

Parenting Tip

Parents should be parents, not pals

By John Rosemond

These days it seems that the more things change in parenting, the more they keep right on changing. For example:

Today's parents are trying to have wonderful relationships with their children. Our foremothers and forefathers were not doing that, realizing that a child required leadership first. And that while the parent/child relationship should by no means be "bad," a parent could not provide proper leadership if the parent's energies were focused primarily on having a "wonderful" relationship with the child. Some things just had to wait.

Moms of today

Today's moms orbit around their children, dedicated to trying to make them happy. Yesterday's moms were at the center of their children's attention, dedicated to teaching them to stand on their own two feet.

Today's moms are trying to do as much for their children as they possibly can. Yesterday's moms were consciously trying to do as little for their children as possible, in addition to insisting that their children both do for themselves and do for the family (in the form of chores).

Today's moms function as servants to their children for the term of their dependency, which is lengthening. Yesterday's moms functioned as authority figures, as dispensers of responsibility.

Today's mom works for her child in perpetuity, believing that the best mom serves best. Yesterday's mom had her child working for her by the time he was three, believing that the best mom is the mom who prepares her child for a life of his own.

Dads of today

Which brings us to today's dads. The new ideal in American fatherhood is that of being the child's best buddy. Yesterday's dad was an authority figure, a mentor. He taught his child magic tricks, how to ride a bike, use a hammer, train a dog, and the like. He and his child had fun together, but he was not his child's friend. He knew that parenting came before friendship, and that one could not be a good friend when the time came - after the child's emancipation - if parenting issues were still begging for resolution.

Yesterday's parents were married to one another. They knew, intuitively, that their relationship had to be stronger than either of their relationships with their children. In today's all-too-typical family, the parent-child relationship is stronger than the husband-wife relationship, which is a clue to why so many marriages dissolve after the emancipation of the last child.

Yesterday's parents were attuned to the voice of common sense, which is why they did not complain that raising children was the hardest thing they'd ever done. For today's parents, the voice of common sense has been drowned out by a deluge of psychobabble, which is why so many parents tell me that raising even one child leaves them emotionally and physically exhausted at the end of many a day.

Yesterday's parents took child rearing, but not their children, seriously. Today's parents - the ones who are likely to read this column, at least - take both child rearing and their children seriously. The former is essential; the latter is a form of self-oppression that drains all humor from the enterprise and turns it into drudgery.

Why are today's parents having so many more behavior and school performance problems with their children than did parents just two generations ago?

It's simple really: You cannot approach child rearing in two entirely different ways and arrive at the same outcome.

Marriage Tip

No. 80

Researchers Discover Your Heart Has A Brain Of Its Own

By Sara Childre, The Institute of HeartMath

Did you know that many scientists and researchers today, along with neurocardiologists, believe that the heart, which maintains a constant two-way dialogue and relationship involving many processes with the brain, contains a brain in its own right?

The heart and brain actually influence one another's functioning, and though not commonly known, the heart sends a great deal more information to the brain than the other way around.

The information it sends includes heart signals that can influence a person's perception, emotional experience and higher cognitive functions.

Dr. J. Andrew Armour first introduced the term "heart brain" in 1991. Armour showed that the heart's complex intrinsic nervous system qualified it as a "little brain." This heart brain "is an intricate network of several types of neurons, neurotransmitters, proteins and support cells like those found in the brain proper. Its elaborate circuitry enables it to act independently of the cranial brain - to learn, remember, and even feel and sense." (From the HeartMath.org book, *Science of the Heart*)

One of the most important discoveries HeartMath researchers made in relation to the heart brain, which HeartMath also calls the intelligent heart, is that "intentionally altering one's emotional state through heart focusing techniques modifies ascending neurological input from the heart to the brain."

This suggests that "as people experience sincere positive feeling states, in which the heart's rhythms become more coherent, the changed information flow from the heart to the brain may act to modify cortical function and influence performance."

"These findings may also help explain the significant shifts in perception, increased mental clarity and heightened intuitive awareness many individuals have reported when practicing the HeartMath techniques."

Special Note: You can learn more about the "little brain in the heart," heart-brain interactions and the implications for personal performance, health, well-being and more in this e-book: *Science of the Heart* (free online for everyone at: <http://www.heartmath.org/research/science-of-the-heart/introduction.html>).

Spiritual Tip

101 Proofs for God: #5 Babies Are Cute

By Jim Stephens

From the website:
www.101ProofsForGod.Com

Think of babies with me for a while. Think of human babies that you have known. Think of animal babies, puppies, kittens, baby birds, farm animal babies, going to the pet store. Think of baby fish of all kinds. Even think of baby plants, shoots coming out of the ground, sprouts emerging.

Let's make two categories: "cute" and "ugly". Or make a long line with "really cute" on the left end and "really ugly" on the right end. Now imagine putting all the babies one by one somewhere on the scale. What would it look like?



I'm going to take an educated guess and say that a very huge percentage of the babies are on the left end over by "really cute" or "mostly cute".

Most puppies and kittens have got to be on the "cute" end. Don't you have a

calendar somewhere in your house with pictures of kittens or puppies? Do you remember the last time you went to the zoo? The biggest attraction was always the baby animals. Even baby hippos are cute. Were there any babies at the zoo for the "ugly" side of the spectrum? I can't remember any.

Go through "Mammals" in the encyclopedia and check out all their babies. Any there any ugly ones there?



Human babies certainly are "cute". They stay that way for years, maybe up to 5 or 6. There is a daycare at the building where I work and all the babies are cute. Maybe a couple get sort of close to the mid-point between "really cute" and "really ugly" on the spectrum, but definitely I'd still put them on the cute side. That's just on physical appearance. If you add in their little personalities...definitely, definitely cute. If you ask their mother's opinion, would you ever get "ugly"?

Baby birds almost all follow this pattern of cuteness. I say "almost" because a few might be tending over into the ugly area. Definitely the gigantic majority of baby birds are cute, for sure.



My wife loves gardening and yard work. Baby plants, flowers just coming up, even new grass sprouting are reasons for her joy and excitement. If pressed to admit it, I'd have to say that those baby plants are actually pretty cute.

I've left insects for last because I'm a little conflicted where to put them on the scale. Probably, I'd have to get very close to, if not touching, "really ugly" when I'm thinking of baby flies (i.e. maggots). Can't think of too many baby insects that I could put on the cute side. What about you? So I don't mind if the ugly bugs get eaten by birds and mammals. (Maybe bugs were created ugly so we'd avoid attachments to them.)

So all in all, what percentage of the above creatures would be on the cute side? I'd go with about 98% myself when I look at the world. What about you?

If humans and animals are all the result of random accident, why are we all so darn cute? It makes no sense. Natural selection and survival of the fittest have no connection with

"cuteness". Ugly can survive and prosper just as well as cute. Do animal parents kick out the ugly ones and only keep the cute ones? Do animal parents even have any idea that we humans look upon their offspring and say, "Oh, he's so cute!"

Can we all agree that only humans see "cuteness"? It gives us joy. It also motivates us to act to share our feeling of joy with others.

Human parents expend great time and effort to give joy to their children. Isn't that the whole point behind toy stores and going to the zoo, or buying them a pet?

The cuteness that I see everywhere in the world is not an accident. It's a deliberate effort on the part of my "original" parent, God, to give joy to me personally, as well as all you other people collectively. We are God's children. You know it in your heart.

There must be a God.

Compliments of the District 1 Marriage and Family Ministry, FFWPU

For more:
Marriage Tips, Resources, or copies of these Sunday Inserts visit:

www.TheMarriageLibrary.com

Visit **RESOURCES:** username: Member
password: 20112011