

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**COLONIAL WARS: collective traumas,  
European memories**

Coimbra (PT), 2-5 October 2011

Convened by:  
**Margarida Calafate Ribeiro and Luísa Sales**

---

**SCIENTIFIC REPORT**

---

# 1. Executive summary

## Background and goals

The European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop *Colonial Wars: Collective Traumas, European Memories*, organised by the Centre for Social Studies, at the University of Coimbra, was a two-day meeting that assembled experts from three different research fields — cultural studies, history and psychiatry.

The meeting was a follow-up to the project *Children of Colonial Wars: postmemory and representations*, coordinated by Margarida Calafate Ribeiro at the Centre for Social Studies (2007-2011). This 4-year project (sponsored by FCT and the Ministry of National Defense) had as one of its aims to open lines of comparative research at European scale to study the postmemory of the European Colonial Wars of the 20th century. This multidisciplinary exploratory workshop was a first step in that direction.

The goal of the workshop was to broaden the knowledge of intergenerational transfer of historical, cultural and psychopathological memories related to the overseas experience of the European colonial wars. The specific objectives of the workshop were:

- To rethink the concepts of memory, postmemory and trauma critically.
- To explore the impact of the postmemory of overseas colonial wars on European postcolonial imaginaries.
- To inscribe 20th century European colonialism in the context of a history of violence.
- To rethink post-Second World War multicultural Europe as the result of both colonial heritage and a process of migratory fluxes.
- To bring together expertise on the study of psychopathological vulnerability to trauma in children of men suffering from war PTSD.
- To analyse the possibility of a European comparative study on second-generation memories, “transfer of memories”, and vulnerability to trauma.
- To explore the multidisciplinary dimension of studies on the impacts of historical and/or traumatic events on second generations.
- To bring together a research network in order to formulate an application for funding from European research programmes.

## Workshop agenda

Nineteen experts from eight countries gathered for two days of intense work in Coimbra. One guest was from Mozambique, and a second guest from Croatia, representatives of two countries with a different historical experience when we discuss the colonial overseas European experience, but with violent experiences of war. These two contributions were fundamental to complexify the discussion around experience of war, memory, testimony and trauma adding a comparative stance to the discussion about the memories of European overseas colonial wars.

The workshop was organised into five thematic sessions: (i) memory, postmemory, identities; (ii) traumatic memory and vulnerability; (iii) colonial memories, postcolonial predicaments; (iv) colonial wars, European memories; and (v) second generation and the question of testimony.

In each session, participants were asked to contribute with a fifteen minutes reflection on the subject under discussion. However, all participants were to intervene in the following debate, which was granted enough time, as to create the necessary dynamics for debate.

CES premises are strategically located in the main campus of the University. Organizers took advantage of it and used nearby facilities to offer the coffee/tea breaks, in order to offer participants a short walk in the sun during the breaks, allowing for individual acquaintances and strengthening of academic ties. Although the workshop was very intense, the organizers could nevertheless find a 30 minutes interval at lunch time, to offer our guests a guided tour to the University's Joanina Library on October 4. This is an 18th-century baroque style library that holds precious manuscripts in the University. The down side of the intensive working programme was the tiredness showing during dinners, thought initially as the main forum for additional informal interaction.

### **Overall conclusions and expected follow-up**

The workshop allowed thus a relaxed – though hardworking – atmosphere, which gives the convenors the certainty for future success of the workshop agenda: to constitute a net of contacts to facilitate the thematic and geographical mobility of researchers at post-graduate level and beyond; and, to produce an application for a project on the postmemories of European wars. In order to enable the contact between the group, the convenors have created a restricted access website, where participants have access to the archives of the meeting, including papers and presentations, contacts, biographical notes, etc. ([www.ces.uc.pt/projectos/filhosdaguerracolonial/pages/en/esf-workshop.php](http://www.ces.uc.pt/projectos/filhosdaguerracolonial/pages/en/esf-workshop.php))

## **2. Scientific content of the event**

### **Opening session**

At the opening session Margarida Calafate Ribeiro welcomed all the participants and expressed her and the Centre for Social Studies (CES) gratitude to ESF and to all the participants. A special welcome was addressed to Prof Akile Gürsoy, ESF representative, and to Prof. João Paulo Borges Coelho, who came from the University Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique.

She also presented Dr Luísa Sales (co-convenor) apologies and regrets for not being present due to severe illness.

Prof. António Sousa Ribeiro, as a member of CES team and a founder of the institution, did a brief presentation of CES as a scientific institution devoted to research and advanced training in the area of the social sciences and humanities. He also emphasised the major strategic orientations of the institution:

- To promote cultural interaction and interdisciplinarity;

- To strengthen the participation in national and international networks, with special attention to European and North-South cooperation, and the relationship with Portuguese-speaking countries;
- To promote human rights, democratic participation and active citizenship supporting the elaboration of public policies;
- To improve the knowledge about the Portuguese society in a comparative perspective;
- To promote post-graduate studies and advanced training activities.

Margarida Calafate Ribeiro explained the objectives of the workshop and presented the main results of the project *Children of the Portuguese Colonial Wars: post-memory and representations*: this was the starting point of the workshop, as expressed in the working paper that circulated among the participants before the workshop. She concluded with the certainty that the diversity of disciplines presented in the room, the diversity of nationalities and European languages and the diversity of knowledge and experiences would be a guarantee of a successful workshop.

### **Presentation of the ESF representative, Prof. Akile Gürsoy**

The presentation was extremely well presented and informative. The participants dialogued with Prof. Akile Gürsoy about the topics presented and the possibilities of research offered by the ESF. Prof. Akile Gürsoy kindly answered all questions and offered her contacts for further information. During the two day workshop Prof. Akile Gürsoy was an extremely devoted participant in all discussions and provided all relevant information regarding ESF for the participants.

### **Thematic sessions**

The workshop was organised into five thematic sessions: (i) memory, postmemory, identities; (ii) traumatic memory and vulnerability; (iii) colonial memories, postcolonial predicaments; (iv) colonial wars, European memories; and (v) second generation and the question of testimony.

The first session - **Memory, Postmemory, Identities** - was a wonderful dialogue between an historian, a media studies specialist and a psychiatrist and discussed, in different perspectives, the important concepts of the workshop.

**Diogo Ramada Curto** focused his presentation on the analysis of the Portuguese official discourses that legitimated the beginning of the colonial war in Angola, in 1961, and in the discourse of those who opposed it.

The two cases under analysis were the official discourse of lusotropicalism, by the Brazilian sociologist and anthropologist Gilberto Freyre (a discourse based in a colonial society that was able to integrate people coming from different races, ethnicities, identities) and the reaction to these trends, mostly promoted by people affiliated with the opposition, and historians (namely Charles Boxer), sociologists and intellectuals who emphasised violence, conflict and racial discrimination as a feature of the Portuguese empire at large.

The discussion centred on this form of duplicity, of dissimulation on the official discourse for internal and external propaganda. To conclude, these discourses will certainly contribute to today's divorce and conflict between the official memory of the colonial wars and the private and public memories of the same war.

In dialogue with the questions raised by Ramada Curto's intervention, the psychiatrist **Rui Mota Cardoso** explained clearly what memory is and how it works in physiological and psychological terms. In this definition, memory is the way past events affect the future and the way people forget or remember facts and narratives that are important to understand the present. The important second point of this talk was the difference between memory and forgetting, that which is medically called "explicit memories", the ones we remember, and "implicit memories", the ones we forget, and can come to life in the case of an experience of trauma, for example. The third part of the talk concerned the human body inscription of a traumatic memory and how it conditions the future, summarized in the expression, "the body remembers". Finally, Mota Cardoso concludes with data from the project *The Children of the Portuguese Colonial Wars* to define post-memory as a presence of an absence.

**Cristina Demaria** returns to the social sciences approach to memory, but in dialogue with the definitions previously presented. Her discussion was a conceptual one, regarding the main concepts on the field of memory: memory, cultural memory, official memory, collective memory, on one hand, and private memory, familiar memory and post-memory, on the other hand. She also provided an excellent synthesis of trauma in the European cultural horizon. As if to complete Mota Cardoso's definition of memory as the way past events affect the future, Cristina Demaria talked about cultural memory as a production of an *effet du sens*: it is the meaning, articulated in a narrative, of what is to be remembered, but also the effect of the very practice of remembering.

Thus, since the first interdisciplinary session, the group was engaged in lively dialogue and the following debate reflected on one hand on the justificative dimension of the colonial discourse and its transfer nowadays to some politics of remembrance and, on the other hand, on some reactions to the conceptual debate presented by this session, which were very useful for the next session that would focus more on traumatic memories - **Traumatic Memory and Vulnerability** - and the ways of dealing and coping with it.

**Dean Ajdukovic** talked about the individual and massive traumatic memory in a post-conflict community, following a perspective from the field. The example under study is the post-conflict in Croatia after the war in the nineties. The key questions for the analysis are:

How does exposure to massive trauma affect the functioning of groups at different levels – from a family to a community?

How does past experience of massive suffering affect life in ethnically mixed communities today?

How does the past relate to social reconstruction of communities and individual recovery from trauma?

What is the general social context of recovery in a post-conflict community?

Dean Ajdukovic identifies five characteristics: (1) lack of stability and feelings of safety add weight to the experience and memory of suffering; (2) loss of capacity to plan life is enhanced by objectively unstable post-conflict environments; (3) communities are fragmented and divided; (4) social networks and other normally available support mechanisms are shattered; (5) the increase in family and public violence is evident in all countries affected by upheaval and social transition in Europe.

The conclusion is that such context increases the likelihood of transgenerational transmission of violence and there is no immediate solution but a series of strategies to try to deal with an heritage of destruction and ethnic killing: (1) create within the community the transitional space where is possible to mobilise thought and words to talk about distress and pain as an

individual and collective level; (2) promote the social reconstruction, structures like homes, schools, churches, charity points are special places to promote and to work out social reconstruction.

In dialogue with Dean Ajdukovic, **Michèle Vitry**, as a psychoanalyst, discussed the importance of creating the ideal conditions for the traumatized person to speak out; regarding collective trauma, the conditions are much more complex for the psychoanalyst and the work with a team of specialists is essential to arrive at a plan of action in collective and individual terms.

**Miranda Olf** has a very proactive action of intervention on crisis, depending on the type of event that provokes the trauma and on the type of trauma: whether a singular trauma from experiencing a single traumatic situation or a succession of traumatic events. The approach to deal with trauma is a combination of psychological and pharmacological interventions that can help individuals to turn maladaptive responses into more adaptive ones. She concludes that additional research is needed examining the associations between appraisal and coping and the neuroendocrine response to further our understanding of the process through which PTSD and other psychopathologies develop.

The discussion that followed was quite specialised, dealing with the ways of coping with trauma. Dean Ajdukovic gave interesting testimonies about the work process in concrete places of Croatia where vulnerability to trauma is already transmitted to the next generations; the audience then discussed the impact of trauma on the following generations with a special reference to the Holocaust.

The following session - **Colonial Memories, Postcolonial Predicaments** – dealt with colonial violence, memories and “transfers of memory” (B. Stora) based on concrete case studies – France, by Sandrine Lemaire and Portugal, by António Costa Pinto.

**Sandrine Lemaire** gave an interesting talk on French difficulty of dealing with colonial past and possible explanations for that difficulty. According to Sandrine Lemaire, since colonial history is deeply separated from French national history, the colonial heritage is not part of French Republic’s discourse as it wasn’t in colonial times. Thus the colonial imagination prevails without a critical approach: even the Algerian case is referred as a crisis and not as a colonial problem or a colonial war. Thus, according to Sandrine Lemaire, it is possible to avoid the subject by a delusional discourse that Algeria was not a colony, but an overseas France, as it was in colonial times. The similitude with the Portuguese case in terms of rhetoric is impressive and like Portugal, France failed to bring the colonial subject to school, both as a way to avoid it but also as a way of avoiding a history of emigration and its relation to French colonial past.

In conceptual terms Sandrine Lemaire dealt with the gap between private and public memory and the construction of an official memory that promotes consensus, writes the official history and promotes silence. Another interesting concept that she raised is the one of *the transfer of memory* from Benjamin Stora that links colonial memory to racism against migrants specially the ones with a historical/colonial relation with France.

In dialogue with Sandrine Lemaire, **António Costa Pinto** presented the Portuguese case and why the Portuguese deal apparently well with colonial memories and particularly the colonial war memories, transforming this episode simultaneously in a ghost and a fantasy of the past, not exactly related to a colonial history, but misreading it as a continuation of the Portuguese expansion history.

His presentation is based in three main concepts: the concept of legacy of the past; the transitional justice and the eruption of memory.

In a comparative perspective, when we look at colonial European powers involved in colonial wars we think about democratic regimes. Portugal was the exception. The authoritarian nature of the political system that was fighting the colonial wars is important in terms of understanding some of the legacies, the transitional justice adopted and the eruption of memory.

In the Portuguese case we have simultaneous processes of political change that affects both the *metropole* and the *colonies*. In the Portugal of 1974-75, you have a simultaneous process of democratization and decolonization. Why might this be an important element of explanation for some variation between official memories of the past and official memories of the colonial wars? For the simple reason that in the Portuguese case the perpetrators of the colonial wars are the liberators in the process of political change, they were in the centre of the political system of transition. Thus the radicalization of transitional justice and punishment of the new elites were violent: they punished capitalism, because they associate capitalism with the previous regime; they punished the political police; they sent segments of the authoritarian regime into the exile, etc. But there's nothing about the colonial wars. No punishment of the political police in the colonies; no politics of memory in the sense of liberation of archives. The liberators in Portugal are the professional army officers who do the colonial wars, that is to say the professional army officers are at the same time the heroes of the process of transition to democracy.

**João Paulo Borges Coelho** as a Mozambican chose to look at the colonial wars in Africa as “seen from the other side”. For this historian, in Portugal the regime brought by the 25th of April 1974 military coup, opened the possibility of a new collective destiny, but did not eliminate a deep feeling of defeat that denied any public or private sense to the experience of the war. This denial of such a strong experience is undoubtedly behind the cloak of public silence that for a number of years surrounded the issue of the colonial wars and was perhaps a great deal responsible for a sort of extra-pressure and a certain malaise of other memories such as individual, family, community, and even academic. In other words, for João Paulo Borges Coelho public silence emerged perhaps as an invitation for other memories to be silent too: either because these were irrelevant, inconvenient or even shameful. In those days after the colonial wars and the process of decolonization, Portugal was intent on its European destiny and the obstinacy of the colonial wars was a nightmare that seemed to be over, publicly at least.

What happened in Mozambique was the opposite in almost specular terms. That same military coup in Lisbon (the 25<sup>th</sup> of April, 1974) was naturally followed by a widespread sense of victory, leading to an intense and public vocalisation of the war experience. It was that war, after all, that had led to the independence of the country, a glorious beginning of the nation.

Two very different situations were thus created by what we could consider the public way of remembering that war. While in Portugal public silence prevailed, Mozambique developed a strong public memory with particular characteristics: it was hegemonic and overwhelming in the sense that it did not allow the development of alternative memories, which were discarded as irrelevant, bourgeois or even counter-revolutionary. In these literally subaltern memories we could include the timid attempts of academic narratives of the war outside the narrow political scope, individual and family memories that could not fit as examples in the official one, and of course, the views of political dissidents. In Mozambique, production of alternative memories (remembering alternative experiences) becomes always, by definition, a subversive act.

The discussion was naturally concentrated in the two cases under analysis – the French and the Portuguese case, the possibilities of comparison of the two processes and the postcolonial predicaments of these two processes. Concepts under attention were those of victory and

defeat, silence and vocalization. The new concept brought by João Paulo Borges Coelho - “subaltern memories” - also provoked some productive discussion.

The fourth session - **Colonial Wars, European Memories** - open to other cases and perspectives.

**Rolf Kleber** started by presenting an historical context of Dutch overseas colonial wars. He explained that former Dutch Indies fought their liberation struggles after living through the Second World War (1941-1949). Almost 10 years of wars had left long term consequences in The Netherlands due to the homecoming of around 300.000 of European-background settlers and Indonesians. After a period of public silence, the 1970s, 80s and 90s experienced a boom in the studies of trauma and the description of PTSD, largely under the influence of clinical work with Vietnam War veterans. He then moved on to explain in detail type I and II trauma, complex PTSD, delayed PTSD and second generation effects, drawing on the results of specific studies in The Netherlands. Rolf Kleber finished his presentation by pointing out some of the main difficulties in integrating the concept of trauma in research. He underlined the difference between ‘suffering’ and ‘trauma’ (which are frequently mixed up or undifferentiated), since only trauma manifests itself as a psychopathological syndrome, with enduring personality changes.

In dialogue with Sandrine Lemaire, **Tramor Quemeneur** talked about the gap between the history of France and the French colonial history. According to the T. Quemeneur study, the French colonial history seems to be studying a history of “another country”. In this “not-talk-history” the relevance of the Algerian War is little more than an episode, but in fact a traumatic episode that transformed forever the idea of France and “France outremer”. Inside this non war, there are several non histories that Tramor Quemeneur chose to exploit. One of those is the history of the dissidents, deserters or soldiers that refused to obey during the Algerian War. This is in a very strict sense a NON WAR, according to Tramor Quemeneur, as it is a "no to this war", but at the same time a matter that doesn't exist to French Army. However, as Tramor Quemeneur explains based on his research presented in his recent book, in 1955 and 1956, the "demonstrations of conscripts" raise the issue of insubordination. From 1957 to 1959, the disobedients contest inside the Army, deserters and insubordinates get organized in exile or in prison for the conscientious objectors and the communists "soldiers of refusal". The public debate blows up in 1960 when the Young Resistance came to light. Some intellectuals supported them by writing the Declaration on the right to insubordination in the Algerian War called "the 121 Manifesto". Disobedients become more and more numerous, against the Algerian War or in favour of "French Algeria" with the Secret Army Organisation. Finally, the non-violent civic action stood up in favour of conscientious objectors. On conclusion that is a subject that France at the time and nowadays insists to avoid and to deny.

**Jürgen Zimmerer** presented the German case. He argues that there is a racist bias in German public memory that silences its colonial war experiences overseas and remembers intensively its protagonist role in both World Wars of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As Zimmerer states, the European Holocaust led by Germany constituted a “transfer of experience” of the Holocaust in Namibia over the Herero and Nama peoples in 1904-1908. Based on this case, Zimmerer interrogates critically the concepts “colonial wars” and “transfer of memory”, as proposed in the position paper of the workshop. He proposes that the concepts “colonial” and “colonial wars” include what he calls the German Empire and the German colonial wars in Europe between 1939 and 1945, because the aims and the methods applied were an extension of the overseas experience. And he also proposes that the concept “transfer of memory” is broadened to include “transfer of experiences, memories and imaginaries”.



These new ways of reading European history – the non stories/ history and the paradigm of colonial wars inside Europe – seduced the auditorium and generated hard discussions, marked by a conceptual discussion of what it was a colonial intervention or war from an European point of view.

The final session - **Second Generation and the Question of Testimony** - was dominated by three case studies: the late colonial wars between the United Kingdom and Argentina about the Maldives/ Falklands; the children of the disappeared in dictatorial regimes of Latin America; the second/ third generation of the Shoah. Finally a theoretical reflection on memory and postmemory is proposed by Roberto Vecchi.

Linking with the previous session, **Bernard McGuirk** talk reflected about winning and losing, from the perspective of the generation who participated in the war and from the perspective of the second generation. The example under analysis was the Maldivas War/ Falklands War at the time of the war and 15 years later and the different perspectives that emerge especially under the distinction between *us* and *them*.

The first point was the definition of the kind of war and there is no doubt that the Maldivas War/ Falklands War was regarded not only by Argentina but also by the United Nations, (particularly as voiced by India and Venezuela), as a classic example of a late colonial intervention. In terms of post-traumatic stress disorders, the collective trauma of Argentina was huge. When the troops returned home they were instructed not to speak about the war: “¡De eso no se habla!” Reification, abjection, denial, defeatism, silence? Currently, it is estimated that for every Argentine that died in the ten-week conflict, at least one Argentine veteran has taken his own life. It is calculated on the British side that for every combatant that died there has been one ex-combatant suicide. So who is the winner, who is the loser? The delusionary triumphalism of the legacy of Thatcherism eventually allowed Margaret to be fused into Tony; Dame de Ferbecame homme de guerre.

Finally, what of “European” postmemory? Of course, we are speaking about constructs, about “*effets de sens*”; and we should always remember that the post-, as well as the past - are in the present. What can we do with these memories? To be historically responsible. As for example - and to introduce a second generation action - the actions of associations like “Hijos” of children of ex-political prisoners of the Latin American dictatorships regime that claim for the right to remember, the right to know the truth and for justice.

In dialogue with this problematic of the second and even third generation, **Raffaella Di Castro** presented the main conclusions of her study of the memory of the Shoah by the third generation in Italy. She raised the important question of whether public remembrance of the Holocaust is a method for coming to terms with these traumatic experiences or, in an ironic and perverse way, it reproduces the Nazi’s methods of annihilation. She recalled Primo Levi’s explanation of the *lager* as a place of death but also of annihilation of humanity in individuals. This “rendering possible the impossible” has left a lasting imprint in the Jewish familial memories and inheritance, which stands out in the interviews with third generation. Indeed, the third generation’s memory of the Shoah is an “emotional experience” and identification, which stood out through the recurrent use of “*as if it had been me*”. Nevertheless, Raffaella Di Castro also identified in her interviews willingness for transformation of these emotions into critical understanding; a search for a meaning to this traumatic experience, by “reconnecting memory and trauma with experience”. In her opinion, questioning the primary (and almost unique) role of the Shoah in Jewish identities is important to break the “Nazi’s curse” of total destruction. Her thought-provoking argument was considered by the participants to shed new light on theories of memory, public remembrance, and trauma, also in the study of the

experience of overseas colonialism and/or colonial wars. And indeed, it is a conclusion that meets the main conclusion of the project “Children of the Colonial Wars”, at CES: the “postmemory” of the second generation raised the important question about that war and searches and offers new meanings to the experience of these wars, beyond a strictly family experience.

According to this **Roberto Vecchi** claims that post-memory proposes a conceptual reconfiguration of the transmission of memory, emerging from a reflection on family background, that is, inside a private dimension.

For Roberto Vecchi what the debate on post-memory in some way requires is a review of the social protocols of memory and a redefinition of its particular field. A memory through an intermediary also analyses and dismantles the mechanisms of witnesses, the witness assumed as an author of an act, external to the titularity of experience.

As a conclusion for this session the main problem is how to build a public memory sharing responsibility, or how the experience can become part of a joint heritage of pain. In spite of the risk of monumentalization in a false linearity, the institutionalization of such a memory allows looking directly at the scars of the past. And which is the future of the past? This is the challenge of the present reflections on post-memory.

### **3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome**

Considering the objectives of the workshop and reading the substance of the interventions and debates we can conclude that the objectives were achieved with very good results. The international nature of the workshop and all case studies under discussion (Portuguese, French, British, Dutch, and German) highlighted the role of national histories in a construction of Europe, but also highlighted the similitudes of post-colonial Europe and its common colonial heritage.

Thus the idea of questioning the way we use to narrate the European history emerged from the final discussion, as a main conclusion/ challenge of the workshop. Reinterrogating that history from the point of view of the post-memory and particularly, in historical terms from the point of view of decolonizations – the European collective trauma – and its effects builds the possibility of reelaborating the loss of empires and the loss of European centrality. At the same time it introduces colonial history in the European history. That idea led us to another important objective/ conclusion – that we need to introduce the violence of European colonialism in the 20th century European history of violence, with two World Wars, Holocaust, massacres, genocide, the war of former Yugoslavia, etc. etc. That way we can possibly re-think the post-Second World War multicultural Europe as the result of both colonial heritage and a process of migratory fluxes.

Conceptually we conclude that concepts like postcolonial Europe, memory, second generation memory, post-memory, trauma are essential to achieve a new approach on the matters under discussion and should be an important part of further projects.

In practical terms, we can identify several follow-up actions to the workshop:

- We built at CES an intranet accessible to the group that can be seen at <http://www.ces.uc.pt/projectos/filhosdaguerracolonial/pages/en/esf-workshop.php>

- From the network built at the ESF workshop, we are now applying for a European Research Council Grant “Synergies” and later in May we should be applying for “HERA-Humanities in the European Research Area”, a partnership that includes the European Science Foundation.
- At a smaller scale some colleagues are responding to Bernard McGuirk’s appeal to collaborate in the *Words of the World* project from the University of Nottingham (<http://www.wordsoftheworld.co.uk/>):
- Some colleagues from psychiatry and psychology are going to work together in a large project, financed by the Portuguese Gulbenkian Foundation, to provide advanced training to Angolan health professionals. The course will be direct by Luisa Sales (one of the convenor of Coimbra ESF workshop) and will involve several ESF workshop members. The training will be on coping with trauma in post-conflict societies and cultures.

## 4. Final programme

### Monday 3 October 2011

- 09.30 - 09.40    **Welcome by Convenors**  
**Margarida Calafate Ribeiro** (Centro de Estudos Sociais, Coimbra, Portugal)  
**Luísa Sales** (Centro de Estudos Sociais, and Army Hospital of Coimbra, Portugal)
- 9.40 - 10.00    **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**  
**Akile Gürsoy** (Official representative of the Standing Committee for Social Sciences (SCSS))
- 10.00 - 12.30    **Morning Session 1: *Memory, Postmemory, Identities***  
Chair: **António Sousa Ribeiro** (Centro de Estudos Sociais, Coimbra, Portugal)
- 10.00 – 11.00    Presentations by:  
**Diogo Ramada Curto** (Universidade Nova de Lisboa)  
**Cristina Demaria** (University of Bologna, Italy)  
**Rui Mota Cardoso** (Faculdade de Medicina, Porto, Portugal)
- 11.00-11.30    *Coffee/ Tea break*
- 11.30 – 12.30    Open discussion
- 12.30            *Lunch*
- 14.30 - 16.30    **Afternoon Session 1: *Traumatic Memory and Vulnerability***  
Chair: **Luísa Sales** (Centro de Estudos Sociais, and Army Hospital of Coimbra, Portugal)
- 14.30 – 15.30    Presentations by:  
**Dean Ajdukovic** (University of Zagreb, Croatia)  
**Miranda Olf** (University of Amsterdam, Netherlands)  
**Michèle Vitry** (P&M Curie University, Paris, France)
- 15.30 – 16.30    Open discussion

16.30-17.00 *Coffee/ Tea break*

**17.00 - 19.00 *Afternoon Session 2: Colonial Memories, Postcolonial Predicaments***

Chair: **Roberto Vecchi** (University of Bologna, Italy)

17.00 – 18.00 Presentations by:

**Sandrine Lemaire** (Lycée Jean-Jaurès à Reims, France)

**João Paulo Borges Coelho** (University Eduardo Mondlane, Maputo, Mozambique)

**António Costa Pinto** (Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Lisboa)

18.00 – 19.00 Open discussion

20.00 *Dinner*

**Tuesday 4 October 2011**

**10.00 - 12.30 *Morning Session 2: Colonial Wars, European memories***

Chair: **Bernard McGuirk** (University of Nottingham, UK)

10.00 – 11.00 Presentations by:

**Rolf Kleber** (Utrecht University, Netherlands)

**Jürgen Zimmerer** (University of Hamburg, Germany)

**Tramor Quemeneur** (Institut Supérieur Commerce et Gestion, Paris, France)

11.00-11.30 *Coffee/ Tea break*

11.30 – 12.30 Open discussion

12.30 *Lunch*

**14.30 - 16.30 *Afternoon Session 3: 'Second Generation' and the question of testimony***

Chair: **António Sousa Ribeiro** (Centro de Estudos Sociais, Coimbra, Portugal)

14.30 – 15.10 Presentations by:

**Bernard McGuirk** (University of Nottingham, UK)

**Raffaella Di Castro** (Università La Sapienza di Roma, Italy)

**Roberto Vecchi** (University of Bologna, Italy)

15.10 – 16.00 Open discussion

16.00-16.30 *Coffee/ Tea break*

**16.30 - 17.45 *Discussion on follow-up activities and networking***

Chair: **Margarida Calafate Ribeiro** (Centro de Estudos Sociais, Coimbra, Portugal) and **António Sousa Ribeiro**

17.45 *End of workshop*

20.00 *Conference Dinner*

## 5. Final list of participants

Dean AJDUKOVIC, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

Rui Mota CARDOSO, Department of Neurosciences and Mental Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Portugal

João Paulo Borges COELHO, Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University Eduardo Mondlane, Maputo, Moçambique

Diogo Ramada CURTO, CesNova, New University of Lisbon, Portugal

Cristina DEMARIA, Department of Communication Sciences, School of Letters and Philosophy, University of Bologna, Italy

Raffaella DI CASTRO, Department of Philosophy, School of Letters and Philosophy, University 'La Sapienza' of Rome, Italy

Rolf KLEBER, Department of Clinical & Health Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

Nicola LABANCA, Department of Communication Sciences, School of Letters and Philosophy, University of Siena, Italy

Sandrine LEMAIRE, Jean-Jaurès High School, Reims, Soissons, France

Bernard MCGUIRK, Department of Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom

Miranda OLFF, Head Centre for Psychological Trauma, Department of Psychiatry/ AMC, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

António Costa PINTO, Institute for Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Tramor QUEMENEUR, Higher Education Institute for Commerce and Management, Paris, France

António Sousa RIBEIRO, Centre for Social Studies, and School of Arts and Humanities, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Margarida Calafate RIBEIRO, Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Luísa SALES, Centre for Social Studies, and Army Hospital of Coimbra, Portugal

Roberto VECCHI, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, School of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Bologna, Italy

Michèle VITRY, Faculty of Medicine, P&M Curie University, University Paris VI, France

Jürgen ZIMMERER, Department of History (*Fachbereich Geschichte*), Faculty of Humanities, University of Hamburg, Germany

## 6. Statistical information on participants

<b>Countries</b>	<b>Number of participants</b>
Portugal	4
Italy	4
France	3
The Netherlands	2
United Kingdom	1
Germany	1
Croatia	1
Mozambique	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of participants</b>
Women	7
Men	12
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>

<b>Scientific specialties</b>	<b>Number of participants</b>
Literary and Cultural Studies	7
History and Political Science	6
Psychiatry and Psychology	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>