

## Chapter 8 | Blockage Removal: Ratification

Sam Soleyn

January 18, 2020

The concept of ratification is extremely important in distinguishing between the acts of others and your own acts. You can forgive the acts of others, but when you ratify a behavior, you provide, independent of the acts of others, you provide a legal basis on which for your enemy to oppress you. We typically conflate those two things, because stepping over the line to ratify a thing almost happens automatically. Meaning, if you have believed a lie about yourself for so long, since it was installed in your emotions in the womb, confirmed successively by actions prior to your ability to remember as between the womb, the time you were born, and about the age of five, it is very difficult to get your arms around what would be the truth about your existence. Then, if things continued to happen, but now you remember them, up until say your early teenage years, those things are so familiar to you that they are your default setting and you view everything in your life through those lenses. By the time you reach a certain age, this false view of yourself has been firmly installed in your mind. You do not know yourself to be anything but that false view, and you do not tend to act out of any other motivation than what is demanded by that false view. It is a horrible entrapment. So then, about the time that you are approaching adulthood, you will either do or say something that causes this lie to move from the acts of others to what you accept as being true about yourself, based upon something you either did or said.

What that looks like when you have done that is now:

- You receive the lie as if it is the truth;
- You act out of the lie as if it is the truth;
- And you tend, typically, not to go back before the time when you either did or said the things that you did or said.

So now you have handed your enemy, unwittingly, unknowingly, having been deceived along the way, systematically deceived, you now hand to your enemy the right to oppress you without any resistance from you, because *you* say, “This is who I am.”

Let me set this up for you in the Scriptures. This is from a reading in the gospel of John, chapter 5.

*After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Now there is in Jerusalem by the Sheep Gate a pool, which is called in Hebrew, Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a great multitude of sick people, blind, lame, paralyzed, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain time into the pool and stirred up the water; then whoever stepped in first, after the stirring of the water, was made well of whatever disease he had. Now a certain man was there who had an infirmity thirty-eight years. When Jesus saw him lying there, and knew that he already had been in that condition a long time, He said to him, "Do you want to be made well?" (John 5:1-6 NKJV).*

Let's pause there for a moment. That would seem like a rather silly question, would it not? Here is a man who has had an infirmity for thirty-eight years and has been lying by the pool for a good period of this time. In fact, he was lying there for a long time, whether it was for the full thirty-eight years or not, it is not clear to me anyway, from the record. But here is this sick man who has been in a condition of sickness for thirty-eight years, waiting for this troubling of the water by an angel every year. Jesus comes to him and says to him, "Do you want to be well?" That would seem like a rather odd question at best. You would expect that his answer would be, "But, of course! I have been waiting to be well!" But it is his answer that tells us why Jesus asked him the question. Listen to his answer. Just to recap, Jesus said to the man, "Do you want to be well?"

*The sick man answered Him, "Sir, I have no man to put me into the pool when the water is stirred up; but while I am coming, another steps down before me" (John 5:7).*

That was not the question. He was giving an excuse for why he was not getting into the pool ahead of everybody else. We know all kinds of people who have grown accustomed to an identity of being the sick man by the pool. Because, if you are healed, you have to go back and take up your responsibilities at home: you have to take out the trash, you have to go to work, you have to attend to your wife and your children (if you have wife and children), you have to meet with people, you have to engage life. What are we hearing in these words? We are hearing a man who has become comfortable with being the victim. Because when you are a victim, you have immunity from responsibility. When you are a victim, everything you do, whatever you do is not your fault, because there is a superseding, intervening causation that justifies everything you do. If you are

the sick man by the pool, nobody ought to expect you to go to work. You do not have to take up any responsibilities; you can just lie there. When people ratify this false view of themselves, typically, they fall into victimhood, and they begin to rely on victimhood for the things they now no longer are able to do.

I knew a man, in fact I worked with him for a period of time, who was a computer guy. He was always looking for a disability. In fact, he had surgery done on his wrists for carpal tunnel syndrome, but I can tell you that... Nothing I am saying suggests people are not injured in computer work, in particular, with what is called the carpal tunnel syndrome. This is not a comment on that. This is a comment on a man who went through the surgery in order to be established as having disability. But I can tell you before that, and years before that, he did not work. He did not work with any measure of consistency. His wife and his children supported him. For some reason, he ratified that he was a “ne’er do well” and came to the point of accepting that his was not the responsibility to provide for his wife and his children. As you might imagine, his wife despised him, because he was reduced to being not much, inasmuch as he was lying around the house most days and talking about things—talking about things that he was going to do—but never seemed to be able to get around to doing those things. His children had no respect for him. In fact, on occasions I heard his children say about him things that you would cringe that any child would say about his or her father. As a consequence, his children have gone in every direction, as you might expect for children without any boundaries or borders established by a father, and his generations have been decimated.

This man came for a time under my oversight, and on an occasion his wife told me it was the most consistently productive period of his life. He actually worked. And it was during this time that he was working, for no more than a five-year period, in which he began to complain nearly from day one that he had carpal tunnel syndrome. I do not mean to take a lot of time lining out this example. He ended up getting on disability, but then he had to stay on disability; he could not get well. But that was his goal, that was his aim.

Now, again, do not hear any reference in anything I am saying to the fact that people are legitimately injured in this manner. This guy was not, and people like that make it difficult for legitimate cases. Also, I am not in any way speaking to the issue of disability. People do suffer on-

the-job disabilities or disabilities that result from any number of conditions, and all of which are legitimate. I actually directed a legal aid program many years ago, and one of the set of cases I took on as a portion of my work was the appeals of people from having been denied social security disability. I handled many cases, successfully, on behalf of legitimately hurt people. So, this is not that. I am talking about *a* man who ratified a view of himself as “the sick man” because, in his social life, he had abandoned his wife and his children. If you go back into his family, you will find that this was a chronic pattern that stretched back at least to his father, as far as the narrative that we understood.

But in the Scripture there is the example of a man who would not answer the simple question, “Do you want to be healed?” What would you expect a man to say who had been sick for thirty-eight years and lying around a pool, presumably in the anticipation of getting to the water first, for thirty-eight years? Being approached by the Lord with the question, “Do you want to be healed?”, what would you expect the response to be? Instantaneously and without a second thought, he would have said, “But, of course, Lord! Of course! Please, heal me!” A vast difference from the man in the country of Gadara, who had the legions of demons who cried out to Jesus for mercy (cf. Mark 5:1-20; Luke 8:26-39). He [the sick man at the pool] was passive. And in the exchange, we can see that he had developed a mindset around the identity of a sick man. Therefore, he had ratified a false image of himself based, perhaps, on the convenience that victimhood accorded to him.

I have undertaken something on the order now of about two hundred cases of blockage removal. In all that time, I have only had two people who were not significantly benefited or benefited at all, so about 1%—2 of 200. In both cases, one was a woman and the other was a man.

In the case of the man, he had come to have me fix his marriage, basically. I confronted him at the beginning with the fact that there was hard work to be done once the spirit was driven off, and that hard work was the retraining of his emotions to become a useful husband. He was the cause of his wife’s distress because he was an unreliable man. As we understood the narrative of his life, from early childhood this idea of his identity had become distorted. He had no clear sense of who he was. I could give you the variations on the theme: he was molested as a small boy and his identity of being a man or a woman, whether he was homosexual or heterosexual, was confused, and he would go back and forth between them. But mostly, this brokenness was something he developed

an identity around, from his early years, and he discovered that living in a fantasy world had little or no pain to it while he was in that fantasy world. So he chose not to live in the real world, because in his mind, the real world brought back the emotions of pain to him. Except that now, he was married and had children and was frustrating his wife. I had a confrontational conversation with him around the issue of him clothing himself in victimhood and told him that the challenge would be for him to intentionally exit the fantasy world that he had created in which to avoid responsibility. When he left, although we had taken him through the complete process, when he left, I doubted that he did any more than accommodate to what my requests were for information and the like. He actually chose not to engage the process, and therefore was not set free.

The other was a woman who was very much in charge of the family, meaning, she had no intent of submitting to the order of God, although that had been an ongoing conflict between her and her husband. She found her identity in her accomplishments as a professional. It went back to the conflict she had with her mother on her importance as a child and the model of a father who simply acquiesced to the mother's aggressive leadership of the house. In her case, as well, prior to leading her through, I had that discussion with her. I would say that she derived no benefit, not even a benefit of a lasting nature. All she really wanted was to be healed of a particular infirmity, but her condition continued to be and remains the thing that it has come to be, which is one of ratifying the enemy's false identity as to who she is. But the appeal, the allure to her, was that of victimhood, like it was of the man. If you are obviously impaired, then nothing is your fault. The problem is that your condition will remain, and if it is a condition produced by sin, the sin will remain.

In ratification there comes a point in the process where one acts as if the lie is the truth. The form that this might take is some bad behavior. For women, sometimes it is that they were raped. But they would ratify this false view of themselves, even though the thing that was done to them was horrible, was wrong—criminal. If they had believed all along the lie as to who they were, when they found themselves... A common scenario is where they were at a party and got drunk and went home with somebody, without actually intending to do that. Most of the rapes, I would say, are unreported. Most of the rapes women experience are unreported, and part of the silence of it is that they have ratified a view of themselves that is false. It was never true. It was a setup from the womb. But if you believe the setup, and then something happens that triggers a transfer of that

from what other people have said to you to what you actually say about yourself, that is ratification. That is the point at which you have ratified all of the lies that have been said against you.

I had an example some time ago in which there was a woman who said to me that this man—she was visiting a certain neighborhood where friends lived, and so on—she was visiting friends and this man stalked her for four days. They both happened to be at the same party in which she had too much to drink. Listen, the fact that a person has had too much to drink never justifies a criminal assault on them. It never does. It is two separate things. She may have exercised bad judgment in being inebriated, thereby losing control of even her ability to protest, but that is never an excuse. It is never an excuse for rape. Because what happened is, some predator in her environment summed her up as being vulnerable. But in this particular case, the woman inferred that because she was drunk—she was a young woman when this happened, barely in her twenties—and the young man who raped her was yet in his teenage years. Yet, when we went through this, she was thinking that it was her fault. The trauma of this marked her, in her mind, as becoming damaged. And so, guess what; you can fill in the blanks: she began to behave in a manner that continued to ratify this false view of herself. The lie that she was damaged goods was now the basis on which she would routinely go out and pick up men and sleep with them. Needless to say, even if the woman grows up and changes that behavior, that stuff in the backcourt of their lives, that ratification, is one that confirms the lie as their identity. It is a pattern of lies leading up to the embracing of a false identity.

In the next broadcast, I will continue ratification. I will focus on statements that people make, and I will go down a different train of thought that has to do with how people make statements to protect themselves against the misuse of authority, especially if that authority is the authority of their husbands or their fathers—early on, the authority of their fathers. Ratification occurs when a lie has been acted upon by a person to confirm a false identity that may have existed from the womb—that may have been implanted to them by events that began to take place while they were in the womb. That ratification, the way it looks is like the man at the pool who says, “I am the sick man at the pool. That is my identity. I am a victim, and I cannot be healed.” One of the things, believe it or not, that I have heard people say is, “I am a hard case. I cannot be healed.” That is to limit the work of God. We will talk about the authority of the Lord to relieve us from every scheme of the enemy. But no, ratification, though it may give the enemy a new basis for attacking you,

that basis being your agreement with a lie, it still is a lie. The foundation was a lie, the agreement with it was a lie, and when you appeal to God to deliver you from a lie, He will grant relief immediately.

We will continue with ratification.