

3/30/05

Hello Carol. Thanks for writing. Your questions are good. Let me respond best as I can.

First, my heart hurts over this situation. I wish as do so many others that I had the power to go in myself and change this situation and “make it right” (however I might see that.) But I do not have that power. So I must turn to the Lord. And that is what I have done in coming to the position I have. That said, let me now respond to you:

There are many “what ifs” that can be asked about this situation. Some of them would change the validity of what I have said. Others would not. In your case, you are asking whether Michael Schiavo’s status as a believer or his motives for wanting to pull the tube affect his right to do so under divine order.

The divine order was established regarding the family from creation and is not affected by whether one believes in Christ. The divine order in Gen. 2 was established for all mankind and has never been revoked. It is the foundation stone for all society and government. Because of this, it must be honored as the first line of government in this situation.

Within that government, Michael Schiavo is accountable to God for the motives in his decisions regarding Terri’s body—just as anyone in any government is accountable to God for how he stewards his authority (regardless of faith in Christ). We should remember that Michael had to approve keeping Terri alive by a feeding tube. He did not have to do so. He could have said, “No. Let her go in peace. I do not want to try to artificially keep her alive.” And no one would have batted an eye. The same authority he had for approving the tube is the authority he has for removing it now.

What this means is, if we try to use Michael’s motives to challenge his right to remove the tube, then we would have to use his motives to challenge his right for having inserted it in the beginning. What if his first motives for inserting it had been selfish? Should someone then have challenged his right to have inserted it? This is the problem with trying to use the issue of motives to justify taking away a legal right of authority granted by God in a situation on the basis of motive.

To properly deal with the issue of motives, we have to appeal to the court of the heart through intercession. That is where the church’s true and rightful power is in this situation. As believers, we do have authority in the spirit for putting Michael’s motives to the test. But our only rightful court for doing so is the court of heaven.

Let’s suppose Michael’s motives are wrong. They may well be and some evidence suggests that they are. What if we, as a nationwide praying church, had instead been turning all our energy spent on protesting and human government appeals into *intercession for Michael* for proving his motives before the court of heaven? I really believe that this situation would have been resolved already. I believe Michael would have been convicted to keep Terry alive, (assuming his motives for not preserving her are wrong). I even believe it would have been possible to effect Terri’s actual resurrection from brain death!

But what does the church do? It repeatedly makes its judgments based on information from the media rather than revelation of the Spirit, and then appeals to the power of human government rather than the power of the Spirit for enforcing the will of God in the earth. (That is the underlying complaint in what I wrote.)

You asked about whether Michael’s having a mistress changes his right to authority under God regarding Terri. I thought about that carefully. This case is unique in the setting of a society which does not allow for multiple wives. By the standard of our society, which reflects the perfect will of God from creation, Michael must be considered either an adulterer or a bigamist. Assuming there

is no grace in this situation such that Michael must be considered an adulterer, does that remove his God-given authority for Terri's body?

While adultery is grounds for killing a marriage, adultery of itself doesn't automatically annul a marriage in God's sight nor therefore the authority attached to it. If it did, there would be no possibility for forgiveness and restoration of a violated marriage. All violated marriages would have to be declared annulled and wives and husbands forced to divorce or else to have to remarry each other.

But the Lord teaches no such thing. The Lord does teach that the violated partner has the *discretionary power* to sue for divorce based on adultery and so be released from the creational authority. So, if Terri wants to sue for divorce, she can. But since she can't communicate any wish, we are again left to *Michael* to determine what Terri would want or allow for in the situation! No one else has creational authority to determine this. Again, the focus of authority and so of prayer *comes back to Michael*.

There is another "what if" you did not raise, but I will address it here because others have. "What if the entire reason for Terri's situation is that Michael mistreated her and did something to try to kill her?" There are all kinds of charges to this effect flying about the counter-culture media, quoting evidences from hidden court testimony, etc.

If these things are true, then they obviously change the validity of what I said. A higher governmental authority in the society has the right to intervene to protect the life of the innocent. Let me just say two things to this:

First, if these allegations are all true, then why is it that after 15 years the parents haven't raised these charges in a court of law nor made them the basis for their appeal for Terri's life? Why has no one dug into the evidence to bring about a legal complaint against Michael Schiavo for wife battering or attempted murder? That is my immediate first question.

Second, if these allegations are true but have been successfully concealed, then they need to come to light and be proven before one can justify challenging the divine order of Genesis 2. What this means is, the church's role is to intercede and call on the court of heaven to bring these issues to unmistakable exposure so that the higher authority in society may bring forth justice for Terri and prosecute Michael Schiavo.

But my point is this: The church is charged to operate based on *revelation*, not on unproven information and counter-information. And then the church is charged to bring *intercession* to bear for the establishing of justice, not appealing to human government in the flesh to bring about justice based on counter hearsay.

Let me be equally clear. If what is happening to Terri is indeed due to a secret work of darkness perpetrated by Michael Schiavo, then Schiavo has surrendered his creational authority for Terri's body to the higher authority of society. He has no more authority. By all means, I want it exposed. But it takes much more than unproven allegation to give the church a true basis for raising its voice in this situation. And short of revelation and proven allegation, we have to stand as defenders of the creational order established by God.

Carol, It ultimately all comes back to how are we to truly function regarding the society. I believe that if our people had truly brought this properly through intercession before the court of heaven, we could have affected Michael's heart, saved Terri's life, and, where necessary, have produced the exposure of wrong doing for all to see.

It's clear to me that, whatever this situation is about for the nation, it is a test for the church—how the church responds to what happens in society. And I believe that we have once again failed the test.

I hope this helps. Sorry to have gone so long. But your questions deserved a thorough answer.

Sincerely,

Chris Anderson