



A DCI Deliberation Guide

Lessons of War, Prospects for Peace:

What should we say about the legacies of World War II in the Asia-Pacific region?

Format for Deliberation

Before the Deliberation

- I. Read this Deliberation Guide (required)

During the Deliberation

- I. Setting Expectations (5 min.)
- II. Getting to Know Each Other (5 min.)
- III. Brainstorming: Universal Lessons (35 min.)
 - A. Getting Started (10 min.)
 - B. Divergent Phase (15 min.)
 - C. Convergent Phase (10 min.)
- IV. Reflections (10 min.)

Background

Davidson College is a place where intellectual inquiry and historical reflection can shape a deeper understanding of global issues. The recent planting of eight ginkgo tree saplings on campus represents an opportunity for such reflection. These saplings, descendants of trees that survived the atomic bombing of Hiroshima were donated by Green Legacy Hiroshima to promote awareness of the dangers of warfare. However, their presence on campus has sparked conversations about how we remember and interpret the legacies of World War II in the Asia-Pacific region.

While serving as powerful reminders of the devastation caused by nuclear weapons, the ginkgo trees' symbolism has raised the concern that the project's focus on Hiroshima and Nagasaki risked overlooking the broader and more complex history of World War II in the Asia-Pacific. The war's impact extended beyond Japan's suffering, encompassing the Imperial Japanese government's military invasions, occupations, and atrocities in various other countries. As a result, some felt that the well-intentioned project presented a one-sided historical narrative.

The controversy highlights the challenge of drawing universal lessons from diverse World War II experiences in the Asia-Pacific. The education system in the United States often focuses on the atomic bombings, while Japan's imperialism receives less attention. In contrast, many Asia-Pacific nations emphasize their experiences of occupation, forced labor, and war crimes, shaping distinct collective memories that influence international relations. The planting of the ginkgo trees thus enables us to not only learn about these different historical perspectives but also reflect on how memory shapes present-day diplomacy in East Asia.

The Deliberative Citizenship Initiative (DCI) was asked to facilitate a thoughtful, inclusive, and historically-informed conversation about the legacies of World War II in the Asia-Pacific region. This project aims to ensure that the ginkgo trees serve as symbols of remembrance that acknowledge the diverse perspectives on the war's impact. The goal is not to impose a singular historical interpretation but rather to encourage meaningful engagement with the complexities of history and the ongoing importance of peace and reconciliation.

The DCI is planning a Deliberative Forum for Davidson students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community members to learn about this topic and engage with each other on the questions that it raises. Within this dialogue, we want to ask ourselves: What should we say about the legacies of World War II in the Asia-Pacific region? How can we craft an interpretation that honors the universal suffering caused by war while respecting how nations and individuals remember this history? By approaching these questions with openness and a commitment to historical nuance, we can ensure that the ginkgo trees foster reflection not only on the past but also on the shared responsibility of shaping a more peaceful future.

This Deliberation Guide is designed to assist our community in thinking about this topic. The following pages first examine the regional impact of WWII in the Asia-Pacific from various national perspectives, highlighting its complexity without claiming a comprehensive view. Second, the guide explores theoretical frameworks on war and peace, offering different interpretive approaches to these historical events. These sections are limited in scope and detail due to space constraints and should not be considered comprehensive or authoritative. Instead, they should be viewed as starting points for a discussion highlighting historically grounded, culturally diverse, and theoretically engaged perspectives that participants can respond to and build on in their deliberations.

The guide concludes with the expected outcomes of the forum, deliberative dispositions, and conversation agreements to guide the conversations, as well as a set of questions that the DCI's trained facilitators will use to guide the breakout discussions.

Regional Perspectives on WWII's Legacies in the Asia Pacific

Japan

Japan's imperial expansion began in the late 19th century, long before World War II. Following its victory in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895), Japan annexed Taiwan and gained influence over Korea. In 1905, after defeating Russia in the Russo-Japanese War, Japan secured control over southern Manchuria and strengthened its hold on Korea, which it formally annexed in 1910. During World War I (1914–1918), Japan expanded further by seizing Germany's Pacific territories.

The next major step in Japan's expansion came in 1931 with the seizure of Manchuria, marking a shift toward full-scale militarism. Motivated in part by economic struggles and resource shortages, which was exacerbated by a U.S. oil embargo, Japan sought to establish dominance in Asia. This expansion escalated into the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937–1945) and later merged with World War II. Domestically, Japan was moving from a democratic to military dictatorship under the Prime Minister Tojo, where they imposed Gunritsu (martial law) and promoted a militaristic culture that glorified sacrifice, exemplified by Kamikaze pilots, who carried out suicide attacks against enemy targets.

During the war, over a million Japanese children were evacuated to the countryside as cities faced increasing devastation. By the early 1940s, Japan suffered severe food shortages, and its soldiers endured both psychological and physical hardships. As the war progressed, Japanese cities were heavily bombed, most notably in the firebombing of Tokyo, which killed an estimated 80,000 to 100,000 people.

On August 6, 1945, the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, killing approximately 140,000 people. Two days later, the Soviet Union declared war on Japan, and on August 9, a second atomic bomb struck Nagasaki, killing an estimated 74,000. Survivors suffered long-term effects from radiation, including leukemia and cancer. Facing total defeat, Japan agreed to surrender on August 14, and Emperor Hirohito formally announced unconditional surrender on August 15.

World War II claimed an estimated 2.6 to 3.1 million Japanese lives, roughly 3% of the population. Following the war, the United States military occupied Japan for seven years as it went through a reconstruction process led by General Douglas MacArthur. The Tokyo War Crimes Trial began on April 29, 1946, sentencing 16 individuals to life imprisonment for their roles in the war.

Korea

Korea experienced Japanese imperialism long before World War II. From 1910 to 1945, Japan ruled Korea and pursued an aggressive policy of Japanization, culminating in the suppression of Korean names and language. Girls as young as 12 were forced into sexual slavery, while the

Imperial Japanese Army carried out mass killings; for example, the Gando Massacre of 1920, resulted in the deaths of 5,000 people and widespread sexual violence.

As World War II escalated, Japan further exploited Korea's population. Amid a national labor shortage, the National Mobilization Law was extended to Korea, leading to the forced relocation of thousands for labor in Japan's war industries. By 1943, as Japan faced mounting losses, it abandoned its claims of ethnic superiority and began conscripting Koreans into its military. The legacy of the U. S. military's atomic bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima remains deeply complex for Koreans. On one hand, the bombings brought the collapse of the Japanese empire and Korea's long-awaited liberation. On the other hand, as many as 40,000 Koreans—mostly forced laborers—were killed by these two atomic bombs.

Nearly a century later, the memory of this period remains starkly different across the Sea of Japan. South Korea regards it as a national tragedy and a defining moment in its modern history, while Japanese politicians remain reluctant to fully acknowledge responsibility. Historical disputes continue to fuel tensions in their relationship.

China

China's involvement in WWII began in 1937 with the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War, known in China as the Eight Years' War of Resistance. However, Japan's aggression started earlier with its 1931 invasion of Manchuria and the establishment of a puppet state there. The Second Sino-Japanese War became a crucial front in the broader struggle against the Axis Powers in the Pacific.

As a primary battleground, China suffered immense destruction and loss, with estimated casualties reaching 20 million. One of the war's darkest chapters was the Nanjing Massacre of 1937, in which Japanese forces killed an estimated 100,000 to 300,000 civilians and prisoners of war within weeks. Across occupied territories, Japanese military actions included widespread war crimes, from forcing women into sexual slavery as "comfort women" to conducting lethal human experiments in facilities like Unit 731. Scorched earth tactics displaced millions, devastated infrastructure, and deepened the humanitarian crisis.

China's wartime resistance profoundly shaped its national identity and continues to influence regional relations. In a rare moment of unity, the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party formed a United Front, and the shared experience of resistance fostered a sense of national solidarity in the face of Japanese aggression. While Japan has issued official apologies over the years, their depth and sincerity remain disputed. In contemporary China, national pride and historical memory of wartime humiliation continue to shape complex and often conflicted attitudes toward Japan, making the legacy of the war a persistent and sensitive issue in China-Japan relations.

Southeast Asia

Shortly after Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it swiftly invaded Southeast Asia. By 1942, Japan controlled much of the region, including Burma, Thailand, Malaya,

Indonesia, Indochina, and the Philippines. These occupations were part of Japan's broader imperial ambitions, aimed at expanding its influence and securing vital resources such as oil, tin, and rubber to sustain its war effort. The invasion replaced colonial rule of these countries by the Americans, British, French and Dutch with Japanese rule.

Japanese occupation had immediate and devastating effects on Southeast Asia's economy and civilian population. In 1942, thousands of Chinese civilians were killed in Singapore in the Sook Ching massacre. Seeking to establish an east-west transport link, Japan constructed the Thailand-Burma Railway, a project that resulted in the deaths of thousands of Burmese laborers. By 1944, severe malnutrition and famine spread across Vietnam and Java, claiming 3.4 million lives.

The occupation left a lasting impact on the region. The weakening of Western colonial rule hastened the push for independence across Southeast Asia after the war. The economic toll was severe—shipping and trade collapsed, food shortages led to widespread deprivation, and nearly 2 million more people died from famine. Infrastructure deteriorated, industrialization efforts stalled, and transportation networks crumbled. By the war's end, the region's GDP had shrunk by half.

United States

Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, served as the immediate catalyst for U.S. entry into the Pacific conflict, prompting a shift from isolationism to active engagement. This surprise assault galvanized American public opinion and justified full-scale military action against Japan, leading to critical battles such as Midway in 1942 and Leyte Gulf in 1944 that established U.S. naval dominance in the Pacific.

The U.S. adopted an island-hopping strategy to bypass heavily fortified Japanese positions, capturing strategic islands that brought American forces closer to Japan's mainland. This approach culminated in the U.S. military's decision to deploy atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 that was followed by Japan's surrender. This decision was driven by a combination of military strategy, political calculations, and a desire to swiftly end the war without a costly invasion of the Japanese mainland.

Domestically, the war with Japan fueled widespread anti-Japanese sentiment in the United States, culminating in the internment of over 120,000 Japanese Americans under Executive Order 9066. In 1988, President Reagan signed a bill providing restitution to all of those who had been relocated or detained under this order still alive at the time, stating that a grave wrong had been done.

The war's end initiated the U.S. occupation of Japan which focused on demilitarization, democratization, and economic recovery. The Dodge Plan (1949) was crucial in stabilizing Japan's economy, transforming it into a key U.S. ally in the postwar era. By embedding democratic institutions and capitalist economic structures, the U.S. worked to ensure that Japan would serve as a fortification against communist expansion in Asia. This reconstruction effort

fostered deep economic ties and mutual dependency that continue to define U.S.-Japan relations.

Politically, the war weakened European colonial powers in Asia, creating power vacuums that fueled independence movements and Cold War tensions. The rise of communist China in 1949 and the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 prompted the U.S. to provide military and economic aid to anti-communist authoritarian regimes in the region – including to Chiang Kai-shek's government in Taiwan and Syngman Rhee's government in South Korea. Through these alliances with Taiwanese and South Korean leaders and the establishment of U.S. military bases in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, the U.S. managed to maintain its influence in the region.

The San Francisco Treaty of 1951 formally ended the state of war with Japan and reintegrated the country into the international community, solidifying the foundation for the enduring U.S.-Japan alliance. The U.S. military's continued presence on over 40 military bases in the Pacific continues to shape geopolitical dynamics in the region.

Theoretical Perspectives on WWII's Legacies in the Asia Pacific

Pacifism

Pacifism, though not a central paradigm in international relations, is a widely held ethical perspective that rejects war and violence as a means of conflict resolution. It advocates for diplomacy, dialogue, and cooperation, asserting that war is never justifiable due to its inevitable loss of life and immense suffering. Pacifists argue that violence perpetuates cycles of harm, undermining long-term peace and stability. Pacifism includes absolute pacifism, rejecting all violence, and conditional pacifism, opposing war but allowing force in extreme cases like self-defense or humanitarian intervention.

From a pacifist perspective, World War II in the Asia-Pacific reveals the catastrophic impact of militarism and the abandonment of diplomacy. Japan's expansionism and atrocities, like the Nanjing Massacre and the Allied atomic bombings, exemplify the destructive cycles of violence and ethical failures of war. These events highlight pacifism's emphasis on nonviolent conflict resolution and postwar reconciliation, such as reparations and dialogue, to foster lasting peace. Despite its moral appeal, pacifism is often criticized as impractical in the face of aggression and expansionist threats. However, pacifists argue that alternative approaches, such as the just war theory—which posits that war can be morally justified under certain conditions—have largely failed to regulate international violence or break the cycle of conflict in many ongoing crises. Some scholars contend that pacifism should be more seriously integrated into the study of international relations to broaden the ethical horizons of policymakers and expand the debate on how to respond to violent threats and actions.

Realism

Realism views states as unitary actors operating in an international system characterized by anarchy, where there is no law-enforcing authority. This anarchy compels each state to prioritize

its own security. The security dilemma, a key tenet of realism, asserts that one state's efforts to increase its security often make other states feel less secure. Ergo, states must value relative rather than absolute gains of capability. States' actions are guided by the power distribution within the international system, and depending on the specific strain of realism, states either seek to balance the power of the most dominant state or to achieve global or regional hegemony—securing as much power as possible to ensure their own security.

Offensive realism, a version of realist theory, argues that states pursue aggressive strategies to maximize their power. From this perspective, Japan's expansionism during WWII can be seen as an effort to establish regional hegemony in the Asia-Pacific to secure its own national security. In contrast, defensive realism would interpret Japan's actions as a reaction to the rising power of Western states. Its aggressive expansion into China, Korea, and Southeast Asia aimed to balance the influence of the United States, the United Kingdom, and European powers, and solidify its position in the region. Finally, classical realism would suggest that Japan's expansionist policies were driven by the leadership's desire for power and prestige, reflecting the human nature assumptions central to the theory.

However, critics argue that realism has limitations in explaining important aspects of conflicts. In this view, it oversimplifies power politics and struggles to account for how states adapt to systemic shifts in power. Realism has difficulty addressing differences between states that are not directly related to power levels, such as variations in domestic ideology, economic systems, or political institutions. Additionally, realism struggles to explain cooperation between states, which often occurs despite competition for power.

Constructivism

Constructivism understands the global system as the result of social construction rather than material power differentials. Constructivists agree with realists that the international system is anarchic, characterized by the absence of a rule enforcing sovereignty, but argue that anarchy does not inevitably lead to a security dilemma, where one state's efforts to increase security (e.g., military spending) make others less secure.

Instead, states' past interactions shape their mutual perceptions of identity and interests. A cooperative security system arises when states view each other as benevolent with shared interests. An individualistic system emerges when states see each other as indifferent, focused on their absolute gains. Finally, a competitive security system develops when states perceive each other as rivals, concerned with relative power gains. Constructivism argues that cooperation between states is possible when norms of behavior are established through repeated interactions. Once norms such as mutual respect and adherence to treaties are formed, they can foster cooperation and peaceful coexistence.

From a constructivist perspective, World War II in the Asia-Pacific reflects how identity, norms, and historical interactions shaped state behavior. Japan's militarism stemmed from a constructed identity of imperial ambition, while the Allies' perception of Japan as an aggressor reinforced a competitive security system. These dynamics, constructivists argue, were socially

constructed, a result of past interactions between the nations. As such, they were not inevitable, but there was the potential to reshape norms, foster shared identities, and build cooperation through dialogue and trust to prevent future conflicts.

Constructivism explains World War II in the Asia-Pacific by highlighting how norms, identities, and historical interactions shaped Japan's militarism and the Allies' rivalry. It suggests conflicts might have been mitigated by reshaping norms and fostering trust. However, its focus on intangible factors limits its ability to account for the rapid escalation of violence and the decisive role of material - military and economic - power in the war.

Institutionalism

Institutionalism is an international relations paradigm that emphasizes the role of international institutions, norms, and cooperation in shaping state behavior. It argues that, despite an anarchic international system, institutions and treaties help mitigate conflict, facilitate collaboration, and promote stability by providing rules, reducing uncertainty, and creating incentives for cooperation. Institutionalism suggests that repeated interactions, economic interdependence, and shared norms can foster sustained cooperation.

Liberal intentions failed to prevent the outbreak of World War II. The League of Nations, weakened by its lack of enforcement power, was unable to curb the aggression of the Axis Powers, often overlooking and appeasing significant expansionism. In the case of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, no institutional framework existed for regulating the use of nuclear weapons. As the first nation to develop them, the United States was not subject to any international norms about how to use these weapons. Consequently, when President Harry Truman chose to pursue nuclear strikes against Japan, there was no formal international accountability to consider. However, in the aftermath of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the international community sought to address the nuclear issue through institutional cooperation. The adoption of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968 and its indefinite extension in 1995 demonstrated a global commitment to avoiding further nuclear conflict. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the US and the Soviet Union during the Cold War showcased two adversarial powers cooperating to avoid nuclear war. Today, institutionalists remain optimistic that the mutual benefits of institutional cooperation can prevent future nuclear tragedies.

III. Deliberation Structure (60 min)

Setting Expectations (5 min)

In this section, we will review the "Expected Outcomes," Deliberative Dispositions," and "Conversation Agreements" below.

Expected Outcomes of the Conversation

This deliberation aims to deepen our understanding of World War II's legacies in the Asia-Pacific and how they are remembered today. Through discussion, we will engage with diverse

perspectives, examine key historical interpretations, and consider the role of the Ginkgo Tree Project in conversations about war, peace, and reconciliation. By the end, we will have explored areas of agreement and disagreement, reflected on what we have learned, and considered how we can foster a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of this history. Finally, we hope to gather input on what information should be included on the interpretive plaques placed in front of the Ginkgo trees on campus.

Deliberative Dispositions

The DCI has identified several “deliberative dispositions” as critical to the success of deliberative enterprises. When participants adopt these dispositions, they are much more likely to feel their deliberations are meaningful, respectful, and productive. Several of the Conversation Agreements recommended below directly reflect and reinforce these dispositions, which include a commitment to egalitarianism, open mindedness, empathy, charity, attentiveness, and anticipation, among others. A full list and description of these dispositions is available at <https://deliberativecitizenship.org/deliberative-dispositions/>.

Conversation Agreements

In entering into this discussion, to the best of our ability, we each agree to:

- Be authentic and respectful
- Be an attentive and active listener
- Be a purposeful and concise speaker
- Approach fellow deliberators’ stories, experiences, and arguments with curiosity, not hostility
- Assume the best - and not the worst - about the intentions and values of others, and avoid snap judgments
- Demonstrate intellectual humility, recognizing that no one has all the answers, by asking questions and making space for others to do the same
- Critique the idea we disagree with, not the person expressing it, and remember to practice empathy
- Note areas of both agreement and disagreement
- Respect the confidentiality of the discussion
- Avoid speaking in absolutes (e.g., “All people think this,” or “No educated people hold that view”)

Getting to Know Each Other (10 min)

In this section, we'll each share:

- Our names
- An important aspect of our identity
- Our Davidson affiliation
- Our reason for attending this event

Additionally, please answer one of the following questions:

- What connections or thoughts do you have about World War II in the Asia-Pacific or war in general?
- What does peace mean to you?

Brainstorming: Universal Lessons (35 min)

In this section, we will explore the following question:

- What should we, as a community, convey about the legacies of World War II in the Asia-Pacific that acknowledge the universal human cost of war while respecting diverse perspectives on this history?

Our goal today is to contribute to the decision-making process about the information placed in front of the ginkgo trees on the lawn between Chambers, Wall, and the Library. As a community, we will determine the lessons we want to share about the historical experiences of World War II in the Asia-Pacific.

Getting Started (10 min)

To kick off our discussion, we'll each answer one of the following questions. Please wait until everyone has shared before engaging in cross-talk:

- Which aspects of the history of WWII in the Asia-Pacific resonate with you the most?
- Have you learned something new about the diversity of perspectives on this war?
- As historical narratives about WWII differ across countries, what, if any, universal lessons or general conclusions do you think we can draw from studying this history?

Next, to help us think about different approaches to war, consider the following theoretical paradigms:

- Pacifism: Emphasizes the human cost of war.
- Realism: Focuses on power distribution and security interests.
- Constructivism: Considers identity, interests, and norms.
- Institutionalism: Highlights the capacity for trust and cooperation.

Reflect on these perspectives and share:

- Which of these lenses do you most/least resonate with when drawing lessons from war?

Divergent Phase (15 min)

To begin, each participant will write their thoughts, insights, or key lessons on post-it notes and place them on a large sheet of paper in the group's center. These can include reflections on the impact of the war, ideas for what should be conveyed in front of the Ginkgo trees, or broader takeaways about war and peace. Participants are encouraged to capture a range of perspectives and interpretations.

After everyone has posted one note, each person will explain their thought process to the group. This cycle will be repeated three times.

Convergent Phase (10 min)

Once all ideas are shared, we will group similar themes and discuss emerging patterns. Where do we find agreement? Where do perspectives differ? Does the collection of lessons and proposed messages for the Ginkgo trees reflect the diversity of national and historical experiences with WWII in the Asia-Pacific?

As a group, we will critically engage with these questions to ensure our reflections promote a nuanced and inclusive understanding of this history.

Finally, scan the QR code on the table to post your input online. The committee working on the interpretative materials for the Ginkgo trees will review and incorporate these ideas to share our collective lessons from history.

Reflections (10 min)

While today's discussion has provided a valuable opportunity to explore the legacies of World War II in the Asia-Pacific and the significance of the Ginkgo Tree Project, developing a shared understanding of these complex histories will require ongoing dialogue and reflection. Please take a moment to consider the insights gained from your conversation with fellow participants, and then answer one of the following questions without interruption or cross-talk. After everyone has shared, we can explore additional questions as time allows.

- What was most meaningful or valuable to you during this deliberation?
- What areas of agreement and disagreement emerged in your group?
- What should we as a community learn from the history of World War II in the Asia-Pacific?
- What should we learn about approaching complex history and cultural narratives?
- What measures can you, individually, or Davidson as a community take to honor the lessons of war?
- Has this conversation introduced any new ways of thinking about the historical events, their legacies, or the role of remembrance in fostering peace?
- Were there perspectives missing from this conversation that should be included in future discussions?

- What did you hear today that gives you hope for the future of conversations about war, memory, and reconciliation?

This reflection encourages thoughtful consideration of the themes discussed and inspires ongoing engagement with the historical and ethical questions surrounding the Ginkgo Tree Project.

About This Guide

Writer: Flo Moser '26, Keya Zhou '25, Luna Noguchi '25, Romeo Norris '27, Casey Scheiner '28, Lily Ogawa '28, and Graham Bullock

Executive Editor: Graham Bullock

© Copyright 2024 Deliberative Citizenship Initiative (First Edition)

The Deliberative Citizenship Initiative

The Deliberative Citizenship Initiative (DCI) is dedicated to the creation of opportunities for Davidson students, faculty, staff, alumni, and members of the wider community to productively engage with one another on difficult and contentious issues facing our community and society. The DCI regularly hosts facilitated deliberations on a wide range of topics and organizes training workshops for deliberation facilitators. To learn more about these opportunities, visit www.deliberativecitizenship.org.

DCI Deliberation Guides

The DCI has launched this series of Deliberation Guides as a foundation for such conversations. They provide both important background information on the topics in question and a specific framework for engaging with these topics. The Guides are designed to be informative without being overwhelming and structured without being inflexible. They cover a range of topics and come in a variety of formats but share several common elements, including opportunities to commit to a shared set of Conversation Agreements, learn about diverse perspectives, and reflect together on the conversation and its yield. The DCI encourages conversations based on these guides to be moderated by a trained facilitator. After each conversation, the DCI also suggests that its associated Pathways Guide be distributed to the conversation's participants.

DCI Pathways Guides

For every Deliberation Guide, the DCI has also developed an associated Pathways Guide, which outlines opportunities for action that participants can consider that are related to the covered topic. These Pathways Guides reinforce the DCI's commitment to an action orientation, a key deliberative disposition. While dialogue and deliberation are themselves important contributors to a healthy democracy, they become even more valuable when they lead to individual or collective action on the key issues facing society. Such action can come in a range of forms and should be broadly understood. It might involve developing a better understanding of a topic, connecting with relevant local or national organizations, generating new approaches to an issue, or deciding to support a particular policy.

If you make use of this guide in a deliberation, please provide attribution to the Deliberative Citizenship Initiative and email dc@deliberativecitizenship.org to tell us about your event. To access more of our growing library of Deliberation Guides, Pathways Guides and other resources, visit www.deliberativecitizenship.org/readings-and-resources.