The Real Michael Farris – His Faith and Friends

Recently I wrote an article called “ConCon – Throwing the Baby Out With the Bath Water” – Bath Water referencing the ConCon. In that article I named along with other supporters of the Convention of States or ConCon Michael Farris, the Chancellor of the Patrick Henry College and the founder of the Home School Legal Defense Fund (HSLDA).

Nearly 30 years ago upon watching Tim LaHaye’s television show and hearing Raymond Moore as a guest talk about the merits of home schooling, Farris immediately consulted his wife and they agreed to pull their oldest daughter out of school and home school her.

It was that very event that changed the course of Farris’ life and gave him a new life’s work in American culture and politics – so he says! The media spotlight has been on Farris again as he tried to get his **Parental Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution through Congress.**

Farris proposed the amendment, the aim of which is to preserve parents' rights to educate and raise their children, especially in light of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, (UNCRC) an international treaty critics claim will usurp authority from parents and place it in the hands of government. Among other things, the treaty bans traditional disciplinary methods such as spanking.

This writer totally agrees with the “stated” problems surrounding the UNCRC, but not some of the explanations Farris has given along the way. Claiming to be an expert in U.S. constitutional and international law, I have to question some of his remarks regarding where “parental rights come from – God or the Government!

Michael Farris has created a very profitable eisegesis – [personal interpretation of a text (especially of the Bible) using your own ideas] - the practice of forcing pre-conceivable bias (in Farris case also profitable) onto one’s use of the Word of God.

In a letter dated Dec. 12, 1997, to an unnamed home-school mother, Michael Farris established his belief as to why the **government** has the Biblical right to punish a parent who doesn’t teach their child to read. It reveals his fundamental Biblical error, which, when believed by tens of thousands of home-school families helps provide the fuel to his profitable enterprises.

He writes,

*“I believe that God commands parents to teach their children. Deut. 6:7; Eph. 6:4. God does not command or authorize the government to teach children. God does not command or authorize the church to teach children (although Scripture does command the church to teach young men and women). I do not feel that I can interpret this scriptural pattern for others. But for me and my house, I believe that the Bible requires my wife and I to teach our children ourselves. (When they are young men and women we believe the church can play a substantial role and this is why our oldest daughter attends a Christian college).*

*(His verse quote as “I (Farris) believe that God commands parents to teach their children” is correct, however the whole chapter of Deuteronomy 6 is talking about “****Now these are the commandments, the statutes and the judgments which the Lord your God commanded to teach you”.*** *. . it certainly doesn’t refer to “school”. In Ephesians 6:4 it reads,* ***“Fathers, do not exasperate your children; instead bring them up in the training and instruction of the Lord”*** *referring to the Father’s not to create resentment in their children – they are to train them to learn right from wrong in everyday life in the context of a loving, caring, forgiving relationships.) Again where does this refer to school?*

*“I (Farris) also believe that God commands the government to punish those who do evil. I Peter 2:14. I (Farris) believe that this includes the power of government to punish parents who do evil to their children. If a parent rapes a child, beats a child with chains, intentionally breaks a child's arm, or intentionally starves a child the government has the responsibility to punish such evil doing. Likewise, if a parent denies their child food, clothing, basic shelter, or education I believe the government can punish such a parent because God requires the parent to furnish all these things to their child.*

*Again, this is what happens when you use biblical verses to further your own means without being completely honest. In 1 Peter 2:13-17 the reference in whole is to fear God not man. Peter himself modeled one exception to this principle when the authorities told him not to speak about Jesus (Acts 5:29) and (Acts 4: 19-20) that we should submit not to human authorities but to God’s Word and Spirit.) (Of course, loving parents don’t want these things done to any child, but using biblical verse out of context to me – is just as wrong).*

*“Stated simply, if a parent has a child who has the basic intelligence to be capable of reading the Bible, and that parent deliberately fails to teach that child to read (by the time the child is twelve years old, for example) the government has the authority to punish such a parent because the parent has done an evil thing as defined by God. "But if anyone provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." I Timothy 5:8. (FARRIS)*

**(Anyone** who does not provide for their relatives, and especially for their own household, has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever. “His own” is the main words in this verse, but again if you begin at the beginning Paul is talking about “if there is an elderly man in the village everyone should treat him as a father (take care of) and if there is a widow and she has children or grandchildren they should take care of her before expecting the church or anyone else to do it.” As I read this, it is talking about our showing love to the world as God shows his love to us.

WHERE IN THE WORLD DOES FARRIS GET THE IDEA THESE BIBLE VERSUS’ ARE GIVING THE GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY TO DO ANYTHING TO ANYONE? Doing evil, saying evil are all evil in the eyes of God, but that does not necessarily mean the civil authorities should become involved.

Reading further in 1 Timothy 5 through verse 16 shows this chapter addressing both the 5th and 8th commandments – honoring your father and mother and not stealing from the church. The whole chapter is mostly about the elderly addressing the difference between the Godly and ungodly. It clearly states the Godly widow who has no family are to be cared for by the church, but the family of Godly widows who have the means to provide but do not forcing the church to care for them are stealing from the church.

Even Paul does not call on the government to punish the Christians who are burdening the church, but rather speaks of their spiritual state in verse 8 . . .for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

What is Farris’ purpose in going so far off from the true biblical intention? Fear? Guilt? Manipulation? Is this a direct attempt to bring Home Schooling parents back to the 19th century democratic experiment of civil religion also referred to as ‘government education’.

The original premise of such laws was to insure the student learn how to read, by being in school. America’s mass illiteracy should well demonstrate that this notion was false. When the Lord speaks about teaching he is referring to teaching by parents - - no mention of schools!

Does Michael Farris have another motive? Did he start off sound, but in time recognize the religious right's magical fund-raising formula - that of mixing a little bit of fear and a whole lot of Federal government "solutions" will yield a massive pile of cash?

Does he have a messianic complex with the Republican Party? Where does Farris promote local homeschool authority, local home-school organizations, local homeschool legal defense, strengthening local political authority - especially when prior to the 14th Amendment, America knew that all family law matters belonged at the county and state level, but no higher. And certainly, not with Constitutional Amendments!

Why does Farris promote increasing federal involvement with homeschooling when the 10th Amendment movement, spreading across America, reflects what's going on around the world? Centralized governments and their economies (I.e. Euro) are breaking apart. In a word - decentralization!

He should be behind Nullification rather than giving more power to the Federal government!

Herein lies the danger of so many of the New Age “so called preachers” as with the likes of Joel Osteen and Rick Warren who take the Bible out of context in preaching their “prosperity” theology!

Michael Farris and the Common Core Standards (CCS) – Farris states he had a phone conversation regarding the CCS with David Coleman and basically agreed to disagree. Farris states they each gave their reason for and against it but that they both did not like the “data mining” part. Supposedly, Coleman said he didn’t like the database all that well. It was not originally part of the Common Core, but other people have seized the opportunity to make a centralized data collection effort through the implementation of the Common Core.

So Mr. Farris, if you are against the CCS, why aren't you stating it isn’t appropriate to force everyone in the country to follow it. If his main problem is with the Common Core and all forms of centralized educational planning, then why does he have all these Math curriculums listed on his web site for parents to choose from?

[Saxon Math is Common Core Aligned](http://truthinamericaneducation.com/common-core-state-standards/homeschoolers-beware-saxon-math-aligns-to-common-core/) - From Houghton Mifflin Harcourt - Saxon Math makes it easy for you to empower all of your students to Master the Common Core State Standards and excel on the Common Core Assessments. Saxon math is one of the most popular among homeschoolers. It uses "incremental approach"

[Singapore Math](https://www.singaporemath.com/) - Singapore appears frequently in the research used to arrive at the Common Core States Standards in Mathematics. It is therefore not surprising that our Singapore Math® programs are well-aligned with those standards.

Geometry Seeing Doing Understanding by Harold Jacobs, Teaching Geometry According to the Common Core ...

[Math-U-See](http://truthinamericaneducation.com/common-core-state-standards/math-u-see-touts-common-core-alignment/) - We welcome the emphasis in the Common Core State Standards Initiative on conceptual understanding. The goal of the Common Core State Standards for elementary mathematics is to “provide students with a solid foundation in whole numbers, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions and decimals.”

[Right Start Math](http://rightstartmath.com/home-school/first-or-second-edition) - The revised lessons and worksheets incorporate a slightly different and easier-to-follow format. It also incorporates the Common Core State Standards as a basic minimum and almost always exceeds these benchmarks.

Instead, why aren't you pointing your Home School families to Home School programs like "Freedom Project Academy, Seton or the Robinson curriculum?

Just so you remember Tim LaHaye is the American evangelical minister best known for his writing of the *“Left Behind”* series along with Jerry Jenkins. He is also the man who made the statement during one of his visits to Reverend Sun Myung Moon "The moment he took Reverend Moon's hands, Dr. LaHaye was overcome with tears and couldn't even speak.

When he finally could speak, he said, "Reverend Moon, please forgive the American government. America has committed a great sin against you. I really want to apologize to you on behalf of the government and the American people. Please forgive America. Not all American people are like that." Then he wept again. LaHaye also gave almost all the money he made from the sale of his books and CD’s for the “Left Behind” series to Moon and his ministry.

Chuck Missler, Jerry Falwell, Rick Warren, Joel Osteen, Benny Hinn, Rick Joyner, Calvery Chapel along with LaHaye and others are all part the ECUMENICAL Council for National Policy (CNP) of so called ministers whose church teaching includes not submitting to the Word of God, but taking the word out of context and using it to give a new meaning to the “worldly things”. They are supposedly the organization which plans the strategy of the Religious Right and Conservative’s in the United States.

The Council for National Policy was formed ostensibly to be the conservative alternative to the Council on Foreign Relations. Jesse Helms put together the political machine that was unprecedented for the ultra-right. Tom Ellis -- who directed the agency which funded racial science for the purpose of eliminating inferior races was president of the CNP after Tim LaHaye.

Tom Ellis was former director of the Pioneer Fund, a foundation which finances efforts to prove that African-Americans are genetically inferior to whites. Recipients of Pioneer grants have included William Shockley, Arthur Jensen and Roger Pearson, who has written that 'inferior races' should be 'exterminated.' All three and others were funded during Ellis' directorship on the Pioneer board. Yet Ellis served on the CNP's thirteen-member executive committee with Holly Coors (who was married to Joseph Coors, the president of Coors Brewing Company.), along with Paul Weyrich and Heritage Foundation president, Edwin Feulner. Oliver North and Reed Larson also joined the executive committee. Oh what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive!

What does all this have to do with Michael Farris and the Home School movement? To show that once again, something that was started with good intentions becomes cloaked within a totally different agenda.

There were 3 initial sources behind the start of the modern day Home Schooling.

* John Hoyt who came up with the phrase “un-schooling” which meant removing the structured methods used in public schools
* Raymond Moore is the one credited with the start of home schooling but his approach was from his religious beliefs – he was a missionary.
* Ayn Rand helped in the movement with her belief that every child should have the chance to develop their mind to their potential and emphasis on the individual freedom of each person.

This writer happens to agree with Ayn Rand. It wasn’t until the federal government got into the education game that things went from good to bad to worse. The problem begins when those on the Ecumenical side of religion take the words from the bible and translate them for their own use.

Francis Schaeffer was a Evangelical Christian theologian, philosopher, political activist and Presbyterian pastor. He is most famous for his writings and his establishment of the L'Abri community in Switzerland and he was opposed to theological modernism (Liberal Christianity).

“Pre-suppositional Apologetics, basing his “philosophy beliefs on his interpretation of 1 Peter 3:15 stating "But sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts, always being ready to make a defense to everyone who asks you to give an account for the hope that is in you, yet with gentleness and reverence".

As the word “Apologetics” implies it is the branch of Christianity that deals with the defense and establishment of the Christian faith. Do you feel like you have to **defend** your faith? What the KJV bible actually says is: "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear".

The difference – “their” version presents an argument which will never convince anyone to love God. God doesn’t intend for us to **DEFEND** our faith but to give the **REASONS** we carry him in our hearts.

This is part of the beginning of the Ecumenical definition of Christianity along with the twisting of the words and meaning of the bible. Evangelicals have more of a focus on conversion and spreading the gospel to everyone. They don't, as a rule, believe that the Bible is literally true.

Fundamentalists in my experience are actually less focused on conversion (with some major exceptions like Jehovah's Witnesses) and more on defending the complete literal truth of the Bible, to the detriment of every other aspect of their religious life. They are more likely to pass judgment on and argue with a non-fundamentalist stranger than try to convert them. They are generally unpleasant to be around.

What I Included in my blog “ConCon – Throwing the Baby Out With the Bath Water” - Michael Farris – He is referred to as a Constitutional Attorney although this writer has found following KrisAnne Hall to be a more truthful understanding when it comes to constitutional law. Farris is the Executive Director of ParentalRights.org; founder of the Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) and Patrick Henry College. Home Schooler’s parents all over the country look to Farris almost as their protector and savior from the big bad wolves and I see him as one. His total distortion in regards to the Parental Rights Act (PRA) is leading all parents down a path of parental rights destruction.

The Declaration of Independence tells us our Rights come from God not the government; they are unalienable. The very purpose of the government is to SECURE the rights God gave to us and when the government seeks to take away our rights it is time to throw them out with the “bath water”. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights enumerates 30 + rights and states they come from “man” (constitution or laws). Not God but Man! Wrong!

Now to take a look at Michael Farris web site parentalrights.org and see what he says about our Rights. If you take the time to go to the web site you will see that once again it is being stated parental rights are coming from the Constitution and not God - that they are fundamental rights not unalienable rights. So now from what I read on the PR website they state:

Today the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) is approaching a possible ratification by the United States Senate. This treaty, as harmless as it may appear, is capable of attacking the very core of the child-parent relationship, removing parents from their central role in the growth and development of a child, and replacing them with the long arm of government supervision within the home.

I will take Mr. Farris’ own words and turn them back on him. Yes the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child is a very dangerous document and must never be agreed to by the United States; however, Mr. Farris uses that as an example to his followers as the very reason to support his PRA when they are no different. Both state parental rights are coming from the government not GOD. I wonder if some of the very religious Home School families realize this.

Now Mr. Farris, for unclear reasons, has decided we should put our entire Constitution on the line in aiding those who wish to firm up our country as a Democracy or even worse Tyranny by government.

From Publius Hildah Parental rights: God-given and Unalienable? Or Government-granted and Revocable? 7/2-/13) Farris uses Supreme Court Justice Scalia’s Dissent in Troxel v. Granville (2000) using this to support his own theory that unless a right is enumerated in the federal Constitution, judges can't enforce it, and the right can't be protected. Scalia’s stated in part: parental rights are “unalienable and come from God and are from the 9th Amendment; the Declaration of Independence does NOT delegate power to the federal courts – only the federal constitution; It is for State Legislators and candidates for that office to argue that the State has no power to interfere with parents' God-given authority over the rearing of their children, and to act accordingly. [The People need to elect State Legislators who understand that the State may not properly infringe God given parental rights]; the federal Constitution does not authorize judges to come up with their own lists of what "rights" people have; and the federal Constitution does not mention "parental rights" so the federal courts have no “judicial power” over these types of cases.

In his closing, Scalia warned against turning family law over to the federal government:

"…If we embrace this un-enumerated right ... we will be ushering in a new regime of judicially prescribed, and federally prescribed, family law. I have no reason to believe that federal judges will be better at this than state legislatures; and state legislatures have the great advantages of doing harm in a more circumscribed area, of being able to correct their mistakes in a flash, and of being removable by the people."

Parental Rights are a state issue so again, maybe Mr. Farris should go back to law school. When he says: "4. The Parental Rights Amendment does not give the Judiciary legislative power but constrains the judiciary's exercise of its existing power” his words are false. The PRA expressly delegates power to the federal and state governments to infringe on God-given parental rights.

Do you want this man being in charge of any part of a ConCon or your children’s education?

Few Americans know about General Francisco Franco and his fascist regime in Spain. Even fewer know that its ideology came from the Falange, a political-ideological organization of well-meaning conservative lawyers and professors in Spain who wanted a conservative corporate state along the lines of Mussolini’s Italy – but still committed to the Catholic Church and the Christian faith – to fight socialism, communism, and the decay of morals.

At the end, when Franco died, his regime was so universally hated, that what he claimed to protect – good morals and the church – went into such steep decline, that church membership and attendance dropped by 90% within several years, and social morality crashed completely. (Spain today has the highest rate of drug addiction in all Europe, and immorality is rampant.) And what he claimed to oppose – socialism and communism – took over Spain without a fight. The result of Franco’s fascism was that Spain, at the end, was as close to socialism and immorality and as far away from righteousness and justice as she’s never been before, since the times of the Carthaginian dominance.

And the ideology for that fascism in traditional Christian, church garb was provided by a few well-meaning, conservative, pro-church and pro-traditional family academics and lawyers. Fascism in Spain was not the occult, atheistic type of fascism in Italy or Germany. It was conservative and right-wing. And it carried a cross and swore in the name of Jesus Christ.

In America we have our own well-meaning lawyers and academics who are concerned about the growth of socialism, and about the decay of morals, and want to deal with it in a centralized, tyrannical, fascist way. They have the same ideology as the Spanish Falange: A centralized corporate state imposing “accepted morality” upon the population. For good purposes of course.

Where am I going with this? These men I have mentioned here and more will eventually bring about our own American Franco who will in turn destroy the Christian roots and character this nation, using Christianity as an excuse for fascism. They will, that is, if they are not exposed and stopped. Some of these academics and lawyers are leaders of successful Christian ministries, and thus have influence in Christian circles. Unfortunately, they use their influence to spread their fascist ideologies. They must be exposed and stopped, before it’s too late.

Is our Franco Ted Cruz with his Dominionist religion and pattern of lies along with those who worship the same as he have anointed him as God’s choice as the next Messiah? Remember the Dominionists believe THEY are to govern and rule the world according to THEIR beliefs – not yours or mine – but theirs.

These American fascists in Christian garb have been alarmed recently of the comeback of the Conservative Christian faith and the new generation of Christians, and especially young homeschooled Christians.

Men and women of the cloth have long been held to a higher standard than the rest of us and I believe they should be. However, scandal has surrounded several of these “Evangelical” churches. Mostly with charges of adultery being the culprit, these ministers seem to walk away forgiven to only take another position of stature.

The theme in Christianity today seems to be unless you have a MEGA church of 2-5,000 you are not an effective man of the word. All most all of the large evangelical church ministers believe in some form of the “controlling power” status methodology.

Examples of these ministers believing “male” superiority in the family is what God wants are not what I believe God wants the male role to be. Yes he wants the male to take the lead in being master of his home, but I also believe that God wants a husband and wife to make decisions together. God also wishes the man to honor his wife not treat them as they should be “on the back of the bus”.

**Michael Farris** from his 1996 book “How A Man Prepares His Daughters For Life” states “a woman should be submissive to her husband” (page 96); defends “a very traditional view about the role of women in churches” (page 27) and later explains that he means “a doctrinal position of male-only elders” (page 55).

Bill Gothard, Christian minister, speaker, and writer, and the founder of the Institute in Basic Life Principles (IBLP) wrote in his 1979 book “*Our Most Important Messages Grow Out of Our Greatest Weaknesses”*, ‘If two Christians marry and one persists in being unfaithful, does the other one have “Scriptural grounds” to get a divorce?’ He says NO! He claimed there is no “victim” if we understand that we are called to suffer for righteousness quoting 1 Peter 2:21 and then goes on to state Christ wasn’t a victim willingly giving his life for us.

I am sorry but I do not see a comparison of a man or wife cheating on their spouse as a test of “suffering”, but as the spouse not abiding by the 7th Commandment. However I do understand according to these men the men are never wrong.

James Dobson once told an abused wife whose husband was repeatedly beating her with his fists if she should get a divorce and he responded “the path to take was to heal the husband not kill the marriage”. His solution is rather to have Laura directly agitate her husband: “I would suggest that Laura choose the most absurd demand her husband makes, and then refuse to consent to it. Let him rage if he must rage.” Dobson **hopes** this will shock the abusive husband into acknowledging “he has a **severe problem** so that he will agree to “competent Christian counseling” that can lead to “reconciliation”.

Does she tell him this while her husband is beating her? As a formerly abused wife I can tell you any man or woman who is in a state to the point of beating another human being they are supposed to care about is not even HEARING a word you are saying.

My God does not wish for any of his children to be hurt or abused – I truly believe that and Luke 17:2 expresses God take on this: *“It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.”* KJV God considers all of us his children no matter what our age is. Dobson never even suggested she call the police.

Most of the problems today and that includes our marriages’ and raising of our children would not be so difficult if we had stayed in what were actually God led churches/ But NO, we were indoctrinated in school and our parents by TV to believe the propaganda being put out by those who wish to overtake our country. A New World or One World Order is not a myth or fairy tale but actions taking place.

The main 45 planks of the Communist Manifesto laid it all out and most damaging in those plans was to remove us from our churches and their teaching, create division and conflict in the family and tear down the basic moral structure of America.

America is hurting - she is in pain. She has been abused by many to whom she has given much. In George Washington's "Farwell Address" he spoke, " have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty."