Parenting With Love And Logic: Teaching Children Responsibility
This parenting book shows you how to raise self-confident, motivated children who are ready for the real world. Learn how to parent effectively while teaching your children responsibility and growing their character. Establish healthy control through easy-to-implement steps without anger, threats, nagging, or power struggles. Indexed for easy reference.

I borrowed this book from the library and have just finished reading part one. I will admit first that I am the product of what the authors call "helicopters," so some of the ideas in the book are unusual to me. In general, I like the idea of natural consequences, enforceable choices, and encouraging children to think through their problems. I can see myself using these principles with my own daughter, but not always the way the authors do it. Some of the sample dialogues in the book are reasonable but many do not sound as genuine and empathetic as the authors imply. Some of the examples in the book and in the "pearls" are making me very upset. In one case, a child has been neglecting her dog by not feeding it, so the mom just gives it away with no warning and without...
confronting the girl about it. The authors admit this is a really tough approach but that’s how kids learn that unless you take care of your health and your animals serious illness or death can result. Now this sounds crazy to me. In our home, we think of pets as a family responsibility, so that might be one difference. Still, wouldn’t it teach the girl more about empathy to sit her down and say "you can either come up with a schedule and feed the dog or we are giving it away, you have one week to improve." Why do these authors feel that giving someone a second chance is a bad thing? It seems this might teach her "if I don't fulfill my responsibility, someone else will take care of it for me." Another example is a mom who asked her son to do something and he mouths off and refuses. So the next day when he asks for a ride she says, yesterday you showed me that asking nicely can be ignored, so I’m not going to drive you to your activity, even though you asked nicely.

So, I am not going to try to avoid redundancy here; I am just going to chime into the chorus of people stating that this book takes sound psychological principals, twists them into opinionated, super Christian fundamentalist parenting "tips" which, if applied, will most likely end up as abuse. The way I see it, this book has some major, horrible issues. My background: I am a linguist and cognitive scientist who advocates neurological nurturing and optimal brain health through parenting the sound, scientific way. I have a two year old, and I am a devoutly practicing Orthodox Christian. So note that when I say that I find this book lacking in the Christian principle of love, of treating others how one would like to be treated, and full of evangelical wrong-headedness. It is also chock-full of bad neurological strategies, and takes advantage of a child’s dependence and immature brain structure by making them choose out of helplessness to the situation. This is dangerous stuff.

Problems outlined: 1. Chiming into the chorus - no innocent animal should ever be allowed to suffer; If we took the sound conclusion that the authors make elsewhere in the book, that warnings allow kids to know that they have stretch room in our discipline habits, and that we should avoid warnings and make a serious point to let kids know that unacceptable behavior has an immediate consequence, then the logical conclusion to come to is that if your kid can't take care of the dog they wanted, they have to find that dog (with help, of course) a loving and better home than the one they’re providing...not withhold food from the dog. It’s cruel, and the dog never deserved to have to suffer.
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