



The Good News

June 25th, 2017

Volume 17, Issue 26

Spanking and the Nanny State

By Jerry Fite (first published 6/19/16; used with permission)

Fathers are commanded by the Lord to bring up their children in the “*chastening and admonition of the Lord*”(Ephesians 6:4). The word “chastening” focuses the head of the family on the “*training*” or “*discipline*” of his children. This discipline complements the verbal warnings of “*admonition*” to the mind, but is distinguished from such reproof.

Complimenting good behavior, and offering a firm “no” for bad behavior, the father helps his children know the boundaries of approved conduct. But when the lines are crossed, despite the clear “no’s” and warnings of verbal “reproofs”, the father’s training in the Lord comes in yet a new and different form. The “*Foolishness*” of a child is to be driven away by “*the rod of correction*” (Proverbs 22:15).

When the rod of correction is applied by the father, he does so, manifesting love, hope, and deliverance. **Love:** “*He that spareth his rod hateth his sons; but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes*” (Proverbs 13:24). **Hope:** “*Chasten thy son, seeing there is hope; and set not thy heart on his destruction*” (Proverbs 19:18). **Deliverance:** “*Withhold not correction from the child; for if thou beat him with the rod, he will not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from sheol*” (Proverbs 23:13-14).

Honoring the authority of Scripture, why would the timely re-strained swat to the bottom of a disobedient child be condemned? Yet in Norway, it is illegal to spank a child.

Recently, Marius and Ruth Bodnariu had their five children abruptly taken away from them by Barnevernet, the Norwegian child protective agency. They determined from a principal’s interview that the Bodnariu’s two young school age daughters were victims of abuse in the home due to their Christian

faith, and acknowledging spanking in the home. So, when the two girls came to school, Barnevernet took them away and placed them in foster care. Ruth was instructed later to bring her two young boys and an infant son in for a further interrogating interview. For the next four months, the parents were only allowed short visits, with-out any indication of when, or even if, they would have their children returned to them.

Secular humanists with governmental power have determined corporal punishment in the home is abuse, and manifests the lack of parental skills. Therefore, the “nanny state” must step in to protect.

Scans and X-rays revealed no evidence of abuse. But the children were still not allowed to return to their parents. From the incessant questionings regarding faith and religious practice, the nanny state seemed determined to protect the children from parents raising their children according to the Scriptures. It is impossible in the thinking of secular humanists for a parent to love their children and spank them. When the children said they were not afraid to go home, this was code to Barnevernet that they were victims of indoctrination and needed saving.

All the children have recently been returned to Marius and Ruth. Barnevernet dropped their case. Was it because they have changed their mind regarding the Scriptures? No. Over 60,000 signatures from all over the world, 100 international lawyers and the publicity of unfair treatment all combined to move the nanny state to drop the charges. The overreach of the nanny state in this case reveals the underbelly of the secularists’ distrust for the revealed Truth of God. When and where will the nanny state reach again?