

I'm not a robot













## Bésame mucho libro

Jump to ratings and reviewsCarlos González, tras el indiscutible éxito de Mi niño no me come, que alcanzo los 40.000 ejemplares vendidos, regresa con Bésame mucho, una versión actualizada que incluye nuevos ejemplos que pueden ayudar a los padres a entender más y mejor a sus hijos. ¿Por qué los niños no quieren dormir solos? ¿Por qué tienen celos?, ¿Por qué tienen rabietas?, ¿Por qué lloran?, ¿Por qué llaman nuestra atención? Bésame mucho, es un libro ameno, divertido, pero sobre todo especialmente didáctico, donde los padres pueden encontrar las respuestas a los mil y una preguntas que cada día les asaltan sobre el crecimiento de sus hijos.GonresParentingNonionFamilyPsychologyEducationChildrensScience 683 people are currently readingCarlos González, a father of three, studied medicine at the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona and trained as a paediatrician at the Hospital de Sant Joan de Déu. The founder and president of the Catalan Breastfeeding Association (ACPAM), he currently gives courses on breastfeeding for medical professionals.Since 1996 he has been breastfeeding correspondent for Ser Padres (Being Parents) magazine.Displaying 1 - 30 of 313 reviewsJuly 26, 2022It is very difficult to be a good father. The main challenge is knowing what to do in each situation. Of course you will do what you think is the best but there are always lots of doubts.For instance, there some popular books that ask you to let your baby cry in order to teach him or her the correct manners. I just could not stand the idea of doing something like that.This book is an alternative that is based in a close relation with your baby. Skin to skin. It has a simple message. Do you love your baby? Just let him or her know. Kisses are welcome. Baby in your bed is welcome. Warm hugs are welcome.With this book I have found the way I know - deep inside - I should care for my baby.September 29, 2009This book was the first book about parenting that told me that it was Ok what I was doing with my son: caring him, sleeping with him, "spoiling" him. Then I found "attachment parenting": that validated what I knew in my heart, but was embarrassed to accept in public .)October 2, 2012I'll be buying my own copy of this book. It's not the best argued, the way it uses evidence is possibly rather suspect, but it has a unique eloquence.It's a lovely book that I'll want to re-read and share with others, especially when I want a laugh, and to get some perspective, especially when I despair of my children behaving as I would like them to. It's quite unusual to read polemic with such humour. I've heard Carlos Gonzales speak and despite the challenges of excellent English with a heavy Spanish accent, he was captivating. I loved his "My Child Won't Eat". Despite being a paediatrician by training he has a way of really going down to fundamentals and seeing things very simply through a child's eyes (without blaming parents for their feelings and situations) and in this book he has just let rip with it - he says himself that these are really just his opinions because that's all there is.It was also interesting for someone like me, immersed in supporting others with the fallout from so many English-speaking parenting forums pronounced from the polarised to the faux-moderate to see that there are similar issues in the non-English speaking parenting literature. Whilst he's not the first person to do it, his use of quotations from very old parenting texts is both amusing and salutary. He shows how the self-positioning of some authors as the 'middle way' or 'moderation' is at best merely a reflection of where they choose to place their own goalspost. Like Sue Gerhardt's excellent 'The Selfish Society, he takes the discussion slightly further and I am sure there will be some who are uncomfortable with his implicit political view and explicit personal values. He has some lovely, moving examples which are best left for the reader to discover for themselves. So no, it's not "How to raise your children with love", it's not "Kiss me!" but it is "Put yourself for a moment in your child's position and then see whether you think you should carry on with exactly the same expectations or practices" (you might, but it will not be for the same reasons). library-loan non-fiction professional March 28, 2020They recommended me the author and this book as "the bible" for modern parenting, so I really wanted to like this book, but I absolutely didn't. It was very difficult even to finish it, not because I don't agree with many of his ideas or values, but because of how the author expresses them, and to sum up because of the book's general inconsistency.First of all, the book is not taking into account any new researches he could actually use to prove some of his arguments with logic. In general the book has an incredible lack of scientific, educational and psychological backup, and when he uses some, they tend to be very old, out-of-date, and unusable. He is not doing that because there is not enough research or because he is "supporting the children's side" ... he has to do so because is the only way his arguments can hold together somehow. Also the examples and quotes he uses are extreme and useless, criticising other perspectives without strong or argumentized reasons, therefore making his arguments to fall apart all the time. Again, he could prove he is right in a proper way! And the most annoying thing: a book that is supposed to explain how to parenting with love and understanding, but that instead is a repetitive, unjustified anthropologic comparison between parenting in different cultures and periods of history, while blaming a very specific type of parenting as general parenting or the majority, and actually not explaining or justifying anything. In general, and this part I am speaking only as an educator, he could have defended some of his ideas so easily with updated research he completely ignored, or with "normal real" (not extreme) and not stigmatized examples they do exist, or by quoting theories and concepts from many great pedagogues, psychologists, doctors, etc., whose ideas and theories are to the way well-established for long in Spain and in general in Western countries, both in public and private schools and nurseries, and are normalised for many parents around the world or even in the societies. Just sad he focused on the "bad" parents or "strict" parents or "traditions/myths", when parenting and education is developing so well and fast lately, and parents try more and more to be well-informed, more empathetic and understanding more and making more efforts for a better way to raise, breed and educate their children, in this crazy world.Not worth it at all, especially if you are a parent-to-be or a new parent.September 28, 2010This is a very interesting book, writing by a pediatric (Carlos González) dealing with many of the myths and falsehoods of child care.Truly, it pays special attention to the called "Método Estivill" (the Spanish version of the behavioral Ferber method), although it deals with a huge amount of other well established believes and myths.Basically, he gives scientific evidence (on a huge bibliography) of their falsehood and erroneusness providing the results of statistical data (if available) or pointing out the skewed and dubiousness of their conception and interpretation.Interesting enough, Dr. Estivill does not provide any but general, unsupported claims.Anyway, as a resume, Dr. Carlos González tells you that your child (toddler) is a real person, with rights, desires, hopes and in truly need for your love, care and attention. His behaviour is shaped by thousands of years of evolution and it is not to be neither a dictator nor a demented master "that deprives you of the most basic freedoms and dignity, and asks you unquestioning obedience". If you do not tolerate that anyone beats you, asks you blind obedience in every aspect of your life or abuses you in anyway... why do you see it right when dealing with children? The author keeps on pointing this simple fact with multiple examples throughout the book, showing the dual morality by exchanging "child" by "spouse" or "patron" or "colleague"...The point is, I think, that many a parent long for the time when they have time for doing whatever they wanted. And now they face the fact that their time is not entirely theirs and that there is now "somebody" stealing away their comfortable lifes... and want them back! So the Ferber/Estivill method is just a behavioral one, that just makes your child do what you want, when you want and how you want, as if training a pet.As Dr. González says, to sleep, to eat, to walk, to stop using diapers... are things that happens naturally (dysfunctions avoided) without the need to be learned. What must be learned is HOW. And what many parents want is that their child DO all those things the way they want and that cause them less disturbances. Certainly, many will think that it is better if you TRAIN your child to sleep without assistance when you order it (independently if the child or the baby want it) than being with him half an hour or an hour or more telling tales or just rocking in your arms. For those who thinks the first is the best way, I tell them that they deprive themselves of the happiest and most truly moments of affection they will ever experience. A pity.Your child craves for your love. There is no teddy bear nor toy that can replace you (ask a child if they prefer sleep with his mother or with a teddy bear). There is nothing that you may do that they cannot forgive. Now... how are you paying back this unbound love?non-fiction spanish-versionNovember 12, 2011Piece of shit. The author uses the kind of arguments that won't hold together and the kind of comparisons that only use extremism to try to convince you. Honestly, piece of shit. If you want to read a really good book about the same subject, with about the same conclusions but with real scientific backup, please read "Bright from the Start" by Jill Stamm & Paula Spencer. I'm so sorry for those who can only read Spanish, because this piece of shit is in their language and the really good books are only in English. If you've read me this far, go read Bright from the Start, since you can.Una mierda. El autor usa la clase de argumentos que no se sostienen y la clase de comparaciones que sólo utiliza extremismos para intentar convencerte. Sinceramente, una mierda. Si quieres un libro realmente bueno sobre el mismo tema, con más o menos las mismas conclusiones pero respaldado por ciencia de verdad, por favor lee "Bright from the Start" de Jill Stamm y Paula Spencer. Es una lástima que este libro no esté traducido al español, porque libros como "Bésame mucho" pueden, con su o"forma" de decir las cosas, hacer un daño que sólo mejor libros podría prevenir o curar. Si no sabes leer en inglés, intenta que alguien que pueda se lea "Bright from the Start" por ti y te lo explique.January 28, 2020This book had been sitting around at home for a few months, since before our little baby was born. A workmate of my girlfriend had lent it to her, together with a few others related to pregnancy, babies and child-rearing. I had not paid much attention to it because its title and appearance put me off, frankly: "Kiss Me! How To Raise Your Children With Love". Seriously? It totally looked like some bland, self-help-y, silly book for emotional mothers-to-be full of proclatin. (And there goes your politically incorrect comment of the day, you're welcome).But then, a colleague of mine (physicist, PhD, master of two, damn smart) recommended to me two other books by the same author, saying that they have a good scientific basis and that she had learnt something from them. I didn't have those other two, but I happened to have this one at hand. So I started reading it a couple of months ago.These are the thoughts of a practising paediatrician about raising babies and children today.First of all (and because I have a fixation with the form, the medium, the use of language) I have to say that it is very well written, with an elegant but approachable style, avoiding clichés. I spotted only one or two typos or punctuation errors (and that is quite unusual). The subject is treated in a very humane and understandable way, with plenty of day-to-day examples and some real testimonies from parents. It is quite funny sometimes, and often touching.Another thing I liked is the emphasis on evolutionary psychology. The first part of the book is dedicated to explaining why children are the way they are: they want to be cuddled because not feeling any movement probably means that the entire tribe is gone and they are now in danger; they cry as soon as they are left alone because it's the best way for their mothers to find them again; they need to be fed every few hours at night because... etcetera. That is all interesting, and indeed explains much of the behaviour of babies nowadays.The author dedicates the last part to criticising pedagogical theories or fads that he finds false or even cruel or offensive: whimsical methods of discipline, corporal punishment (even the mildest forms of it), overly rigid approaches to sleep, food, play time, etc. Most of that criticism sounds right to me, too.The overall message of the book is: kids are the way they are for good (evolutionary) reasons; trying to bend their will is pointless at best, and often harmful; in most scenarios, simply do what feels right to you (comforting the baby, feeding it, letting the kid sleep in your bed); give them time and don't be angry at them, and they'll learn all important things by themselves sooner or later (eating, walking, going to the toilet); parents should mind the interests of their children first, and then their own; expressing unconditional love is the most important thing; violence (of any intensity) is to be completely avoided, as are insults, deprecating comments, threats, and even punishment (grounding).Most of that is comforting to parents, because it feels good and it takes some burden off their shoulders (because they can mostly follow their instincts and not feel guilty). And I like a lot the loving attitude, the simple ideas about caring for children and attending to their needs as the basic, most important principle.But I have some issues with the ideas in the book.One problem I have is that explaining why babies are the way they are does not help resolve the question of whether/when it is necessary/good to let them be that way in the 21st century. And that dilemma, I think, is at the root of most difficult situations about parenting.For example, Yes, babies cry a lot and demand to be held and rocked because it's the best way for them to stay alive in cold nights, among hyenas and wolves. But, when I'm absolutely certain that the night inside the bedroom will be warm, and that there will be no predators around, what reason is there to (almost?) always give up and hold a baby? Is the baby going to suffer some trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but very funny). The problem with this rhetorical device is it's equally easy to produce outrageous sentences corresponding to actions by parents that are obviously right and fair! Consider, for example: "bathe your husband at least every other day and use moisturiser sparingly" (who has a right to bathe the other people against their will?); "if your co-worker kicks you in the balls inadvertently for the fifth time this morning, don't be mad at him and shout; instead, explain to him politely, yet again, that you find that most inconvenient"; or "it's good for their development if you let Asian bartenders sleep in your bed with you when they wake up scared in the middle of the night".original-in-spanishOctober 3, 2012Puede gustarte su filosofía o no, pero el autor pasa todo el día criticando otras ideas y poniendo comparaciones inverosímiles, resulta bastante pesado y no guía nada a los padres. La idea puede ser buena y clarificadora, pero con leer las primeras páginas basta para captar su mensaje.July 23, 2016Below are my comments on the first half of the book, because I did not have enough patience to finish the other half.In the first 20 pages or so, the author attempts to clarify the stance of child educators and of himself. I really appreciate the effort, since many authors do not detail what assumptions they have made in their arguments. However, the author somehow mis-presents his standpoint. He pledges to defend children and mothers, but that is half true. His actual stance is rather naturalistic: he believes that anything associated with nature or trauma if I restrain from doing so, say, half of the times, because I want to do other (reasonable, necessary) things? Where is the evidence for this? In fact, often I would hold my baby pursuing my own interest (because it feels nice to me, and because I would feel guilty otherwise), not its own. So, what's the reason to treat babies as if we were still a naked tribe rummaging the savannah, combating predators and famine?To most day-to-day situations that the author explains away using evolution and biology, one could reply: "Sure, 100% agree, that's how it came to be. Now, what is the advantage of this or that adaptive behaviour in a safe environment in a developed country in 2020?". There are many obvious examples: babies hate getting shots; they cry and complain. One can imagine that feeling that acute sting hundreds of thousands of years ago could only be a sign that a scorpion is nearby, that one has injured their leg with some thorns, or that rats are biting. It made perfect sense, back then, to kick around and to try to avoid that pain. Should parents be mindful of that, respect their babies' instincts, do what feels good immediately, and thus stand behind their child and the needle? Of course not. Lots of other day-to-day situations would be like that. So, what's the value in understanding why babies can be so annoying, irrational and demanding, if at the end of the day it is absolutely desirable to override many of those behaviours by force, for their own benefit?Another issue is that the author assumes that little kids are incredibly generous and moral by default. As if Rousseau were right and man were good from the crib, unless forced to be otherwise. The book is full of passages detailing how some selfish and thoughtful baby is misunderstood and finally reprimanded by their egotistical parents: "Es notable que muchos niños muestren en esta época [la época en que pueden caminar un poco solos] una especial delicadeza de sentimientos: el mismo niño que exige con llantos desesperados que sus padres le lleven en brazos será capaz de caminar junto a sus abuelos, porque percibe que estos no tienen ya la fuerza y la agilidad para llevarle. (...) Y no lo ha hecho para obtener ventajas y alabanzas. (...) sino por pura bondad, porque tiene una conciencia moral y desea hacer el bien siempre que le es posible." Those ideas seem exaggerated to me. One thing is to presume that kids raised with love and patience tend to become reasonable, pleasant adults; it is very different to exclude the possibility that kids misbehave on purpose sometimes, or are consciously disrespectful of the needs of others, and need to be reprimanded.Finally, there's yet another bogus line of reasoning in the book, that appears regularly: Dr. González suggests from time to time that we replace "children" with "women", "blacks" or "workers" in seemingly innocuous sentences about babies, to help reveal the latent evil in them. Doing so, one may end up with outrageous statements like: "John grounded his disobedient wife for the rest of the weekend!"; "for their own benefit, it's good not to give blacks everything that they demand"; or "make sure you monitor what TV programmes your factory workers watch regularly, and exercise appropriate control". Clearly wrong ideas (but