

Workshop 4

Continuing Psycho-Social Assistance:
some comments on the contents of
paragraphs III, IV and IX of the Draft
Standards

Emergency assistance (par. III)

- **“evidence based”** instead of **“appropriate”**?
- **Inclusion of “witnesses”**
- **“free of charge”** might suggest other forms of assistance mentioned throughout the rest of the standards are not free of charge; should these terms be excluded?
- **“immediate needs”** are primarily provided by non-professionals; should citizens be trained for provision of assistance immediately after the traumatic event?
- **Coordination**; how should this be adequately arranged?
- **“spiritual assistance”**; what does this mean?

Continuing assistance (par. IV)

- **Community based interventions should be included as well (e.g. self-help groups of victims)**
- Problem of causal relation between traumatic event and particular psychological complaints post-victimisation
- Problem of recognition of traumatic events by practitioners
- How to determine when healing has occurred?

Information to victims and the public (par. IX)

- “open, transparent and honest” information instead of “adequate”?
 - mistakes in communication are likely to occur in the immediate aftermath of a traumatic event
 - risk of inducing fear among citizens

Final/general remarks

- How many professionals do we need?; **should an obligation to provide for enough monetary resources to train psychologists be included in the standards?**
- Cross-cultural validity of standards?
- Provision of varying forms of assistance realistic?
- **“mass victimisation of terrorism” or “mass victimisation”?**
- **Inclusion of definition of “ first responders”?**
- **“a/the victim” and/or “victims”?**