

Review of: "Psychotherapy as a Subversive Art"

Susana Silva¹

¹ Universidade do Porto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

As a researcher in experimental Psychology who misses big ideas and critical thinking, I was happy to be given the opportunity to analyze this paper.

I did resonate with (what I think is) the premise - Psychotherapy should not be viewed as a “neoliberal” technical guidance-procedure, very often deprived of proper reflection and of the “aesthetic dimension” the author writes about.

However, my impression is that the author intentionally avoids structure - an underlying architecture of properly sequenced ideas and clarity - simple, unambiguous statements - in favor of quoting philosophers' concepts. The latter is, of course, not a problem (and can be a good thing), but, in this case, I think it obscures the author's own ideas, which should be the focus.

As a result of this, I was unable to follow the sequence of ideas leading to the conclusion that therapy is a subversive art, which is a pity because, somehow, I sympathize with what I think the claim is.

I believe this lack of structure and clarity is not specific to the author, but something that follows a tradition within philosophy - some sort of impressionist, syncretic, resonance-like register that is expected in philosophical texts..

Personally, I do not believe that things have to be like that. Depth and conceptual complexity can go along with linguistic simplicity - think about mathematics, which does not even use verbal language. It is also my opinion that these problems emerge from the insufficient separation between ideas and words - words often take the place of ideas.

I would really like to read a new version of this paper that I can “talk with”. I know I am challenging a whole tradition, but - why not risking and building readable, crystal-clear,... “subversive” philosophy?