly our union and communion with God." (138 BI)

Payne claims that Christ "points to the deeps of our personalities, deeps both good and bad that we are not in touch with" so that "our idea about ourselves changes" (138 BI). Furthermore, "He gathers together the scattered parts of ourselves we have been separated from" (138 BI). Payne believes that this process is one that we all need, but particularly homosexuals:

"A secure sexual identity is merely part of a secure personal identity--one that spans the full range of what it means to be a human being." (138 BI)

It is true, in one sense, that we need accurate knowledge about ourselves. We need the knowledge of our spiritual condition apart from Christ, as sinners in need of redemption. The knowledge that we need is found in the pages of Scripture, not the writings of Freud, Jung, and other twentieth century men who have rejected the gospel and asserted hatred for their Creator. Payne borrows heavily from the tainted theories of such men. Her focus is far too much on self, self, and more self. There is much erroneous *psychology*, and far too little sound *theology* in her writing. We must know ourselves in relation to God, and we must be reconciled to Him, not to self. Payne advises her readers to find "identity" in Christ, but she wants to call forth some buried, inherently good "true self," rather than truly knowing self in relation to the one true God.

Payne's comments about Christ "gathering" the "scattered parts" of ourselves bring us to our next theme: separation. Man

is separated from God by sin, but Payne sees man separated instead from himself.

Separation From Self

Payne views man's fallen condition as involving both a spiritual separation from God *and a psychological separation from the true self:*

"The fallen condition is a crisis in separation, and within the trauma of broken relationships resides what is described today as the identity crisis.... Theologically speaking, sin or evil is separation from God; psychologically speaking, it is separation within, and ultimately from my **true or higher self.**" (30 BI, emphasis added)

Actually, sin separates man from God; sin is the cause of that separation. Sin is not *equal to* separation, nor is "separation within," from *self* rather than from *God*, a biblical concept. Payne's view comes perilously close to an equation of the "higher self" with God.

Separation and sin. The split within self is a theme that emerges repeatedly in both *The Broken Image* and *Crisis in Masculinity*. In speaking of a young homosexual man she once counseled, Payne claims that:

"There was no way Richard could have lived his life from that Center within him where Christ had been invited to dwell, for he was a man who had long been absent from himself." (19 CM)

Similarly, she "explains" a minister's repeated failure to tell the truth as being "split off" from his "masculine side" (51 CM). She describes him as "a man living out of a fearful, unhealed, guilty little boy within who could never accept himself or receive the love he so desperately sought from others" (52 CM). In describing this man's childhood and how it allegedly affected him:

"He needed to confess his mother's sin of lying [to protect him from a beating] and forgive her for its later effects on him" (55 CM).

Payne thus proposes a *split from self*, rather than a *split from God*, as the real root of sin. Male separation from the "feminine" within is another description of the alleged culprit:

"Men everywhere are separated from their own hearts, the 'feminine' within them and within their female counterparts, and are therefore unable to get in touch with the mystery of *being*." (84 CM)

Therefore, Payne claims, men see themselves in strictly biological terms, ignore mystery, transcendence, and "one's real and higher self in God" (85 CM).

Payne explains one man's use of pornography as the result of his being "cut off" from his own masculinity (23 CM). She speaks of a confession of sins in the presence of God as an aspect of her "healing prayer" (22 CM), but her primary goal appears to be a search for some part of self which has been split off. She explains the inability to live a godly life as the result of being "split psychologically" (56 CM). Speaking of a man she once counseled:

"Separated from himself, he could not live and move from that divine Center where Christ dwells." (56 CM)

Payne's view of the origins of sin is one that blurs the reality of heaven and hell, in addition to misplacing the "separation" that occurs. After noting her belief that the human will is "a masculine part of our being" (45 BI), she states that:

"With it we consciously and deliberately choose the heaven of the integrated and emancipated self rather than the hell of the disintegrated self in separation." (45 BI)

This is a dangerous, unbiblical discussion of heaven and hell, which are eternal realities, not merely psychological states during our life on earth. Those realities concern man's eternal separation from God or presence with Him, not simply a "disintegrated self" or "integrated self." The difference is eternally significant!

Integration. Payne mentions the gospel message of reconciliation with God:

"Our Creator God, Elohim, the Three-In-One, made provision for fallen man (all of us) to once again be linked with Him. This is the Good News, the gospel, the truth of Christ *in us*, healing us of our separation." (141 BI)

This statement, unfortunately, leaves the impression that Christ is already "in" the unbeliever prior to regeneration. At least it does affirm man's separation from God rather than merely from self. However, instead of maintaining the focus on man's need for reconciliation with God, Payne insists on an integration that allegedly needs to occur within self. She believes that God's presence must call forth the "true self," and then, supposedly, "we are united within" and "we can realize the freedom to live out from that center of our being, that place where His Spirit indwells ours, and our will is one with His" (50 BI). Similarly, she speaks to women in particular about an internal feminine integration:

"The prayer of faith will envision this estranged feminine self and see it being accepted and integrated into the personality. This is not hard to do. We have acknowledged the Presence of our Lord and see with His eyes the beautiful woman within, waiting to be affirmed, to be called forward. With this powerful help from the Lord, the woman can begin the process of *becoming*, of integrating with the feminine self she has so long denied." (109 BI)

The integration proposed by Payne is one that seeks to correct the masculine/feminine "imbalance" that she sees at the root of man's fallen condition, and which can deal a "potentially fatal blow" to an entire society or civilization (109 CM):

"Invariably when a soul needs healing there will be an imbalance within of the masculine and feminine.... This imbalance of the power to initiate and the power to respond can always be healed when a person forsakes his *vision and will in separation from God* (what the Scripture calls dying to the old man), comes into the Presence, and there unites with the incredible realities outside himself." (99 CM)

Similarly, Payne cites one woman's "separation" from her femininity as the cause of her failure to forgive:

"After this separation of her identity from that of her mother's [Judy], there was yet another very important

healing needed. I asked the Lord to enter into her and to find and affirm the beautiful *woman* within." (130 CM)

On the whole, this recurring separation-from-self theme is an unbiblical explanation for sin and results in a solution, "integration," that upstages man's need for reconciliation with God. In an important sense, self replaces God in this scheme.

Memories: Haunting and Healing

Payne believes that the retrieval and "healing" of painful buried memories, through prayer, is *the key* to solving present problems of living. In addition to blocking progress in righteous living, it is alleged that:

"Particularly humiliating memories from the past can make us afraid to listen to God and to our own inner selves and feelings, for fear of what we might find when we do."
(69 BI)

What about listening to *God's Word*? Since when is it necessary to listen to "our own inner selves"?

Following is one summary of Payne's method and goals:

"This is healing of memories: **forgiveness of sin applied at the level for which it was intended, that of the deep heart (mind or unconscious).**" (21 BI, emphasis added)

Payne's later book, *Crisis in Masculinity*, repeats this definition almost word for word:

"The healing of memories is the forgiveness of sin applied at the level of the deep heart (the deep mind, or unconscious)--the level, I must add, for which it was always intended." (33 CM)

Explaining the process more fully, she states that:

"The confession of sin and reception of its absolution is the key to inner healing, and for this reason there is no power to heal the soul like that found in the power that Christ gives. This healing flows to the deepest levels of awareness, and the healing of those memories reveals the

truest and deepest roots of our problems in relating to others and to ourselves." (171 BI)

Payne calls healing of memories a type of mediation, a "priestly" activity of "bringing the healing Christ into the memory, of helping the sufferer to confess his sin or to forgive one who has sinned against him, and of proclaiming (in such a way as the deep heart can receive it) the forgiveness of God." (34 CM) She cites Psalm 32:5 as evidence. In this text, David has confessed his grievous sin (adultery plus murder) and proclaims the joy of being forgiven by God. It is important to note that David didn't go to a therapist to retrieve the memory of that sin, nor was he concerned with the sins of other people. Payne is misguided in her citation of this Psalm. In addition, she attacks the completed work of Christ by calling her method a "priestly" activity, because He is our Great High Priest whose completed work makes it unnecessary to ever again appoint earthly priests (see the book of Hebrews).

Both the failure to forgive others, and the failure to receive forgiveness, "call for what we commonly refer to as the healing of memories" (35 CM). Payne claims that this type of prayer results in a release from the bondage of sin:

"That which is hurt and bound is healed and set free, and we find ourselves released from the limitations imposed upon us by that sin. This is what healing of memories is all about." (175 BI)

Comparing her ministry to Jesus healing a woman who had been ill for 18 years (Luke 13:12), Payne says that:

"In healing prayer we loose them from their infirmity: the grip which patterns of self-hatred, rebellion, and lustful or lying fantasies have on their minds." (58 CM)

Citing Joel 2:25, she adds that: "He turns the old wounds, sorrows, and deprivations into healing power" (58 CM).

Payne's emphasis on the forgiveness of sins appears at first to be a valid biblical focus. Christ died and rose from the dead, securing forgiveness of sins for believers. He has paid the penalty for sin and broken its power. We are exhorted, in turn, to forgive others as God in Christ has forgiven us (Ephesians 4:32). The problem with Payne's method, however, is

that it obscures the *completed* work of Christ on the cross. She *adds* the requirement that a person retrieve "repressed" memories from years past for "healing," and she cites the sins of *others* as a block to progress more than repentance and forgiveness for *one's own* sins. Furthermore, the Bible never speaks to the application of forgiveness at some mysterious "unconscious" level. Payne exalts emotion here, making it more important to *feel* forgiven than to faithfully study Scripture and *know* God's plan of redemption, *trusting* in what He has done.

As an example of what occurs during "healing prayer," Payne's first chapter of *Broken Image* is about a young woman (Lisa) who supposedly suffered from "repressed memory." As Payne gave a message in a church concerning the "healing" of such memories, she asked the Lord "to bring up from the corners of the deep mind such memories as not only needed healing, but could be properly dealt with in a group of **several hundred** people" (15 BI, emphasis added). Lisa's memories, however, required individual attention. This young lady had entered into a homosexual relationship in her childhood (17 BI). Her childhood history included estrangement from her parents (17 BI) as well as a commitment to Christ at age six (18 BI). Payne's prayer with her was one in which she asked God to "go back in time through her memories to the moment of conception," seeking memories that would *explain* her current life's difficulties (19 BI). The "first five years of life were blanked out from memory" (19 BI). Payne claims that she "knew that the key or root memory was locked up in the repressed memory bank of her first five years" (19 BI). She admits that such memory failure may well mean only that those years were uneventful (20 BI). However, she claims that *she knew*, "by the Spirit of God," that such was not the case with Lisa (20 BI). (It is difficult to refute this type of subjective "revelation"!) During the prayer time, Lisa allegedly recalled sexual abuse by her father at the age of three, followed by her mother throwing her across the room (20 BI). Payne claims that it was the Lord Himself who caused these "repressed memories" to surface:

"In Lisa's case, Jesus Himself had brought up the thing that needed healing, and He Himself walked into that memory, enabling her to forgive her father, her mother, and the early circumstances of her life, releasing her from her own 'grievous reactions' to her parents' sin against her, and from the **false guilt** surrounding the entire event."
(21 BI, emphasis added)

Payne explains that Lisa's:

"...feeling about herself was far too ugly--her guilt too deep and she too injured--for her to be able to look up and see with the eyes of her heart the Lord in the midst of that hellish memory of her father's sexual abuse and her mother's violent reaction to it" (28 BI).

Besides Lisa and others, Payne recalls her own personal experience with "inner healing." Even after working in a healing ministry with Agnes Sanford,¹ Payne claims that she was "unaware of the psychological injury (rejection in this case) that had underlain much of my need for healing in the first place" (173 BI). Another ministry leader prayed for Payne in chronological sequence and told her to *forgive her father for dying* (173 BI). (Dying is not a sin to be forgiven!) This is how she allegedly learned the "root" of her inability to write and publish a book.

These cases underscore the methods of "inner healing" as well as some of the underlying assumptions. It is assumed here that:

- * Events of early life are the *cause* of later life behavior.
- * Events are recalled *accurately* during "healing prayer."
- * Such events *need to be recalled* in order to enable a person be "healed" and thus live a godly life in the present.
- * Accurate *revelation* occurs during "healing prayer," not only as to specific early life events, but as to the cause-and-effect between those events and later life problems.
- * People sin because they are *injured* by the sins of others.

¹ The theories and methods of Agnes Sanford conflict with biblical truth, bringing in techniques that are more akin to New Age theology than the Christian faith.

* "False guilt" surrounding the sins of *others* is a key to "healing" and to the ability to change current behavior and emotions.

* "Feeling bad about self" is a fundamental human problem.

These assumptions are not founded on even one biblical example. Not once in either the Old or New Testaments are believers ever encouraged to resurrect events of their past in order to explain the present or enable them to walk in a manner worthy of their calling in Christ. The Bible does not point out either "false guilt" or low self-esteem as the key to sinful living.

Nevertheless, Payne alleges the involvement of the triune God in her counseling methods, believing that she can simply invoke God's presence and secure His blessing for what she is doing. She notes that prayer for memory healing requires "extraordinary caution in listening to and collaborating with the Holy Spirit" (16 BI). It is the Holy Spirit who supposedly "baptizes" her methods and thus distinguishes "inner healing" from psychotherapy:

"It is this, the invoking of the Presence, that differentiates prayer for healing of the soul from psychological and other forms of counseling.... In the Presence, our time together is transformed into an informal but powerful 'Office of the Confessional.'" (21-22 CM)

"The *essential* action, that which differentiates healing of memories from psychological methodologies, is the action of the Holy Spirit pointing to *the Presence of our Lord who is there.*" (27 BI)

It appears that the Holy Spirit is a mere *addition* to an essentially psychological approach.

Jesus Christ is alleged to be the primary power behind the prayer. During "healing prayer," Payne claims that:

"Jesus, the Infinite One who is outside of time and to whom *all times are present*, enters into what for us is a past occurrence, one known only in retrospect, though we experience its consequences in the present. Here the past-present-future time sequence in which we experience existence comes together in a particularly meaningful way

with the Eternal. And that which is eternal within us and therefore not bound by time is sparked." (27 BI)

During prayer for inner healing, Payne claims that "we experience past and present as one" because "all times are present" for Jesus (36 BM). Even very early "memories" (prior to the *ability* to remember) are not excluded from Payne's methods:

"Sometimes the memories that need healing go far back, before we can consciously remember anything." (35 CM)

"Christ can enter into and heal prenatal, birth, and early infantile trauma without the necessity of the person reliving the memory." (79 BI)

Payne recommends that parents lay hands on traumatized *infants* so that the Lord can "walk into those memories of pain and heal" them (79 BI).

Visualization is an important aspect to "healing prayer," including attempts to see Jesus:

"In the prayer for such a one's release, I usually ask them to see Jesus with the eyes of their hearts, to see Him on the cross, there taking into Himself the very pain and bondage they are now struggling with, as well as any unforgiveness or sin within their hearts." (105 BI; almost identical wording on 128 CM)

Other "visualization" occurs, sometimes of other people, sometimes of symbols. After counseling one woman, Payne asked her to visualize her mother in order to fully forgive:

"Because the Holy Spirit is in control and healing is so powerfully taking place, they will nearly always have a picture of her that is most revealing, one that will enable them to see her objectively for the first time, one that will better enable them to fully forgive her." (105 BI)

The next step was to "see" and "name" any remaining bondage, then visualize cutting through these bonds with scissors (105 BI, 129 CM). "The release that comes with this is often nothing short of phenomenal."

These "visualization" techniques pose serious problems. The Second Commandment warns against making for ourselves any graven image. "Visualizing" Jesus Christ, according to our own sinful imaginations, comes perilously close to constituting a "graven image." The visualization of other people, and symbols of invisible realities such as "bondage," does nothing to actually change reality. New Age advocates would love this sort of method, but it has no place in a biblical plan for sanctification.

The Presence of God

We have seen that the presence of God is a central aspect of Payne's "healing prayer." She speaks of our desperate need to know that He is there:

"This, the knowledge that God is truly with us--that it is possible to be in familiar communion with Him--is the primary need of every lonely, suffering soul." (145 BI)

Payne speaks correctly when she notes that:

"In this kind of relationship we cease to look for signs or some sort of sensory proof of His Presence and begin rather to delight ourselves in Him. He is our goal. We practice His Presence with us as we read the Scriptures, as we pray, as we ride in our cars, as we move through our duties and our play." (145 BI)

According to Payne, "He manifests Himself in such a way that our sensory being is alerted when we least expect this to happen" (146 BI).

It is most unfortunate that Payne's writings are not more focused on immersing ourselves in prayer, Scripture, and the practice of godliness.

Sadly, Payne moves way beyond the Bible in her comments about the presence of God in our lives. She believes that her ability to practice healing prayer is rooted in the presence of Christ:

"Because Jesus, *the Gift*, lives in me, the gifts and the fruits of His life are present and can radiate through me.

I am thus empowered by His indwelling Presence to heal in His name." (164 BI)

The Holy Spirit's presence does result in good fruit: love, joy, peace, gentleness, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, and self-control (Galatians 5:22). Healing is another subject; Christ and His disciples performed many special healings in order to demonstrate the power of God during a unique time in history. God still does heal, of course, but Payne's claim to "heal" is of a very different nature. She is attempting to "heal" memories, not bodies. When we are dealing with the inner man, it is not "healing" that is needed, but God's forgiveness for sin and sanctification. There is no "healing of memories" ever recorded in Scripture.

Payne skirts on the edges of pantheism in some of her comments concerning God's presence. When praying for inner psychological healing of others, Payne claims that "we bring them into what has been most wondrously called the Great Dance" (165 BI). This "dance" is described as "love flowing down from the uncreated into the created, and from thence into all other created beings" so as to "call forth the real 'I'" in others (165 BI). Such "dance" imagery calls forth a vision that sounds suspiciously similar to New Age monism:

"If we allow our imaginations the freedom, we can 'see' each person, wholly giving himself in perfect obedience to the divine rhythm flowing through the dancers, clasping hands with the person on his right and the one on his left, until all men are hand in hand. We then see that they are somehow encircling all creation, and that all creation is being 'taken into' them. The 'rhythm' flowing through them is divine energy, and our final image is of all creation on tiptoe with joy." (165 BI)

In heaven, but no sooner, there will indeed be a fullness of joy. There will be a new heavens and a new earth: no more sin, no more tears, no more sickness, no more sadness. However, Payne's vision seems to merge all of the creation. Mixing in "divine energy" blurs the Creator-creature distinction. This is not the "presence of God" to be experienced by the believer in this age or even in the age to come.

Homosexuality: Sin or Sickness?

The preface to *The Broken Image* refers to homosexuality as a complex sexual neurosis. This biblically defined sin is thus placed within the realm of disease. Payne, however, actually wants to have it both ways. She views homosexuality as both sinful, involving the human spirit, and immature, involving the human soul (38 BI). She rejects the notion of some within the church that it is part of the variety that God has ordained and therefore a proper moral choice for some (37 BI). For her, psychological factors explain its origin while spiritual methods prescribe the cure. She notes that psychiatrists rarely hold out hope for change (33 BI). It was Freud who first proposed that homosexuality be viewed as a psychological disorder rather than a moral issue, but he considered it untreatable (35 BI). Payne believes that the imbalance has now turned in the opposite direction, because homosexuality is viewed in exclusively psychological terms, denying moral and spiritual aspects of the problem (35 BI). According to Payne, Freud considered people responsible for their choices, so that it is diluted versions of his theories negate such responsibility (35 BI). She explains that there is a difference between trauma and conflict, and claims that individuals choose, "however primitively and unconsciously," how to resolve their inner conflicts (36 BI). The problem here is that a "primitive and unconscious" choice is not really a choice for which a person may be morally accountable. Freud, the initial architect of homosexuality-as-neurosis, rejected God and His standards.

Psychological explanations abound throughout *The Broken Image*. Payne does acknowledge that homosexuality is a sin, and believes that aspect must be stressed in the face of demands that it be recognized as a legitimate lifestyle (159 BI).

"For pastors and counselors within Christendom to accept and condone homosexuality rather than to heal it is to deliver the individual into the consuming power of his own sin and sickness.... As pastors and counselors, we must help that soul turn from the very thing that is killing it. To teach obedience is the loving thing to do." (159 BI)

However, Payne clearly sees homosexuality as also a "psychological sickness" (158 BI). At one point, she sees it as a choice that is made when a person's "need for intimacy becomes compulsive" (65 BI). She considers it an attempt "to find a

sense of identity in relationships" (65 BI). It is also claimed to result from "separation anxiety," associated either with "loss of well being" or "loss of *being* itself" (123 BI). Fear or hatred of one's father (113 BI) and extreme deprivation of a mother's touch (114 BI) are other reasons offered. Payne then attempts to offer a *spiritual* solution to a problem with allegedly *psychological* roots:

"The touch of others does not suffice for it, even as various other attempts to compensate do not. In fact, it takes the Lord's healing touch to make up for the deficit and free the woman from her attempts to compensate, a terrible condition that until surmounted will not allow her to go on to other concerns. Until then, she may think of herself primarily in sensory or sexual terms." (115 BI)

Love and acceptance of self (or the lack thereof) is another prime emphasis borrowed from modern psychology. This is seen when Payne cautions counselors not to become discouraged if a homosexual person falls temporarily back into old patterns:

"Those, for instance, who are freed from severe lesbian or homosexual neuroses, but are still in the process of accepting themselves, can be swiftly and powerfully overtaken by the 'cannibal compulsion' (see Chapter 3). This is an exceedingly strong projection of the part of themselves they cannot acknowledge onto another of their own sex." (157 BI)

Amazingly, after all of these "explanations," Payne discusses the "disease of introspection" in one homosexual young man (68 BI). Psychotherapy promotes this sort of "disease." So does "inner healing," which is psychotherapy repackaged as a spiritual experience. What else could be expected to result?

Psychological Explanations: Female Homosexuality. As noted earlier, Payne views female homosexuality as often, although not always, the result of a woman's need for a mother's arms, the failure to be in a loving, trusting relationship with mother during the early years of life (29 BI). The "healing" that occurred with one young woman included a visualization of her being held by her aunt, a woman she loved and trusted as a child (28 BI). Later in the book, Payne describes two lesbian women who supposedly fell into that sin because of overly domineering mothers (102-103 BI):

"The psychological healing needed was that of *separation of their identities from that of their mothers*, along with prayer for a full inner freedom from the bondages the maternal possessiveness and domination had wrought in them." (103-104 BI)

In such cases:

"The prayer is much like one of exorcism, only it is for deliverance from the domination of the mother and her inroads into the very spirit and soul of the daughter." (104 BI)

Also, Payne deals with "false guilt" she believes exists here, "of never having been able to please her mother" (104 BI).

Psychological Explanations: Male Homosexuality. While the first chapter of *The Broken Image* involved a young woman who engaged in homosexuality, the third chapter involves a young man, Matthew. His story "of course" involved his parents. Payne notes that Matthew attempted to portray his parents in a charitable manner:

"Fidelity to one's parents, even when the parenting has been manifestly bad, is at times a barrier to sharing one's deepest hurts and rejections." (39 BI)

Matthew's father was cruel and physically abusive (40 BI). His mother was "ruthlessly ground down" and Matthew was alienated from her (41 BI). Payne further explains that a male homosexual like Matthew may experience an "identity crisis" as the result of an overly protective mother, such that he is "unable to separate his sexual identity from hers" (43 BI). She explains his deviant sexuality in terms of his having lost some masculine aspects of himself:

"He was looking at the other young man and loving a lost part of himself, a part that he could not recognize and accept." (47 BI)

Matthew, allegedly, was "painfully estranged from parts of himself" (47 BI). Later, Payne draws an analogy between cannibals and homosexuals, who both allegedly attempt to secure the good traits seen in others (67 BI). She claims that the

traits Matthew admired in the other man were his own outstanding traits that he was unable to accept in himself (46 BI). Payne also believes that Matthew held "deeply repressed anger" in addition to his "suppressed masculinity" (52 BI). This anger "increasingly made itself known to his conscious mind" (52 BI).

Psychological explanations swallow up any real concept of sin in this analysis. Payne sees "certain root problems" and "basic psychological needs" common to many homosexuals (66 BI). She views the failure to love *self* as common to homosexuals (57 BI). Homosexuality is something she views as rooted in immaturity and "arrested growth" (57 BI).

Sin and forgiveness. Matthew, because of his homosexual longings, "could only think of himself as the basest of sinners" (46 BI). *This is exactly how the Scripture views us* (Romans 3:10-18), and we have the glorious solution in the cross of Christ. In spite of her lip service to the reality of sin, Payne leads homosexuals on a psychological detour where self-love, self-acceptance, identity, affirmation, and other such erroneous solutions abound. She sometimes replaces *God's* forgiveness with *self*-forgiveness:

"Besides forgiving himself, he [a homosexual man] had to be patient and gentle toward the self that had erred, and reject only the sinful behavior." (70 BI)

When receiving forgiveness is mentioned, it is nevertheless phrased in psychological terms that obscure the biblical reality. For example, Payne claims that "prayer and reception of forgiveness," for Judy (a homosexual), "opened the way for her psychological healing" (126 CM).

Where the need to forgive others is discussed, the entire concept is warped. Payne discusses the homosexual raping of a child as a traumatic event that can lead to homosexuality later in life (76ff BI).

"The primary need, of course, is for healing of the traumatic memory itself. In this prayer, the victim forgives the one who has so monstrously sinned against him." (77 BI)

Note that this "healing prayer" does not include any *communication* of forgiveness to the person who has sinned. It

is an exercise designed solely to "heal" the memory and the victim, rather than to restore the offender. This unbiblical exercise also includes prayer for release from demonic oppression, "i.e., casting out any oppressing spirit of sexual lust" (78 BI). The Bible never speaks of any "spirit of sexual lust," but speaks of such matters in terms of the lusts of sinful human hearts.

Demonic oppression. Payne suggests that the homosexual must "objectify" a troublesome mental image, such as a lustful thought, in order "read its psychological implications" and to "take authority" over it (67 BI). Acting out of homosexual fantasies allegedly leads the person (*even a Christian*) to come under severe demonic oppression (67 BI). Payne's methods are highly questionable when she uses "Holy Water (water blessed and prayed over by a priest and set apart for this purpose)" in connection with prayers to *command* the powers of darkness to release a troubled person (68 BI).² Along with "Holy Water," Payne anoints the head of a person she's about to pray for, making the sign of the cross (68 BI). This sort of ritual borders on a man-made sacrament. (It differs significantly from the medicinal anointing with oil, in James 5, by the *elders* of the church.)

Worship of the creation. Payne comes far closer to biblical truth when she acknowledges the truth found in Romans 1 about homosexuality. Man has exchanged the worship of the Creator for the worship of created things:

"Thus, from worshipping God as Creator, man worships himself, the creature. Homosexual behavior is merely one of the twisted paths this basic fallen condition in man takes." (139 BI)

"The healing of man--and his loneliness--has to do with acknowledging himself to be a creature, *created*, and in looking up and away from himself, from self-worship to the worship of Elohim, Creator of all that is: time, space, mass, myself." (139BI)

It is most unfortunate that this otherwise biblical observation is tainted with the modern psychological concern with identity:

² Such a practice would be wholly unacceptable to Protestants. Although the book isn't specific, it appears that Payne is Episcopalian.

"We are all fallen, and until we **find ourselves** in Him, we thrust about for identity in the creature, the created." (139 BI, emphasis added)

"In worshiping the creature, we lose our identity." (140 BI)

What makes this type of book so very dangerous is its mixture of truth and error.

The Person and Work of Christ

Payne's books acknowledge the deity of Christ and His work on the cross, but serious errors creep into her analysis and application.

The atonement. Payne believes that the reason for Christ's atonement is to take away *pain* from unmet needs:

"He who is love *became*, as the sacrificial Lamb of God, the terrible sin of unlove that left us so **injured**. In prayer, we see Him on the cross, and we take our place in His crucified body." (125 BI, emphasis added)

The entire atonement is turned upside down by such analysis. Christ took upon Himself *our sins*. We are *guilty*, not *injured*. Christ was the sacrifice for our sins, making propitiation and appeasing the holy wrath of God against that sin (1 John 2:2, 4:10; Romans 3:25; Hebrews 2:17, 9:5). The gravity of sin is obscured by Payne's emphasis on injury instead of guilt.

Union with Christ. Our union with Christ, in His death, burial, and resurrection (Romans 6:1-14) is an important biblical concept. Our sins are imputed to Him, and His righteousness imputed to us (Romans 5:12-21). The power to live a new life is rooted in this mysterious union.

Payne's view of this concept is outside the scope of biblical revelation. She confuses the incarnation and our union with Christ, among other errors. Union with Christ is described in terms of a "higher" self:

"The true or the higher self in each one of us is the essential self in union with God." (83 CM)

This "self," Payne alleges, "has always been understood to be feminine" (83 CM). In addition, she claims that union with Christ concerns a reconciliation of "parts" *within* the self:

"As we will to be in Christ, he gathers together the scattered, unaffirmed parts of ourselves from which we are estranged." (93 CM)

Payne also speaks of a "higher" will:

"We are already in the higher Will; He is in us.... The will, the power to obey, the power to know the truth and do it, speak it, be it, is all in Christ, in our God." (93 CM)

In her work with a homosexual young man, Payne led him (Richard) through an exercise where he visualized each body part as being "made one with Christ," so that instead of perceiving Christ as *outside* himself, he "saw our Lord walk *inside and become one with himself*" (41 CM). Payne explains that "this experience illustrates what is meant by incarnational reality, the central and unique truth of Christianity" (41 CM). She describes this "unique truth" of our faith in terms of such "incarnational reality":

"All that is real is incarnational. The eternal Masculine and the Divine Will may *descend* into us and radiate through us, fulfilling and completing our own 'natural' faculties. Just as Another's righteousness is ours, so Another's will is ours." (93 CM)

Richard's "union with Christ" appears to be primarily an *experience*, a *feeling*, rather than the historical reality of the cross:

"His [Richard's] conscious and unconscious minds needed to get a firm grasp on this reality and to form a new image of himself in full union with Christ." (41 CM)

Payne hoped that Richard could "affirm" his masculinity through this experience:

"As all this was taking place, I prayed that in his union with Christ, Richard would increasingly partake of Jesus'

masculinity and would continue to acknowledge, accept, and be affirmed in his own." (41 CM)

Our union with Christ, according to Payne, requires "permission" from the individual believer:

"The Christ within needs full freedom (i.e., our full permission) to live His life through us." (41 CM)

This, Payne asserts, occurs through the baptism in the Holy Spirit (41 CM).

The believer, *by definition*, has the Spirit of Christ dwelling within (Romans 8:9). There is no second "baptism in the Holy Spirit" required for this indwelling, nor does Christ require "permission" from us for *anything*.

The phrase "in Christ" occurs many times in the New Testament. We were chosen *in Christ* before the foundation of the earth (Ephesians 1:4). We were called *in Christ* (2 Timothy 1:9; 1 Corinthians 1:9). We were *in Christ* in His death and resurrection; His objective once-for-all work has efficacious power in our lives (Romans 6:1-7:6; Ephesians 2:4-6; Colossians 2:11-13, 2:20, 3:1-4; Galatians 2:19-20; 1 Peter 4:1-2; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15). Only when salvation is effectively applied to us, through the powerful work of the Spirit, do we partake of the benefits of being united with Christ. We were regenerated *in Christ* (Ephesians 2:10, where Paul uses the phrase "new creation...created in Christ Jesus"). Believers are justified *in Christ* (Romans 8:1; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 2:17; Ephesians 1:6-7). We persevere in our faith *in Christ* (Romans 6:4; John 15; 1 Corinthians 1:4-9, 6:15-17). Death does not separate us from Christ; we die *in Christ* (1 Thessalonians 4:14-16; Revelation 14:13). Finally, we are glorified *in Christ* (Romans 8:17, 28-29; 1 Corinthians 15:22). In a mysterious way, we are united with our personal, living, resurrected Lord. This glorious reality does not require "visualization" or a particular feeling. This vital, life-giving union occurs through the instrument of faith, and nothing--including "repressed memories" from the past--can separate us from the love of God in Jesus Christ (Romans 8:35-39).

At the same time, the *incarnation* is not something that occurs here and now, nor is it "all that is real." The term incarnation refers to what happened when the eternal Son of God

took on human flesh and came to earth. Christ does not "become one" with self such that the Creator-creature distinction is blurred. His righteousness is imputed to the believer, who He lives in through His Spirit, enabling the person to live a new life. Payne's view of "incarnational reality" and of our union with Christ is one that finds no scriptural support and merely confuses the biblical reality.

Conclusion

In her attempts to address the problems of modern man, Payne rests her underlying theories and methods on a subjective "revelation" that goes beyond the bounds of Scripture. This flawed foundation results in a variety of errors as she combines Christian terminology with the tainted speculations of ungodly men such as Freud and Jung. In doing so, an unbiblical view of sin emerges, such that man is estranged from himself rather than separated from God. Instead of forgiveness for sin, Payne advocates a "healing of memories." Man is primarily a victim rather than a sinner in this scenario.

Payne addresses and emphasizes the important contemporary problem of homosexuality in her writings. She acknowledges the biblical reality of sin and refuses to view it as a legitimate alternative lifestyle. This is initially refreshing in a day when homosexuals aggressively pursue their "rights" to be recognized and morally tolerated. However, when she roots homosexuality in psychological deficiencies such as "gender imbalance," Payne obscures both the essential problem of sin and the glorious solution of the gospel. Christ's atonement is seen more as taking on man's pain and injury rather than satisfying divine justice by suffering the penalty for sin. Great caution and discernment is needed in reviewing Payne's writings.

© **1999, Christian Discernment Publications Ministry, Inc.**
www.christiandiscernment.com