

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Trauma *in a Hurry*

What it does, and what helps

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 20

What People Get Wrong 30

Use It 35

Terms 40

Go Deeper 43

Notes and Sources 45

Bibliography 51

The Whole Thing in One Page

Trauma is commonly pictured in two unhelpful ways. In one, almost any painful experience is trauma, so the word loses the distinctions needed for care. In the other, trauma is mysterious damage stored inside the brain or body, waiting to be released. The first model is too broad. The second is too neat.

Begin with three levels. A traumatic event is what happened. A trauma response is what a person learned, felt and did in relation to it. A trauma-related disorder is a defined pattern that persists, causes distress or restricts life. The event raises risk. It does not dictate the outcome. Most people exposed to frightening events do not develop lasting post-traumatic stress disorder, and two people can live through similar events without carrying the same aftermath.

A useful starting point is protection under uncertainty. During danger, a system built for survival favours speed over perfect accuracy. Missing a real threat may be catastrophic, while a false alarm may cost only sleep, comfort or embarrassment. Afterwards, that bias can remain. A sound, face, bodily sensation or loss of control begins to predict more danger than it should. The present is read through the emergency.

Memory is part of this, but not a recording. A traumatic memory may be vivid in fragments, uncertain at its edges, or difficult to place in sequence. A flashback is not proof that every detail is exact. It is a state in which part of the past arrives with too little of the information that says where and when the person is now.

Avoidance is one powerful maintenance loop. Leaving, checking, numbing, overworking, suppressing, pleasing or controlling can bring immediate relief. Relief then teaches the system to use the same strategy again. Opportunities to discover what would happen without it disappear, so resemblance can remain confused with recurrence.

Fear is only part of the subject. Trauma can reorganise shame,

responsibility, trust, identity, sleep, attention, bodily sensation and relationships. Freezing or submitting under coercion is not consent. Anger may defend against helplessness. Dissociation may reduce immediate overload while making the present hard to reach. None of this is proof that the body contains a hidden toxic memory. The effects extend across perception, action, meaning and social life.

PTSD and complex PTSD are useful maps, not explanations of a whole person. Good care begins with current safety and a formulation of the loops that matter. It does not prescribe debriefing or make disclosure a test of courage. When symptoms persist, several structured trauma-focused therapies have strong evidence. They differ in procedure, but each helps the person approach what has been avoided, update what the event means, and recover present choice. Medication can help some adults, usually as an alternative or adjunct rather than an eraser of memory.

Recovery is not forgetting, forgiving or becoming calm at all times. It is better discrimination and more options. The event need not be forgotten for it to feel more clearly in the past. Alarm becomes information rather than command. The person can approach, leave, connect, rest, speak or protect themselves because the present supports the choice, not because the past has made it compulsory. The same protection that once narrowed life can learn a more exact job.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A door slams. A car brakes hard. A particular smell reaches you in a lift. Before any explanation forms, the body has moved first: heart faster, muscles ready, attention narrowed. Nothing visible may be wrong, yet for a few seconds the present has been organised by an older danger.

That sequence matters because people are judged at the speed of behaviour. Withdrawal looks cold. Scanning looks distrustful. Irritability looks hostile. Perfectionism looks controlling. Numbness looks uncaring. A person

who cannot speak during threat may later be asked why they did not refuse more clearly. Without a model of protection, symptoms become moral verdicts.

The same mistake enters self-judgement. Someone knows the crash is over but still avoids the road. They know the partner who abused them is gone but cannot sleep beside a new one. They can explain, in ordinary sentences, that the fire alarm was a test, yet their hands shake. The gap between factual knowledge and learned safety produces a second injury: *I know better, so why am I doing this?* Understanding the mechanism does not excuse every consequence, but it replaces contempt with a tractable question. What danger is this response predicting, and what evidence has not reached it?

You should also care because first aid can go wrong. Good intentions produce pressure to recount everything, advice to stop thinking about it, reassurance that the person is safe when they are not, or promises that one breathing trick will reset the nervous system. Some people need quiet company, food, sleep, transport, information, money or protection before they need a coherent story. Psychologically focused debriefing is not recommended to prevent or treat PTSD. Immediate support should restore practical control and allow choice.

Treatment choices become clearer once the model is sound.

Trauma-focused cognitive therapies, prolonged exposure and eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing are not competing rituals for extracting hidden material. They are structured ways of helping memory, prediction, meaning and behaviour meet information that avoidance has kept apart. Major guidelines agree that trauma-focused psychological treatments should usually lead adult PTSD care, though they differ in how strongly they rank particular methods. That disagreement is useful. It tells you that the evidence supports a family of approaches more securely than one grand theory of how all of them work.

This model also changes institutions. Police interviews, courts, schools, hospitals and workplaces often reward calm chronology, rapid decisions and

consistent detail. Trauma can disrupt all three without making a person dishonest or incapable. The correction is not to treat every inconsistency as proof of trauma either. It is to stop using presentation style as a shortcut to truth, and to gather evidence without suggestive pressure. Clinical support and factual investigation have different jobs. Confusing them can harm both.

The limits matter. Not every painful event meets a diagnostic trauma definition. Not every trauma response is PTSD. A frightened person may be reading danger accurately. Poverty, racism, war, coercion, unsafe housing and institutional betrayal cannot be breathed away. Children, refugees, veterans, survivors of prolonged abuse and people with dissociation or other conditions do not form one interchangeable population. Treatment evidence gives probabilities, not commands.

Still, the subject is more hopeful than its popular language suggests. A trigger is an association, not a life sentence. A flashback can make the past feel present; it is not proof that time has stopped. Avoidance is learned, which means its grip can change. Shame has a history, responsibility has a timeline, and alarm can become more specific. The aim is not to return to a person who existed before the event. It is to make the present large enough that the event no longer decides every next move.

The Core Ideas

Three levels, one confused word

The word *trauma* now carries three jobs, and trouble begins when they are merged.

The first is an event. Diagnostic systems draw boundaries around exposure to death, serious injury, sexual violence, or events described as extremely threatening or horrific. The exact wording differs between the American DSM and the World Health Organization's ICD. Everyday speech reaches further, taking in humiliation, abandonment, discrimination and relationships that damage trust without containing one conventionally traumatic episode. The broader use can give suffering a name. It can also imply that all distress

has one mechanism and one treatment.

The second job is a response. After danger, a person may replay what happened, avoid reminders, scan for recurrence, sleep badly, feel detached, become angry or numb, and revise what they believe about themselves or other people. None of those reactions belongs exclusively to PTSD. They may appear briefly, persist in a different disorder, or exist without any diagnosis. The response reflects the event and the conditions around it: age, injury, coercion, responsibility, prior experience, escape, support, later losses and whether the threat ended.

The third job is a disorder. A diagnosis requires a particular pattern, duration and degree of impairment. ICD-11 defines PTSD through re-experiencing in the present, avoidance and a persistent sense of current threat. It defines complex PTSD through that core plus lasting difficulty regulating emotion, a persistently negative self-concept and disturbed relationships. DSM-5-TR uses a broader PTSD symptom set and does not create a separate complex PTSD diagnosis. These systems overlap without being interchangeable.

Timing creates further labels. Severe symptoms in the first days or weeks may be understood as an acute stress response or, under DSM criteria, acute stress disorder. For PTSD, DSM-5-TR requires symptoms to persist beyond one month, while ICD-11 requires persistence for at least several weeks. Delayed full expression can occur, but it should not be turned into the claim that symptoms were wholly absent and then appeared from nowhere. Diagnostic names mark patterns and thresholds; they do not reveal a single hidden disease process.

This separation matters because exposure is not destiny. Many people endure frightening events without developing a lasting disorder. Some experience severe early distress and recover. Others function during the emergency and struggle later, when work slows or safety makes feeling possible. There is no single visible performance that reveals the final outcome.

The distinction also prevents a moral competition. A person need not win an

argument about whether an experience was bad enough before seeking help for nightmares, avoidance or shame. It also keeps neighbouring problems visible. Depression, panic, grief, chronic pain, substance use, traumatic brain injury and psychosis can overlap with trauma responses without being explained by trauma alone. Treating the label as the cause can hide a medical condition, a separate disorder or a practical crisis that needs its own response. Nor does calling every wound trauma improve care. Bereavement may require grief support. Workplace intimidation may require organisational action. Panic may require a different formulation. A traumatic brain injury may need neurological assessment. Precision does not deny pain. It stops one word from hiding the response that needs attention.

The useful sequence is therefore: what happened, what changed, what keeps that change going, and what is the cost now? Diagnosis can organise part of the answer. It cannot replace it.

The event cannot be undone. Its place in a life can change. That leaves work to do even when no apology, verdict or treatment can return what was lost: less of the day spent anticipating danger, more room for relationships, and fewer decisions made on the event's behalf. Separating event from aftermath makes that possibility easier to see.

Protection pays more for a missed threat

A survival system does not wait for courtroom certainty. It works with incomplete evidence and unequal costs.

Imagine hearing movement behind you at night. If you turn and nothing is there, the cost is a pulse of fear. If you fail to turn and there is danger, the cost may be far greater. Under uncertainty, a protective system can be biased towards false alarms without being badly designed. The bias becomes especially strong when the original event involved surprise, helplessness or a failed warning.

This explains why post-traumatic responses often feel irrational from the outside. The system is solving a different problem. It is not asking, *What is*

the most statistically likely explanation? It is asking, *What must I do before certainty arrives?* Heart rate rises, attention narrows, muscles prepare, pain may recede, and behaviour shifts towards fighting, fleeing, freezing, hiding, submitting or seeking protection. Human defence does not fit one tidy list, and the same person may move between patterns within seconds.

The lesson is stored in cues. Some are obvious, such as a road, uniform or voice. Others are structural: being unable to leave, hearing someone approach from behind, depending on a powerful person, feeling bodily arousal, or noticing that nobody else believes you. The learned danger may be less *men are unsafe* than *kindness followed by isolation is unsafe*. A formulation must find the prediction at the right level.

The body can become part of the warning signal. Breathlessness, sexual arousal, dizziness or a relaxed posture may resemble sensations present during the event. The person then responds to the sensation as evidence of danger, which increases it. A protection system can therefore create some of the data it uses to confirm its prediction. This is one reason blunt reassurance rarely settles the loop for long.

Generalisation is necessary. A child burned by one pan should not have to touch every pan before becoming cautious. Yet protection can generalise too far. One aggressive supervisor becomes authority. One assault becomes intimacy. One medical emergency becomes every bodily sensation. A system trained by rare catastrophe may prefer broad rules because broad rules miss fewer threats.

Current danger changes the interpretation. Scanning a room during stalking, war or continuing abuse may be accurate, even if it is exhausting. The aim is not to persuade someone that danger is imaginary. It is to distinguish the parts of the response that track the present from those that have spread beyond it, and to increase real options. Housing, safeguarding, money, legal advice or medical care may be more urgent than calming techniques.

Protection is therefore not character. Staying awake may be an attempt to prevent surprise. Anger may create distance. Perfectionism may try to

prevent punishment. Pleasing may reduce the risk of escalation. These strategies can injure relationships and still have an understandable function. Responsibility for present behaviour remains, but condemnation alone does not build an alternative.

The question that opens the mechanism is precise: *What danger does this response predict, and what does it prevent in the next minute?* Once the prediction and reward are visible, treatment can preserve protection while reducing its unnecessary range.

Memory can be true and badly dated

A traumatic memory can be accurate in what it refers to and misleading in what it predicts now.

Ordinary remembering includes a quiet tag: this happened before. In a flashback or vivid intrusion, part of that tag is weak. An image, sound, smell, pressure or emotion arrives with the force of present threat. The person may retain some awareness of the room, or lose much of it for a short period. The defining problem is not merely vividness. It is re-experiencing with too little access to current time and context.

Memory is reconstructive. Attention during danger favours what seems central to survival, while sequence and peripheral detail may be poorly encoded. Later recall is influenced by repetition, questions, knowledge gained after the event and the purpose of remembering. Some trauma accounts are fragmented. Some are coherent. Some become more organised over time. None of these forms is a reliable lie detector.

Repeated events create another problem. Details from similar episodes may be remembered without a secure date or order. That does not make the whole account false, but it limits what memory alone can establish about a particular occasion. Establishing disputed facts calls for careful interviewing and independent checks where available. Therapy needs humility about fact-finding. The same caution protects a survivor from being disbelieved because recall is imperfect and protects others from confidence manufactured by suggestion.

That conclusion cuts in both directions. Inconsistency does not prove fabrication, especially when events were repeated, consciousness was altered, or the person is recalling under pressure. Vividness and confidence do not prove accuracy either. Suggestive interviewing and therapies aimed at recovering hidden memories can shape recall. A clinician can treat distress without claiming to verify what only independent evidence could establish.

The idea of a trigger becomes clearer here. A trigger is not anything upsetting. It is a cue that activates a learned state linked to threat. The cue may be external, such as a tone of voice, or internal, such as breathlessness, sexual arousal, pain or calm. The link may be symbolic, but it often rests on sensory or situational features learned during the event.

Context tells the system what the cue means. A bang at a fireworks display, a bang in a combat zone and a bang in an unknown alley share sound. They differ in source, predictability, location, control and available action. When current context fails to regulate the association, similarity is mistaken for recurrence.

Treatment does not need to delete the original memory. It needs to change the network of predictions around it. *I could not leave then* can meet *I can leave this room now*. *I froze* can meet *freezing was involuntary, not consent*. *Nobody helped* can meet a person who responds differently. These additions do not make the event less real. They make the present more available.

Claims that memory can be cleanly erased through reconsolidation overshoot the clinical evidence. Retrieved memories can change, and laboratory work matters, but no routine method offers a switch that rewrites the past. A better description is updating. The memory remains; its timestamp, meaning and expected consequence become more exact.

Relief can teach the alarm to return

Avoidance works. That is why it is difficult to loosen.

A person approaches a crowded train, feels alarm and goes home. The alarm falls. The immediate lesson is not *the train was safe*. It is *leaving saved me*. Psychologists call this negative reinforcement: removing an unpleasant state strengthens the behaviour that removed it. The next train now carries the memory of relief as well as the expectation of danger.

The loop is simple: cue, alarm, avoidance or safety behaviour, immediate relief, no corrective learning, greater reliance next time. It can operate in minutes and then shape years.

It can also recruit other people. A partner checks every lock, answers every reassurance request or speaks on the person's behalf. The help lowers distress and may be necessary for a time. If it becomes the only route through ordinary situations, both people can end up maintaining a rule neither chose. Support works better when it combines compassion with small returns of agency rather than sudden withdrawal or permanent rescue.

Some avoidance is visible. A person stops driving, dating, sleeping in darkness or visiting a place. Some is hidden. They attend only with an exit plan, scan every face, rehearse every sentence, keep a weapon nearby, drink first or seek repeated reassurance. Involuntary detachment can also interrupt engagement, though it is not a chosen safety behaviour. The situation is technically faced, but the person credits survival to the safety behaviour rather than discovering what they could tolerate without it.

Mental control can join the loop. Suppression requires monitoring for the thought that must not appear. Rumination looks like engagement but may circle the same unanswerable questions: *Why did I not know? Why me? What if I had turned left?* The person feels busy while remaining outside the parts of the memory, meaning or present life that could change.

Avoidance is not always wrong. Leaving abuse is protection. Refusing contact with a perpetrator may be wise. Choosing not to disclose is a right. Temporary distraction can keep a person functioning. The clinical question is whether the strategy is freely chosen and proportionate, or whether alarm has made it compulsory and life is shrinking around it.

This is why effective trauma treatment often includes approach. The person may revisit a memory in a planned setting, enter avoided situations, test a prediction, write about meaning, notice bodily sensations without escaping, or practise closeness with boundaries. The procedure is not valuable because suffering purifies. It is valuable because new evidence cannot correct a prediction that is never allowed to run.

Exposure is sometimes described as waiting until fear disappears. That is too narrow. Fear may remain during useful learning, and calm can occur without changed beliefs. The stronger aim is discrimination and flexibility: this reminder is not that event; fear can rise without catastrophe; I can choose my response; the safety behaviour was not the only reason I coped.

Approach must be collaborative. Flooding someone without consent repeats loss of control and can teach another lesson about danger. Progress is measured by life regained and predictions revised, not by how much distress a person can endure for display.

Trauma can change responsibility, trust and identity

A fear-only model cannot explain why some of the hardest trauma symptoms begin with sentences rather than alarms.

It was my fault. I should have stopped it. I am contaminated. People always leave. Power makes care impossible. If I relax, I become the person who allowed it. These are not decorative thoughts attached to a bodily disorder. They help determine what the event becomes in memory and how the person acts afterwards.

Responsibility is especially easy to distort because hindsight supplies knowledge that was unavailable during danger. After a crash, the route not taken looks obvious. After abuse, the first warning sign appears decisive. After combat or emergency work, an action made under seconds of uncertainty is judged with months of information. A fair appraisal must put each choice back into its time: what was known, what options existed, what coercion operated, and who had the duty and power to act?

The body can be drawn into the verdict. Freezing, becoming still, complying, feeling arousal or failing to fight are often interpreted as consent. They are not. Involuntary defence and automatic bodily responses do not confer agreement. A person can regret a survival response without accepting blame for the violation that produced it.

Shame and guilt also require separation. Guilt concerns an action: *I did something wrong*. Shame concerns the self: *I am wrong*. Guilt can sometimes guide repair where responsibility is real. Shame tends to hide the person from evidence, support and proportion. It can turn a perpetrator's act into a victim's identity.

Moral injury names another pattern. A person may feel damaged by committing, failing to prevent, witnessing or being betrayed in relation to acts that violate deeply held moral expectations. The term emerged strongly in military and occupational settings, but the problem is broader. Moral injury overlaps with PTSD and depression without being reducible to either. Fear treatment alone may leave guilt, grief, anger or betrayal untouched.

Trust changes through learning too. Interpersonal trauma teaches about power, dependence and credibility. When harm came from a caregiver, partner, professional or institution, closeness itself may carry mixed evidence: safety and danger were delivered by the same channel. Recovery cannot consist of telling the person to trust again. It requires opportunities to test trust in degrees, with boundaries and the right to withdraw.

Institutional betrayal can deepen the lesson. A school, employer, police service, military unit, faith community or health system may fail to prevent harm, disbelieve a report, expose the person to retaliation or protect its reputation. The aftermath then confirms the original prediction that power is unsafe. Repair requires more than sympathetic language. It requires accountable procedures, practical protection and evidence that rules apply when they are inconvenient.

Repeated or developmental trauma can narrow identity around survival. Someone becomes the competent one, invisible one, angry one, helper,

problem or patient. These roles may have preserved belonging. Later they can block needs that did not fit the old environment. Treatment should not tear away a survival identity before alternatives exist.

Nor must trauma produce growth. Some people find new priorities, activism, faith or closeness. Others want an ordinary life and no lesson. Growth language can become another demand to make harm useful. The central task is less glamorous: place responsibility accurately, recover a self larger than the event, and make relationships subject to present evidence rather than past law.

The body is evidence, not a storage vault

Trauma is bodily. That does not mean the body contains a sealed substance called trauma.

After threat, people may notice pounding heart, breathlessness, nausea, pain, trembling, sexual difficulty, digestive change, numbness, fatigue or sudden heat and cold. Sleep may fragment. Startle may become violent. The body may feel unsafe from the inside. These experiences are neither imaginary nor proof of one hidden lesion. They emerge from interacting systems that regulate arousal, attention, movement, pain, sleep, memory and interpretation.

Bodily sensation can become a trigger. A racing heart resembles panic during the event, so exercise begins to predict catastrophe. Relaxation resembles the moment before an attack, so calm feels exposed. Pain resembles injury, so every sensation demands scanning. The interpretation increases arousal, which supplies more sensation, and the loop confirms itself.

Dissociation is another part of the picture, though the word covers different experiences. Depersonalisation is a sense of detachment from oneself or one's body. Derealisation is a sense that the surroundings are unreal or distant. Other dissociative experiences involve gaps in awareness, altered time or reduced access to memory. Some accounts describe detachment under overwhelming threat as protective; that does not give every

dissociative state the same cause or purpose. These states can occur in PTSD and elsewhere. They require careful assessment because panic, sleep loss, substances, neurological conditions and other disorders can produce overlapping experiences.

Dissociation is often described as the opposite of arousal. Real people are less tidy. Numbness can coexist with a racing heart. Someone can appear still while internally overwhelmed. A single scale from calm to activated misses these combinations.

Grounding helps when it makes current context easier to detect. Naming the date, turning the head, locating doors, feeling the pressure of feet, holding a cool object, moving or hearing a trusted voice can add information about now. The aim is orientation, not compulsory calm. Slow breathing can be useful, but not everyone finds attention to breath safe, and no technique guarantees a reset of the vagus nerve or nervous system.

Sleep deserves special weight because it affects every other loop. Nightmares make sleep itself a cue. Delayed bedtime then increases fatigue, irritability and attentional bias. Alcohol and some sedating medicines may shorten the wait for sleep while disrupting its quality or creating dependence. Treating PTSD can improve sleep, yet persistent insomnia or nightmares may need direct attention as well.

Pain and illness create similar interpretive risks. Trauma can shape attention, muscle tension, activity and medical encounters, while injury and disease can produce symptoms that deserve investigation in their own right. Explaining every physical complaint as trauma can delay care and make a person distrust their body further. A trauma-informed clinician takes history and context seriously without using them to close the differential diagnosis.

The popular phrase that the body keeps the score contains one useful warning: a person may carry effects that are not resolved by an intellectual explanation. Taken as a physical claim, it misleads. Bodies do not archive a perfect story in tissue, posture or fascia for a practitioner to read. A bodily response is present evidence about prediction, state and learning. It is not

independent proof of a past event.

Movement, exercise, sleep care, sensory regulation and body-oriented practices may support recovery, especially when they restore agency and tolerance of sensation. They should be judged by safety, function and evidence, not by claims that shaking, touch or a proprietary sequence releases stored trauma. The body matters because it is where protection is enacted and choice is felt, not because it hides a code waiting for an interpreter. The same standard applies to brain images and wearable data: group associations can inform research, but no scan, heart-rate trace or sleep graph diagnoses an individual history.

Recovery is credible new evidence

Recovery need not look calm. It can look like choosing while afraid.

A person can be anxious and recovering because they take the train anyway. They can have a nightmare and recover more quickly after waking. They can remember the event without losing the room, set a boundary without disappearing, or notice shame without treating it as a verdict. Symptoms matter, but function and flexibility often reveal change first.

The event cannot be reversed, but its aftermath is not a fixed property of what happened. Persistence can involve current predictions, meanings, behaviours, relationships and conditions. Working on these processes gives treatment somewhere to act. A memory can remain painful while the prediction attached to it becomes less commanding.

The evidence must be credible. Repeating *I am safe* while still living with violence teaches little. Telling someone *it was not your fault* may fail if they have never examined the information and coercion present at the time. Entering an avoided place while relying on every old safety behaviour may credit survival to the ritual. A useful update is specific and experienced: the door was unlocked; I chose to stay; fear rose and fell; this person stopped when asked; I can leave; responsibility belonged elsewhere.

Consider an illustrative treatment goal: being able to attend a medical

appointment after a frightening procedure. Knowing that this clinician is different may be necessary and insufficient. The person might need explanations before examination, a way to signal a pause, and supported work on the memory or belief that makes the room feel inescapable. An appointment completed through silent panic is a different experience from one in which a request is heard and a pause happens. Several established therapies can help build such changes by different routes. Their success does not prove that every route uses one mechanism.

The therapeutic relationship supplies evidence too. Predictable boundaries, consent, repair after misunderstanding and a clinician who neither panics nor takes control can challenge lessons about power. Relationship alone is not always sufficient for PTSD, but technique delivered without agency can repeat the problem it aims to treat.

Some adults prefer medication, cannot access a trained therapist or need help with depression, anxiety or sleep alongside psychological treatment. That choice is legitimate. It does not turn medicine into a chemical cure for memory, and it does not make therapy a moral test. Recovery plans should reflect evidence, risk, preference, access and the problems causing the greatest restriction now.

Recovery also depends on the world outside treatment. Stable housing, protection from a perpetrator, disability support, fair work, community, cultural recognition and justice can alter the prediction system because they alter reality. A person is not failing therapy when the environment keeps producing the danger the therapy asks them to reconsider.

Recovery makes no compulsory demand for forgiveness, reconciliation, public disclosure or a positive lesson. Contact with a perpetrator may remain unsafe. Justice may matter and remain unavailable. A person can recover while angry, while remembering clearly, or while choosing permanent distance. The measure is whether those choices are increasingly deliberate rather than dictated by fear, shame or pressure from other people.

Setbacks do not erase learning. Old associations can return under stress,

illness, anniversaries, sleep loss or fresh threat. The question is whether the person has more ways to respond and returns sooner. Recovery is often an expansion before it is a silence: more places, people, feelings and futures become available.

The final test is discrimination. Can the system tell danger from resemblance, memory from recurrence, bodily arousal from proof, guilt from hindsight, and caution from compulsion? Can it respond differently when the context differs? The event raised risk, but it never contained the whole outcome. Recovery is the continuing work of giving the present enough weight that the past becomes history rather than instruction.

How It Actually Works

During and immediately after danger

The first task is survival, not understanding. Attention selects what may matter in the next second. The body mobilises, becomes still or shifts into compliance. Pain may be muted. Time may stretch, collapse or break into fragments. Complex social judgement narrows because speed has become more valuable than reflection.

What happens next can shape what the event comes to mean. A person who is believed, protected and given clear choices receives different evidence from one who is blamed, exposed to further danger or required to repeat the account to several strangers. The aftermath does not create the original harm, but it can confirm or contradict its lessons about power, control and whether help exists.

Immediate support should therefore be practical and humane. Check safety and medical needs. Help the person contact people they choose, obtain food, shelter, transport, information and privacy, and regain small decisions. Do not press for a detailed emotional account. Some people want to speak. Others need ordinary company or silence. Psychological First Aid is a framework for this kind of supportive, non-intrusive help rather than a therapy session conducted at the scene.

Choice should be concrete. *Would you like the door open or closed? Who should be called? Do you want information now or written down?* These questions return a small amount of control without pretending to repair the event. They also avoid making the helper's preferred response into another demand. The survivor may need an advocate during police, medical or employment procedures, especially where repeated accounts and loss of privacy create further strain.

A calm appearance proves little. Someone may be numb, highly trained, socially constrained or focused on a task. Intense distress also does not predict a permanent disorder. The first hours show a system responding under load, not a settled prognosis.

The first days and weeks

Sleep disruption, replaying the event, feeling on edge, poor concentration and avoidance are common early responses. They can be painful without being pathological. Many people improve as danger ends, routines return and support becomes credible. This is one reason universal treatment for everyone exposed to trauma is a poor policy.

The opposite mistake is waiting passively while severe symptoms destroy sleep, work or safety. Active monitoring means checking the trajectory rather than assuming either recovery or deterioration. It asks whether symptoms are easing, staying fixed or expanding, and whether the person can function, care for themselves and remain safe.

NICE recommends active monitoring for subthreshold symptoms within the first month, with follow-up arranged, and trauma-focused cognitive behavioural treatment for adults with acute stress disorder or clinically important PTSD symptoms during that period. It advises against psychologically focused debriefing to prevent or treat PTSD, whether or not attendance is compulsory. The distinction is not between early help and no help. It is between support or treatment matched to need and a procedure that has not earned its preventive promise.

Psychological debriefing became persuasive because it offered an orderly

story: express the experience quickly, process the emotion, prevent later illness. Trials did not establish benefit, and some evidence suggested worse outcomes. This does not mean silence protects everyone or that early therapy is harmful. An organised one-off retelling is not a vaccine against PTSD. Voluntary conversation, practical support and indicated treatment are different interventions and should not be collapsed into one verdict.

Children require developmentally adapted assessment. Distress may appear through play, behaviour, regression, bodily complaints, separation or school difficulty rather than an adult account. Caregivers can be part of treatment when safe and appropriate. A child should not be made responsible for managing an adult's need to know every detail.

Substances deserve early attention because alcohol, sedatives or stimulants can become efficient short-term regulators. Relief is real, which makes the pattern attractive. The later costs may include poorer sleep, dependence, risk-taking and a second avoidance loop. Advice works better when it addresses the function of use than when it treats it as mere indiscipline.

Return to work and routine can help by restoring structure, competence and contact, but speed is not a virtue on its own. A graded return may prevent avoidable overload. Media exposure can also matter after public disasters: repeated footage may keep threat salient without supplying useful information. The practical test is whether an activity rebuilds life, meets a real need or keeps the emergency running after the information has stopped changing.

When the emergency becomes a pattern

Consider an ordinary evening in an illustrative example. Someone who has been having nightmares postpones bed. They tidy the kitchen, answer another message and check the time. Each extra task postpones the feared moment of falling asleep. By morning they are exhausted. A sudden noise at work feels harder to bear; concentration slips; they take this as evidence that they are losing control. That evening, bed seems less inviting still. The original event has not happened again, but its aftermath has acquired a daily routine.

Several processes can keep that routine going. Trying to prevent every intrusive memory may turn attention into a lookout for the next one. Interpreting an intrusion as proof of permanent damage adds fear to an already painful experience. Avoidance brings relief quickly enough to hide its slower cost. These are possible maintaining loops, not a sequence every survivor must follow.

Meaning can hold a pattern in place even when obvious fear falls. A person may believe that recovery would betray someone who died, that pleasure means the event did not matter, or that one action under coercion defines their character. Another may remain angry because anger is the only state that does not feel helpless. More sleep or relaxation alone cannot settle those questions.

Social responses join the pattern. A family may stop mentioning the event, organise life around triggers, or repeatedly demand reassurance that the person is better. A workplace may punish reduced concentration, confirming that vulnerability is dangerous. A partner may provide so much protection that neither person can discover what the survivor can now choose. The loops are interpersonal as well as internal.

Dissociation can maintain a different version of the same problem. If signs of rising distress are noticed only after orientation has collapsed, the person may experience each episode as unpredictable. Avoiding all sensation then becomes protective. Treatment may first improve recognition of early cues

and access to the room, so approach can occur without losing the context that makes learning possible. This is preparation in service of change, not proof that the memory is too dangerous to touch.

Positive states can become cues too. Rest, intimacy, success or joy may predict vulnerability, betrayal or guilt. A life can therefore shrink around avoiding good experiences as well as frightening ones. Any model that asks only what the person fears will miss what they have learned not to allow.

Assessment: name the pattern without mistaking it for the person

The same diagnosis can lead to different first appointments. Consider three examples: someone avoiding driving after a crash; someone able to face reminders but carrying severe guilt after an occupational death; and someone still in contact with a perpetrator. All may have PTSD. None can be understood by borrowing the other person's treatment plan.

Assessment works out what belongs to this person's problem. It separates current danger from reminders and asks how symptoms affect sleep, work, relationships and safety. It checks physical health, substances and other possible conditions rather than attributing everything to trauma. It also asks what is going well, who is safe, what the person wants changed, and what makes attending treatment difficult. Diagnosis may clarify eligibility and treatment options. Formulation explains how the pieces fit together here.

Differential assessment matters because trauma language can attract unrelated symptoms. A racing heart may be panic, medication, thyroid disease or cardiac illness. Confusion may follow sleep deprivation, substance use, head injury, epilepsy or dissociation. Voices may occur in trauma-related states and in psychosis. Grief, obsessive-compulsive disorder, autism, attention difficulties and chronic pain can alter presentation. A good history keeps several explanations open until the evidence narrows them.

Assessment is not forensic verification. A clinician should not use symptom intensity, bodily reactions, fragmentation or confidence to certify the

historical accuracy of every detail. Nor should uncertainty about detail be used to dismiss suffering. Clinical and legal questions overlap, but they require different standards and methods.

Risk changes the order of work. Immediate protection, severe substance withdrawal, acute mania, psychosis, neurological symptoms or imminent self-harm may require attention before a planned trauma-focused session. That is not the same as declaring a person permanently too fragile for trauma treatment.

Goals should be observable. Fewer nightmares can matter, but so can taking one trip, sleeping without checking the door six times, returning to study, reducing alcohol, tolerating a medical examination or disagreeing with a partner without expecting abandonment. Regular measures can show whether treatment is moving the intended problem, while conversation explains what a score cannot. Failure to improve should prompt a review of diagnosis, formulation, delivery, barriers and preference rather than blame.

What trauma-focused treatment does

Treatment begins by agreeing on a model the person finds credible. The model links reminders, predictions, sensations, meanings and protective behaviour. It should explain symptoms without turning them into a permanent identity. It should also state what treatment will ask of the person, what choices remain theirs and how progress will be measured.

Trauma-focused work brings separated information into contact. A memory is revisited while the person remains connected to the present. An avoided place is approached without all the old safety behaviour. A belief is examined using what was known and possible at the time. A bodily sensation is experienced without treating it as proof of catastrophe. The goal is not maximum distress. It is new learning that is specific enough to matter.

Memory work is often selective rather than exhaustive. The clinician may focus on the moments carrying the strongest current meaning, such as the instant of believing death was certain or recognising betrayal. The person notices what happened next, what they know now and what the old

conclusion leaves out. Repetition can help, but repetition without new information can become rehearsal. The treatment needs both contact with the old prediction and access to a different one.

Therapists use several routes. Cognitive therapy for PTSD identifies appraisals that create a current sense of threat, works with the worst moments in memory, and changes behaviours that maintain the problem. Cognitive processing therapy concentrates on beliefs about responsibility, safety, trust, power, esteem and intimacy. Prolonged exposure uses repeated, planned engagement with trauma memories and avoided but safe situations. Narrative exposure therapy places multiple events within a chronological life narrative, often where repeated trauma and displacement make one isolated memory an inadequate unit.

EMDR asks the person to hold aspects of the trauma in mind while following bilateral stimulation, commonly guided eye movements, within a wider structured protocol. It can be effective for PTSD. What the eye movements contribute, and which proposed mechanism best explains change, remain debated. The evidence for benefit does not require certainty about one exclusive mechanism.

Present-centred therapy and written exposure therapy appear in some guidance as alternatives, especially when first-line protocols are unavailable or not preferred. They do not justify the claim that any supportive counselling is equivalent to a structured treatment. Treatment name, training and fidelity matter, but so does whether the procedure targets the person's maintaining processes. A protocol delivered mechanically can miss the problem; an improvised therapy can omit the parts with evidence.

For children and young people, trauma-focused CBT usually combines psychoeducation, coping skills, gradual work with trauma memories and meanings, caregiver involvement where appropriate, and help returning to developmentally important activities. In NICE guidance, EMDR is considered for some children aged seven to seventeen with a diagnosis or clinically important symptoms more than three months after trauma when they do not respond to or engage with trauma-focused CBT. Adult

recommendations are broader.

Choosing between recognised treatments

A list of therapy names can make choosing care feel like choosing a language before knowing what needs saying. Start with a more useful question: which recognised treatment can this practitioner deliver well, and how does it fit the problem we have agreed to address? A recommendation matters, but so do a clear explanation, consent and a workable plan.

There is substantial agreement about the main options. NICE recommends individual trauma-focused CBT approaches for adults with PTSD or clinically important symptoms. These include cognitive processing therapy, cognitive therapy for PTSD, narrative exposure therapy and prolonged exposure. It also recommends EMDR for adults presenting more than three months after non-combat trauma, and considers it between one and three months when the person prefers it.

The rankings are not identical. The 2023 US veterans' and defence guideline gives its strongest psychotherapy recommendation to prolonged exposure, cognitive processing therapy and EMDR. The American Psychological Association's 2025 guideline places EMDR, cognitive therapy and narrative exposure therapy below its first-line tier of prolonged exposure, cognitive processing therapy and trauma-focused CBT. Cognitive therapy and the broader CBT category are distinguished in that grading, even though their names are easily confused. This is a difference in how evidence is grouped and assessed, not evidence that EMDR has no benefit.

For the reader, the practical consequence is choice within evidence, not a contest between brands. Ask what the sessions involve, how progress will be checked, what happens if the approach does not help, and which adaptations are available. A practitioner should be able to answer without claiming that every other method treats only the surface.

Competence includes explaining options without selling one method as uniquely deep, checking consent throughout, recognising when current danger makes an exercise inappropriate, and maintaining enough structure

that avoidance does not quietly redesign treatment. It also includes cultural and language adaptation that changes examples, pacing and delivery without quietly replacing a tested treatment with an untested one. No guideline can specify that balance for every service or person.

Medication, complexity and access

Psychological treatment usually leads guideline recommendations for adult PTSD, but medication is a valid choice. The VA and DoD guideline recommends sertraline, paroxetine or venlafaxine for PTSD. It suggests prazosin for trauma-related nightmares rather than for overall PTSD symptoms, and recommends against benzodiazepines for PTSD because harms and poor fit outweigh evidence of benefit. Prescribing decisions belong with a qualified clinician who can consider other conditions, interactions, pregnancy, withdrawal and preference.

Complexity should alter care without becoming an indefinite waiting room. Severe dissociation, unstable housing, self-harm, substance dependence, neurodivergence, chronic pain, repeated trauma or relationship danger may require pacing, coordination and practical support. Evidence does not support requiring the same preparatory phase for everyone with repeated or childhood trauma. Some people need preparatory skills. Others improve with direct treatment adapted to their needs. The question is what increases safety and engagement for this person, not whether they have passed a ritual test of readiness.

Co-occurring substance use does not automatically rule out trauma-focused treatment. Integrated or concurrent care can address both, though dropout and relapse remain serious risks. Ongoing violence changes the plan more fundamentally: treatment must not train tolerance of a threat that should be escaped or stopped.

Access is part of effectiveness. Waiting lists, cost, language, childcare, disability, digital exclusion, immigration status and distrust of institutions can decide whether an evidence-based treatment exists in practice. In England, adults can self-refer to NHS Talking Therapies for problems including PTSD,

though service availability and specialist expertise vary.

Supported digital trauma-focused CBT can widen access for some adults. NICE considers it after three months for people who prefer it and do not have severe PTSD symptoms, particularly dissociation, or a risk of harm to themselves or others. It is not a universal low-cost replacement for a clinician. Privacy, reading load, digital safety, dissociation, risk and the person's home environment may alter suitability. The correct format is the one that the person can use safely and consistently, not the one that is easiest for a system to purchase.

Ending and returning

Treatment can end before every symptom disappears. A useful ending reviews what changed, which old loops remain tempting, what signs show recurrence and what the person will do next. Anniversaries, fresh threat, illness or sleep loss may reactivate old learning. Return is not reset. The measure is whether the person recognises the pattern sooner and has more options.

A relapse plan names likely pressures, early signs, helpful people, practical protections and the small actions that previously restored orientation. It also names when self-management has reached its limit. Returning for care is use of learning, not evidence that the first treatment failed.

The final change is temporal. The event moves from instruction towards history. It can still hurt, matter and shape a life without impersonating the present.

How we know

The strongest treatment claims come from randomised trials, systematic reviews and guidelines that appraise them. Those sources support trauma-focused cognitive therapies, prolonged exposure and EMDR, but the evidence base is uneven. Trials often exclude people with acute danger, severe instability or some co-occurring conditions, and many are conducted in high-income settings with trained teams that ordinary services cannot reproduce. Average symptom change does not predict one person's result.

Mechanism evidence is less settled than outcome evidence. Fear learning, memory context, appraisal, avoidance, inhibitory learning and therapeutic relationship each explain part of change, but no single account owns every symptom or treatment. Diagnostic systems also carve the subject differently, especially around complex PTSD.

Memory research supports caution in both directions: trauma can produce vivid involuntary recollection and difficulty with context, while all memory remains reconstructive and open to suggestion. Symptoms cannot verify an event. The account in this book therefore distinguishes established treatment effects from plausible mechanisms and rejects brain-scan, body-storage and recovered-memory claims that outrun their evidence.

What People Get Wrong

"Trauma is whatever hurts"

The wider use of *trauma* has made experiences such as coercion, humiliation and betrayal easier to discuss. The error is assuming that every painful experience belongs to one clinical category. Trauma-related diagnoses use narrower exposure criteria because research and treatment require boundaries. Grief, burnout, bullying, discrimination and relationship loss can cause severe suffering without sharing one mechanism or remedy.

The broader claim became persuasive because the word validates pain and links it to an external cause. Yet a label can legitimise and obscure at the

same time. Someone with panic, depression, chronic pain or an unsafe workplace may be directed towards trauma processing when another intervention is more relevant.

The correction is not to police language or rank suffering. Separate event, response and disorder. Ask what changed and what maintains the problem now. Precision protects access to the right care. It also preserves an important fact: exposure to a qualifying event does not automatically produce a trauma disorder, and distress that falls outside a diagnostic definition still deserves attention. The word should open inquiry, not finish it.

"If you froze or complied, you chose it"

Threat can reduce speech, movement and deliberate choice. People may freeze, become still, submit, appease, detach or perform whatever action seems least likely to increase danger. Genital response can occur without subjective desire. None of these responses establishes consent.

The misconception survives because events are judged from safety. A later observer sees options that were unavailable, invisible or too dangerous in the moment. The survivor may do the same, replaying what a calmer body with more information could have done.

Responsibility must be timed. Ask what information was available, how power was distributed, which constraints operated and who was obliged to stop the harm. A survival response can be understood without declaring every later behaviour harmless. The person remains responsible for how they treat others now, while the perpetrator remains responsible for the violation. Mixing those timelines converts involuntary defence into moral evidence and strengthens shame precisely where accurate responsibility could loosen it. This is why questions such as *Why did you not fight?* can wound even when asked as requests for information.

"Traumatic memory is a perfect recording"

Traumatic memories can be vivid, persistent and sensory. That does not make them video. Attention under threat is selective, sequence may be weak, similar episodes can blend, and later questions or information can alter recall. Confidence, detail and emotional intensity are poor substitutes for corroboration.

The opposite slogan is wrong too. Inconsistency does not prove a memory false, and fragmented recall is common enough to require careful interviewing. There is no universal memory shape that certifies trauma or deception.

This correction matters in therapy and investigation. Clinicians should address current suffering without acting as forensic excavators. Police and courts should avoid suggestive repetition and should seek independent evidence. Methods that promise to recover hidden memories through pressure, imagery or bodily interpretation can increase confidence without increasing accuracy. The honest position is less satisfying than either extreme: people can remember real trauma imperfectly, forget or delay recognising parts of it, and also form mistaken memories. Symptoms cannot settle which occurred. Nor can bodily reactions, dreams or a sudden feeling of certainty. These may be clinically meaningful experiences, but they are not independent corroboration. Good practice tolerates that uncertainty rather than filling it with certainty borrowed from a theory.

"You have to tell the whole story immediately"

The belief offers an attractive plumbing model: distress is pressure, disclosure releases it, and delay seals it in. It supports compulsory debriefing after disasters and pressure from helpers who feel that talking must be action.

Evidence has not established benefit from psychologically focused debriefing, and NICE advises against it for PTSD prevention or treatment. Some people want to speak early and find it useful. Others need safety, sleep, food, information, practical control or chosen company. Targeted

trauma-focused treatment can be appropriate within the first month when acute stress disorder or clinically important symptoms are present. That is different from making every exposed person recount the event.

Good support follows need rather than a timetable. It invites, does not interrogate. It allows a person to tell part, all or none of the story and to change their mind. In later treatment, structured memory work may be central, but it remains collaborative and purposeful. Disclosure is neither a test of courage nor a debt owed to the helper. A person can receive support before they can speak coherently, and coherence should never be the price of being believed or protected.

"The body stores trauma until it is released"

The body plainly participates in trauma. Heart rate, pain, sleep, posture, digestion, sexual response, numbness and movement can change. The leap is to treat these effects as a hidden physical archive that a special technique can read or discharge.

That story became popular because it gives varied symptoms one cause and makes treatment visible: shake, breathe, press, release. The evidence supports no literal store of autobiographical trauma in fascia, posture or a single branch of the nervous system. Bodily reactions are current patterns of prediction, arousal, attention, learning and health. They can be important without serving as independent proof of what happened.

Body-oriented practices, exercise, sleep treatment, breathing, movement and touch may help some people when safe and chosen. Their benefit should be measured in function, distress and agency. Claims of guaranteed nervous-system resets or released cellular memories should raise suspicion. A useful bodily intervention returns options. It does not require a mythology of trapped material. If a practitioner claims to know the history from a posture, tremor or sensation, the claim has crossed from treatment into unsupported fact-finding. Relief after a technique cannot establish the truth of the explanation sold with it.

"Complex trauma always needs stabilisation before trauma-focused work"

Some people need practical safety, substance treatment, crisis care, emotion-regulation skills or help staying oriented before focused memory work. The mistake is turning that sensible judgement into a universal sequence with no stopping rule.

The rule became persuasive because clinicians fear making vulnerable people worse, and because complex PTSD includes difficulties beyond fear. In a Dutch trial of adults with childhood-abuse-related PTSD, adding a preparatory skills phase did not produce superior overall outcomes to direct prolonged exposure. That challenges a compulsory sequence; it does not show that preparation is useless. The trial did not cover everyone in acute crisis or continuing danger. Skills can be taught before, during or alongside treatment.

Readiness should be defined by the specific barriers to engaging safely, not by a vague impression that someone is too complex. Preparatory work should have an aim, a measure and a route forward. Endless stabilisation can become therapist-led avoidance, confirming that the memory is unmanageable. Rushing can also cause harm. The correction is individual sequencing with active review, not one doctrine for every survivor. Complexity is a reason for better formulation and coordination, not a lifetime ban on the treatments with the strongest outcome evidence.

"Recovery means forgetting, forgiving or growing"

None is required. Memory may remain clear. Anger may remain proportionate. Distance from a perpetrator may remain the safest choice. Justice may matter and never arrive. Some people find meaning or growth; others want the event to occupy less of an ordinary life.

The misconception persists because recovery stories are edited for resolution. They favour dramatic disclosure, reconciliation and a stronger final self. Real recovery is often quieter: sleeping, working, travelling, tolerating closeness, recognising a trigger sooner, or choosing distance

without panic.

The strongest measure is flexibility. Can the person distinguish reminder from recurrence, guilt from hindsight, bodily arousal from proof, and present caution from inherited compulsion? Can they choose among approach, protection, connection and rest? Symptoms can recur under stress without cancelling that change. Recovery does not make the event good or useful. It gives the present more authority over what happens next. That may include forgiveness, but only as a free choice. It may equally include prosecution, protest, grief, distance or no public story at all.

Use It

A missed appointment, an angry reply or a request to leave a room gives you behaviour, not its explanation. The useful move is to ask what the person expects will happen next. These lenses can clarify your own pattern, a conversation or the design of a service. They are ways to notice and ask, not to diagnose someone from a distance.

Name the predicted danger

Start with function rather than appearance. Anger, withdrawal, checking, pleasing, sleeplessness and perfectionism can look unrelated. Ask what each response expects and what it prevents in the next minute.

A person who checks the door six times may predict intrusion, intolerable doubt or blame for failing to prevent harm. Someone who cancels a date may predict assault, humiliation, dependence or the bodily state of being trapped. The prediction needs the right level of detail. *People are unsafe* is often too broad to test. *If I disagree while alone with someone, I will not be allowed to leave* is closer to a learning target.

Do not force an answer. Some patterns become visible only by comparing situations: when does the response appear, what changes it, and what relief follows? The immediate benefit often explains why logic has not removed the behaviour. Once the function is clear, the task is to preserve legitimate

protection while finding a less costly route.

Separate danger, resemblance and uncertainty

Place a current problem into three columns in your head, though no written worksheet is required. What evidence indicates danger now? What merely resembles the past? What remains uncertain?

This prevents two opposite errors. Declaring everything a trigger can hide stalking, coercion, unsafe work or medical risk. Declaring the response irrational can ignore how closely the present reproduces the old structure. A new manager may not be abusive, yet private criticism behind a closed door may recreate loss of exit and power. The answer could be a boundary or open door, not an instruction to calm down.

Uncertainty deserves its own category because no one can prove complete safety. The goal is not certainty. It is a proportionate response based on current evidence and available options. Ask what action would still make sense if the feared outcome were possible but not certain. That question often produces protection without surrendering the whole life to prevention.

Draw the relief loop

Take one recurring pattern and write it as a sequence: cue, prediction, sensation, action, immediate result, later cost. Keep it behavioural.

Suppose an email from authority produces heat, a belief that punishment is coming, repeated rereading, a request for reassurance and two hours of delay. Reassurance lowers distress. The later costs are lost time, greater dependence on reassurance and no chance to learn that uncertainty could be tolerated. The behaviour is not foolish. It has been paid immediately and charged later.

Change one link, not the whole system. Reread one fewer time. Wait ten minutes before asking. Keep the exit plan but do not check it twice.

Approach a mild reminder while staying connected to the present. The step should test a prediction without creating needless danger. Record what happened, including any safety behaviour that might otherwise receive the

credit.

If distress becomes disorienting, risk rises or the exercise concerns a severe trauma memory, stop self-directed experimentation and seek trained help. Graded change is not a contest in endurance.

Add now to then

During a flashback or dissociative state, argument may be too abstract. Add sensory and factual information that belongs only to the present.

Turn the head rather than fixing the eyes. Name the place, date and your current age. Find an object that could not have existed at the time of the event. Feel the floor through both feet. Notice the nearest exit and whether you can use it. Move the shoulders or stand if that increases orientation. Contact a person whose voice is associated with the current life.

Choose methods while relatively settled and keep several. Breath-focused exercises help some people and intensify panic or bodily attention for others. Touch helps only when invited. Cold sensation can orient one person and overwhelm another. Grounding is successful when it improves access to the room and choice, not when it produces a prescribed degree of calm.

Afterwards, ask whether there was an earlier cue you could recognise next time. The aim is to recognise the shift sooner, not to blame the person for entering it.

Put responsibility on a timeline

When guilt or shame dominates, reconstruct the decision without hindsight. What did the person know at that second? What options were physically and socially available? What did each option risk? Who had more power, information and duty? What automatic defence occurred before deliberate choice was possible?

Then separate four things that are often merged: responsibility for causing the event, responsibility for choices made under constraint, responsibility for

repair where real harm was done, and responsibility for present behaviour. A survivor may have no responsibility for an assault and still need to repair the way trauma-driven anger has affected a partner. A responder may have made the best available decision and still grieve the outcome.

Accurate responsibility is not automatic absolution. It allows guilt to guide repair where it belongs and prevents shame from colonising everything else. Do this carefully. Courts, safeguarding inquiries and employment investigations have evidential tasks that a private reflective exercise cannot settle.

Return choice when helping

Listen without interrogation and take what the person tells you seriously. Help them find safety and support; you do not need to establish every detail before doing that. Avoid pressing for detail, offering a diagnosis or demanding confrontation with a perpetrator.

Offer choices small enough to use. Ask whether they want company, information, transport, food, a quieter place, help contacting a service or no conversation for a while. During a flashback, use short present-tense information and ask before touching. Do not crowd the person with questions.

Support approach without secretly becoming a safety behaviour. A partner can accompany the first trip, then agree how support will reduce as confidence grows. They can listen without answering the same certainty question indefinitely. Boundaries are part of safety: a helper may care deeply and still refuse abuse, sleep deprivation, financial control or being the only crisis plan.

Encourage professional help by naming the problem and the options, not by declaring someone broken. In England, NHS Talking Therapies accepts self-referrals for PTSD in many areas. Immediate danger, inability to stay safe, severe withdrawal, psychosis, mania or concerning neurological symptoms require urgent routes rather than a waiting-list referral.

The limits

This model compresses varied lives. Threat learning and avoidance explain much, but they do not explain every consequence of violence, racism, displacement, poverty, disability or betrayal. Political and material harms remain political and material even when they alter psychology.

Self-help has a narrow remit. It can improve orientation, reveal a loop and support small returns to life. It cannot provide safeguarding, diagnose head injury, manage medication, treat severe dependence or replace specialist care during acute risk. Deliberate exposure to severe memories without adequate support can become overwhelming or unstructured rehearsal. No reader owes the book a test of courage.

The evidence also has borders. Adult PTSD trials are weighted towards high-income countries and selected participants. Child treatment, complex PTSD, severe dissociation, neurodivergence, refugee experience and ongoing danger require adaptation and human judgement. Cultural differences affect what counts as self, safety, disclosure and recovery. A treatment can have a sound average effect and still be wrong for one person at one time.

The one thing to keep

Keep the distinction between alarm and command.

An alarm says that a system has detected resemblance, uncertainty or danger. It deserves attention. It does not by itself prove which one is present, and it does not dictate the response. That small gap is where recovery grows.

Ask what the alarm predicts, what evidence belongs to now, and what options exist. Sometimes the answer is to leave, report, protect or seek urgent help. Sometimes it is to stay, approach, remember, rest or allow the sensation to fall without obeying the old rule. The same bodily intensity can support different actions because context changes meaning.

Trauma makes the past feel like law. Recovery does not repeal history. It

returns jurisdiction to the present. The event remains part of the record, but it loses the automatic right to decide who is dangerous, what the body means, which relationships are possible and what the next minute must contain.

The durable change is not fearlessness. It is a wider set of deliberate moves.

Terms

A glossary of the distinctions used in this book and the language most likely to appear in further reading or clinical care.

Traumatic event. An event or series involving severe threat, violence, injury, sexual violation or horror. Diagnostic systems define the boundary more narrowly than everyday use of the word *trauma*.

Trauma response. Changes in emotion, attention, memory, bodily state, meaning or behaviour after an overwhelming event. A response may be brief, persistent or present without a formal disorder.

Post-traumatic stress disorder. A diagnosis following qualifying exposure, involving a defined pattern of re-experiencing, avoidance, threat or arousal, and other changes depending on the diagnostic system, with significant distress or impairment.

Complex PTSD. An ICD-11 diagnosis comprising the PTSD core plus persistent problems with emotion regulation, negative self-concept and relationships. DSM-5-TR does not list it as a separate diagnosis.

Acute stress disorder. A DSM diagnosis for a trauma-related symptom pattern lasting from three days to one month after exposure. Early severe symptoms require care but do not guarantee later PTSD.

Re-experiencing. The return of trauma-related memory with a sense of present occurrence, often through intrusive images, nightmares or flashbacks. It is more than choosing to think about the event.

Intrusion. An unwanted memory, image, thought, sensation or emotion entering awareness. Intrusions occur in several disorders and ordinary life; their meaning depends on content, context, frequency and impact.

Flashback. An episode in which a traumatic memory is experienced with reduced access to current time and surroundings. Flashbacks vary from brief sensory moments to marked loss of present orientation.

Trigger. A cue that activates a learned trauma-related state. It may be external or internal and need not resemble the event in an obvious verbal way.

Avoidance. Efforts to escape or prevent memories, feelings, sensations, people, places or activities linked to threat. It may protect appropriately or maintain a problem by blocking corrective learning.

Safety behaviour. An action used to prevent feared harm while entering a situation, such as repeated checking or relying on an exit ritual. Survival may then be credited to the behaviour.

Hypervigilance. Persistent monitoring for danger in the environment, other people or the body. It may track current risk, overgeneralised threat, or both, so context is essential.

Startle response. A rapid defensive reaction to sudden stimulation. An exaggerated startle can occur after trauma, but it is not specific enough to diagnose PTSD or reveal what happened.

Threat generalisation. Learning that spreads from a dangerous cue to similar cues or situations. Some generalisation protects; excessive spread makes safe differences hard to use.

Contextual learning. Learning about where, when and under what conditions a cue predicts danger. Context helps a reminder remain a memory rather than becoming an apparent recurrence.

Negative reinforcement. Strengthening a behaviour because it removes an unpleasant state. Avoidance persists partly because leaving, checking or

numbing lowers distress in the short term.

Dissociation. A broad term for disruptions in the usual integration of awareness, memory, identity, sensation or surroundings. It requires assessment because several psychological, medical and substance-related conditions can overlap.

Depersonalisation. A dissociative experience of detachment from oneself, one's thoughts or one's body. The person may feel unreal or observe themselves from a distance while knowing the experience is altered.

Derealisation. A dissociative experience in which the environment feels unreal, distant or dreamlike. It can occur with trauma, panic and other conditions without proving any single cause.

Grounding. Methods that increase access to present time, place, sensation and choice during overwhelming or dissociative states. The aim is orientation, not a compulsory level of calm.

Formulation. A collaborative explanation of how a person's problems developed and are maintained, including triggers, meanings, behaviour, relationships, strengths and current conditions. It complements rather than replaces diagnosis.

Moral injury. Distress following acts, omissions or betrayals that violate deeply held moral expectations. It may involve guilt, shame, anger or loss of trust and can overlap with PTSD.

Shame. A painful appraisal that the self is defective, contaminated or unworthy. Unlike guilt about a specific action, shame tends to generalise across identity and relationships.

Trauma-focused CBT. A family of structured cognitive behavioural treatments that work directly with trauma memories, meanings and avoidance. The label covers related protocols rather than one identical procedure.

Cognitive therapy for PTSD. A treatment developed around appraisals,

trauma memory and behaviours that maintain a sense of current threat. It combines memory updating with behavioural change.

Cognitive processing therapy. A structured treatment that examines trauma-related beliefs, especially around responsibility, safety, trust, power, esteem and intimacy, through discussion and written work.

Prolonged exposure. A structured treatment that repeatedly approaches the trauma memory and situations avoided despite present safety. Its purpose is new learning and regained life, not distress for its own sake.

EMDR. Eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing, a structured trauma treatment combining recall with bilateral stimulation, commonly guided eye movements. It can help PTSD although its precise mechanisms remain debated.

Psychological First Aid. Humane, practical and supportive help after crisis or disaster. It prioritises safety, needs, information, social support and choice rather than compulsory emotional debriefing.

Active monitoring. Planned follow-up after recent trauma when symptoms do not yet require immediate treatment. It tracks safety, function and whether reactions are easing or expanding, rather than assuming that time alone will solve them.

Go Deeper

The broad human frame. Judith Lewis Herman, *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence, From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror* (2022 edition). Herman connects private violence, captivity, social recognition and recovery without reducing trauma to an isolated brain problem. Her three-part sequence of safety, remembrance and reconnection has shaped clinical language for decades. Read it for the insistence that power, relationship and public truth belong inside the subject. The book first appeared in 1992, so some diagnostic and treatment details predate current guidelines. Its larger social argument remains a useful counterweight to accounts that place the whole burden of recovery inside the individual.

The memory correction. Richard J. McNally, *Remembering Trauma* (2003). This is the demanding choice, and the best antidote to the claim that vividness, fragmentation, bodily sensation or hypnosis can certify historical truth. McNally examines traumatic memory, repression, recovered-memory controversies and the laboratory evidence with a scepticism that can feel severe. That severity is useful where clinical compassion and factual investigation are being confused. The book does not deny trauma or the reality of abuse. It shows why care for a person cannot depend on treating one theory of memory as settled, and why suggestive attempts to excavate hidden events can create harm.

The treatment guide. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, *Post-traumatic Stress Disorder*, guideline NG116 (2018). This is the most useful next stop for a UK reader deciding what evidence-based care should look like. It covers recognition, active monitoring, trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapies, EMDR, medication, children, complex needs and the warning against psychologically focused debriefing. It is a clinical guideline rather than a self-treatment manual. Use it to check whether a proposed service offers a recognised intervention, trained delivery, consent and review. Its recommendations reflect evidence and the NHS setting, so access and practice elsewhere may differ.

The working model. Anke Ehlers and David M. Clark, “A Cognitive Model of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder” (2000). This journal article supplies one of the clearest technical accounts of why a past event can continue to feel like a current threat. It links memory qualities, appraisals, avoidance and safety behaviours, then shows how each can prevent updating. Much of this book’s language about present threat and dated memory draws from that tradition, while combining it with other learning and social models. The paper is written for clinicians and researchers, but the account of persistence repays the effort. Treat it as a powerful model, not the sole proven mechanism of every trauma response.

Notes and Sources

The notes follow the manuscript in order and identify the main support for claims that carry diagnostic, causal, treatment or safety weight. They do not turn every ordinary clinical description into a citation trail. Diagnostic summaries are educational and cannot establish a diagnosis in an individual.

Reader note and current UK routes. NHS guidance was checked on 5 September 2026. In England, NHS 111 provides an urgent mental-health option, while immediate danger or inability to stay safe requires 999 or A&E. NHS Talking Therapies permits self-referral for many adults and includes PTSD among the conditions it may treat. Local thresholds and specialist pathways vary. Samaritans' 116 123 number is current for the UK and Republic of Ireland. These routes are jurisdiction-specific and may change.

Event, response and disorder. The diagnostic event boundaries and symptom descriptions draw from the American Psychiatric Association's *DSM-5-TR* and the World Health Organization's 2024 clinical descriptions for ICD-11. ICD-11 PTSD centres on re-experiencing in the present, deliberate avoidance and a persistent sense of current threat, with impairment. ICD-11 complex PTSD adds disturbances in affect regulation, self-concept and relationships. The systems do not use identical definitions. Neither treats exposure as sufficient for diagnosis. WHO also states that most people exposed to potentially traumatic events do not develop PTSD. Variation in response trajectories is supported by Galatzer-Levy and colleagues' review, but trajectory estimates depend on sample, measure and observation schedule.

Protection, generalisation and context. The false-alarm model is a synthesis of learning theory and cognitive accounts, especially Ehlers and Clark, Dunsmoor and Paz, Craske and colleagues, and Liberzon and Abelson. Threat generalisation is not inherently pathological. It becomes costly when cues resembling danger trigger broad, rigid protection that no longer tracks context. Brain-region descriptions in the research literature are

group-level, probabilistic and heterogeneous. They do not permit a scan, wearable trace or bodily pattern to diagnose PTSD or reconstruct an event in one person.

Memory and present time. Brewin's 2014 review supports a distinction between perceptual and episodic memory processes without claiming that traumatic memory has one universal form. McNally's synthesis and Otgaar and colleagues' review support the cautions about suggestibility, recovered-memory practices and the absence of a reliable truth test in vividness, emotion or fragmentation. Trauma can affect encoding and retrieval, but inconsistent order is neither proof of lying nor proof of trauma. Clinical support should not be used as forensic verification. Memory reconsolidation is an active research framework, reviewed critically by Elsey and colleagues. Laboratory findings do not establish a clinical delete button.

Avoidance, safety behaviour and exposure. Ehlers and Clark describe behavioural and cognitive strategies that reduce distress while maintaining a sense of current threat. Craske and colleagues explain exposure as new inhibitory learning rather than a requirement to become calm during every exercise. This supports the manuscript's emphasis on outcome, agency, context and the removal of unnecessary safety behaviours. It does not make avoidance universally irrational. Leaving real danger, limiting contact with a perpetrator and using protective equipment are different from treating safe resemblance as recurrence.

Freezing, submission and responsibility. Defensive immobility and involuntary responses are documented across human and animal threat research, but simple fight-flight-freeze taxonomies can overstate neat biological categories. The manuscript therefore uses these terms descriptively rather than diagnostically. Consent requires freedom and capacity, not a particular pattern of resistance. Chivers and colleagues studied laboratory agreement between genital and self-reported arousal, not whether assault survivors consented. The finding supports non-equivalence of physiological response and felt desire. RAINN's consent guidance explicitly states that involuntary arousal does not equal consent; it supplies

the direct support for that distinction here. Later knowledge is separated from the information, coercion and options available during the event. Moral injury is used as a clinical and conceptual term following Litz and colleagues, not as a DSM or ICD diagnosis.

Shame, trust and the social aftermath. Herman's work supplies the broad social frame: trauma can involve power, captivity, recognition and damaged connection as well as conditioned fear. The account of identity and trust is also consistent with cognitive models in which appraisals about self and others maintain present threat. Institutional failure is treated as a real change in the environment, not an internal symptom to be corrected. No single therapy model proves every social claim in this section.

Body, dissociation, sleep and pain. DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 recognise dissociative and somatic experiences around trauma, while clinical reviews show considerable heterogeneity. The manuscript rejects a single arousal scale and any claim that tissue, fascia, posture or a proprietary test stores a readable event record. Grounding examples are low-risk orientation options, not guaranteed treatments. Sleep and pain may interact with PTSD, but persistent physical symptoms still require appropriate medical assessment. Group associations between PTSD and physical health do not establish a psychological cause for an individual's symptom.

Early support. The World Health Organization's *Psychological First Aid* guide supports humane, practical assistance that protects dignity, culture and choice. It is not compulsory emotional processing. The Cochrane review by Rose and colleagues and NICE NG116 support the warning against psychologically focused debriefing for prevention or treatment. NICE recommendation 1.6.5 is not confined to compulsory attendance. This evidence does not mean that voluntary conversation, accurate information or supportive listening is harmful. NICE distinguishes active monitoring for some recent subthreshold symptoms from targeted trauma-focused CBT when acute stress disorder or clinically important PTSD symptoms warrant treatment. Holman, Garfin and Silver found an association between heavy media exposure after the 2013 Boston Marathon bombings and acute stress

in a US survey. The setting, self-reported exposure and observational design do not establish that any amount of news viewing causes later PTSD.

Assessment and neighbouring conditions. The diagnostic sections use DSM-5-TR, ICD-11 and NICE. PTSD can coexist with depression, grief, panic, substance use, pain, traumatic brain injury, psychosis or other conditions. Similar surface symptoms can arise through different processes. The manuscript does not supply a diagnostic questionnaire or a rule for separating them without assessment. New neurological symptoms, severe withdrawal risk, psychosis, mania, inability to care for oneself or imminent suicide risk require appropriate urgent or medical care.

What trauma-focused treatment is trying to change. Ehlers and Clark, Foa and Kozak, and Craske and colleagues offer overlapping but non-identical accounts involving appraisals, emotional processing, context and new learning. Effective treatment does not prove one exclusive neural mechanism. The manuscript's phrase *credible new evidence* is an editorial synthesis. It is meant to connect memory, meaning, behaviour, relationship and real-world safety, not to claim discovery of a single biological process.

Guideline agreement and difference. NICE NG116 was published in December 2018. The recommendations cited here were checked for this edition on 5 September 2026. The 2023 US Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense guideline strongly recommends individual trauma-focused psychotherapy over medication and names cognitive processing therapy, EMDR and prolonged exposure. The American Psychological Association's 2025 adult guideline places cognitive processing therapy, prolonged exposure and trauma-focused CBT in its stronger recommendation tier, with EMDR, cognitive therapy and narrative exposure therapy in its suggested second-line tier. These grading differences reflect methods, included evidence and decision rules. They do not justify calling EMDR unsupported, nor do they prove that every named therapy is interchangeable for every person.

Children and young people. NICE gives development-specific

recommendations. Trauma-focused CBT leads treatment for children and adolescents, with caregiver involvement where appropriate and safe. EMDR has a more restricted place than it does in adult recommendations. Adult trials cannot silently supply a paediatric treatment rule. This manuscript therefore keeps child care at boundary depth and directs it to trained, developmentally appropriate services.

Complex PTSD and preparatory work. ICD-11 complex PTSD is a distinct symptom organisation, not shorthand for any long or severe trauma history. Opriel and colleagues compared prolonged exposure, intensified prolonged exposure and STAIR followed by prolonged exposure in 149 adults with PTSD related to childhood abuse in the Netherlands. All groups improved, without a significant overall advantage for the phase-based sequence. The study compared eight preparatory STAIR sessions followed by exposure with standard or intensified exposure, not years of preparation. Participants were adults able to enter a Dutch outpatient trial; acute suicide risk and other serious instabilities were excluded. That one trial does not settle readiness for every person, culture or service. Safety, dissociation, substance withdrawal, housing, coercion, capacity and preference can make preparation essential. The correction is against a compulsory indefinite gate, not against preparation.

Medication. NICE allows venlafaxine or an SSRI such as sertraline for adults who prefer drug treatment, with specialist antipsychotic augmentation only in selected severe cases. The VA/DoD guideline gives its strongest medication support to sertraline, paroxetine and venlafaxine, recommends against benzodiazepines for PTSD, and distinguishes possible prazosin use for nightmares from treatment of PTSD overall. Licences and prescribing practice differ by country. No reader should start, stop or alter a medicine from this book. Abrupt withdrawal after dependence on alcohol, benzodiazepines or other sedatives can be dangerous.

EMDR mechanism. Treatment efficacy and mechanism are separate questions. Guidelines support EMDR, while research on the added contribution of eye movements and the precise mechanism remains

debated. Lee and Cuijpers found an added effect of eye movements in experimental and treatment studies, but this does not establish one complete explanation. The manuscript therefore describes the protocol and evidence without presenting bilateral stimulation as a device that extracts or erases stored memory.

Co-occurring substance use and other complexity. Current guidelines and systematic reviews no longer support a universal rule that a person must achieve prolonged abstinence before any trauma-focused treatment. Integrated and trauma-focused approaches can help selected people with PTSD and substance-use problems. Intoxication, unstable withdrawal, overdose risk and inability to engage still require direct management. The most appropriate sequence depends on acute safety and the functions the substance is serving.

Recovery and growth. Recovery is described through symptom change, restored function, wider behavioural options and more accurate discrimination. It does not require forgiveness, reconciliation, disclosure or a return to a pre-trauma identity. Post-traumatic growth is a reported experience for some people, but self-reported growth does not always equal measured positive change. Tedeschi and Calhoun establish the construct. Frazier and colleagues compared retrospective growth reports with change measured across two months in university students. That limited design challenges treating a growth questionnaire as proof of measured change; it does not establish that no survivor grows.

Illustrative material and provenance. The door slam, hard braking, lift smell, dinner, train, corridor, medical appointment, evening routine, boundary and helper examples are illustrative constructions, not reports of named patients or documented events. They combine common mechanisms to make them visible. No invented dialogue, private motive or recovered factual memory is presented as evidence. The examples should never be used to infer what happened to a particular person.

Data and external validity. The book deliberately avoids combining prevalence figures with incompatible populations, trauma definitions,

instruments or observation periods. Guideline publication dates, surveillance dates and the periods covered by supporting trials are kept separate. The adult treatment evidence is weighted towards high-income countries, people able to enter trials and services with trained therapists. Transport to children, refugees, people living under continuing violence, neurodivergent people, culturally distinct communities, severe dissociation, disability and multiple unstable conditions requires more judgement than a one-hour general book can supply.

Bibliography

Diagnostic systems, guidelines and official sources

American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed., text rev. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Publishing, 2022.

American Psychological Association. *APA Clinical Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in Adults*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2025.

National Health Service. *Find NHS Talking Therapies for Anxiety and Depression*. London: NHS, accessed 5 September 2026.

National Health Service. *PTSD (Post-traumatic Stress Disorder)*. London: NHS, accessed 5 September 2026.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Post-traumatic Stress Disorder*. NICE guideline NG116. London: NICE, 2018. Recommendations consulted 5 September 2026.

US Department of Veterans Affairs and US Department of Defense. *VA/DoD Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Acute Stress Disorder*. Version 4.0. Washington, DC: Departments of Veterans Affairs and Defense, 2023.

World Health Organization. *Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Requirements for ICD-11 Mental, Behavioural and Neurodevelopmental Disorders*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2024.

World Health Organization, War Trauma Foundation and World Vision International. *Psychological First Aid: Guide for Field Workers*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2011.

National Health Service. *Where to Get Urgent Help for Mental Health*. Accessed 5 September 2026. [NHS urgent help](#).

RAINN. *Consent 101: Respect, Boundaries, and Building Trust*. Updated 31 May 2026. [Consent guidance](#).

Samaritans. *Talk to Us on the Phone*. Accessed 5 September 2026. [Telephone support](#).

US Department of Veterans Affairs, National Center for PTSD. *Overview of Psychotherapy for PTSD; Clinician's Guide to Medications for PTSD; Dissociative Subtype of PTSD; and Complex PTSD*. Accessed 5 September 2026. [Psychotherapy guidance](#); [medication guidance](#); [dissociation](#); [complex PTSD](#).

Pappas, Stephanie. "PTSD and Trauma: New APA Guidelines Highlight Evidence-Based Treatments." *Monitor on Psychology*. July 2025. American Psychological Association. [Issuer's account of the 2025 guideline](#).

Books, reviews and research

Brewin, Chris R. "Episodic Memory, Perceptual Memory, and Their Interaction: Foundations for a Theory of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder." *Psychological Bulletin* 140, no. 1 (2014): 69-97. DOI: 10.1037/a0033722.

Craske, Michelle G., Michael Treanor, Christopher C. Conway, Tomislav Zbozinek and Bram Vervliet. "Maximizing Exposure Therapy: An Inhibitory Learning Approach." *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 58 (2014): 10-23. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2014.04.006.

Chivers, Meredith L., Michael C. Seto, Martin L. Lalumière, Ellen Laan and

Teresa Grimbos. "Agreement of Self-Reported and Genital Measures of Sexual Arousal in Men and Women: A Meta-analysis." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 39, no. 1 (2010): 5-56. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-009-9556-9.

Dunsmoor, Joseph E., and Rony Paz. "Fear Generalization and Anxiety: Behavioral and Neural Mechanisms." *Biological Psychiatry* 78, no. 5 (2015): 336-343. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.04.010.

Ehlers, Anke, and David M. Clark. "A Cognitive Model of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder." *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 38, no. 4 (2000): 319-345. DOI: 10.1016/S0005-7967(99)00123-0.

Elsley, James W. B., Vanessa A. Van Ast and Merel Kindt. "Human Memory Reconsolidation: A Guiding Framework and Critical Review of the Evidence." *Psychological Bulletin* 144, no. 8 (2018): 797-848. DOI: 10.1037/bul0000152.

Foa, Edna B., and Michael J. Kozak. "Emotional Processing of Fear: Exposure to Corrective Information." *Psychological Bulletin* 99, no. 1 (1986): 20-35. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.99.1.20.

Frazier, Patricia, Howard Tennen, Margaret Gavian, Crystal Park, Patricia Tomich and Ty Tashiro. "Does Self-Reported Posttraumatic Growth Reflect Genuine Positive Change?" *Psychological Science* 20, no. 7 (2009): 912-919. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02381.x.

Galatzer-Levy, Isaac R., Sandy H. Huang and George A. Bonanno. "Trajectories of Resilience and Dysfunction Following Potential Trauma: A Review and Statistical Evaluation." *Clinical Psychology Review* 63 (2018): 41-55. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2018.05.008.

Herman, Judith Lewis. *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence, From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*. New York: Basic Books, 2022.

Holman, E. Alison, Dana Rose Garfin and Roxane Cohen Silver. "Media's Role in Broadcasting Acute Stress Following the Boston Marathon Bombings." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 111, no. 1 (2014): 93-98. DOI:

10.1073/pnas.1316265110.

Lee, Christopher W., and Pim Cuijpers. "A Meta-analysis of the Contribution of Eye Movements in Processing Emotional Memories." *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry* 44, no. 2 (2013): 231-239. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbtep.2012.11.001.

Liberzon, Israel, and James L. Abelson. "Context Processing and the Neurobiology of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder." *Neuron* 92, no. 1 (2016): 14-30. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2016.09.039.

Litz, Brett T., Nathan Stein, Eileen Delaney, Leslie Lebowitz, William P. Nash, Caroline Silva and Shira Maguen. "Moral Injury and Moral Repair in War Veterans: A Preliminary Model and Intervention Strategy." *Clinical Psychology Review* 29, no. 8 (2009): 695-706. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2009.07.003.

McNally, Richard J. *Remembering Trauma*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.

Oprel, Danielle A. C., Chris M. Hoeboer, Maartje Schoorl, et al. "Effect of Prolonged Exposure, Intensified Prolonged Exposure and STAIR+Prolonged Exposure in Patients with PTSD Related to Childhood Abuse: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *European Journal of Psychotraumatology* 12, no. 1 (2021): 1851511. DOI: 10.1080/20008198.2020.1851511.

Otgaar, Henry, Mark L. Howe, Lawrence Patihis, et al. "The Return of the Repressed: The Persistent and Problematic Claims of Long-Forgotten Trauma." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 14, no. 6 (2019): 1072-1095. DOI: 10.1177/1745691619862306.

Rose, Suzanna C., Jonathan I. Bisson, Rachel Churchill and Simon Wessely. "Psychological Debriefing for Preventing Post Traumatic Stress Disorder." *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 2 (2002): CD000560. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000560.

Tedeschi, Richard G., and Lawrence G. Calhoun. "Posttraumatic Growth:

Conceptual Foundations and Empirical Evidence.” *Psychological Inquiry* 15,
no. 1 (2004): 1-18. DOI: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1501_01.