

Michel-André Horelt

Dramas of Reconciliation

A performance approach to
the analysis of political apologies
in international relations



Nomos

Michel-André Horelt

Dramas of Reconciliation

A performance approach to
the analysis of political apologies
in international relations



Nomos

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

ISBN 978-3-8487-2098-9 (Print)
978-3-8452-6161-4 (ePDF)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-2098-9 (Print)
978-3-8452-6161-4 (ePDF)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Horelt, Michel-André

Dramas of Reconciliation

A performance approach to the analysis of political apologies in international relations

Michel-André Horelt

262 p.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-8487-2098-9 (Print)
978-3-8452-6161-4 (ePDF)

1. Edition 2019

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2019. Printed and bound in Germany.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to "Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort", Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the author.

Acknowledgements

This book is the product of a long and hard academic journey paved with several academic rites of passages on its way. It started with a fascinating radio show on rituals and symbols. While cleaning up the apartment in one of the several crisis moments of my early PhD project – desperately searching a presentable research puzzle at the time – I stumbled over this eye-opening perspective on the world as I carefully listened to the invited anthropologists speaking at the radio. Conscious that memory betrays us all, I perceive this to be the *décllic*, the initial moment in which this PhD project really began. From then on I screened the symbols that imbue politics and especially memory politics. But it took a long time until the idea took material shape. This is now the materialization of the thoughts, the hardships, and the enlightening moments on this winding road.

It is clear that I did not walk this road alone. I have to thank first and foremost my supervisors for their patience and assistance. I thank Christopher Daase for pointing via dry and targeted questions to the weaknesses of the work in process, while always encouraging continuing the path. I thank Berthold Rittberger for his analytic sharpness and his support he gave me to finalize this research project. A special thanks goes to Rainer Hülse, with whom I share the passion for David Kertzers *Ritual, Politics & Power* – an inspiring masterpiece of political anthropology and spiritus rector of this book. I want to thank Tine Hanrieder, the best sparring partner ever, with whom I shared the manuscript of several parts of this book and who brought me through my thesis defense. And special thanks goes to Jan Tiedeman, who brought this work into its appropriate format. I want to thank also all the other participants of the Monday evening research colloquium of the chair of International Relations at the Ludwig Maximilian University in Munich. Amongst them: Judith Renner, Dieter Kerwer, Stefan Engert, Alexander Kruck, and Alexander Spencer and all the others.

But, the biggest thank you goes to my wife who always stood by me, who helped and supported me in the best possible ways throughout the years. Without you, this book would not exist. Thank you.

Preface

The phenomenon of political apologies for historic crimes has been increasingly discussed in international relations during the last few decades. Some scholars and observers have castigated these political apologies as empty political rituals. Others have been more enthusiastic and interpreted political apologies as meaningful reconciliation rituals, but they have failed so far to analyse the ritual itself. The ritual feature of political apologies is still a blind spot in the academic field today. This book addresses this lacuna and sheds light on the ritualistic features of political apologies. What renders these rites meaningful, what renders them void of meaning? What kinds of performances exert a performative power transforming the relationship between collective groups in post-conflict situations? Contrary to common approaches that locate the transformative power of apologies in correct wording, this book grounds the force of apologies in ritual performances. Based on discourse analytical studies this book lays down the technologies of how agents stage state apologies in public and how the various forms of apology performances create different apology events with different grades of success. Contrary to common approaches that either dissect or deconstruct the linguistic content of apologies to display either the strength or the shortcomings and thus the failure of apologies, this book decidedly focuses on social performance and symbolic gestures as an avenue of explaining why some apologies work, while others fail. As the book reveals, even vague apologies work due to other channels of communication, which are activated through the symbols enacted within bilateral rites of passage. This book thus demonstrates the value and scope of ceremonialism in apology performances.

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Pictures	15
Figures	17
Photogramms	19
I. Introduction	21
1. From apologies to apology gestures	23
2. Individual apologies	24
3. Collective apologies	26
4. “Successful” apologies	28
4.1. Content	28
4.2. Actors	30
4.3. Context	32
2. Lacunae in apology research	33
3. Taking rituals seriously	38
4. Rituals of apologies as liminal events	39
5. “Successful” apology performances	43
6. What renders apology performances successful?	44
7. Epistemological considerations	45
7.1. Case selection	48
7.2. Phenomenological Methodology	49
8. The chapters	50
II. The emergence, force, and types of apology rituals in international relations.	55
1. Introduction	55
2. Ritualized apologies – Where do they come from?	56
2.1. Human rights	57

2.2. Globalized Holocaust memory	58
2.3. Rituals of transition in transitology	58
2.4. Apologies as historically incorporated practices	59
3. What do rituals do?	65
3.1. Ritual as the creation of apartness	66
3.2. Rituals as a communicative system	67
3.3. Rituals as performative action	69
4. How do apology rituals transform?	70
4.1. Rituals of purification	71
4.2. Apologies as settlement rites	72
4.3. Apologies as liminal performances	73
5. What is “success” in ritualized apologies?	76
6. Elements of apology performances	78
III. The Warsaw Kniefall	84
1. Introduction	84
2. The forefront	86
3. The performance	88
4. The liminal character of Brandt’s performance	95
4.1. Suspended time – sacred time	96
4.2. Status reversal	97
4.3. Spontaneity and Virtuosity	99
5. The closing	100
5.1. The emotional impact	101
5.2. The status transformation of the collectivity	102
5.3. The biography of the protagonist	103
6. Brandt’s Kniefall: the creation of a global icon	103
7. Conclusion	108
IV. Festivals of apology – The Australian and Canadian child removal apologies	110
1. Australia	110
1.1. Forefront	112

1.2. The procession	115
1.2.1 The creation of an apology event	115
1.2.2 The apology declaration	118
1.3. The closing	122
2. The Canadian apology	123
2.1. The historic wrong	123
2.2. The apology crisis	124
2.3. The forefront	125
2.4. The procession	126
2.5. The Closing	129
3. Conclusion	130
V. Katyn N° 2	132
1. The historical wrong	132
2. Forefront	133
3. The Procession	135
4. The Closing	140
5. Katyn No 2	143
6. Conclusion	152
VI. A tour of reconciliation through the graveyards of former Yugoslavia	153
1. Introduction	153
2. The Yugoslav Wars	155
2.1. Vukovar	155
2.2. Srebrenica	156
2.3. Ahmići	156
3. The Apologies in 2010	157
3.1. The Ahmići Apology	158
3.1.1 The forefront	158
3.1.2 The Procession	160
3.1.3 The Closing	167
3.2. The Vukovar apology	170
3.2.1 The forefront	172
3.2.2 The Procession	174

3.2.3 Closing	180
3.3. The Srebrenica Apology	184
3.3.1 Forefront	184
3.3.2 Procession	186
3.3.3 Closing	187
3.4 The silenced gesture in Srebrenica	190
3.4.1 Forefront	191
3.4.2 Procession	192
3.4.3 Closing	198
4. Conclusion	199
 VII. “Bowing alone”: An analysis of failed Japanese apology presentations	 202
1. Introduction	202
2. Politicized atonement in the early 1990s	204
3. The 2001 Seodaem Prison Hall apology by Jonichihiro Koizumi	211
3.1 The forefront phase	213
3.2 The procession	214
3.3 The closing	219
4. Conclusion	221
 VIII. The Power of Rituals of Apologies	 223
1. The ceremonial inventory of state apologies	226
1.1 Forefront	226
1.2 Procession	228
1.3 Marking New Beginnings – Inaugurations	235
1.4 The Actors:	235
1.5 Closing	239
2. Conclusion – The significance of symbols all the way down	241
2.1 Space matters	241
2.2 Time matters	242
2.3 Mise-en-scène matters	243
2.4 Performance matters	244
2.5 Actors matter	244

3. The force and limits of apologies as dramas of reconciliation	246
4. Ritual apologies as global rituals	247
5. The Limits of ceremonialism	249
6. Implications for further research	251
IX. Literature	253

Pictures

Picture 3.1: “Do you Remember?”	107
Picture 4.1: “Public screening and mass mobilization”	116
Picture 4.2: “inclusive spatial configuration of the apology ceremony“	128
Picture 6.1 “Tadić at the Ovčara memorial”	176
Picture 6.2: “Tadić in Srebrenica on 11 July 2010”	194
Picture 7.1: Koizumi at National Cemetery for the fallen soldiers of the Korean War	215
Picture 7.2: “Koizumi at the Sodaemun Prison Hall memorial”	217

Figures

Figure 1.1: States of social Integration and Disintegration	44
Figure 2.1: Reading memory conflicts as social dramas	74
Figure 2.2: Characterizations of states of social Integration and Disintegration	78
Figure 2.3: Elements of apology performances	82

Photogramms

Photogramm 3.1: Official joint wreath depositing ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier	89
Photogramm 2: The Warsaw Kniefall	90
Photogramm 5.1 “Katyn – Official Wreath depositing ceremony”	137
Photogramm 5.2: “Putin, Tusk lay flowers at plane crash site near Smolensk“	145
Photogramm 6.1: “Croatian Leader Apologizes for War-Time Crime”	162
Photogramm 6.2: “Boris Tadić arrives on the ferry Golubica“	175
Photogramm 6.3: “Ovčara Protest”	178
Photogramm 6.4: “Crowded Ceremony in Potočari”	195

I. Introduction

‘Genuine apologies... may be taken as the symbolic foci of secular remedial rituals’

- Nicholas Tavuchis¹

‘A ritual apology is insincere and therefore meaningless’

- Alison Dundes Renteln²

It has become fashionable in academic works devoted to the issue of state apologies to present an account of the innumerable instances in which political agents have delivered words of regret or apologies for historic crimes over the last twenty years. This introduction is no exception in this regard: Pope John Paul the Second apologized in 2000 for the mistreatment of Jews in the long history of Christianity, the French President Jacques Chirac 1995 for the complicit deportation of Jews under the Vichy regime during the Second World War, the British Prime Minister Tony Blair for the British role in aggravating the Irish famine in 1921 and the British Queen towards the Maori for the colonial crimes perpetrated in the name of the commonwealth. This snapshot reflects the fact that the phenomenon of state apologies has gained currency in the way nation states and other corporate actors address painful and conflictive memories in their international and domestic relations. The phenomenon of apologies has thus entered the global stage during the last two decades. By the same token the requests and delivery of apologies have subsequently been the onus of political contestations. Apologies are becoming increasingly politicized and even overshadow bilateral relations. “The problem of History” (Kristof 1998) with regard to the appropriate atonement of the Japanese government for Japanese War crimes or the Turkish—Armenian dispute with regard to the question of the Armenian Genocide are indicative here and representative of various other cases strained by memory conflicts. “Accounts, Excuses and Apologies” (Benoit 1995) are part of the inventory of how political actors address these delicate memorial con-

1 Nicholas Tavuchis (1991): *Mea culpa: A sociology of apology and reconciliation*. Stanford, 13.

2 Dundes Renteln, Alison (2008): *Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Analysis*, in: Gibney, Mark (ed): *The age of apology. Facing up to the past*, Philadelphia, FN 11.

flicts in their domestic and international relations. The academia is split with regard to the reconciliatory potential of so-called collective apologies, hailing them on the one hand as meaningful reconciliatory devices or as empty rituals on the other void of meaning. The inflationary empirical record of this atonement practice has hence triggered the analytical interest of academia.

Several prisms have been deployed to analyze this subject. Scholars have questioned whether collective apologies are per se normatively warranted and under which conditions requests for apologies are legitimate (Jaspers [1946] 1960; Gilbert 2001; Thompson 2002, 2006). Some commentators have even ventured that the apology deliverances encountered over the last few decades represent normative progress and a promotion of international law with regard to state responsibility (Barkan 2000; Barkan/Karn 2006; Howard-Hassmann/Gibney 2008). More analytical sociological approaches have tried to delineate the distinctive character of state apologies compared to individual ones (Tavuchis 1991; Celermajer 2009). Further perspectives have taken the specific *meaning* of apologies into account. In this regard scholars have questioned the targeted group to which these performances presumably speak. Some commentators have interpreted the distinctive meaning of collective apologies to lie in its inwardly-focused reflexive force to ratify a normative change for the apologizing community (Celermajer 2009; Andrieu 2009). Others still have contested the possibility of genuine collective apologies and castigated these apology strategies as “abortive rituals”, which are purely outwardly-oriented image restoration strategies that mimic interpersonal apologies and are solely aimed at morally re-positioning the own group in international society, with no substantial value for reconciliation between the parties (Lübbe 2001; Ross 2008; Trouillot 2000). In contrast to these critics this book will demonstrate that apology rituals are indeed valuable; and it will do this by showing how apologies are actually performed empirically. This book does not constrain itself to pure description but demonstrates how collective apologies work as reconciliation events and how this is related to the ritualistic form of their presentation. By doing so it returns to a classic speech act communication perspective: When do apologies succeed in re-tying positive relations between groups in memorial conflicts? When do apologies as (speech) acts become felicitous?

The avenue for providing and identifying an answer to this question will deviate from the classical route. In order to answer the question of felicitous speech acts this book will literally bracket out the dominance of

speech and highlight the significance of non-verbal communication, and the ritualistic features and ceremonialism present in collective apologies. According to observers and academia apologies are ‘delivered’, ‘presented’, ‘enacted’, and ‘performed’. All these predicates explicitly denote the staged characteristic of apologies, in other words, that these kinds of remedial actions are acted out publicly by political actors. However, all too often scholars have neglected the theatricality and dramatic component that is translated through the manner in which apologies are perceived. This is exactly the entry point of this book. The approach presented here broadens the concept of speech to communicative behaviour that uses paralinguistic channels, non-verbal communication and sign activation through the enactment of symbols. In this regard this book takes on a different perspective to the analysis of collective apologies. The critical evaluation of the existing literature will demonstrate that the predominant approaches to understanding the potential power of apologies are either content driven, and as such predominantly focus on the rhetorical shape of the apology, or highlight contextual and sidelining policies that converge or undermine the apology act. However, they prevalently bypass the distinctive value of apologies and specifically neglect the ritual quality of public apologies. As this book will demonstrate, non-verbal gestures on symbolic sites in staged dramas of reconciliation count as well as meaningful acts of atonement. The Philosopher and Linguist John L. Austin coined the term of performative utterance to denote utterances that by their very utterance ‘do’ something (Austin 1962). Austin highlighted how speech may act in the social world. The argumentation of this book here will reverse the Austinian credo from ‘speech that acts’ to ‘action that speaks’.

1. From apologies to apology gestures

Speech acts, as Searle once put it, have the ‘mysterious’ power to change the world solely through the spoken word (Searle 1971; Austin 1962). So apologies, as speech acts, may change social relationships and foster reconciliation. How do apologies and especially group apologies accomplish this ‘mysterious’ change? In order to approach this question it is crucial to undertake a twofold differentiation: first to differentiate between the characteristics of apologies on the individual and collective level and secondly to separate analytically the *characteristics* of apologies on the one hand and *conditions of their success* on the other hand. To start we will consider

1. Introduction

the characteristics commonly associated with individual apologies and then proceed to the elements characterizing group or collective apologies before approaching the theories and factors put forward in academia that contribute to the success of apologies.

2. Individual apologies

First of all, apologies are expressions of something, more specifically, of regret for a harm done by someone. Apologies are expressive utterances that “allow a public hearing of the inner conversation” (Taft 2000: 1140) of an apologizing agent. According to Nicholas Tavuchis the centrepiece of an apology is the (1) “expression of sorrow and regret” (Tavuchis 1991: 23). So apologies make a state of mind explicit. Consequently, apologies are (2) public expressions and not private reflections.

With this explicitness of sorrow and regret comes a third (3) component of apologies: *acknowledgement*. According to Govier and Verwoerd the thrust and strength of apologies rest in the public acknowledgement of having perpetrated harm, having broken a rule (Govier/Verwoerd 2002: 67–82). Through acknowledgement, a formerly contested factual account is corroborated (Smith 2005: 476–477); this provides a common narrative leading to the harm officially being recognized and the harmed and offended person reaffirmed as a moral subject.

Closely related but subtly different is the question whether the (4) *responsibility* for wrongdoing is assumed. Otherwise, without assuming responsibility, one should correctly speak of excuses, clarifications, explanations or even justification and not of a moral pardon or apology (Austin 1975). Real apologies, so called “categorical” apologies, have to convey “the acceptance of causal responsibility rather than mere expression of sympathy” (Smith 2005: 477).

With the characteristics of regretting, acknowledging, and assuming responsibility comes a certain kind of openness and nakedness to which the apologizer exposes him or herself. This is less of a compositional element that characterizes the apology and more of an immediate effect of the overall apology deliverance in process of “remedial interchange” (Goffman 1971). Through the apology, the apologizer gives an account of her inner conversion, affirms responsibility and expresses sorrow to the victim for having perpetrated a moral breach. However, it is up to the discretion of the addressee, the former victim, to grant or withhold forgiveness. The

apologizer can only beg for forgiveness. An apology thus symbolizes the reversal of power relations (Lazare 2004: 52). The former perpetrator can only passively ask for something that lies in the will of the former victim. This last element has been highlighted by Ervin Goffman, who states that apologies have to represent a certain kind of *vulnerability* of the apologizer (Goffman 1971: 138–140, see also Tavuchis 1991: 20, 27; Carl Schneider 2000: 265–280).

The term “apology” thus refers to an essentially relational phenomenon. As Aaron Lazare underlined, apologies are characterized by the “encounter between two parties in which one party, the offender, acknowledges responsibility for an offense or grievance and expresses regret or remorse to a second party, the aggrieved” (Lazare 2004: 23). This book will mainly draw on this relational conceptualization with one important restriction: the elements identified above are not assumed to be the necessary criteria that discriminate apologies from other remedial actions. The basis of this study is a broad definition of apology that allows for the incorporation of verbal utterances and gestures that run under different subcategories such as “accounts”, “excuses”, “statements of regret”, “expressions of atonement”, “the expression of pardon” and “asking for forgiveness”. Several of these subcategories bypass or circumvent the explicit acknowledgement of a wrongdoing, the detailed enumeration of a crime and the unequivocal acknowledgement of responsibility. There are several “apology strategies” (Meier 1998) at work empirically that belong to the broader cosmos of remedial (speech) interaction. Thus, the definition is held deliberately broad – not for the sake of blurring analytical concepts, but in order to hint at other dimensions that surmount the fine-grained dissection of the linguistic approaches to apologies. As the book will demonstrate, we encounter apologies that are fraudulent in their linguistic shape, but highly meaningful due to the context in which these fraudulent apologies are presented and the way they are performed. Thus the focus of the linguistic content does not tell the complete story. Form counts as much as content in the creation of powerful apologies.

Therefore we can broadly conceptualize “apologies as illocutionary events denoting to an addressee the repentance of a speaking subject” (Trouillot 2000: 174). And importantly, this “denoting” is not necessarily linguistic; it can also take the form of symbolic non-verbal behaviour. Until now we have deciphered apologies in the interpersonal mode; but apologies are issued by different types of actors, and via different communicative channels. “Each party may be a person or a larger group such as a

family, a business, an ethnic group, a race, or a nation. The apology may be private or public, written or verbal, and even, at times, nonverbal” (Lazare 2004: 23). Let us now turn to the question of how collective apologies differ and the kind of analytical and practical problems they reveal.

3. *Collective apologies*

As Tavuchis points out, group apologies are not personal apologies written large (Tavuchis 1991: 98–101; Celermajor 2009: 6–7). To equate interpersonal apologies with group or collective apologies would be sociologically misleading since it unduly transposes processes from the individual level to the collective level. Group processes are more than the mere aggregation of individual processes. Social facts have a *sui generis* status, meaning that they are “emergent entities with characteristics that set them apart from individuals functioning as sovereign actors” (Tavuchis 1991: 99).³ This said, it is still necessary to critically evaluate the transfer of characteristics of interpersonal apologies to group apologies and to scrutinize the implications these different characteristics have on the modus of presentation of the apology.

“An apology by a government actor to a group within the nation... necessarily involves different social relationships than an apology offered by one individual to another, or even to a group” (Minow 2003: 115–116). In contrast to individual apologies, collective apologies face the problem of representation and social power. A collective apology, to be successfully conveyed as such, needs to be emitted by those political actors who are institutionally and symbolically authorized to do so, those who are “endowed with the *skeptron*” as Pierre Bourdieu stated (Bourdieu 1995: 109). Therefore, to be representative of the whole group of ‘apologizers’, an apology on a group level needs the credence of that group’s highest representatives (Pitkin 1972). Thus apologies must be presented by the highest authorities of a political community in order to be perceived as being offered by the whole group (Lazare 2004: 177, 204). Consequently, as for every ritual ceremony, it is important to specify who is entitled to do what,

3 On the issue of social facts and the differentiation between the individual and collective level see also Gilbert 2001, Gilbert 2006 and Olick 2007a.

and who has the role to authoritatively speak for the specific collective group. As Austin already noted in his discussion on potential infelicities in the presentation of speech acts – discussed as *misapplications* of specific ritual rules – the ‘failure’ occurs because an improper person who ‘has not the capacity to perform it’ performed the speech act and thus made the action void (Austin 1962: 23–24). We see that the question of what constitutes a collective apology and what makes an apology successful is intermingled here. We will come back to the issue of authority to perform a collective apology when discussing the criteria that render apology rituals felicitous.

Tavuchis argues that “[t]he major structural requirement and ultimate task of collective apologetic speech is to put things on record. And what goes on record... does not necessarily express sorrow” (Tavuchis 1991: 109). For Tavuchis, public collective apologies would be overburdened and sociologically misconceived if they were to express sorrow and remorse, categories that are considered as individual in his analysis. What makes this definition attractive and at first sight pleasing is its parsimony and the way it bypasses the question of sincerity.

To respond to the question of what characterizes collective apologies in their content, we may say: nothing in essence. Empirically, collective apologies do not have any substantial necessary features. Their content can be defined by the form of pure sign-based communication. Non-verbal gestures may be interpreted as apologies as will be further demonstrated in the analysis of the *Kniefall* by the German Chancellor Willy Brandt in Chapter 3. In the discussion above, apology events were conceived as “denoting to an addressee the repentance of a speaking subject”, where the *speaking* subject is a metaphorical one. Non-verbal actions may also “speak”. We are thus in the spectre of “family resemblances” (Wittgenstein 2003) when dealing with the characterization of essential elements partaking to collective apologies. Condensed sequences of various verbal as well as bodily actions – symbolic gestures on symbolic sites on symbolic dates – may also count *empirically* as apologies. It could be countered that these putative apologies are not apologies in a pure sense, that they are sometimes fraudulent and the characterization of them as apologies is a categorical mistake. Indeed they do not fit the ideal criteria of apologies set out above. However, as they are *perceived* as collective apologies and bear the potential to exert their apologetic work, i.e. *count* and *accomplish* their performative force, this book will legitimately invoke the category of apology to describe these instances. I thus follow the “postmodern trend...

where... the apology is considered to be primarily ‘a judgement made about someone’s linguistic performance’ rather than a specific set of semantic properties” (Grainger/Harris 2007: 3) that defines them internally. *In toto* we can say that collective apologies are an entity of social performances performed by a political agent, that is, externally identified as attempts to atone a past; and that can assume different “linguistic and paralinguistic forms” (Grainger/Harris 2007: 2). The grounding definition of apologies in this book thus shifts the analytical angle from apologies comprising a fixed set of a priori postulated essential features to apology gestures that empirically count as such a posteriori. Thus, we can characterize collective apologies as public actions performed by representative political bodies recognized as expressing remorse for the victimization of another group.

4. “Successful” apologies

Pertinent to the phenomenon of apologies in international relations is the question of when they transform relationships. When do collective apologies lead to reconciliation? In order to answer this question, approaches stemming from different academic branches, social psychology, politeness studies, sociological approaches and approaches that belong to the domain of normatively-oriented Transitional Justice studies provide various explanations and sum up different factors leading to successful apologies. The next section extracts the criteria put forward by these different branches and systematizes the criteria in three categories: Approaches underscoring the significance of the content (4.1), the actors (4.2) and the role of the apology performance’s context (4.3).

4.1. Content

Approaches to apologies that follow linguistic studies have evaluated the transformative power of apologies with reference to the formulae used in apology presentations. These formulae of apologies should ideally comprise of the (i) admission of historical responsibility, (ii) the factual description of the crimes in question, (iii) the public condemnation of these wrongs, (iv) an expression of sorrow or regret for the crimes and (v) a demand for forgiveness (Löwenheim 2009).