

## BRIEF BACK COVER BLURB

Psychoanalysis has evolved over the last several decades; the stereotypic image of the unresponsive, disengaged analyst has given way to a reality where analysts find themselves clinically capitalizing on instances when they become swept up in the treatment more than they'd planned. Some analysts see such enactments as the new "royal road to the unconscious" while others beg to differ—seeing these clinical events as insurmountable yet regrettable instances of the analyst's failure to live up to his duty to contain the patient's material rather than enact it.

The enactment debate is but one of a slew of controversies swirling about psychoanalysis of late. Another debate centers on whether analysts can truly be objective, leading analysts who think not to deem the practice of interpreting to patients bogus at best, if not potentially harmful for patients whose pathology readies them to be misled. Other controversies raise questions about whether efforts to reach a widening scope of patients might water down psychoanalysis, causing it to lose its essence. A particularly galling controversy involves the question of whether any given treatment approach trumps others in terms of effectiveness, as some analysts contend. And then there's the controversy within the general populace that questions the legitimacy of psychoanalysis itself—whether it can be scientifically validated or, rather, is a gigantic hoax.

This book outlines some of the chief controversies, introducing some additional controversies along the way, such as the one that has to do with how a given analyst's theory serves to determine what he considers salient, causing him to implicitly search for certain sorts of data while overlooking other types of data. This book covers the waterfront by addressing controversies that help further the field by raising questions that help evolve the treatment, challenging every analysts to re-think what he's doing in the consulting room . . . and why.