Opinion

Do you have any utopia as a collective? I have several. One of them, and perhaps one of the main ones, is to see psychology as something attainable and accessible, a democratic psychology. When I think about the question "What do I expect for my profession in the post-pandemic era?", it immediately comes to me, I want a more accessible psychology, a psychology for everyone and everywhere. A psychology that occupies the territory, that is in contact with people's daily lives, that promotes collectivity and increasingly moves away from a purely individualistic idea. I want a psychology that values human subjectivity, but that finds in the social a way to enhance it. A psychology that does not expect people to go after it, but that it does meet collectives, communities, centers, groups, universities. My utopia is a psychology that is in the academy, but that is also jumping over its walls. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) in the edition of the annual report social panorama of Latin America 2020, emphasizes that the pandemic in the year 2020, economic, political and social crisis in the Latin American scenario, intensifying the unfair division sexual work, the social disorganization of care, injuring the rights and autonomy of individuals, especially women [1]. Also according to this report, it is estimated that the number of people in poverty increased to 209 million during the year 2020. Of this total, 78 million individuals were in extreme poverty, these rates are equivalent to 37.2% of the population in poverty and 15.8% in extreme poverty [1].

The rapid growth of the pandemic and the large number of information available-some of which are unreliable-generated behavioral changes, which greatly increased the picture of psychological suffering, with a greater number in people in poverty [2]. Studies show that the pandemic was directly related to the increase in psychological suffering, manifested through symptoms such as anxiety, stress and depression [3]. Despite these contexts, not all people who are experiencing psychological suffering are able to access psychological care, as one of the biggest financial crises in history is spreading in Brazil [4]. In addition, the health crisis generated by the pandemic made it impossible for public health policies that offered MH care to the population to work face-to-face [5]. In view of this, there is a marked increase in the psychological suffering of various audiences during the Covid-19 pandemic and little support from SM for those who are in a situation of social vulnerability. From the above, it can be recalled that the clinic in psychology for a long time was criticized for having an elitist bias and following a model that categorized subjects. Psychology professionals in the context of public policies came to break with this idea - and have reinvented themselves every day - seeking to overcome hegemonic practices associated with the biomedical model of pathologization of life and enter dimensions related to cultural, political and social aspects that demarcate suffering of collectivities. It is believed that psychology must assume a social commitment in its praxis, taking into account the ethical-political suffering of the subjects.

In view of this, we ask: why do populations that are in a situation of vulnerability have such limited access to psychological clinics? This is not a criticism of the expanded form of public policy work, given its great importance. However, one disagrees with the exclusion of clinical practices aimed at people in situations of social vulnerability, since the dimension of a qualified listening to subjective aspects is powerful for the mental health of the subjects, since it allows a talk about suffering, organization of affections and opening new ways of life. Furthermore, regardless of the area of activity, intervention space and psychological approach used, we believe that psychology must insistently be focused on a socio-historical praxis. There is a need to create public policies that offer psychological care in a more specific way, especially in view of the continuous increase in the demands of psychic suffering in the Brazilian scenario and the possible damage that the pandemic may still cause. In a macro way, the implementation of a policy that offers psychological care could be articulated with existing public policies, strengthening and relieving the spaces that offer mental health care. To think about this view of Psychology in relation to the poverty of Latin American peoples is to think about capitalism, neoliberalism, colonization, the legacy of European oppression that was left here. It is to think of a whole system that does not seek to empower people to find ways to get out of poverty, but to keep them in this place of inferiority, blaming, marginalizing, sinking these individuals into conformism.

Psychology in this place of criticism must escape the danger of maintaining an oppressive ideology: welfare. Psychology has to get out of the character of "savior" and start to see itself as a mechanism to potentiate these oppressed voices. Claiming in social struggles, giving voice to popular movements, breaking with the concept of meritocracy. I emphasize these issues, being aware that it is a revolutionary change and that it does not happen overnight, not seeking to generate demands or blame on professionals, but to reflect on what we can do to build this revolution together. The first step (of so many to come) is not to conform to reality. Thinking, encouraging, stimulating this critical look is a social duty that belongs to all Psi professionals. Finally, I present the perspective of Martín-Baró [6] who reports that for us Latin American psychologists we need a good bath of reality, because only by immersing ourselves in the social reality of the subjects and listening to their narratives can we let ourselves be impacted and distressed by this context. which, at times, oppresses the subjects. When one goes through such an experience, it is possible to think of a practice in psychology that is more democratic and politically committed to the emancipation of subjects. For, it is in reality that life happens, where prejudices take root and where oppression spreads. It is to this reality that we have to turn our gaze for the transformation to take place. Does our Brazilian reality allow a good life for the entire population? Is this reality the same for everyone? The numbers show that no, especially with the pandemic that came to widen the social chasms that already existed and intensified with Covid-19.

The Psychology of Liberation, a theory by Martín-Baró [6], in addition to looking at the social, is a proposal to evaluate
the dominant (biomedical) psychology and criticize it not in the sense of “destroying” its practice, but transforming it. It in a more real profession and focused on real people, inserted in its history, in its origin and in its context. Making a psychology that values liberation and does not want to take the individual out of his place and look at him from the outside only from a biological perspective. It seeks, in fact, to value the origin of each person so that he can emancipate and transform. Liberation Psychology cannot only propose a curative action because it makes the individual dependent on it. This psychology that makes my eyes shine thinks more than ever about making this person autonomous, aware of himself and his reality, so that he not only survives, but lives in full dignity [6]. Definitely, my desire is to always live that psychology that inhabits my utopia: A psychology that opens doors, that breaks stigmas and that gets closer and closer to the reality of the people, because this psychology has a lot to contribute to society and to the post-pandemic scenario, we need more psychology in public policies, we need a psychology for everyone and everywhere [7].
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