

Knut Stauri

Public Apologies - What do they mean?

A critical analysis of apologies as a phenomenon in the context of Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people of Norway

Master's thesis in Language Studies with Teacher Education

Supervisor: Astrid Rasch

May 2022

Knut Stauri

Public Apologies - What do they mean?

A critical analysis of apologies as a phenomenon in the context of Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people of Norway

Master's thesis in Language Studies with Teacher Education
Supervisor: Astrid Rasch
May 2022

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature



Kunnskap for en bedre verden

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Astrid Rasch, for encouraging me throughout the entire semester. Her expertise in the field of research and quick responses to my questions have been necessary to complete my project.

I would also like thank my good friend Øistein, my family, and especially my girlfriend, who have been of great support throughout this demanding, but interesting and educational process.

Trondheim, May 2022

Knut Stauri

Abstract

During the last decades, there has been a drastic increase in public apologies by heads of state or government representatives (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 373). In the wake of this, scholars have criticised them and questioned their true meaning and purpose (e.g., Gibney & Roxstrom, 2001; Bentley, 2015). One of these critics is Dr. Tom Bentley, who has a PhD in International Relations at the University of Sussex. He has analysed four interstate apologies and detected that they tend to advance interests of states that has historically engaged in colonialism, and that they create new discourses and narratives that resemble attitudes from the colonial past, which sanitises and legitimises them (Bentley, 2015, p. 5). This study sets out to analyse four domestic apologies, using Bentley's critical approach to apologies as a framework to see if his findings are transmittable to my cases. The study also seeks to explore how the speeches change over time. Bentley's critical framework is divided into three categories: sanitisation and glorification, paternalism, and ventriloquism. Two of the apologies are from Australia to the Aboriginal Australians, and the remaining two are from Norway to the Sámi people. There are roughly 14 years between the Australian apologies and 20 years between the Norwegian apologies. The results indicate that there are elements of sanitisation and ventriloquism in all speeches, but less glorification than in Bentley's studies. The results change minimally from the first speeches to the last speeches. However, regarding the Australian speeches, I suggest that the most recent speech seems to have had a negative change. Regarding the Norwegian speeches, the findings could indicate a positive change.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Literature review	4
2.1 Public apologies	4
3. Historical background	7
3.1 Aboriginal Australians	7
3.2 Sámi people of Norway	8
4. Theory	12
4.1 Apologies.....	12
4.2 Settler colonialism.....	14
5. Methodology	17
5.1 Data material	17
5.3 Case study.....	19
5.4 Potential challenges of case study as research method.....	19
5.5 Document analysis and discourse analysis.....	20
5.6 Rhetorical analysis	21
6. Analysis	22
6.1 Kevin Rudd’s speech.....	22
6.1.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past	23
6.1.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism.....	24
6.1.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised.....	25
6.2 Scott Morrison’s speech	26
6.2.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past	27
6.2.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism.....	28
6.2.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised.....	29
6.3 King Harald V of Norway’s speech	29
6.3.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past	30
6.3.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism.....	31
6.3.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised.....	32
6.4 Erna Solberg’s speech	33
6.4.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past	33
6.4.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism.....	34
6.4.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised.....	35
7. Discussion	36

8. Conclusion.....	39
Bibliography	40
Appendix	46

1. INTRODUCTION

Many indigenous peoples today have worse social, cultural, and economic conditions than other sections of a national community (Anderson et al. 2016, p. 132). The Aboriginal Australians were forced off their lands by white settlers, and systematically oppressed by racist government policies for much of the 20th century. The Australian government separated Aboriginal children from their families for the purpose of saving them and having them grow up as white Australians (Australia & Wilkie, 1997; Nogrady, 2019). Today, these children are referred to as “The Stolen Generations”. The Sámi people in Norway faced similar assimilation policies of the government, a term also known as “Norwegianisation”. Sámi children were taken away from their families and homes, and they were placed in schools where they were forced to learn the Norwegian language and culture, and depart from anything related to the Sámi culture (Eriksen, 2018, p. 58). Their culture was considered sinful, and therefore the Sámi children were forbidden to use their mother tongues at school and perform “yoik”, or any other Sámi cultural expressions (Harrison, 2019, p. 17). These dark chapters of history have affected the everyday lives of Aboriginal Australians and Sámi people, and still do. By the end of the twentieth century, Aboriginal Australians were overrepresented as inferior on all measures of socio-economic status, despite constituting only 1.6 percent of the population (Celermajer, 2009, p. 144). Sámi people in Norway are still to this date encountered with discrimination regarding ethnic identity, as well as structural and indirect discrimination (Eriksen 2018, p. 58).

In the wake of these events, the victims and the people of the nation demanded an official apology. In Australia it had been a long-time demand, especially since the release of the “Bringing Them Home “ report in 1997, which was the main initiative for the demand (Australia & Wilkie, 1997; MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). The report revealed the history of Australian crimes, policies, and practices such as child removal and frontier violence, and how there had been a collective amnesia about these events (Keynes & Marsden, 2021, p. 136-137). However, the Liberal government led by former Prime Minister John Howard did not validate this “black armband view of history” that the report had revealed, and therefore refused to apologise for almost a decade (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). It was a hard-won victory for the Aboriginal peoples when former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd gave the official apology in 2008. Although the victims eventually earned their apology, there was no form of compensation for them attached to Rudd’s apology (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). The Sámi people received their first official apology by King Harald V of Norway, at the opening of the Sámi parliament in 1997. Even though the “Norwegianisation” policy ended in 1950, lasting for roughly 100 years

(Johansen, 2013, p. 57), it took nearly 50 years for Norway to offer an official apology to the Sámi people. It had been a long-time demand, and already in 1959, the Sámi council used the term “colonialism” to describe the subjugation, repression and the unequal power relation between the Sámi people and the Norwegian state, where the Sámi people were the victims (Lehtola, 2015, p. 23). The radical Sámi movement, emerging among young, educated people during the end of the 1960s, continued to fight for justice, and compared themselves with oppressed indigenous peoples (Lehtola, 2015, p. 23). The largest political conflict between the Sámi people and the Norwegian state was the Alta conflict, lasting from 1968-1982. It was a devastating conflict, and according to Andersen & Midttun (1985) it revived traditional cultural and territorial cleavages between the Sámi people and the government (p. 333). When the Sámi people finally received their official apology in 1997, they were compensated by the Norwegian state. The older Sámi people could apply for forfeited schooling and were compensated with about NOK 70,000 (Lehtola, 2015, p. 22). However, support for repatriation and reconciliation policies has been met by ambivalence and dismissive attitudes from the Nordic populations (Lehtola, 2015, p. 22).

Tom Bentley has a PhD in International Relations at the University of Sussex. He has done several studies in this field, and amongst them are studies in political apologies. He explains that apologies is a complex phenomenon that raises several challenges, such as how they are received and what their purpose really is (2015, p. 21). He criticises the phenomenon and explains that “an apology is not by necessity an absolute disavowal of an action, but frequently entails – to differing degrees – elements of justification, defence and denial” (Bentley, 2015, p. 21). He further explains that apologies may not include or address the entirety of the event, which can lead to negative consequences such as accepting, legitimising, and reproducing attitudes from the colonial past. They articulate new constructions of historical narratives, where the colonial, western elite is the narrator. The apologies are revealed to be “crucial textual, symbolic and ritualistic sites where colonial/post-colonial relations are illuminated, rearticulated, renegotiated and reproduced” (Bentley, 2015, p. 4). Through public apologies, it is exposed that elite governments struggle with notions such as colonial guilt, colonial nostalgia, and how they are perceived.

This thesis studies public apologies to the Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people of Norway by qualitative research, using Bentley’s critical approach to apologies as a framework. This critical approach applies to specific criticisms that are divided into the following three categories: sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past, paternalism, and

ventriloquism. The data material consists of four apologies in form of speeches. Two of the speeches are from Australia's former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd and Australia's current Prime Minister Scott Morrison to Australia's indigenous people, offered on behalf of the Australian government. The two remaining speeches are from King Harald V of Norway and former Prime Minister Erna Solberg to the Sámi people. The Australian speeches that will be analysed are "Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples", offered in 2008 by former Prime Minister of Australia, Kevin Rudd, and "14th anniversary of the Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples", offered in 2022 by current Prime Minister of Australia, Scott Morrison. The Norwegian speeches that will be analysed are "Sametinget 1997: Åpningstale" [Sámi parliament 1997: Opening speech], offered in 1997 by King Harald V of Norway, and "Tråante 2017: Åpningstale" [Tråante 2017: Opening speech], offered in 2017 by former Prime Minister of Norway, Erna Solberg. Bentley studies only apologies between states, whereas the cases of Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people are intrastate or domestic apologies. It is therefore interesting to analyse apologies as a phenomenon in the context of the Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people and explore whether and how Bentley's framework applies to these studies. Considering that the indigenous peoples of Australia and Norway are still underprivileged in society (Celermajer, 2009; Eriksen, 2018) it is possible that the apologies have been deficient or futile. Consequently, in an interpretive approach, I will analyse the speeches and investigate whether they resemble the patterns that Bentley has identified in his studies of public apologies and explore the potential differences and development between the first apologies and the most recent ones. As a result, this thesis aims to answer the following research question: Can sanitation and glorification, paternalism, or ventriloquism be detected in the domestic apologies to the Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people, and if so, how do the speeches change over time?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In line with the increasing frequency of public apologies during the late twentieth and the early twenty-first centuries, research on public apologies has grown in importance (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 373). This chapter provides a comprehensive summary of the most relevant existing literature on public apologies. It presents pioneering research in the field and addresses the complexity of the phenomenon. Secondly, it targets research on demand for an apology, as well as the refusal of offering an apology, which are both crucial topics in my cases. Finally, the disagreements regarding public apologies and potential gaps in the research field will be addressed.

There are several existing studies on public apologies. I seek to summarise those who are most relevant to my topic and to explain how my study is different. To already existing research on public apologies, this thesis builds on specifically analysing domestic apologies. Although Bentley's studies are used as a framework for my study, the research field is different in terms of type and data material. To the existing research field, my study adds analyses of the recent domestic apologies from 2017 and 2022 and targets the development in apologies over the last 14-20 years. It also provides analyses of two of the apologies to the Sámi people, which is a less researched field. Through analysing domestic apologies in form of speeches, this thesis elaborates on further explaining apologies as a phenomenon and the power related to it.

2.1 Public apologies

Since the end of the twentieth century, there has been an increase in the discourse of apologies, including both the demand for an apology by the victims and the offering of apologies by governments. Olick (2017) is one of the most established researcher and sociologist in this field, having a critical contribution with his collection *The Politics of regret: On collective memory and historical responsibility*. Despite the dramatic increase in public apologies, they are still relatively rare, lacking theorizing (Cels, 2017). Although apologies can be meaningful and meant to heal and mend relationships, apologies from governments may be invalid, appearing hollow and at times deceptive (Smith, 2008). The two public apologies in Irish politics offered by Tony Blair in 1997 and the IRA apology of 2002, were considered invalid according to a specific criteria made to test validity of apologies (Cunningham, 2004). Apologies are sometimes seen through the lens of cynicism, as nothing more than a cheap effort to ease the lingering guilt over some wrongdoings from the past, and at the same time, to make those who apologise feel morally superior to the ones before them (Gibney & Roxstrom, 2001). An analysis of apologies from Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States reveal that

apologies play an important role in narrating certain views about history and moral obligation to bear in public life (Nobles, 2008). Public apologies from Germany, Belgium, Britain, and Italy to their former colonies, reveals that former colonisers represent their colonial past by legitimising core attitudes from the past (Bentley, 2015).

Governments usually do not apologise on their own initiative, but often in response to demands by victimised groups (Nobles, 2008). This is evident in Adams & Kampf (2020), who analysed 57 cases of demands for an apology by governments and state actors between 1999 and 2019. In Cunningham (1999) several demands for an apology are presented, such as the Cajun people's demand for an apology from Britain for having their ancestors forcibly removed from Arcadia in Canada, and in Britain, demands for an apology from the Queen for the 1919 massacre at Amritsar. MacLachlan (2015) links the demand of an apology to sheer optimism, a hope that governments will offer good public apologies for their institutional wrongdoings. The research on the subject seems to suggest that most public apologies come as a response to demands. This raises several questions to apologies as a phenomenon, where the most obvious question is whether the apologies are genuine, or if they are offered mainly to satisfy a demand.

Many scholars have addressed and analysed public apologies where either the government or state actors have refused to offer an apology (e.g., MacLachlan, 2010; Celermajer, 2009; Marrus, 2007; Thompson, 2012; Ancarno, 2015). For instance, Soviet and Russian leaders refused to apologise for the massacre of thousands of Polish officers in 1940; Israel refused to apologise for their aggression towards Egypt in 1967; American historian Eugene Genovese did not manage to convince his fellow left-wingers to apologise for their involvement in crimes regarding communism; Prime Minister of Canada Pierre Trudeau refused to have anything to do with apologies since he characterized them as efforts to fix history (Marrus, 2007, p. 77). However, a refusal of offering an apology does not necessarily have to mean that the offender disagrees with the victims' claims of a wrongdoing. Gibney & Roxstrom (2001) argues the question whether public apologies represent any fundamental change, and if they strengthen the relationship between states and people (p. 915). If the offender does not believe that apologies help, it would be pointless to offer one.

Although the main impression from this literature review is that public apologies lack validity, they are not exclusively criticised. Whatever caused the sudden rise of apologies (Cunningham, 2004, p. 81), the more than 50 official apologies offered by governments represent a modern, positive development (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 373). It is a positive development that should be seen as a liberal conception of state and society, and public

apologies can help promote national reconciliation (Andrieu 2009). The overall concept of a public apology is positive, but the use of language in public apologies plays a big part in whether its successful or not (Batistella, 2014). Kim et al. (2019) argues that public apologies are an effective way to resolve a conflict, but to deliver a good apology is more problematic.

3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Aboriginal Australians

The Aboriginal Australians are the indigenous people of Australia. Ever since Australia was colonised by the white settlers in the late 18th century, Aboriginal people were severely discriminated against. The European settlers almost immediately started using frontier violence against the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (Hooper, Richards and Watson 2020, p. 194). This period of wars can be defined to have lasted for as long as 140 years, from the British settlement in 1788 to the Coniston Massacre in Central Australia in 1928 (Rogers & Bain, 2016, p. 83). Although the number of deaths is unknown, mappings of the massacres provide information about the locations of the wars. Most of the killings took place by the coast and near rivers and lakes, since these were fertile areas with important sources of life in a dry continent (Hooper, Richards and Watson 2020, p. 194). During the 1870's, European settlers moved further into the core of the rainforests, which had devastating impacts on the Aboriginal peoples as they were chased further into the dry, desert areas (Henry 2012, p. 34). The colonists' policies were plain; clear the lands from indigenous resistance. This was widely known in 1879 when it was announced through the Brisbane's courier newspaper that they were at war with every tribe of wild blacks at the frontiers. The Senior Supervisor of the Darwin-Adelaide telegraph, Mr. T. Morris openly admitted that the colonists were killing Aboriginals without expressing any shame or regret at their deaths (Casey, 2018, p. 36).

As Aboriginals were killed and forcibly removed from their lands, some Aboriginal families started working for the settlers that had taken their land (Henry 2012, p. 36). They were given the names of the European settlers they worked for. This had severe consequences for the families, since they were separated from each other, and grew up with different surnames and cultures. The European settlers' intentions were to remove the Aboriginal rights and identity to certain locations and create their own, new memory (Henry 2012, p. 36). This practice was a beginning of the assimilation policies that the Australian government would later fully implement. However, having their land and culture taken away as well as being separated from each other was not the only form of cultural assimilation Aboriginal people encountered. During the 1880s to the 1930s, European settlers sought to find a new solution on how to assimilate the Aboriginals, relying on "biological absorption". They intended to erase the indigenous physical attributes through interracial sexual relationships rather than only "whitening" them through a different culture and lifestyle (Ellinghaus 2006, p. 105). The Aboriginals were encouraged to marry white Australians, as the government could ensure that they would be rewarded with

equal treatment. It was a genetic dissolution into white Australians, and the practice exclusively involved having Aboriginals marrying the low-class white individuals. The promise of the government was not kept, and Aboriginal women typically ended up in exploitative relationships with white men (Ellinghaus 2006, p. 106). As members of the working class the Aborigines lives were restricted, and until the 1940s and 1950s, they had no access to voting, drinking, travelling, marrying without permission, and they did not fully have access to their own money that was earned through hard labour (Celermajer, 2009, p. 145). Although these restrictions were lifted, the assimilation process would still last for several decades.

Aboriginal families continued being separated, and children were forcibly split up from their families to grow up as white Australian citizens. Between 1910 and the 1970s, one in three Aboriginal children were separated from their families by racist government policies (Nogrady, 2019). These children are referred to as “The Stolen Generations”. This is specifically what Kevin Rudd addressed in his official apology in 2008, as these governmental actions arguably are the most severe in Australian history. The Australian government separated the Aboriginal people by forcing the children into institutions, foster homes or having white families adopt them (Australia & Wilkie, 1997; Nogrady, 2019). Not only did the Aboriginal parents lose the right to see and raise their own children, but they were also denied access to all information about their children and vice versa. Only at the age of eighteen, the Aboriginal children could see their file, sometimes being full of postcards and letters from their parents who had tried to contact them for several years (Celermajer, 2009, p. 157). When children were taken from their families, they were sent as far away from their home community as practically possible, and often replaced if the white families were not satisfied (Celermajer, 2009, p. 157). The dissatisfaction could be caused by children struggling to adapt to entirely different environments. The consequences of being removed from their family have been critical and traumatising for these children. According to O’Donnell et. al (2019), Aboriginals are still affected by the past as it has left a legacy of intergenerational trauma, drastically increasing the levels of substance use, mental health issues, and deficits in parenting skills (p. 89).

3.2 Sámi people of Norway

The Sámi people are the indigenous people of Norway, or more specifically the Northern Calotte, which is a geographical area covering parts of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. They call this area “Sápmi”, and regard it as their homeland, having an estimated population of 80 000 to 100 000 people (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1145). Their societal existence changed from a hunter-gather and fishing society into a reindeer herding society during the early 16th century.

This is still practised today by 10 percent of the population. The remaining people are in a salaried economy, or a combination of fishing and agricultural lifestyles (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1145). In Norway, there are around 55 000 registered Sámi people, but this is only an estimation as Norway does not register the ethnicity of its inhabitants (Eriksen, 2018, p. 58).

Falch et al. (2016) explain that the Sámi ethnicity inhabited a large area in Fennoscandia since the last thousand years BC, where they dominated the resources long before the modern state formations were established. However, since the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Sámi people of Norway were colonised and had their lands and resources controlled by efforts of Sweden, Russia, and Norway (p. 125). Already from the early 19th century, they suffered assimilation policies, as they were considered a threat to Norway's national culture (Eriksen, 2018, p. 57). This process is referred to as "Norwegianisation". The process fully started in the mid-nineteenth century, and lasted until the 1960s (Maliniemi, 2009, p. 16). It explains how the Sámi people gradually lost their homes and influence in their own areas and how government policies had Sámi children taken away from their families. They were placed in schools where they were forced to learn Norwegian language and culture and depart from anything related to Sámi culture (Eriksen, 2018, p. 58). The main reason for this policy was strong beliefs in nationalism and social-Darwinism (Maliniemi, 2009, p. 16), as the government believed the Norwegian culture was more valuable than the Sámi. The government had the idea that Norway was a homogenous culture and saw Sámi people as a threat to that. They wanted Norway to preserve its homogenous, national culture, but also to make room for expanding agriculture, seeking to increase the Norwegian population in the northern part of the country (Lantto, 2010, p. 549). Sámi people were regarded as simple and primitive nomads, and an obstacle to the Norwegian government's idea of national development (Lantto, 2010, p. 549). After being severely discriminated against ever since the colonisation, The Sámi people in Norway eventually earned their formal reputation and rights as indigenous people in 1990.

Although the Norwegianisation process ended during the 1960s (Maliniemi, 2009, p. 16), the discrimination and undermining of the Sámi people continued. The state's mistreatment of the Sámi people was evident during the emergence of the Alta conflict in 1968, arguably being the greatest political conflict between the Norwegian government and the Sámi people since the Norwegianisation process ended. The government announced in 1968 that they were planning a large-scale hydropower development on the Alta-Guovdageaidnu watercourse, which would have devastating consequences for the Sámi people (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1148). The primary consequences were great endangerment to the Sámi reindeer herding system, and

potential flooding of the Sámi village Máze (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1148). The conflict lasted for more than a decade and included numerous dramatic mass meetings and demonstrations over several years. The mass meetings and demonstrations took place in 1970, 1978 and 1979 and involved civil obedience actions, hunger strikes in front of the Parliament building in Oslo and blocking the access to the construction site (Andersen & Midttun, 1985, p. 319). The protesters offered passive resistance by shackling themselves together, and they later had a referendum on the development, but did not succeed in stopping it (Andersen & Midttun, 1985, p. 319). However, the conflict attracted significant media coverage, and the aftermath had a great impact on the development of Sámi politics. At the height of the conflict, The Sámi Rights Committee was given strong influence to restore Norway's reputation as a modern nation that values human rights (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1149). Furthermore, the Sámi people earned solidarity and informally their status as an indigenous people due to their participation in the Alta conflict (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1149). The aftermaths of the Alta conflict also resulted in the establishment of the Sámi Parliament - an elected assembly intending to support the interests of the Sámi people and represent the Sámi people in Norway (Stordal et al., 2015, p. 1).

Today, the Sámi people have the status of indigenous people, and they have their own language and administrative area, as well as their own parliament. This gives them a strong legal status in Norway; however, it does not prevent incidents of discrimination (Midtbøen & Lidén, 2015, p. 7). Since the beginning of the 21st century, there has been an ongoing study of Sámi people's health and living conditions, known as SAMINOR. The study shows that as much as one in three Sámi people have experienced discrimination due to their ethnical background (Midtbøen & Lidén, 2015, p. 7) In an attempt to legitimise the rights of indigenous people in Norway, the government established the "National institution for human rights and the protection of indigenous peoples' human rights in Norway" (NIM) in 2014, since another report done by the Sveaas-Committee in 2011 had proven that the government had failed to secure the rights of Norway's indigenous people (Vars, 2016, p. 303). However, qualitative studies from recent time (2015) have further shown that Sámi people are still experiencing discrimination, and they are in risk of encountering various forms of structural or indirect discrimination in contact with the labour market, the housing market, and in contact with public service (Midtbøen & Lidén, 2015, p. 7).

These sections show how the Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people of Norway have been mistreated for centuries. They have both been victims to cultural assimilation politics, as well as having their children forcibly removed to grow up in institutions or foster

homes. The wrongdoings of these indigenous peoples have led to a demand for an apology, a complex phenomenon that will be addressed in the next chapter.

4. THEORY

4.1 Apologies

“Apology” is a rather modern phenomenon that accelerated during the late twentieth early twenty-first centuries (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 373). They can be seen as liberal normative principles, where governments seek to take a modern stand and affirm equality, diversity, and respect for human rights, and distinguish themselves from the past (Bentley 2015, p. 26, Celermajer 2009, p. 143). Tom Bentley struggles to offer a definition of apologies, since it is a complex phenomenon that has similarities to accounts and excuses, but also great contrasts (Bentley, 2015, p. 20). Although most people probably know the meaning and purpose of apologies in everyday life, the concept is more complicated, especially in the context of colonial apologies and state apologies. The fundamentals of the term are to disavow a misdeed, express regret, and seek forgiveness (Celermajer 2009, p. 14; Bentley, 2015, p. 21). Bentley explains that an apology is more than saying “I am sorry”, as this phrase is merely expressing sympathy for an unfortunate situation, rather than taking any form of responsibility (Bentley, 2015, p. 21). He draws on Fraser (1981) and mentions four components that are necessary for an apology to be valid:

1. The apologiser must believe that an incident has occurred.
2. The apologiser must believe that the incident has offended or harmed the recipient.
3. The apologiser must believe that himself/herself is responsible, at least to some degree for said incident.
4. The apologiser must feel regret for the incident. (Fraser 1981, p. 261; Bentley, 2015, p. 22).

The function of a successful apology is meant to mend and heal relationships (Bentley, 2015, p. 24). Still, even the sincerest apology can never undo the offence, such as bringing people back to life. It is therefore important that an apology includes certain components to mend and heal relationships in the best possible way. Bentley explains that an apology should proffer a narrative of a past event, providing solid detail on the offence and not exclude or ignore any offence (Bentley, 2015, p. 24). It should identify a moral error and give the event negative significance. This means recognizing that the offence did happen, and that it was beyond the control of the victims (Bentley, 2015, p. 25). An apology should also speak to a group membership. If the apology is accepted by the offended victims, it enables them to re-enter the group of the offender. Finally, an apology is supposed to affirm the dignity of the victims. This

means that the offender must recognise the suffering of the victims and truly believe that the treatment of the person or group was wrong (Bentley, 2015, p. 27).

However, in the context of colonial apologies and state apologies, Bentley explains that there is often a duality in apologies where the apologiser seeks to moderate the perceived offense, even when apologising (Bentley, 2015, p. 21). This means that apologies have a more complex function than only apologising for a misdeed. They can be moderated by consciously or unconsciously failing to address important aspects of the misdeed. Bentley explains that apologies “provide accounts, trivialise incidents, apportion blame and evade accountability” (Bentley, 2015, p. 20). This raises questions such as if the apology is genuine, or if there are other motivations behind the apology than sincerely being sorry for a misdeed. Bentley’s criticism originates from four case studies of state apologies by Germany, Belgium, UK, and Italy. He has analysed Germany’s apology for the genocide of the Herero and Nama people during the early 20th century, Belgium’s apology for its part in the assassination of the first elected Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Britain’s apology for the “Bloody Sunday” massacre in Derry, Northern Ireland, and Italy’s apology for its colonialism in Libya (Bentley, 2015, p. 4).

By analysing these case studies, he found particularly three main criticisms to colonial and state apologies:

1. Apologies tend to sanitise and glorify the colonial past since they often only address certain aspects of the event, such as acts of violence (Bentley, 2015, p. 7). By narrowing apologies to specific acts of violence, Bentley argues that the entirety of the colonial enterprise is legitimised. Examples of this could be found in Bentley’s case studies of Germany, Belgium, and Britain. These apologies specifically deal with genocide, assassination, and massacres, but not really the colonial operation itself (Bentley, 2015, p. 7). For instance, in Belgium’s state apology to The Democratic Republic of Congo, the Belgian Foreign Minister Louis Michel suggested that King Leopold II was a “visionary” and “ambitious” hero for what he did. However, he failed to mention how Leopold’s reign turned Congo into a labour camp using murder and torture. Instead, he sanitised and glorified him by narrowing the apology to focus on his positive achievements, such as railways, schools, infrastructural development, and economic growth (Bentley, 2015, p. 7).

2. State apologies tend to expound contemporary paternalism through seemingly benevolent and altruistic policies (Bentley, 2015, p. 9). Rather than humbling themselves for

their wrongdoings, the state reproduce attitudes from the colonial past by engaging in seemingly benevolent and altruistic politics, promoting triumphalism and paternalism in relation to its former colony (Bentley, 2015, p. 8). For instance, the German apology to the Herero and Nama people claims that the state is now “multicultural” and that it is working for world-wide peace, human rights, development, and reduction in poverty. These initiatives are similar to the paternalistic narratives from the colonial past, in which the former colonial states now act like responsible caretakers. Bentley criticises this, as these are self-indulgent and congratulatory approaches hidden in apologies that emphasise the positive qualities of modern relations (Bentley, 2015, p. 8).

3. Apologies are acts of ventriloquism, where the victims of the offence are denied a voice and are instead spoken for by the colonists or the Western intellectuals. This is also a way of reproducing and glorifying the colonial past, since the powerful offender gets to speak, while the offended must listen (Bentley, 2015, p. 9). According to Bentley (2015), this is a problem since the Western governmental elite gets to create their own version of the events, potentially excluding serious offence and ending up sanitising its past (p. 9). In the end, the apology becomes a powerful story made by Western actors, representing the history of the victims. Not only does the Western governmental elite create their own version, but they also re-author the colonised people’s history for the future (Bentley, 2015, p. 9). Regardless of how well the apology manages to address every aspect of the misdeed, Bentley criticises the concept of speaking on behalf of those who have been wronged. It could possibly end up being a narrative that is told by, and becomes about, the western elite.

These three criticisms will be the main framework for my research, where in total four public apologies by Australia and Norway will be analysed. The three criticisms presented in bullet points serve as a comprehensive summary of Bentley’s criticism and provide a good foundation for analysing and discussing public apologies.

4.2 Settler colonialism

Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people of Norway can both be categorized as victims of settler colonialism. The term has been created by scholars, who sees it as a distinctive kind of imperialism. There are various definitions of the term. Jacobs (2009) defines it as “a type of European expansion that resulted not in overseas empires but in societies in which Europeans have settled, where their descendants have become and remained politically dominant over indigenous peoples and where a heterogenous society has developed in class, ethnic and racial terms” (p. 2). Another definition of the phenomenon is made by one of the most influential

researchers in the field, Veracini (2013). He explains it as when colonisers come to stay and form a new political order, assimilating the native culture rather than exploiting it. It is about turning a location and its people into something else, where the new established society recreates the original one (Veracini, 2013, p. 314).

According to Rowe & Tuck (2017), settler colonial studies are important to Indigenous communities since they prevent erasure of Indigenous genocide and conquest (p. 7). In Australia, settler colonialism is primarily linked with the removal of First Nation peoples since the end of the 18th century, through child removal policy and violent measures such as massacres, starvation, poisoning, rape, disease, and imprisonment (Klein, 2020, p. 266). Also, attempts to change their behaviour, beliefs, and values have been important strategies to assimilate and conquer the First Nation's land. Although Kevin Rudd specifically addressed and apologised for the assimilation policies in his national apology in 2008, Klein (2020) argues that settler colonialism is an ongoing problem in Australia today (p. 265). She explains that assimilation occurs in current settler Australia through kinds of paternalism by the state regarding indigenous policy. One example of this is controlling and managing the economy of indigenous peoples through the "Cashless Debit Card", restricting cash and purchases to ensure "responsible behaviour" (Klein, 2020, p. 265). Klein (2020) argues that this policy supports assimilation in today's Australia since it shows an increased use of behavioural conditions used on Aboriginal Australians to receive their payment (p. 267).

Oksanen (2020) explains that also the Sámi people of Norway are victims of settler colonialism (p. 1141). For centuries, the Sámi people of Norway have resisted the Norwegian state's incursions and attempts to assimilate them. This involves not only cultural assimilation, but also territorial encroachments such as the Alta-conflict, previously mentioned in the historical background (See Andersen & Midttun, 1985). These settler colonial tendencies have caused an increased sense of nationalism in the Sámi community, which have been crucial for its success in challenging the legitimacy of continued settler colonialism in Norway (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1142). The success of challenging settler colonialism has led to a strong revitalisation of the Sámi culture and traditions in Norway, with an increased awareness to maintain the Sámi culture as a unique and valued culture and part of the Norwegian society (Hämäläinen et al., 2018, p. 2). However, Hämäläinen et al. (2018) explain that the process of revitalising the Sámi culture is by no means concluded, and that there are still unsolved discussions about geographical areas and utilisation of natural resources. There are also ongoing conflicts

regarding mining, reindeer herding, fishery and industrial enterprises that raises questions about the Sámi people's rights and ownership in their own areas (p. 2).

This chapter has shown that although the situation of Australian Aboriginals illustrates a clearer incident of settler colonialism, the Sámi people are also victims of settler colonialism (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1141).

5. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodological choices in the research process will be explained. The primary method is case study research, supplemented by document analysis, discourse analysis, and rhetorical analysis. The cases to be studied are public apologies from Australia and Norway to their indigenous people. To analyse these speeches, I will use document analysis and discourse analysis as supplementary research methods to review and interpret historical documents written in a historical context. The first subsection of this chapter will describe the cases and the data material. Second, the purpose of the research and why it is relevant will be explained. Finally, the chapter will provide an overview of case study research and potential challenges with this research method.

5.1 Data material

The case studies consist of two speeches from Australia and two from Norway, which results in a total of four speeches. The Australian speeches are Kevin Rudd's "Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples", from 2008, and Scott Morrison's "14th anniversary of the Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples", from 2022. The Norwegian apologies that will be analysed are Harald V's "Sametinget 1997: Åpningstale" [Sámi parliament 1997: Opening speech], offered in 1997, and Erna Solberg's "Tråante 2017: Åpningstale" [Tråante 2017: Opening speech], offered in 2017.

The intention is not to compare the cases of Australia and Norway to Bentley's studies, but rather to investigate if Bentley's studies are transmittable to other cases. This is interesting to explore, since my case studies have similarities to Bentley's, but also some significant differences. The main difference is that in Bentley's studies, the state apologies are inter-state cases, from one state to another, whereas I study cases of domestic apologies, from one state to its own people. Cunningham (2014) explains that in domestic apologies, the citizens' understanding, interpretation, and support for the apologies matter. It matters since there is not necessarily consensus about the understanding and meaning of an apology, nor whether it should be supported or opposed, as the authenticity of domestic apologies can always be questioned in terms of political motives (p. 70). This is perhaps one of the most important differences, since in domestic apologies, the relation between the victims, citizens and the government continues. In this continuing relation, Bentley (2018) emphasises that also the daily process of nation-engineering and colonial consolidation continues (p. 402). It is therefore in domestic apologies relevant to investigate the daily process after the public apologies were offered, and explore how the relationship between the apologisers and the victims have

developed. When offering a domestic apology, Cunningham (2014) stresses the importance of reflecting on what happens after the apology. This reflection concerns issues such as reparations, which is a major issue since the potential reparation following the apology can cause discord between the political constituencies (p. 71). In other words, it could be tricky to promise something on behalf of others, laying moral guidelines for the opposing political party.

As previously mentioned, Bentley explains that an apology should also speak to a group membership, since if the apology is accepted, it enables the offended victims to re-enter the group of the offender (Bentley, 2015, p. 27). However, the concept of group membership does not apply to the interstate apologies in Bentley's studies, since these are apologies where colonialism has formally ended. This means that the offender and the offended victims do not have to relate to or interact with each other. It shows a significant difference between the types of apologies, since Bentley (2018) suggests that in contrast to inter-state apologies, domestic apologies can be said to undeniably show a continuation of the colonial project. The reason for this is that when governments apologise to their own, marginalised citizens, there is a clearer co-option of indigenous people into the logic of the colonial enterprise. This is being done by seemingly extending citizenship and including the indigenous people into the belonging of the settler state (p. 402). However, the inclusion seems to slowly assimilate them rather than accepting and protecting them.

It could seem like domestic and inter-state apologies in general can and does have multiple motivations such as political advantage, state interest, repair of relationships and affirmation of moral principle (Cunningham, 2014, p. 96). The results from analysing the speeches of Kevin Rudd, Scott Morrison, King Harald V of Norway, and Erna Solberg are intended to give a better understanding of apologies as a phenomenon, and potentially contribute to further pointing out a trend in apologies. Although studies on apologies already exist, Bentley argues that there is still missing comprehensive analyses of the postcolonial implications of apology (Bentley, 2015, p. 9). Using Bentley's approach of studying apologies is therefore relevant as it provides a valuable base for further investigation. By analysing the first domestic apologies to the Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people of Norway, as well as two more recent ones from the last few years, my study will add an understanding of the postcolonial implication due to potential development from the first and the most recent apologies.

5.3 Case study

Case study research is a qualitative research method that is based on data collection. Ridder (2016) mentions four typical ways to collect data material for case studies: sampling, interviews, observations and documents (p. 161). My data material consists of documents, in form of speeches. The purpose of case studies is to construct, develop, and test theories about less or not understood phenomena (Ridder 2016, p. 153). This research method's contribution to science is not only about getting a better understanding of a phenomenon. Case studies are also useful to see if the results of the explored phenomenon are transmittable to other cases (Ridder 2016, p. 153). Hence, I found using Bentley's four case studies on state apologies as a framework to be a fitting way of analysing the speeches, and to break down and understand attitudes. Although there are differences in Bentley's cases and my choice of cases, they share the same fundamentals. Bentley's case studies are helpful to get a better understanding of apologies as a phenomenon, and an understanding of how and why the apologies are received and interpreted in a certain way. According to Corcoran et al. (2004), case studies as a research method is always an appropriate strategy for answering questions about how and why (p. 10). They are descriptive and heuristic, which means that they enhance the reader's understanding of a phenomenon so that the study extends the reader's experience (Corcoran et.al, 2004, p. 10). Since my research question targets public apologies, I found it reasonable to use the speeches as data material. They are documents that can be used for critical reflexive content analysis. Critically analysing the content of the speeches is meaningful, since it contributes to getting a better understanding of a phenomenon (Ridder, 2016, p. 161).

5.4 Potential challenges of case study as research method

Case study research can be categorised as a qualitative research method since the research field is narrow, includes few informants, and is based on observations and interpretations of someone's perception of an event (Khan, 2002, p. 225). Hence, the interpretations are subjective, which means that individuals, in this case Bentley, form their own reality of a phenomenon (Khan, 2002, p. 225). Even though the research is thorough, it lacks scientific rigour since it only considers the individual's interpretation of the phenomenon. It therefore provides little foundation for the results to be generalisable, although this is typically not the intention of qualitative research methods.

Sandelowski (2011) distinguishes "intrinsic case studies" and "instrumental case studies", where in the first term, the researcher's main focus is the case itself, while in the latter one, the case is secondary to understanding a phenomenon (p. 155). In this thesis, an

instrumental case study is used to provide insight into apologies as a phenomenon. However, the results of this case need to be seen in relation to Bentley's studies, which means that whether they are typical or atypical, they always exist in theoretical relationship to other case studies (Sandelowski, 2011, p. 155). In other words, one must ideally have knowledge of Bentley's studies to get a better understanding of this study, since it draws on Bentley's framework. This could be a limitation of case study as a research method since the results become a case that needs to be seen in the context of other cases.

5.5 Document analysis and discourse analysis

Document analysis is a way of collecting data material from company annual reports, websites, political documents and regulations, governmental documents or research documents (Tjora, 2018, p. 134). In this research, the data material is primarily documents in the form of public speeches. This research method can be considered as a type of "unobtrusive methods", where empirical data is collected without involving non-researching participants (Tjora, 2018, p. 134). This is practical, since in research, the researcher has a responsibility to reduce the strain on participants. Tjora (2018) explains that there is no doubt that documents play a great role in the construction of reality (p. 134). This is applicable to Bentley's studies, as he discusses how the public speeches in his studies construct new historical narratives, in which the colonial, western governments are the narrator. Tjora (2018) further elucidates that a significant point about documents is that they give information about an issue that happened at a set time and in a particular place, and often have specific readers in mind (p. 134). Therefore, we are obligated to see them in a context, seeing matters such as where they were written, when they were written, for whom they were written, and for what purpose were they written (Tjora, 2018, p. 134). This was crucial to keep in mind when I analysed and interpreted the speeches.

Document analysis is closely linked to discourse analysis, which further addresses the concept of constructing a reality. This research method seeks to understand how reality is created, reproduced and maintained collectively, by interpreting the use of language (Tjora, 2018, p. 134-135). It is therefore essential to carefully read and interpret the language in the speeches, since the language in a specific context has meaning. For instance, the language in speeches could be used to achieve social goals, or maintaining a friendly relationship to another state or its own people. This is one of many aspects Bentley addresses in his analysis of state apologies. It is also important for the researcher to investigate and explain the relationship between language, reality and discourse since discourse is both shaped by and shapes language in a specific context (Tjora, 2018, p. 135).

5.6 Rhetorical analysis

“If only the Prime Minister's policies were as good as the policy rhetoric we hear, we would all be better off” (Leach 2000, p. 207). In order to further analyse and interpret how language creates reality, it is essential to investigate rhetoric and how it is used as a tool to communicate. According to Leach (2000), politicians perform acts of rhetoric in their speeches, where they create discourse to be persuasive (p. 208). In a rhetorical analysis, the researcher seeks to address or reveal in their analyses of documents if they are persuasive, or worthy of criticism. Allen (2017) explains that a rhetorical analysis can be defined in several ways, and that one way is to separate it into three main components: description, interpretation, and judgment (p. 1503). The description is meant to introduce and describe the subject of matter, which in this thesis will be the public apology speeches, where the obvious purpose is to apologise to the indigenous peoples for the wrongdoings of the past, more specifically the forced child removal policy. The description should also say something about the medium and its form (Allen, 2017, p. 1503). In this case, the public speeches are written documents that were read and broadcasted on television. The form says something about how the elements of the speech were put together. Here, context matters, as many critics of apologies tend to question why certain things are being addressed, and why other things may be ignored. Second, Allen (2017) states that a rhetorical analysis requires an interpretation of the public speeches, where the purpose is to answer the question: “what is this text about”. To do so, the researcher must present evidence to support the claims about the text (p. 1503). The evidence used to support my interpretations of the text will mainly be Bentley’s framework, theory about settler colonialism, and the historical backgrounds of the indigenous peoples. This is valuable information that will be useful to thoroughly analyse the speeches and see parts of it in context. Finally, Allen (2017) mentions that the researcher should confer judgment on the text, and evaluate whether it is good or bad, successful or unsuccessful, or valuable or dangerous (p. 1503). In addition to evaluating the speeches themselves, it is in my study a goal to evaluate or judge the progress after the speeches were expressed publicly. Having the possibility to see the aftermath of the apologies could be helpful to further judge whether the speeches were successful or not. Through analysing public apologies in form of speeches, I seek to use an already existing framework and critically investigate them to get a better understanding of how the speeches are generated and what they really mean.

6. ANALYSIS

In this chapter, Bentley's framework will be used to analyse and interpret the speeches, and see to what extent his framework can explain apologies as a phenomenon, and how this phenomenon can be worthy of criticism. The analysis will separate the speeches into four sections, containing three subsections per speech. The framework of the analysis will be Bentley's three main criticisms to state apologies:

- Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past
- Expounding contemporary paternalism
- Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised (Bentley, 2015, p. 8-9)

To analyse these speeches, I will provide a short introduction to each of the speeches, separating them into the three main components previously explained by Allen (2017): "description, interpretation, and judgment" (p. 1503). This is to give the reader an impression of the content, and a better understanding of my analysis.

6.1 Kevin Rudd's speech

The first speech to be analysed is Kevin Rudd's "Apology to indigenous peoples" from 2008. The public apology is a speech in form of a written document that was aired on 13 February 2008, after Kevin Rudd and the Labor Party won the election on 24 November 2007. The clear purpose of the apology was to offer a national apology to the indigenous peoples for the forced child removal policy, previously introduced in this thesis as the Stolen Generations. The apology was more than a decade overdue and became one of the most discussed events on the Australian cultural public sphere, and officially a new moment of history (Burgess et al., 2010, p. 155). However, the timing of the speech appears to have been an issue that has led to much of its criticism. Since the speech was given so shortly after the election was won, many reviewed it with scepticism, asking if this was truly a new vision, or if the apology was only offered around election times to win votes through hollow words and false promises (Fejo-King, 2011, p. 138). Although an apology had been a long-time demand from the victimised groups and people of the nation, the reception was not necessarily exclusively good. In 2007, an interview of 10 Aboriginal Australians found that not one of them believed an apology would help them forgive, but that it rather would help non-indigenous people understand the past, and facilitate reconciliation (Philpot et al., 2013, p. 37).

6.1.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past

Bentley (2015) observes that apologies tend to be offered only in relation to specific acts of violence but fail to apologise for the entirety of the colonial enterprise (p. 7). It is reasonable to argue that this criticism applies to parts of Rudd's opening segment. Rudd (2008) starts off by saying that he "honours the indigenous people", and "reflects on their past mistreatment". However, these are vague and general statements that he does not further elaborate on nor explain. We learn through his speech that what he refers to as "past mistreatment" is narrowed down to specifically concern the Stolen Generations. Nevertheless, the past mistreatment of the indigenous peoples of Australia has been shown to involve several offenses other than "only" forcibly removing children from their homes. For instance, Hooper et al. (2020) explains that white settlers colonised Australia in the 18th century, and that Aboriginal Australians since then have been discriminated against and exposed to extreme violence and massacres (p. 194). Henry (2012) mentions how the indigenous peoples were chased away from the fertile areas of the coast and into the arid desert which had devastating consequences (p. 34). Casey (2018) informs that colonists were killing Aboriginals without expressing any shame or regret at their deaths (p. 36). These examples are only some of the ways the Australian government and settlers engaged in genocide and assimilation of the Australian Aboriginals, yet Rudd only addresses the issue of the "Stolen generations – this blemished chapter in our nation's history" (Rudd, 2008).

Rudd introduces a notion of glorification as he proceeds with his speech. He suggests that it is time to "turn a new page in Australia's history by righting the wrongs of the past and so moving forward with confidence to the future" (Rudd, 2008) and that a "new page in the history of our great continent can now be written" (Rudd, 2008). It is interesting to unpack the metaphor "new page", which appears twice in the same paragraph. With this remark, it could be argued that Rudd suggests that there is something negative in the past. In the same sentence, however, he refers to Australia as a "great continent", which sounds remarkably like the continent's history is great. This is an interesting contradiction. Although the word "great" can simply refer to the geographical size of the continent, it is logical to interpret it as something more, in the direction of magnificence, pride, and power. In that regard, the way he elsewhere in the speech humbles himself on behalf of the government for the past loses credibility, since there is little pride in looking back at the dark chapters of the history of Australia. However, it does not seem as if Rudd glorifies the colonial past in such ways Bentley (2015) found and criticised in his studies. Although Rudd fails to mention that Aboriginal Australians were driven away from their lands

by the measures of frontier violence and massacres, he does not deny the notion by glorifying a figure or any events from the past. Therefore, Rudd's speech appears as sanitising, but aside from that, the speech is more humbling than glorifying.

6.1.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism

Bentley (2015) explains that apologies tend to emphasise benign aspects of the colonial past, as well as expounding contemporary paternalism through seemingly benevolent and altruistic policies (p. 8). This particular criticism could be argued to be found in Rudd's final segment, where he argues for a "future where we harness the determination of all Australians, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, to close the gap that lies between us in life expectancy, educational achievement and economic opportunity" (Rudd, 2008). In other words, Rudd explains that Australia must move forward as a unity with the beliefs that everyone is equal in terms of rights, opportunities, and status. These beliefs can be interpreted as altruistic, where the Australian government seeks to take care of the victimised groups, and make sure that they are treated equally in society. The criticism of expounding paternalism through seemingly benevolent and altruistic policies is further evident in Rudd's speech, as he mentions that "the Parliament of Australia respectfully request that this apology be received in the spirit in which it is offered as part of the healing of the nation. For the future we take heart; resolving that this new page in the history of our great continent can now be written." (Rudd, 2008). It is interesting to note that this was said in a context where there was a sudden rise of public apologies around the world (Cunningham, 2004, p. 81), and shortly after the Labor Party's takeover after former Prime Minister John Howard had refused to apologise for almost a decade (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). In that case, one may question the genuineness of Rudd's will to heal the nation, since the timing is rather convenient. The quote draws similarities to Bentley's (2015) example of the German apology, where it was proclaimed that the state was now "multicultural, working for world-wide peace, human rights development and poverty reduction" (p. 8). It could therefore be logical to assume that the Australian government seeks to take a modern stand and through this apology show that the state now, and in the future accepts multiculturalism, focusing on human rights development.

About midway through the speech, Rudd apologises for the laws and policies of the state "that have inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on these our fellow Australians" (Rudd, 2008). Here, fellowship and the "national we" are significant subjects. He refers to the indigenous peoples as fellow Australians, which can be argued to neglect Australia's own role in the assimilation, exclusion, and discrimination against the Aboriginal Australians that has

been going on for centuries. This shares similarities with Britain's apology in Bentley's (2015) studies, where the British government neglected its own participation in the violence in Northern Ireland, while in the public apology it claimed to be working towards a political settlement in Northern Ireland (p. 8). Rudd's public apology could therefore be seen as a golden opportunity for the Australian government to expound seemingly altruistic policies. The most explicit instance of paternalism in Rudd's speech is how he repeatedly seeks to promote benevolent and altruistic policies with an emphasis on moving forward as a unity, ensuring that everyone has equal rights. An example of this is how he includes the indigenous peoples by referring to them as "fellow Australians". Since the emphasis lies in explaining the positive traits offered by the government, the apology is ultimately a government that engages in paternalism and triumphalism, rather than a government that humbles itself before the victims (Bentley, 2015, p. 8).

6.1.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised

Bentley (2015) explains that in public apologies, the victims or the offended tend to be denied a voice and are instead spoken for by Western intellectuals, states, or different types of state actors (p. 8). This means that the apologiser gets to create their own story and definition of said offense, and how the offended should feel about it. In Rudd's speech, there are various examples where Rudd articulates the version of the events. By doing so, the indigenous peoples' story is denied, and inscribed by the apologiser (p. 8). This specific criticism is prominent in the beginning of Rudd's speech where he narrows his apology to the Stolen Generations and reflects on the "pain, suffering and hurt of these Stolen Generations, their descendants and for their families left behind" (Rudd, 2008). In this situation, it is reasonable to argue that Rudd speaks on behalf of the indigenous people where he is the one who defines what is worth apologising for, thus also the indigenous peoples' basis for demanding an apology. Rudd first and foremost apologises for what he personally believes to be the most severe of all wrongdoings. This is evident as he on behalf of the government "apologise especially for the removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families, their communities and their country" (Rudd, 2008). By adding the word "especially", he puts extra emphasis on this specific wrongdoing. He evaluates the severity of the wrongdoings and sets the standard for what needs to be addressed in the apology.

According to MacLachlan (2015), the demands of indigenous peoples typically focus on three aspects: claims of land, their own government and cultural preservation (p. 378). In this public apology only one of those aspects are addressed, being the Stolen Generations, which

touches only the aspect of cultural preservation. It is therefore natural to assume that the apology does not necessarily meet the demands of the victims, and that the apology would probably have covered several aspects if the victims were the ones to speak. In this situation, not only are the victims spoken for. They are also having only small parts of their story told, since Rudd creates the narrative of the long-lasting mistreatment of the indigenous peoples, where only one or few of the many wrongdoings are highlighted. This ultimately creates a new representation about the indigenous peoples and the past. I previously mentioned that Rudd focuses his speech on the Stolen Generations. He also spends time to picture the ideal future, wishing for “A future where all Australians, whatever their origins, are truly equal partners, with equal opportunities and with an equal stake in shaping the next chapter in the history of this great country, Australia” (Rudd, 2008). However, one may argue that it is unclear whether this is something he wants, or if this is something the indigenous peoples want. The assumption can be discussed in light of Bentley’s (2015) final criticism of ventriloquism in public apologies, where he explains that the apologiser can set the tone of the apology, sanitise events of the past on terms that are politically expedient for the apologiser (p. 9). It is therefore logical to assume that these are seemingly benevolent and altruistic policies that engage in triumphalism, which in the end is positive for the state and how it is perceived nationally and internationally. This assumption can be supported by the fact that there was no form of compensation for the indigenous peoples following Rudd’s apology (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374).

The apology appears to be clearly characterised by an offender speaking and the offended listening, and where a representation of the past is created through the eyes of the apologiser. By “especially” apologising to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, I argue that Rudd speaks on behalf of the indigenous peoples when it comes to defining the worst of the many wrongdoings. Rudd appears as the one who decides what is worth to apologise for, and while doing so, he excludes aspects of the past and sanitises them. The severe consequence of this is that a new representation of the indigenous peoples’ past is made, while the Australian government appears as the altruistic, modern government that communicates seemingly benevolent policies.

6.2 Scott Morrison’s speech

The second speech that will be analysed is Scott Morrison’s “14th Anniversary of the Apology to Australia’s Indigenous Peoples”. It is a speech in form of a written document that was aired on 14 February 2022. It is a considerably longer speech than Rudd’s, as the transcript consists of 1752 words. The speech was given as a televised statement to both Houses of Parliament as

well as the members of the Stolen Generations that was present. The purpose of the speech was to honour the 14th anniversary of Rudd's speech, and to remind that righting the wrongs of the past is still an ongoing journey. However, the speech has been severely criticized for hinting that the indigenous peoples should forgive their abusers (Latimore, 2022). It reflects upon the victims of the Stolen Generations, and addresses the present situation of Australia's indigenous peoples, and the improvements in indigenous policies during the last few years. It is a rather political speech that seeks to stand out from the opposing political party, which is interesting, since he is celebrating an apology given by the Prime Minister from that side. Finally, the speech seeks to look to the future, and continue the journey of making it right.

6.2.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past

Since this is an anniversary of the national apology which is meant to continue the journey of righting the wrongs of the past, one could assume that it deals with certain demands that were not addressed in the first national apology. However, Morrison apologises only for the Stolen Generations: "Sorry for the cold laws that broke apart families" (Morrison, 2022). Celermajer (2009) suggests that categories that should be subjected in an apology to the Aboriginal Australians are not only separation from family, but also physical and emotional abuse, loss of cultural, educational and economic opportunities, and possible land right claims (p. 165). Even though he apologises multiple times, they are all addressing the Stolen Generations, which means that Morrison fails to address any other atrocity. This is relevant in relation to Bentley's (2015) criticism of addressing only aspects of the colonial enterprise (p. 7), which sanitises and legitimises the rest of the wrongdoings.

Further in Morrison's speech, I suggest that he engages in sanitising and glorifying narratives of the past when he explains that "We belong to a story - from time immemorial, a continent that contends with us all, and the work of building a strong, sovereign and vibrant democracy that gives us all a voice" (Morrison, 2022). The words "from time immemorial" arguably sanitises the invasion of Australia since he portrays a story where the colonisers and the Aboriginal Australians have lived peacefully as one people for eternity. His depiction of Australia as a "strong, sovereign and vibrant democracy" can be interpreted as a glorification of the colonial past since he does not appear to look back with remorse at the history of Australia. Instead, Morrison creates a narrative where Australia is defined by a vibrant democracy, which completely ignores the historical disenfranchisement of the Aboriginal Australians.

Morrison shifts his subject to forgiveness and explains that forgiveness is “an act of grace. It’s an act of courage. And it is a gift that only those who have been wounded, damaged and destroyed can offer.” Here it seems like Morrison is pushing the indigenous peoples for forgiveness. According to the “Bringing Them Home” report of 1997, the first step in forgiving would require an apology that provided a verification of the facts and a full public disclosure of the truth, as well as acceptance of responsibility (Australia & Wilkie, 1997, p. 247). As mentioned before, Morrison fails to give a full public disclosure of the truth, since he exclusively apologises for the Stolen Generations, rather than the entire colonial enterprise or other aspects of it. He pushes the responsibility to the indigenous peoples, since he implies that it is their turn to make the courageous move and forgive. By doing so, it could be argued that he sanitises the colonial past by hinting that the Australian state has offered a sufficient apology that should be accepted by the victims.

6.2.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism

In Morrison’s speech, there are several incidents of benign aspects of the colonial past and where seemingly benevolent and altruistic policies are expressed. For instance, Morrison states that “93 per cent of Indigenous children are now enrolled in early childhood education. That is an increase from 77 per cent in 2016” (Morrison, 2022). This is problematic since the focus lies on the progress, where it is implied that the government has made great progress during the last few years. Bentley (2015) refers to such sentiments as patronising and infantilising, and that they resemble paternalistic narratives of the colonial past (p. 8). The reason why is that the governments use apologies as a platform to front the seemingly altruistic policies, rather than humbling themselves for the victims. Morrison continues to mention positive traits of the Australian government’s relation to the indigenous peoples as he explains that during the “last three years, 23,000 Commonwealth contracts have been awarded to Indigenous businesses.” He also mentions the betterment of “Ben Schaber from Alice Springs who turned his life around by getting out of prison, getting into a job, getting into a trade, and now running his own specialised welding and engineering business in the Territory and providing these same very opportunities to other Indigenous Australians. Ben is an inspiration” (Morrison, 2022). This quote is interesting to discuss in light of Celermajer (2009) who explains that what Aboriginal Australians demanded from an apology was that their subject experience and perspective of history were brought out of the shadows (p. 167). Rather than subjecting atrocities to apology, Morrison keeps emphasising on the progress and the positive contemporary relation.

6.2.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised

Bentley (2015) argues that in apologies, the colonised people are often denied a voice and are instead spoken for by the colonisers (p. 8). This means that the apologiser sets the tone for the apology. This is evident in Morrison's speech, as he seems to suggest that it is time to reconcile and move forward, rather than expressing his sincerest apology for the mistreatment of the Indigenous peoples. He explains that "sorry can never be given without any expectation of forgiveness" (Morrison, 2022) and that forgiveness is "an act of grace. It's an act of courage. And it is a gift that only those who have been wounded, damaged and destroyed can offer" (Morrison, 2022). However, the "Bringing Them Home" report of 1997 suggests that in order to heal and reconcile, people must be given the opportunity to tell their stories, and testimonies must continue to be received and recorded (Australia & Wilkie, 1997, p. 18). In this case, it is only Morrison who speaks. It seems that Morrison on behalf of the indigenous peoples has evaluated and found that they are reconciled, and that it is time to forgive the Australian government. Not only does he speak on behalf of the indigenous people, but he also risks moving too quickly from the apology to the question of reconciliation, which according to MacLachlan (2010) can have a negative impact on the reconciliation process (p. 381).

Morrison mentions that "we are on a journey to make peace with our past. And it's a difficult journey and it is an important one, to draw together the past, the present, and future, so we can truly be one and free" (Morrison, 2022). In this statement, he includes the indigenous peoples on a journey towards the future that it is likely that they never sought to be a part of. Also, what Morrison suggests by being "one and free" might be a more complicated process in the eyes of the indigenous peoples. According to Celermajer (2009), the overall task of a reparation would have to include restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, and satisfaction as well as guarantees that these atrocities would never occur again (p. 167). These types of reparations do not seem to be offered, since for instance there was no monetary compensation following the first apology (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). Other than monetary compensation, the restitution would involve restitution of liberty, family life, citizenship, return of one's place of residence and property (Celermajer, 2009, p. 168). It is likely that such demands would be more present in an apology if the Aboriginal Australians were the ones to speak.

6.3 King Harald V of Norway's speech

The third speech to be analysed is King Harald V of Norway's "Sametinget 1997: åpningstale" [Sámi parliament 1997: opening speech]. The speech had particularly two purposes, which was to welcome the third opening of the Sámi parliament since its establishment in 1989, and to

apologise for the assimilation policies from the past, introduced in this thesis as “Norwegianisation”. Lehtola (2015) explains that ever since the end of the Norwegianisation policy in 1950, there had been a long-time demand for an apology, and that it took nearly 50 years for the Sámi people to receive their apology (p. 23). The Alta conflict of 1968-1982 resulted in an even greater demand for an apology, as it was nationally and internationally considered a devastating conflict (Andersen & Midttun, 1985). This resulted in the establishment of the Sámi parliament in 1989, which further led to an apology that was given in the opening speech on the third opening of the Sámi parliament on 7 October 1997. The form of the opening speech is a written document and consists of 846 words. It is structured in paragraphs consisting of around five sentences, which means that the points made in the speech are often supported by more than one sentence. The speech is only available in Norwegian, as the earliest translated speeches that are registered on the Royal House of Norway’s websites are from year 2000. The quotes that are used to discuss and analyse the speech will therefore be my own translation of Harald V’s words, where I have sought to translate as accurately as possible to minimize the changes from the original speech. King Harald V of Norway is the first person to offer a public apology to the Sámi people on behalf of the government. He does not actively represent or publicly support any political party, and he does not hold any real political power. However, seeing as he is given the responsibility as the orator, it can be argued that he has some political influence.

6.3.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past

Bentley (2015) mentions that the colonial past is sanitised when apologies are offered only to certain aspects of the colonial project (p. 7). An example of this is evident in the very opening of the speech, where Harald V states that “Today we must apologise for the injustice that the Norwegian state has previously inflicted on the Sámi people through a harsh Norwegianisation policy” (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). By subjecting only the Norwegianisation policy to apology, it could be argued that Harald V ignores the entirety of the colonial project, and the notion that the Sámi people are victims of colonisation. This apology is the only one offered in his opening speech, as most of the speech is focused on the future, and how it must serve the Sámi people’s interests. According to Maliniemi (2009), The Norwegianisation policy started fully around the 1850s and lasted until the 1960s (p. 16), while the Swedish, Russian and Norwegian colonisation of the Sámi people started already since the beginning of the seventeenth century (Falch et al., 2016, p. 125). This means that roughly 250 years of colonisation, where the lands of the Sámi people were taken from them, is not included as a

subject to apology and is therefore possibly sanitised. Neither is the ongoing dispossession of Sámi land a subject to apology.

Harald V's awareness of the colonial enterprise is evident as he states that "the Norwegian state is founded on the territory of two peoples – Norwegians and the Sámi people. The Sámi history is closely intertwined with Norwegian history" (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). This is a significant admission of land rights. Yet, he does not apologise for, nor mention the fact that the Sámi people were chased away from their areas, since the Norwegian government saw them as simple and primitive nomads that were an obstacle to the Norwegian government's idea of national development (Lantto, 2010, p. 549). He continues his speech, suggesting that the Norwegian state has a responsibility to facilitate for the Sámi people to be able to build a strong and viable society, since this is a "well-established right based on the Sámi peoples' presence in their own areas that goes far back in time" (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). It seems logical to suggest that the phrase "far back in time" is a vague description of the Sámi peoples' land rights. This could be interpreted as a sanitisation of the colonial past since it does not specify the time of colonisation.

This chapter has shown that there are some issues related to potential sanitisation of the colonial past, in terms of addressing only aspects of the wrongdoings of the past. Since this is a speech that appears rather future-oriented, there are no specific glorifying narratives from the colonial past.

6.3.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism

Harald V mentions that "The Sámi Parliament has in a good and orderly way taken political responsibility for the development of the Sámi society, and thus made a positive contribution to the development of Norwegian society as a multi-ethnic and a multicultural society" (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). Rather than apologising for the past and reflecting about the wrongdoings, the emphasis is instead on seemingly positive features from the relationship with the Sámi people. It can be compared to the example of the German apology in Bentley's (2015) studies where he explained that the state was now "multicultural, working for world-wide peace, human rights development, and poverty reduction" (p. 8). It could be argued that the story of the victims is neglected since the apology targets positive traits about the offender, expressing seemingly kind-hearted and altruistic policies. Harald V's speech seems to repeatedly engage in such acts. For instance, he states that "in recent decades, the Norwegian Sámi policy has developed from actively practicing Norwegiansation policy to being a policy that aims to protect and develop the Sámi culture". It seems fair to categorize this as something

paternalistic, where the Norwegian state knows best and seeks to help the Sámi people. Falch et al. (2016) argue that the Sámi parliament is established in a unitary and state-friendly society, which is not an easy position to be in since it contains boundaries concerning the Sámi people's self-determination and self-rule (p. 125). One may argue that Harald V's statement can resemble paternalistic traits of the colonial past, and it is reasonable to believe that this is something the Sámi people have never asked for.

Harald V continues his speech and mentions that "as a result of the Sámi people's own efforts through the Sámi political organisations, the Sámi people got their own parliament in 1989" (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). Although this sentence sounds perfectly fine in English, the Norwegian phrasing can be problematic. The word "got" can look innocent on the face of it, but the Norwegian meaning of it can imply that the Sámi parliament was a granting from the Norwegian state, and that the Sámi people were *given* their own parliament. Even though Harald briefly mentions that it was their own efforts, this brief explanation fails to include the fact that this was a hard-won battle that had been lasting ever since the end of the Norwegianisation policy. Indeed, the Sámi people had been fighting against settler colonial tendencies for centuries which had led to an increased sense of nationalism in their community which was crucial for earning their own parliament (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1142). Therefore, it should arguably be a bigger emphasis on the battles of the Sámi people rather than communicating that this was given by the Norwegian state.

6.3.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised

There are a few issues in the speech where the Sámi people are being spoken for by Harald, although it appears that Harald V hints to and values that the Sámi people should have a great say and responsibility for their own development. The primary issue of ventriloquism in Harald V's speech is how only the issue of the Norwegianisation policy is subject to apology, whereas disasters such as the Alta-conflict is ignored. The severity of this conflict was massive, as it lasted for more than a decade, including mass meetings, demonstrations, hunger strikes, and civil obedience actions (Andersen & Midttun, 1985, p. 319). It is therefore likely that if the Sámi people were given a say in the apology, this would have been addressed. However, the colonised people are denied a voice, and are instead spoken for by Harald V. Celermajer (2009) argues that justice in apologies is directed towards healing the damage to the identity of the victim (p.169). In this case, only smaller parts of the Sámi people's history are spoken of, and thus only smaller parts of their identity. In that case, not only does the apology fail to heal the damage to the identity of the Sámi people, but also a new representation of the Sámi people is

made where only parts of their history are spoken of. Further in Harald V's speech, he suggests that "to ensure a positive society for us all, a development where the Sámi people and the rest of the Norwegian population can live as equal is of great importance" (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). This is clearly an opinion of Harald V, and it does not necessarily say anything about the Sámi people's perception of an ideal society.

However, Harald V values the Sámi people as he underlines that "the Sámi people themselves should form the Sámi community and the Sámi culture which means that the Sámi themselves will have the opportunity to define the values and attitudes that will form the basis for the development" (King Harald V of Norway, 1997). In this matter, the colonised are clearly the deciding part, and according to Oksanen (2020), the Sámi parliament were given advisory roles and public funds to promote the Sámi culture and livelihoods (p. 1150). Also, the Sámi parliament must be consulted by the government on any issue that concerns the Sámi people (Oksanen, 2020, p. 1150). This may be a result of Harald V's words, where the colonised were the deciding part.

6.4 Erna Solberg's speech

The final speech that will be analysed is Erna Solberg's "Tråante 2017: åpningstale" [Tråante 2017: opening speech]. The speech was primarily an opening speech, which means that there is limited content about apologies. However, I found the speech relevant since it still contains elements of apologies, and it will therefore be treated as one. Also, this opening speech was offered to the Sámi people 20 years after Harald V's apology. It is the first governmental speech, offered by a Prime Minister, as Harald V's position as king possesses no formal political power. The transcript of the speech consists of 500 words. The speech sets out to primarily celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Sámi peoples' first national meeting. The speech targets the Norwegianisation policy and aims to look forward, where a clear cooperation between Sámi people and the Norwegian government is emphasised. The speech is only available in Norwegian, the quotes that I have used to analyse and discuss the speech will be my own translation which I have sought to translate as accurately as possible.

6.4.1 Sanitisation and glorification of the colonial past

In the beginning of Solberg's speech, she mentions that "The Norwegianisation policy forced many Sámi people to abandon their culture and languages", and that "Fortunately, this is no longer a current policy" (Solberg, 2017). As the speech is narrowed down to Norwegianisation, it ignores and fails to mention the entirety of the colonial invasion which according to Falch et al. (2016) took place ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century (p. 125). This could

according to Bentley (2015) be sanitising, since subjecting only the Norwegianisation policy to apology can give the impression that it is detached from the larger scale of the colonial process (p. 7).

Although Solberg fails to apologise for the entirety of the colonial enterprise, she does not imbue it with sanitising or glorifying narratives. She speaks of one figure of the past, “Elsa Laula Renberg, who took the initiative for the national meeting” (Solberg, 2017). This is a great contrast to what Bentley (2015) explains in the Belgian apology, where the Belgian Foreign Minister suggested that King Leopold was a visionary and ambitious hero, denying the notion that his rule had been devastating to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (p. 7). By turning to Elsa Laula Renberg, Solberg instead honours the Sámi people as she glorifies the works of one of their own, and the great battles she fought for the Sámi people. She honours her by explaining that “With her courage and her will to persevere, she put several important Sámi political issues on the agenda” (Solberg, 2017).

6.4.2 Expounding contemporary paternalism

Solberg’s speech seems to show some tendencies of contemporary paternalism. Even though her speech does not emphasise benign aspects from the past, it does seem to emphasise seemingly positive traits of the present relation to the Sámi people. She mentions that “The Sámi Parliament, the Sámi Act and a separate constitutional provision have come into place. Several important Sámi institutions and initiatives have also been established, all of which contribute to revitalizing the Sámi language and culture” (Solberg, 2022). The phrasing “come into place” is a rather cryptic and passive way of saying how the Sámi Parliament, the Sámi Act and the constitutional provision has been founded. It does not suggest that these institutions were results from hard-won battles by the Sámi. However, it can be argued to emphasise seemingly positive traits of the relation between the Norwegian government and the Sámi people. This could according to Bentley (2015) be a sign of paternalism where the government are not humbling themselves for the victims but are instead giving themselves credit for their altruistic policies (p. 8).

Bentley (2015) criticises paternalism in apologies due to the position the governments put themselves in, by acting like someone who cares for and makes choices on behalf of others for their own good (p. 8). However, in this speech, Solberg succeeds at giving credit where credit is due. This is evident as she explains that “Today we can also thank many enthusiasts in all the Sami areas - for the fact that more are about to regain their lost language, and that more also choose to use the language in daily life” (Solberg, 2017). In this case, it is due to the Sámi

people's own effort that they are regaining their language and are revitalising their culture. She also explains that "We - both the Sami parliaments and the governments - have a common goal of reducing border barriers and making co-operation between us in our Nordic countries easier" (Solberg, 2017). Again, Solberg makes sure to include the Sámi people and Parliament in their own policies, which gives the impression that this is not some altruistic policy from the Norwegian government.

6.4.3 Ventriloquism: speaking for the colonised

As previously mentioned, Bentley (2015) explains that in public apologies, the offended are typically denied a voice and are instead spoken for by Western intellectuals, states, or different types of state actors (p. 8). It is reasonable to argue that there are examples of this in Solberg's speech. She mentions that "The Norwegianisation policy forced many Sámi to abandon their culture and languages. Several generations of the Sámi people were trained to believe that speaking Sámi - or being Sámi - was something shameful, which had to be silenced to death" (Solberg, 2017). This is Solberg's perception of the Norwegianisation, and it is likely that the Sámi's perception of the Norwegianisation policy could have been worse than what Solberg is explaining. For instance, Eriksen (2018) mentions that children were physically taken away from their families and homes by the Norwegian government to be placed in Norwegian institutions (p. 58), which can be argued to be considerably worse.

Solberg mentions that "the Sámi languages, the Sámi culture and industry are vulnerable. Through the exchange of experience – across national borders – I believe we can find solutions that ensure a good future for the Sámi culture, and for the Sámi people in Norway" (Solberg, 2017). Here, it could be argued that Solberg speaks for the Sámi people, where she on behalf of the government pictures an ideal future, and an imposition of a statehood that the Sámi people never really asked for. This is since the Sámi people became only a part of the Norwegian state after they were colonised. It is therefore reasonable to interpret it as if these are Solberg's visions, rather than the Sámi peoples' visions.

7. DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results from the analysis will be discussed in relation to Bentley's studies, as well as the existing literature on public apologies. This is to see whether my findings support or contradict existing research, and if there is anything unusual or surprising about my cases.

The main arguments of Bentley (2015) are that apologies tend to advance certain interests of states that have historically been practicing colonialism. In apologies, these states create narratives that resemble the colonial enterprise or legitimise some of its core elements (p. 5). These main arguments could seem to be transmittable to my cases. I argue that all the four speeches fail to address wider aspects of the colonial enterprise, thereby possibly sanitising it, legitimising it, and creating new representations of the past. These findings support existing research, such as Cels (2017), who found that in public apologies, governments may express regret only for the most severe acts of the past, to avoid large numbers of claims for financial compensation (p. 760). The findings also support Adams & Kampf's (2020) research who argue that apologies may legitimise new representations of the past. Finally, Olick's (2007) research is supported, as he argues that we live in a society of narratives where political institutions create narratives that does not fully acknowledge the past, as an attempt to create a new identity and move on (p. 5). None of the speeches, however, seem to engage in glorifying narratives from the past, in which either the former colonial state or a colonial figure is glorified and praised for certain actions. Although one may detect attitudes that glorify the current and the colonial state, they are rather subtle compared to the findings of Bentley (2015). Instead, I suggest that the speeches seem more future-oriented. This could be a contradiction to Bentley's studies, which provide clear narratives where a colonial state or figure is glorified, for instance King Leopold II in the Belgium apology.

The speeches seem to contain elements of paternalistic traits, as they all appear to express seemingly altruistic and benevolent policies from the current relation to the indigenous peoples. Bentley (2015) suggests that this can be done by emphasising subjects such as human rights, multiculturalism, and development. The findings of paternalism in my cases support research of Gibney & Roxstrom (2001), who found that public apologies could be used as a platform to expound policies of development in human rights standards (p. 914). It also supports the research of Marrus (2007) who discovered that in public apologies, there was a growing international movement for human rights in politics, and thus a growing consensus that political elites were committed to promoting them (p. 86). Addressing and promoting human rights is a recurring trend in the speeches, and in this particular field, my findings does not seem to

contradict existing research. The trend of promoting human rights in apologies is problematic, since the apology shifts the focus from a state that humbles itself before the victims to a state that turns the unjust past and current relation to the indigenous into something positive. In terms of ventriloquism, aspects of this could be detected in all the speeches, especially since this specific criticism deals with elements similar to a sanitisation of the colonial past. There are aspects where the apologiser creates a new representation of the past that has significant shortcomings, potentially excluding important elements of the colonial past that ought to be addressed in a public apology. In other words, these are aspects that would have likely been addressed if the victims were the ones to speak. These findings support especially Olick (2015) who precisely deals with new representations of the past in terms of collective memory (p. 46).

Although many scholars argue that public apologies can be cynical and meaningless gestures (e.g., Gibney & Roxstrom, 2011; Cunningham, 1999), findings from my research could seem to prove that they also bear value. It was a relief for the Sámi people of Norway when they finally received their apology in 1997. Also, there was a monetary compensation attached to King Harald V of Norway's apology (Lehtola, 2015, p. 22), which according to Celermajer (2009) is an important part of reparation (p. 167). Not only were they compensated, but the Sámi people themselves managed to revitalise their language and develop their own administrative area, as well as their own parliament which has given them a strong legal status in Norway (Midbøen & Lidén, 2015, p. 7). Rudd's speech was offered after a long-time demand by the victims, ever since the release of the "Bringing Them Home" report of 1997 (Australia & Wilkie, 1997; MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). Because of the long-time demand, it was a great relief for the victims to finally receive their public apology. On the other hand, there was no compensation attached to Rudd's apology (MacLachlan, 2010, p. 374). This could be argued to weaken its value.

By comparing Rudd's speech to Morrison's speech, it could seem that they share a fairly similar amount of sanitisation of the colonial past, paternalism, and ventriloquism. However, Morrison's speech seems to include more controversial aspects, such as suggesting that it is time for the Aboriginal Australians to forgive and reconcile with the Australian government. This has caused an uproar and infuriated the victims (Latimore, 2022). It could possibly be seen as a devastating act of sanitisation, where Morrison seeks to forget, and move on. Due to this, it feels rational to argue that Morrison's speech has had a negative change from Rudd's speech. King Harald V of Norway and Solberg's speeches seem to both contain sanitisation, paternalism, and ventriloquism, although it appears that there were clearer incidents of these

elements in Harald V's speech. This could indicate a positive development. However, as already mentioned, Solberg's speech appears more like an opening speech than an apology. This could potentially be the reason why there are slightly less sanitisation and glorification, paternalism, and ventriloquism, rather than exclusively being an indicator of a positive development.

8. CONCLUSION

In the introduction of this thesis, I presented the following research question: Can sanitation and glorification, paternalism, or ventriloquism be detected in the domestic apologies to the Aboriginal Australians and the Sámi people, and if so, how do the speeches change over time? The study was conducted by analysing four speeches, where two of them were Australian and two were Norwegian. The intention was to see whether Bentley's critical approach of apologies was transmittable to my findings or not, and if the speeches change over the span of 14 and 20 years. The findings from the analysis suggest that elements of sanitisation, paternalism and ventriloquism can be found in all the speeches. However, the elements of glorification in terms of glorifying narratives of the past seem to be less clear in my cases than in Bentley's studies. I suggest that in the Australian speeches, Bentley's critical approach seems to be more transmittable to Morrison's speech than to Rudd's speech, although both speeches demonstrate clear examples. This could indicate a negative change from the first Australian speech to the most recent one. In the Norwegian speeches, the results are quite similar, although the findings could indicate a positive change from Harald V's speech to Solberg's speech, since there are less examples of criticism presented in the analysis of Solberg's speech. However, this could be because Solberg's speech appears more like an opening speech than an apology. However, it is included and treated as an apology in this study as it offers elements of apologies, and since it is the only formal governmental speech offered by the Prime Minister to the Sámi people after Harald V's apology of 1997.

The study could prove to have some potential limitations. It targets only Bentley's critical approach to apologies, which means that using a broader or more general framework could lead to more findings in the speeches. This is because one would be looking at the speeches through a bigger lens. Also, Solberg's speech proved more difficult to analyse, since the format was more of an opening speech than an apology. Despite these limitations, one could recognize various elements of Bentley's criticism, which could further substantiate the existing research on criticism of public apologies. For further research on apologies, it could be relevant to target public apologies to the Sámi people, as this seems to be a less researched field than public apologies to other indigenous peoples. In conclusion, my study has provided results which may be further researched in several interesting ways.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, T., & Kampf, Z. (2020). 'Solemn and just demands': Seeking apologies in the international arena. *Review of International Studies*, 46(4), 555-572.
- Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411
- Ancarno, C. (2015). When are public apologies 'successful'? Focus on British and French apology press uptakes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 84(Jul), 139-153.
- Anderson, Ian, Prof, Robson, Bridget, PhD, Connolly, Michele, MPH, Al-Yaman, Fadwa, PhD, Bjertness, Espen, Prof, King, Alexandra, MD, Tynan, Michael, PhD, Madden, Richard, Prof, Bang, Abhay, MD, Coimbra, Carlos E A, Prof, Pesantes, Maria Amalia, PhD, Amigo, Hugo, Prof, Andronov, Sergei, PhD, Armien, Blas, MD, Obando, Daniel Ayala, BS, Axelsson, Per, PhD, Bhatti, Zaid Shakoor, MSc, Bhutta, Zulfiqar Ahmed, Prof, Bjerregaard, Peter, Prof, ... Bustos, Patricia, MD. (2016). Indigenous and tribal peoples' health (The Lancet –Lowitja Institute Global Collaboration): a population study. *The Lancet (British Edition)*, 388(10040), 131–157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)00345-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00345-7)
- Andersen, S., & Midttun, A. (1985). Conflict and Local Mobilization : The Alta Hydropower Project 1. *Acta Sociologica*, 28(4), 317-335.
- Andrieu, K. (2009). 'Sorry for the Genocide': How Public Apologies Can Help Promote National Reconciliation. *Millennium*, 38(1), 3-23.
- Australia., & Wilkie, M. (1997). Bringing Them Home: Report of the national inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families. Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.
- Bentley, T. (2018). Colonial apologies and the problem of the transgressor speaking. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(3), 399-417.
- Bentley, T. (2015). *Empires of Remorse. Narrative, postcolonialism and apologies for colonial atrocity*. Routledge.
- Battistella, E. (2014). *Sorry about that : The language of public apology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bentley, T. (2018). Colonial apologies and the problem of the transgressor speaking. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(3), 399-417.

Burgess, J., Klaebe, H., & McWilliam, K. (2010). Mediatisation and Institutions of Public Memory: Digital Storytelling and the Apology. *Australian Historical Studies*, 41(2), 149-165.

Casey, B. (2018). Some burning issues : Arthur Upfield and the Murchison murders, marginalising Aboriginal people and suggestions on teaching Australia's history of frontier violence. *Australian Aboriginal Studies (Canberra, A.C.T. : 1983)*, 2018(1), 29-42.

Celermajer, D. (2009). *The Sins of the Nation and the Ritual of Apologies*. Cambridge University Press.

Cels, S. (2017). Saying sorry: Ethical leadership and the act of public apology. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(6), 759-779.

Corcoran, Walker, K. E., & Wals, A. E. . (2004). Case studies, make-your-case studies, and case stories: a critique of case-study methodology in sustainability in higher education. *Environmental Education Research*, 10(1), 7–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1350462032000173670>

Cunningham, M. (2004). Apologies in Irish Politics: A Commentary and Critique. *Contemporary British History*, 18(4), 80-92.

Cunningham, M. (1999). Saying Sorry: The Politics of Apology. *The Political Quarterly (London. 1930)*, 70(3), 285-293.

Cunningham, M. (2014). *States of apology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ellinghaus, K. (2006). *Taking Assimilation to Heart*. Lincoln: UNP – Nebraska.

Eriksen, K.G. (2018). Teaching About the Other in Primary Level Social Studies: The Sami in Norwegian textbooks. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 2, 57-67. DOI 10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v17-i2-1697

Falch, T., Selle, P., & Strømsnes, K. (2016). The Sámi: 25 Years of Indigenous Authority in Norway. *Ethnopolitics*, 15(1), 125-143.

Fejo-King, C. (2011). The National Apology to the Stolen Generations: The Ripple Effect. *Australian Social Work*, 64(1), 130-143.

Fraser, Bruce. 1981. "On Apologizing". In: Coulmas, F. (ed.), pp. 259-271.

Gibney, M., & Roxstrom, E. (2001). The Status of State Apologies. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23(4), 911-939.

Hämäläinen, S., Musial, F., Salamonsen, A., Graff, O., & Olsen, T. (2018). Sami yoik, Sami history, Sami health: A narrative review. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, 77(1), 1454784-8.

Harald V. (1997). Sametinget 1997: Åpningstale. [Sámi Parliament 1997: Opening speech]. Kongehuset. <https://www.kongehuset.no/tale.html?tid=171065&sek=26947&scope=0>

Harrison, K. (2019). Sustainability and Indigenous Aesthetics: Musical Resilience in Sámi and Indigenous Canadian Theatre. *Yearbook for Traditional Music*, 51, 17-48.

Henry, R. (2012). *Performing place, practising memories* (1st ed., Vol. 7). Berghahn Books.

Hooper, G., Richards, J., & Watson, J. (2020). Mapping Colonial Massacres and Frontier Violence in Australia: “the names of places”. *Cartographica*, 55(3), 193-198.

Jacobs, M. (2009). *White Mother to a Dark Race : Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880-1940*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Johansen, &. (2013). Overcoming silence: Language emancipation in a coastal Sámi-Norwegian community. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 7(1-2), 57-77.

Keynes, M., & Marsden, B. (2021). Ontology, sovereignty, legitimacy: Two key moments when history curriculum was challenged in public discourse and the curricular effects, Australia 1950s and 2000s. *History of Education Review*, 50(2), 130-145.

Khan, S.N. (2002). Qualitative Research Method: Grounded Theory (2002). *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9 (11), 224-233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v9n11p224>

Kim, H., Kralik, J., Yun, K., Chung, Y., & Jeong, J. (2019). Neural Correlates of Public Apology Effectiveness. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13, 229.

Klein, E. (2020). Settler colonialism in Australia and the cashless debit card. *Social Policy & Administration*, 54(2), 265-277.

Lantto, P. (2010). Borders, citizenship and change: the case of the Sami people, 1751-2008. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(5), 543–556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2010.506709>

Latimore, J. (2022, February 14). *PM prompts fury by looking for forgiveness 14 years after Rudd's apology*. SMH. <https://www.smh.com.au/national/pm-prompts-fury-by-looking-for-forgiveness-14-years-after-rudd-s-apology-20220214-p59weu.html>

Leach, J. (2000). Rhetorical analysis. In Bauer, M. W., & Gaskell, G. (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound* (pp. 208-226). SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849209731>

Lehtola, V.P. (2015). Sámi Histories, Colonialism, and Finland. *Arctic Anthropology*, 52(2), 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.3368/aa.52.2.22>

MacLachlan, A. (2010). The State of “Sorry”: Official Apologies and their Absence. *Journal of Human Rights*, 9:3, 373-385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14754835.2010.502085>

Maliniemi, K. (2009). Public records and minorities: Problems and possibilities for Sámi and Kven. *Archival Science*, 9(1-2), 15-27.

Marrus, M. (2007). Official Apologies and the Quest for Historical Justice. *Journal of Human Rights*, 6(1), 75-105.

Midtbøen, A.H., & Lidén, H. (2015). Diskriminering av samer, nasjonale minoriteter og innvandrere i Norge. En kunnskapsgjennomgang. [Discrimination against Sámi people, national minorities and immigrants in Norway. A knowledge review]. (Report No. 2015:01). Institutt for samfunnsforskning 2015. <https://www.bufdir.no/bibliotek/Dokumentside/?docId=BUF00002911>

Morrison, S. (2022). 14th Anniversary of the National Apology. GOVAU. <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/ministerial-statement-anniversary-national-apology-stolen-generations-australian-parliament>

Nobles, M. (2008). *The politics of official apologies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nogrady, B. (2019). *Trauma of Australia's indigenous 'stolen generations' is still affecting children today* DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-01948-3>

O'Donnell, M., Taplin, S., Marriott, R., Lima, F., & Stanley, F. (2019). Infant removals: The need to address the over-representation of Aboriginal infants and community concerns of another 'stolen generation'. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *90*, 88-98.

Oksanen, A.-A. (2020). The Rise of Indigenous (Pluri-)Nationalism: The Case of the Sámi People. *Sociology (Oxford)*, *54*(6), 1141–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038520943105>

Olick, J. (2007). *The Politics of regret: On collective memory and historical responsibility*. New York: Routledge.

Philpot, C., Balvin, N., Mellor, D., & Bretherton, D. (2013). Making Meaning From Collective Apologies. *Peace and Conflict*, *19*(1), 34-50.

Ridder, H-G. (2016). *Case Study Research*. Rainer Hampp.

Rogers, T., & Bain, S. (2016). Genocide and frontier violence in Australia. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *18*(1), 83-100.

Rowe, A., & Tuck, E. (2017). Settler Colonialism and Cultural Studies. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, *17*(1), 3-13.

Rudd, K. (2008). *Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples*. GOVAU. https://www.aph.gov.au/Visit_Parliament/Art/Exhibitions/Custom_Media/Apology_to_Australias_Indigenous_Peoples

Sandelowski, M. (2011). "Casing" the research case study. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *34*(2), 153-159.

Smith, N. (2008). *I Was Wrong*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Solberg, E. (2017). Tråante 2017: Åpningstale. [Traante 2017: Opening speech]. NRK. <https://www.nrk.no/sapmi/statsministeren-tok-et-oppgjor-med-fornorskningen-1.13364074>

Stordahl, V., Tørres, G., Møllersen, S., & Eira-Åhren, I. (2015). Ethical guidelines for Sami research: The issue that disappeared from the Norwegian Sami Parliament's agenda? *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, *74*(1), 27024.

Tjora, A. (2018). *Qualitative Research as Stepwise-Deductive Induction*. Routledge.

Thompson, J. (2012). Is Political Apology a Sorry Affair? *Social & Legal Studies*, 21(2), 215-225.

Vars, L.S.. (2016). Nasjonal institusjon for menneskerettigheter og beskyttelsen av urfolks menneskerettigheter i Norge. [National institution for human rights and the protection of indigenous peoples' human rights in Norway]. *Kritisk Juss (Online)*, (4), 301-310.

Veracini, L. (2013). 'Settler Colonialism': Career of a Concept. *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 41(2), 313-333.

APPENDIX

The Master's Thesis Relevance for the Teaching Profession

The curriculum of the English subject (LK20) emphasises the importance of cultural understanding, communication, all-round education, and identity development. It explains that the English subject should give the pupils a solid foundation for communicating with others, regardless of their cultural or linguistic background. Also, the English subject should help the pupils develop an intercultural understanding of the different ways of living, thinking, and communicating (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019). These are some of the English subject's most relevant and central values. This thesis engages with a cultural-historical approach, as it deals with indigenous cultures in Australia and Norway, and their encounter and interaction with modern governments. I am convinced that my thesis has given me valuable insight in cultural understanding, identity development, and especially communication regardless of cultural and linguistic background. These are broad qualifications that apply to the general subject of English, but also the programmes for specialisation.

This thesis may also be relevant for the English subject's interdisciplinary topics "health and life skills" and "democracy and citizenship". Studying indigenous peoples has provided an increased understanding of their culture, and how their lives and experiences in an unjust society can affect their health and life situations. This knowledge could be useful to help the pupils reflect on feelings and thoughts related to health and life, providing useful perspectives of discriminated peoples. Regarding democracy and citizenship, I am certain that this thesis could be useful to help the pupils develop their understanding of citizenship, and that the world is culture dependent. This is necessary to interpret the world, and to help prevent prejudices (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019). In a society characterised by increased globalisation and multiculturalism, I believe this thesis is more relevant than ever for my position as a teacher.

References

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2019). Curriculum in English (ENG01-04). Retrieved from: <https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04?lang=eng>

