

Threats and Opportunities for Critical Psychology in Colombia: The Context of an Agenda

Ángela María Estrada Mesa
Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Abstract

This paper discusses the reproductive strategies of the hegemonic stream of psychology in Colombia. It also identifies the academic, interventive and participative contexts in which a critical perspective in social psychology has an enhanced reception and social impact. Finally, this paper proposes an agenda for critical psychology in Colombia within the framework of the academic-practical, political-cultural and epistemological tensions. It is outlined the necessity for articulating critical and transdisciplinary fields in order to facilitate the insertion and development of critical psychology in the current developments of social sciences as a whole, as well as its contribution establishing ethical and theoretical limits to the mimicry of the hegemonic stream into the practical fields of contemporary critical psychology, facilitating its participation in a cultural change project.

Keywords: Critical Psychology, Colombia, Cultural Change, Agenda, Epistemology.

Introduction

To develop this text, I will mainly use my experience as an academic, a career dedicated to the training of psychologist at the main Colombian universities. Therefore, I will forsake any tone or scientificist pretention of making statements based on objective evidence.

It is my feeling that currently in Colombia critical psychology is taking place in the frame of a set of threats and opportunities that involves: (a) the educational program for the major in psychology, (b) the professional performance within the academy, and c) the different practical fields of action in the social world.

Thus, this paper seeks to examine the reproductive curricular strategies of the hegemonic stream of Psychology in Colombia, in order to identify the intervention, participation and academic context which give a critical perspective in social psychology a greater impact. Finally, paper proposes an agenda for the development of more consistent and inclusive curricula, which emphasizes the need to articulate critical and transdisciplinary fields that facilitate the insertion and development of critical psychology. It is hoped that the paper will establish ethical and theoretical limits to the mimetic reproduction of the hegemonic stream in the practical fields of contemporary critical psychology.

Fragmentations and paradoxes of curriculum programs for the major in Psychology

Paradox has been installed as the dominant trend in the formation of new generations of psychologists in Colombia; in fact, between the syllabus of the curriculum on one hand, and the prevailing trends regarding the expectations and priorities in professional fields of the

discipline on the other, strong disagreements and even important contradictions are to be found.

Moreover, this kind of curriculum uncritically promotes a deep breach between the first level, concerned with the disciplinary academic foundation, generically known as the first cycle; and the second level, dedicated to optional deepening, practical and professional training, generically known as the second cycle.

Particularly, those courses that ignore or minimize the epistemic and political diversity of psychology and implement a hegemonic exercise of power leave students with the implicit requirement to discern: a) the teacher's unique discourse codes and those of the subject's syllabus, and b), the function of truth in the language game of each course and their consequent evaluation.¹

The first cycle has been controlled by academic policies that have mainly legitimized a behaviorist paradigm (which sometimes opens to the individualistic and biologically based cognitivism) and is constituted on the following assumptions:

a) The only scientific method in psychology is the experimental method (even though recognizing that its application is not possible in all cases, mainly because the immaturity of the discipline).

b) The scientific cannon of the discipline is positivism or, at best, post-positivism (now neutralized and rendered invisible in the idea of 'evidence-based science').

c) The process of making the perspective and the cannon of statements notes above hegemonic, is done through a mandatory set of courses in "Basic Psychological Processes": perception, memory, thought, language, motivation and emotion; topics presented specifically from the experimental, individualistic, biological standpoint; therefore, involving teaching in the laboratory.

d) The unit of analysis in psychology is the individual; particularly after the cognitive revolution the mind, seen as an individual 'hidden treasure' (Gergen, 1992), has become the subject of a modern, rationalist and individualistic psychology which facilitates the reification of the economic subject who operates according to a 'minimax' strategy in a social world considered exclusively as market (Gergen, 1990) (altruism and solidarity are ruled out as myths).

The critique which exposes the linguistic, ideological and cultural dependence of the basic psychological processes and the social and historical processes of its production, takes place exclusively in the second cycle, and in most cases in the elective courses taken by students who are not satisfied with the exercise of power executed along the first cycle, and who are not necessarily the majority.

To sustain the hegemonic ideology of the first cycle, which virtually ignores the validity of other approaches, the syllabus of the basic cycle outlined above and the experimental laboratory infrastructure have been legitimized as necessary conditions which have to be accomplished without exception by psychology programs to pass successfully the evaluation in order to get national accreditation. The argument, in a quite rhetorical way, states that this approach responds to international standards for psychology training, which has recently received significant counterevidence.

¹ This applies to the State Tests in the discipline.

The behaviorist and individualistic approaches of the basic cycle in the academic curriculum is also justified and defended on the basis of an argument that appeals to some ‘official history’ of psychology (Farr, 1996), and concretely to the temporal precedence of the behaviorist period of the discipline all over America (Fraisie, 1976, 1982).² The argument assumes such historical precedence as a priority criterion for the design of the curriculum, and specifically, of the approaches of the first and second cycles.³

The lack of consensus and the expression of the dominant paradigmatic diversity in psychology – both internationally and Colombian – is expressed in our curriculum: the diversity and the even contradictions between the approaches of the first and second educational cycles for the major in Psychology is foregrounded throughout.

Indeed, not just because professional teachers, who present the courses of the second cycle, embody such diversity, but also because an important student sector, after receiving the exercise of hegemonic regulation in the first cycle, is ready to seek alternatives that open up new perspectives. When they do not find such alternatives in their own discipline – and if they do not drop out, an important phenomenon in psychology formation – they find it in the rest of social sciences, gaining important benefits from interdisciplinary enrichment.⁴

Students sometimes receive the critical content of the formation in the second cycle from very polarized positions, particularly those who have assumed the function of truth of the hegemonic regulation in the first cycle. I would love to understand more completely how these students are allocated in the labor market as they discover that approaches and contents of the first cycle have diminished acceptance outside the ivory tower.⁵

In the hegemonic exercise described above, neuroscience has come to the rescue. I think this is an international phenomenon with an objectivist claim that places the locus of psychological explanation in the brain. This perspective ignores the hierarchy of the human itself (and the consequent associated reductionism) as well as the acculturation of the human, and the fact that biological processes are, in fact, interpreted linguistically and culturally (Gergen, 2010).

Recognition of rhetoric in all scientific discourses, biology included of course, has enabled the development of an entire critical field of gender and sexualities studies based on the premise that there is no pre-discursive sex (Butler, 2001, 2002), and it has been completely unknown

² This fact has allowed Robert Farr (1996) to state that modern social psychology is specifically a North American phenomenon. It also includes an American power device by which authors presents the paradigm of their preference as the philosophical context of history of the discipline.

³ Precedence is attributed to the temporal ordering of the curriculum, according to its historical appearance.

⁴ Universities with curricular designs that include double degree programs, i.e. whose curriculums are not merely the result of the exercise of power of a unidisciplinary academic community but of a more complex academic practice university, restrict this hegemonic game of power, as has been noted by the authors of the Gulbenkian Report (Wallerstein et al., 2001).

⁵ Although fortunately they are few, it is known that some people are positioned in the advertising field applying conditioning principles both classical and operant. Without a doubt, it is also reported the involvement of professionals of psychology in the practice of torture strategies (Dobles, 2000; Lira and Weinstein, 2000), which in the Bush era was called – in a euphemistic way – “interrogation systems”. The above are some of the most painful forms of application of psychology at the service of ideologies and interests that are opposite to human rights and to the empowerment of individuals, organizations and communities facing the wild capitalism. This does not ignore other applications of behaviorism positively valued by professionals in the field of health, for example, those in the treatment of behavioral problems in people that have intellectual disabilities (thanks to Mark Burton for this remark).

to the hegemonic cognitive-behavioral psychology, which by confusing sex and gender is condemned to carry out identity policies in a very naive way.

Historical responsibilities of critical psychology

The ethical-political dimension of the challenges that are implicated in the development of strategies for critical psychology is shown in a critical scenario for the social sciences, such as the one developed in the Gulbenkian Report (Wallerstein et al., 2001). The fact that cultural resources are becoming lax in order to assimilate and compensate suffering and weaknesses (Gergen, 2007) maintains the validity of some identity politics (Sampson, 1993) which stigmatize and impose limits on those who do not fit in with masculine, heterosexual and eurocentric standards. Such forms of psychology then become socially illegitimate and end up being the subject of political struggle for people and organizations representing affected groups by 'psychological policy'.

Accompaniment-production of the proliferation of genres and subjectivities

It is known that critical traditions in psychology has operated as practices of internal vigilance regarding the consequences of psychological discourses – academic and culturally legitimated – in domains of subjectivity and culture; in other words, monitoring how psychological discourses can influence the configuration of contemporary identity narratives. In this sense, it deconstructs the *psy*-devices (Parker, 1994) of modern culture and highlights modern psychology's responsibility in support of it, setting as a challenge the accompaniment of the construction process of new bodies, new sexualities and new subject positions like new expressions of biopower. In effect, critical psychology plays a decisive role in the reconsideration of the heterosexual matrix that holds – in an uncritical way – man-woman positions in place, and that ignores the historical problems that these positions have represented.

Currently, this matrix is a source of paradoxes like those arising from mere academicism and uncritical reproduction of the discourses that are strategically built for political purposes by the militancy in social movements. Among these discourses we can highlight the victimization of women in the dynamics of domestic violence, which is assumed solely as a power game in which the male takes the place of perpetrator and the woman takes the place of victim. The same happens with the biological determination of homoeroticism.

Thus, modern psychology has contributed to the configuring of a third gender, embodied in the adjustment of homosexuality to health-illness policies and assimilated through policies of inclusion to modern conceptions of romantic love and the nuclear family. This perspective subtracts the critical and renewing power of the homoerotic subject position by merely releasing it from pathologizing policies.

In this sense, it is the work of critical psychology to maintain the validity of a narrative approach to subjectivation, which grants a place and a privilege for the rhetorical perspective and that maintains, at the same time, the interpretative strength of the co-construction of social processes such as domestic violence (Coria, 1989; Cobb, 1997) or sex and the body as realities that make sense in the frame of discursive practices (Butler, 2002), to name just a few.

Critical psychology also faces the challenge of reviewing the inclusion policies as a privileged way of militancy from the LGBT movement, since such a political position undermines a rich critical potential in relation to the modern family (and their practices and teaching about social inequity), as well as the validity of romantic love as a model of the contemporary couple, which is completely worn down and in urgent need of revision (Giddens, 1995; Elia, Lovaas & Yep, 2006; Rubin, 1993).

Without a doubt, as a matter of subjectivity, one of the biggest challenges – more for critical psychologists than for critical psychology – is the appropriation and reconsideration of the discourse from a critical perspective of gender. In this regard, it is very important to go forward in the acceptance that a critical perspective of gender is not an optional alternative, basically for feminists, but a central theoretical element in the critical review of subjectivity; since as Butler (1990, 2001) has shown in a very rich way, the historical emergence of the subject has always been gendered. In other words, gender is not a feminist “add-on” to the theory of the subject and subjectivity, but a central and constitutive element of it.

Animation of political practices of change

Quite notorious in the Colombian society is a current tendency towards unanimism, which legitimizes politically correct positions as “entrance tickets” for recognition and inclusion in the communities that support critical perspectives (often amplifying and echoing popular discourses). Many of these are animated by academic sectors, whose field of research and expertise is located out of political science.

This is worthy of analysis, particularly because currently in Colombia there is an increasing phobia regarding the possibility of peace as well as an important acceptance of violent actions from guerrillas, paramilitaries and other armed groups, depending of the embodiment with a right or left-wing political position.⁶ These positions involve, ultimately, a high dose of fundamentalism.

Critical psychology has a historic responsibility to highlight any kind of fundamentalism – of left or right-wing – that is the product of consensus constructed with the function of truth, considering that such fundamentalism hinders the search for fresh possibilities for change in a culture in which an extremely long armed conflict has become entrenched and has resulted in very damaging effects on cultural resources for reconciliation, recognition of the difference and the integration as a nation.

For this purpose, a more disciplined position is required in order to avoid the facile unanimism. This position is more based on an increased amount of own research and less on complacent attitudes with ambivalent positions regarding different actors in conflict and the non-transparent or unethical exercises that occur when members of political collectivities embody it in their practice.

Critical psychology should get on with processes of accompaniment and development of new citizenships, that is, it should support the emergence of new subjectivities with an extended

⁶ Mainly for international readers, it seems important to make explicit that in Colombia it is accepted that internal armed conflict has been degraded during the last two decades, presenting among other things what is called “populism”, which means practices of mirror games in which armed actors at the margins of the law do not differ in their strategies of war, although the discourses that support them are diametrically opposed (González & Bolívar y Vásquez, 2003).

ability to take informed positions in the political arena. The current unanimism facilitates, in a very dangerous way, the exercise of a citizenship focused on particular interests and at the same time it is legitimized by new forms of *clientelism*, which distort and obscure the paramount importance of collective interests.

Supporting emotional recovery and memory reconstruction of domestic conflict survivors

A great challenge in Columbia is assisting survivors (rather than considering them as victims; see Cobb, 1997) to find appropriate forms of reparation by which they can reconstruct memory in ways that facilitate re-writing their life (White, 2002). Only recently the country became aware of the implications of psychosocial reparation, considering the amount of victims that our prolonged conflict has left in the whole country. Indeed, processes are painfully slow, reparations are almost exclusively economic, guarantees of non-repetition are missing and, in the political environment, there is a trend to manage the historical and the biographical memory in an indiscriminately way. This objectifies a rather static idea of memory in the psychosocial field.

At the theoretical level, critical psychology is able to help set up a narrative notion of biographical memory which recognizes that the objectivity and stability of the story is no guarantee of its validity. This is stated considering that the personal history is reconstructed permanently in the present and that features of the story have crucial performative effects in psychological well-being. From this point of view, accompaniment is oriented – among other things – to support the re-elaboration of stories with a better shape (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Van Langenhove, 1991; Sluzki, 2006).

Our work in the group of Social and Critical Psychology has been directed to develop interpretations and interventions that favor a narrative conception of biographical memory as well as the development of psycho-juridical strategies to psychosocial reparation for victims, looking for complex developments in response to the very complex problems expressed in the reparation processes and needs, and which far exceed the exclusive attention on psychological distress (Estrada, Rodriguez & Ripoll, 2010).

Additionally, the victim advocacy organizations' agendas and political practices in the country exert great pressure on victims to make them assume the narrative and the official agenda of the organization. This generates some forms of guilt and perplexity in view of the dissonance that often emerges between those requirements and organizational policies and the personal narratives, all in a game of power based on the double bond and expert position that does not support emotional recovery (Estrada, 2010; Sluzki, 1994).

Undoubtedly, in Colombia there are a few pioneering organizations in victim assistance – in their experience and point of view. Among these organizations some are worth highlighting (Avre Corporation, 2007; Corporation *Vínculos*, 2004; Group of Critical and Social Psychology, 2006, Terre des Hommes Italy, 2009), however, we need to strengthen the organizational presence and supply a solid scientific, ethical and political quality that recognizes and practices actions specifically focused on psychosocial support to victims-survivors. The fact that some victims do not privilege the point of view and political agendas of supporters and activists – national and international – does not mean they necessarily will fall into a naive psychologism, like some psychologists who have not decided whether their role is mainly political or professional.

Transformation of the modern subject of education

Psychology has exerted, par excellence, the regulation of the subject of pedagogy through the reification of theories that, with the function of truth, impose on teachers a psychological notion of the subject and assign them the responsibility, not guilt-free, of its associated “production” through pedagogical practices.⁷

Without doubt, a very important project for postmodern psychology is the transformation and, one could say, overcoming, of individualism. The objective of this is to find new conceptions of subjectivity that emphasize collaborativity, bonding, care and historical and ethical resonance in the narrative identity. This confronts psychology with the challenge of being open to the ethical-political strategies of deconstruction, interpretation and narrative in order to nurture the renewal of culture.

Life in collaborative relationships involves a crucial shift: from an individual-rational ethics of modernity to an ethic of care that emphasizes recognition of others and the other – in affection and bonding – even within the frame of diversity; an ethic that helps us to recognize the co-constructive sense of the approximation to the other, and therefore, of our voice in their narrative identities.

The exercise of collaborative practices that are intentionally aimed at ensuring that new generations will have the opportunity to experience a collective subject of knowledge and writing production, at the same time as new searches related to new media formats and strategies of knowledge are consolidated, is part of the still distant but needed renovations. Similarly, the creation of classroom mechanisms that contribute to mutual helping processes among peers for the advancement of knowledge are some of the challenges still awaiting a new psychology.

Accompaniment of solidarity forms for productivity

In a period where dissatisfaction with global economy is growing up and where it seems clear that is not only required the application of a critical perspective but also the search of more ethical, inclusive and equitable models, social sciences are called to bring back the economy to the cultural field for a judicious review. Psychology has to carry out a critical review of the economical subject, as was noted earlier.

Indeed, in countries like Colombia one out of every two people are in poverty; worldwide the gap between rich and poor has increased exponentially. This has exacerbated the extent to which individualism serves as an obstacle for establishing consensus about the common good, and thus we need to explore cultural resources for solidarity at the service of new production models.

This question is not even new. In the context of the developments on new social movements and questions about a new cultural paradigm, the topic of solidarity economy and associative models had strongly emerged in the 1980s. However, in political and even social sciences contexts, such models are exclusively seen as complementary proposals that are only suitable for productive developments conducted by people in poverty and as a relative solution to it.

⁷ Hypostatizing a particular psychological theory of subject, which is essentialized by the rhetorical game of truth, pedagogy is proposed as the necessary mechanism to ensure a proper human psychological development.

This is in an interpretive framework that differentiates the traditional productive sector from the rest.

In other words, the ethical *plus* of solidarity in the above proposals is not assumed in its transformative potential for an individualistic economy (Razeto, 1997), neither are the proposals of society formulated with gender criteria (Fraser, 1997). On the contrary, collaborative and solidary endeavors are called on to take a leadership role in transforming culture, economy, traditional psychology and social sciences in general.

Critical psychology is indebted to communities and groups for accompaniment in the formulation, development and support of proposals for an economy of solidarity and society within a gender equity perspective – this with the hope that many successful experiences will sensitize policymakers and economic theorists to consider it as alternatives in the development of new economical models.

Development of participative strategies for public policy formulation

To develop solid knowledge in relation to the options for getting a participative formulation of public policy is a priority because, as was demonstrated by the recent experience of resistance in relation to the educational reforms conducted and presented by the government in order to get its approval in the Congress of the Republic of Colombia, it is clear that subjects of public policy refuse to be passive recipients of successive governments' decisions, and instead have a perspective and an experience to contribute.

Critical psychology has a place and an important responsibility in the organization and accompaniment of these sectors, organizations and target groups of public policy, taking into account their knowledge about conflict resolution processes, organization for productivity, and in general, organization of social movements.

On the other hand, a practical paradigm in critical psychology needs to be further developed – one that demands a transformation of the basic-applied knowledge polarity, and that also privileges the logic of problems-based knowledge production (Schön, 1996) through participative and collaborative strategies rather than through the application of technological procedures specific to social engineering.

Some closing words

As has been pointed out over several decades by important psychologists such as Serge Moscovici (1985) and Ken Gergen (1996), expectations of change in academic psychology are very low, whereas significant trends of change prevail in many fields of the practice outside the ivory tower...

Underlying this movement there is a transition that abandons the undesirable consequences that the project of modernity has had for the social sciences and culture. In fact, there is a project of cultural change that seeks to find ways of social organization focused on equity, and that also accepts practices of responsible consumption and environmental protection, in order to promote more dignified forms of solidarity and respectful ways of co-existence.

In this context, it is certainly recommended that the community that promotes a critical psychology questions itself about its foundations and commitments – not only in the face of current tension of the curriculum, but also current tensions inherent to the definition of the

cannon of the discipline – since the *boom* of neuroscience strengthens the tendency to establish psychology as a “health science”.

A window of opportunity has been opened for critical psychology by the recognition of the co-existence of very different psychologies seeking an articulation with the integration movement in the social sciences (Wallerstein et al., 2001); the emergence of Development and Cultural Studies; and, in general, by the development of the framework of a narrative perspective for social science.

References

- Butler, J. (1990). Variaciones sobre sexo y género. Beauvior, Wittig y Foucault. In S. Benhabib & D. Cornell (Eds.), *Teoría Feminista y Teoría Crítica* (pp. 193-211). Valencia: Edicions Alfons El Magnànim.
- Butler, J. (2001). *El género en disputa. El feminismo y la subversión de la identidad*. México: Paidós-UNAM-PUEG.
- Butler, J. (2002). *Cuerpos que importan. Sobre los límites materiales y discursivos del “sexo”*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Cobb, S. (1997). Dolor y paradoja: la fuerza centrífuga de las narraciones de mujeres víctimas en un refugio para mujeres golpeadas. In M. Pakman (Ed.), *Construcciones de la experiencia humana* (pp. 17-62). Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Coria, C. (1989). Violencia y contraviolencia de la dependencia económica. In E. Giberti & A.M. Fernández (Eds.), *La mujer y la violencia invisible* (pp. 121-140). Buenos Aires: Suramericana.
- Corporación Avre. (n.d.). *Construcción de una estrategia psicojurídica: aprendizajes y desafíos*. Bogotá: Corporación Avre.
- Corporación Vínculos (2004). *Módulos para el acompañamiento psicosocial con niños, niñas y jóvenes desvinculados del conflicto armado*. Bogotá: ICBF-Corporación Vínculos-USAID-OIM.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63.
- Dobles, I. (2002). Apuntes sobre psicología de la tortura. In I. Martín-Baró (Ed.), *Psicología Social de la guerra* (pp. 197-209). San Salvador: UCA.
- Elia, J., Lovaas, K., & Yep, G. (2006). Introduction. Shifting ground(s): Surveying the contested terrain of LGBT studies and Queer theory. In K.E. Lovaas, J.P. Elia., & G.A. Yep (Eds.), *LGBT studies and Queer Theory: New conflicts, collaborations and contested terrain* (pp. 1-18). New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Estrada, A.M., Rodríguez, D., & Ripoll, K. (2010). Intervención psicosocial con fines de reparación con víctimas y sus familias afectadas por el conflicto armado interno en Colombia: equipos psicosociales en contextos jurídicos. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 36, 103-112.
- Estrada, A.M. (2010). Impacto de la dinámica política colombiana en los procesos de reparación a las víctimas de la violencia política. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 36, 133-144.
- Farr, R. (1996). *The roots of modern social psychology*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fraisse, P. (1976). La evolución de la Psicología Experimental. In P. Frisse & J. Piaget (Eds.), *Historia y método de la psicología experimental* (pp. 9-93). Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Fraisse, P. (1985). Por la unidad en la diversidad. In P. Fraisse (Ed.), *El porvenir de la psicología* (pp. 29-41). Madrid: Morata.

- Fraser, N. (1997). *Iustitia interrupta. Reflexiones críticas desde la "posición postsocialista"*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre.
- Gergen, K. (2010). The acculturated brain. *Theory & Psychology*, 20(6), 1-20.
- Gergen, K. (2007). Las consecuencias culturales del discurso del déficit. In A.M. Estrada & S. Diazgranados (Eds.), *Kenneth Gergen. Construccinismo Social. Aportes para el debate y la práctica* (pp. 281-310). Bogotá: Uniandes - Ceso.
- Gergen, K. (1996). *Realidades y relaciones*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Gergen, K. (1992). Toward a postmodern psychology. In S. Kvale (Ed.), *Psychology and postmodernism* (pp. 17-30). Gran Bretaña: Sage.
- Gergen K., (1990). Metaphor, metatheory and the social world. In D. Leary (Eds.), *Metaphors in the history of psychology* (pp. 267-299). Estados Unidos: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1995). *La transformación de la intimidad. Sexualidad amor y erotismo en las sociedades modernas*. Madrid: Cátedra – Teorema.
- González, F., Bolívar, I., & Vásquez, T. (2003). *Violencia política en Colombia. De la nación fragmentada a la construcción del Estado*. Bogotá: CINEP.
- Grupo de Psicología Social Crítica (2006). *Sentémonos del mismo lado. Recomendaciones para la práctica y la política de atención de jóvenes desvinculados del conflicto armado 1 y 2* [CD]. Bogotá: Uniandes-CESO.
- Harré, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 21(4), 393-407.
- Lira, E., & Weinstein, E. (2002). La tortura. Conceptualización psicológica y proceso terapéutico. In I. Martín-Baró (Ed.), *Psicología Social de la guerra* (pp. 335-390). San Salvador: UCA.
- Moscovici, S. (1985). Perspectivas de futuro en psicología social. In P. Fraisse (Ed.), *El porvenir de la psicología* (pp. 130-154). Madrid: Morata.
- Parker, I. (1994). Reflexive research and the grounding of analysis: Social psychology and the Psy Complex. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 4, 239-252.
- Razeto, L.M. (1997). *Los caminos de la economía de solidaridad*. Argentina: Lumen Humanitas.
- Rubin, G. (1993). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of politics of sexuality. In H. Ablove, M.A. Barale, & D. Halperin (Eds.), *The lesbian and gay studies reader* (pp. 3-44). Nueva York: Routledge.
- Sampson, E.E. (1993). Identity politics: Challenges to psychology's understanding. *American Psychologist*, 48(12), 1219-1230.
- Schön, D.A. (1996). La crisis del conocimiento profesional y la búsqueda de una epistemología práctica. In M. Pakman (Ed.), *Construcciones de la experiencia humana* (pp. 183-212). España, Gedisa.
- Sluzki, C. (2006). Victimización, recuperación y las historias con mejor forma. *Sistemas Familiares* 22(1-2), 5-20.
- Sluzki, C. (1994). Violencia familiar y violencia política. Implicaciones terapéuticas de un modelo general. In D. Fried Schnitman (Eds.), *Nuevos paradigmas, cultura y subjetividad* (pp. 351-370). Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Terre des hommes Italia (2009). *Las comunidades frente al trauma por violencia política. Herramientas de apoyo psicosocial*. Bogotá: Unión Europea-Terre des hommes Italia.
- Wallerstein, I. y Otros (2001). *Abrir las ciencias sociales*. México: Siglo XXI.
- White, M. (2002). *Reescribir la vida. Entrevistas y ensayos*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Contact details:

Ángela María Estrada Mesa, Associate Professor

Departamento de Psicología

Universidad Nacional de Colombia

E-mail: aestrada@uniandes.edu.co , am.estradam@gmail.com