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OVERVIEW

Reconciling Injustices in a Pluralistic Canada was a full-day dialogue that took place on January 23, 2014. The goal of the event was to identify shared principles that can support the reconciliation of a broad range of historical and contemporary injustices in Canadian society.

The dialogue was one of the most comprehensive events ever held in Canada to highlight the knowledge and expertise that stakeholders themselves bring to reconciling injustices. Included in the 109 participants were community leaders involved in the reconciliation of specific injustices, representatives from three levels of government, decision-makers from major institutions and members of the public. This level of interaction among different communities and stakeholder groups was a defining feature of the event, and provided a breadth and depth of knowledge not possible from examining any single experience or perspective.

Participants worked together to explore the full breadth of what reconciliation can mean in different circumstances, share approaches that might be of interest to affected communities, and collectively identify principles for handling common challenges that occur during reconciliation efforts. The intended outcomes were to support participants in their ongoing work on reconciliation initiatives, increase public awareness of our shared Canadian history, and create a body of knowledge for stakeholders to consider when working towards reconciliation.
This section provides a single point of reference for the major themes emerging from the *Reconciling Injustices in a Pluralistic Canada* event and includes supporting analysis not present in the rest of the report. Readers are encouraged to read the report in full for additional information about event methodology, outputs from individual event breakout activities, and recommendations for next steps.

**CLARITY OF PURPOSE**

Participants at the workshop emphasized the importance of clearly identifying the intended beneficiaries of reconciliation processes, as well as the groups that are accountable to these beneficiaries.

Participants had varying opinions about the appropriate beneficiaries, with proposals including individuals directly impacted by injustice, their descendants, as well as members of their wider communities. Additional groups identified as potential stakeholders include elected officials, the government and members of the general public, although the roles of many of these groups were not unanimously agreed upon.
ANALYSIS: THREE FORMS OF HEALING

Participants discussed three discrete types of healing throughout the *Reconciling Injustices* event: healing for individuals, healing within communities, and healing between affected communities and Canadian society. Participants suggested a range of possible processes to support each type of healing. Participants did not universally agree upon all processes, with the issues of official apologies and repairing harm receiving moderate amounts of controversy.

**Individual**

Participants discussed several potential ways for reconciliation to support individual healing, including acknowledging wrongdoing, providing space for affected individuals to have their stories respectfully witnessed, repairing harm done to individuals, and designing a process that accommodates individuals at different stages in their healing process.

**Within Communities**

Participants proposed several methods for healing within communities affected by injustice, including ensuring that all community interests are represented in discussions, devoting time and resources for dialogue among community members, and repairing harm done to communities with legacy projects.

**Communities and Society**

Participants suggested several means of healing between community and society, such as officially acknowledging wrongdoing, agreeing upon shared language for how injustices are described, including communities in decision-making, educating the public, and creating legacies that repair harm and prevent future injustice.
Participants discussed the need for the process of reconciliation to empower those who have been historically disempowered, and for society to recognize the historically harmful roles of power. Several sub-themes emerged during these discussions:

- **Responsiveness by government and Canadian society**, where power structures evolve to ensure they reflect the needs of communities that are marginalized or lack political power.

- **Participatory decision making**, where affected communities are not only included in the reconciliation process, but also given a leadership role.

- **Balanced community representation**, where reconciliation processes engage the full range of actors within the affected community, recognizing that communities are diverse and legitimately include different interests. Where community leadership exists, it must demonstrate the extent to which it accomplishes this goal of balanced representation.
ANALYSIS: STAKEHOLDER GROUPS IDENTIFIED BY WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Workshop participants considered a range of stakeholders falling within three major categories: community members directly affected by injustice, the wider community that has been indirectly affected, and Canadian society at large. Several participants expressed concerns that the individualized needs of different types of stakeholders were often misunderstood or ignored during reconciliation efforts. Many discussions focused on the diversity of experience within the affected community, even among individuals directly affected by the same injustice. The desired roles and influence of many of these stakeholders, such as members of the public, remained in dispute throughout the workshop.

**Canadian Society**
- Government
- Political parties
- Perpetrators
- Experts
- ‘Allies’ of affected community
- Members of the public

**Directly Affected**
- Individuals with continuing impacts
- Individuals facing structural barriers
- Individuals with healing or recovery

**Wider Community**
- Second-hand trauma
- Descendants
- Self-identify with affected community (e.g. belong to targeted ethnicity or sexual orientation)
Participants emphasized that rebuilding relationships between affected communities and Canadian society requires a long-term commitment and mutually-held values, such as diversity, inclusivity and a shared sense of humanity. Several participants cautioned that reconciliation processes that focus on short-term political outcomes or lack shared intentions risk causing further harm to affected communities, rather than healing. In contrast, transparent and jointly held principles could provide a foundation for respectful decision making.

The single most repeated and agreed upon theme discussed by participants was education. Participants wanted the full history and scope of past injustices to be acknowledged without revisionism. When delivering a formal apology or implementing a reconciliation process on behalf of Canada, participants wanted the government to have a depth and breadth of knowledge about the historical intentions behind the injustice being addressed. They also wanted the government to have a thorough
understanding of the outcomes it intends through its present-day actions, and to tailor these actions based on what is culturally appropriate for the affected community.

Participants felt that widespread knowledge about injustice is necessary to truly create reconciliation between the affected community and society-at-large. Several participants expressed dissatisfaction with seeing past injustices described in sidebars, separated from the primary narrative of Canadian history. In general, participants expressed support for involving affected communities in deciding how injustices are described and formally recorded. They also felt that government has an obligation to use its influence to increase public awareness and communicate accurate information about past injustices.

EDUCATIONAL METHODS SUGGESTED BY PARTICIPANTS

- Storytelling from elders
- Incorporating injustices in official history (e.g. textbooks)
- Revising K-12 and post-secondary curriculum
- Education through the arts
- Publicizing information in public spaces and media
- Preserving archival materials
- Newcomer and immigrant education
- Incorporating injustices in official history (e.g. textbooks)
- Revising K-12 and post-secondary curriculum
- Education through the arts
- Publicizing information in public spaces and media
- Preserving archival materials
- Newcomer and immigrant education
MORE THAN I’M SORRY

An overarching message throughout the day was that governments must be accountable for past injustices and take substantive actions to repair the resulting harm. Many participants felt that high profile apologies receive disproportionate attention compared to other forms of action that are more important to affected communities. Without such substantive actions, some participants expressed concern that apologies risk becoming partisan acts designed to attract voters from specific ethnic or cultural communities.

Examples of substantive actions included policy changes to prevent current or future injustices, widespread education about past injustices, reparations to affected individuals, and cultural and social infrastructure for affected communities. Of these, the idea of reparations to individuals, although supported by many participants, generated the most controversy during breakout group discussions. Further exploration of this topic would require grounding participant discussions in the context of a specific injustice, including detailed information such as how long ago the injustice occurred and what ongoing impacts are felt by the affected individuals.

A DEEP EXCHANGE OF IDEAS AND EXPERIENCES

Participants described in detail the potential for a poorly designed reconciliation process to cause further harm within their communities. Several described past experiences with processes that were rushed, transactional and adversarial in nature. A recurring topic during participant discussions was a desire to explore perspectives and experiences in a full and respectful manner. Three sub-themes relate to this idea:

- **Opportunities for communities to work through internal conflict**, where upfront space for dialogue and consensus building within the affected community is built into the start of a reconciliation process. This is in recognition that communities are not homogenous and need time to collectively work through the outcomes they would like to achieve when working towards reconciliation.

- **Respectful and two-way discussion forums between community and government**, providing opportunities for community members to discuss their perspectives in greater depth and respond to each other’s ideas through dialogue. A few participants contrasted these ideas with less dynamic public hearing-style formats, where stakeholders speak their viewpoints to government representatives but do not respond to each other or co-create solutions.

- **Sharing personal narratives**, where the needs of individuals to tell their stories and have these witnessed is built into a reconciliation process to promote personal healing and help educate the public.
SFU’s Centre for Dialogue developed the *Reconciling Injustices* dialogue as part of a series of community-engaged events associated with the 2014 Jack P. Blaney Award for Dialogue. These events focused on the theme of Reconciliation, drawing inspiration from award recipient Chief Robert Joseph’s leadership in this field through his tireless work to renew relationships among Canada’s Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples.

The focus of the *Reconciling Injustices* dialogue was informed by the Centre for Dialogue’s preliminary finding that many official responses to injustice within Canada have been ad-hoc and reactive, rather than planned and purposeful. The Centre therefore envisioned an event that would bring together relevant stakeholders to jointly develop principles that could be helpful for governments and affected communities to consider during future reconciliation efforts.

The Centre also confirmed that an event held in British Columbia could make a substantial contribution to this policy area, based on the province’s status as an epicenter for several prominent national injustices and a home to a range of relevant expertise.

This intended focus was confirmed through consultations with Chief Joseph and Reconciliation Canada. An Executive Advisory Committee helped to further refine the dialogue objectives and approach, and provided initial suggestions for communities to consult. The Centre then conducted a series of exploratory interviews with key figures from communities affected by injustice, as well as civil servants and representatives from relevant institutions. These interviews helped to confirm that a dialogue focused on principles for reconciliation was desirable to affected communities and useful from the perspective of government and other major institutions.
The Centre focused its outreach efforts on six historical and contemporary Canadian injustices: Indian Residential Schools, the Chinese Head Tax and Exclusion Act, the Japanese Canadian Internment, the social and legal exclusion of LGBTQ Canadians, the Komagata Maru Incident, and Canada’s refusal of Jewish refugees from the Holocaust. The number of injustices examined was constrained by the time required to respectfully consult with each affected community and the resources necessary to research and write a brief case study of each injustice for inclusion in the dialogue Discussion Guide. The choice of these case studies was not a judgment of their importance versus other possible injustices. Rather, they were chosen because they provided a diverse range of experiences to contextualize a broad conversation about how Canadians respond to injustice in the future.

Repeated themes among affected communities included frustration that the sincerity of government responses to injustice was compromised by politics. Some individuals expressed concern that the perspectives and histories of communities were simplified by society-at-large. Others described aspirations to achieve a variety of reconciliation outcomes that often included, but were far more complex than, apologies or compensation, both of which tend to dominate media attention.

Consultations with government officials and decision-makers from major institutions were far-ranging, but often included themes such as liability, consistency and resource limitations. All stakeholder groups frequently described difficulties related to representation within communities affected by injustice, with communities often facing internal disagreements about reconciliation objectives and approaches. Stakeholders also demonstrated inconsistent definitions of the term reconciliation, with some community stakeholders expressing concern that the term failed to hold government and society accountable, while some institutional stakeholders feared that the term implied an endless number of apologies and compensation agreements that could lead to divisive identity politics.

These results from stakeholder consultations helped the Centre to develop a draft dialogue process design and Discussion Guide. The Discussion Guide includes an introduction to the Reconciling Injustices dialogue, historical context for Canada’s past approaches to reconcile injustices, short case studies of the six selected injustices, and a series of discussion questions to frame the dialogue. The Centre asked a network of 11 stakeholders from government, relevant institutions and communities affected by injustice to provide feedback on the draft process design and Discussion Guide as part of its participatory approach.
109 participants attended the Reconciling Injustices dialogue. Half of all spaces were reserved for invited government officials, decision-makers from major institutions and members of communities affected by injustice. The remaining spaces were opened to the public and were advertised widely through mass emails, event calendars and social media, as well as through relevant organizations aware of the event.

Recognizing the diversity of opinion that exists within any group, the Centre extended a wide range of invitations within each of the six communities engaged through the outreach process. Common target groups included historical societies, cultural societies, advocacy groups, support groups, academics and individuals who were directly affected by injustice or their descendants.

Invitations were also extended to a variety of civil servants in federal, provincial and municipal government, especially in portfolios such as Multiculturalism, Citizenship, Trade, Aboriginal Relations, Education, Justice, and Heritage. From the non-profit sector, the Centre invited organizations focused on intercultural education, multiculturalism, history and art.

A breakdown of participant demographics is provided in Appendix A. The full list of registrants who attended the dialogue is available in Appendix B.
The primary goal of Reconciling Injustices was to develop principles that could inform how Canadian society responds to a wide range of injustices within Canadian society. This focus on broad principles was in recognition that individual reconciliation processes must be tailored to the circumstances of their specific injustice and the needs of the affected community. The principles developed in Reconciling Injustices therefore provide useful reference points for government and affected communities to consider when responding to injustice, without being overly prescriptive about detailed approaches.

Many individuals interested in the event had previous experiences attending Truth and Reconciliation-style events, which focus on sharing personal stories about the impact of injustice, as well as official government consultations about apologies or redress for specific injustices. In contrast, the objectives of Reconciling Injustices required participants to interpret their experiences and develop principles that could apply across many potential injustices. The event Discussion Guide and other pre-event communications helped to orient participants towards this focus, and provided case studies of six major injustices to reduce the pressure on participants to provide detailed historical accounts within the limited time available.

The dialogue was structured as a one-day event so that it could fit within the schedules of prominent stakeholders. The
morning program, What is Reconciliation?, provided space for participants to explore the concept of reconciliation and express a broad range of potential meanings for this term. The detailed method and results of this section are described in Section 4.

The afternoon program explored the theme: Challenges and Solutions of Reconciliation. Activities included Skills for Reconciliation breakout workshops, where participants discussed different approaches to reconciliation in groups of 20-30. The method and results for these breakout workshops are described in Section 5. In the final exercise of the day, participants returned to tables of eight where they developed principles for either government or affected communities to consider when working to reconcile injustices. The method and results for this final exercise are described in Section 5. Section 6 provides the results of a final exercise focused on actions necessary to create reconciliation.

Both the morning and afternoon programs began with feature speakers from diverse backgrounds. These speakers presented an array of ideas about the meaning and process of reconciliation to stimulate discussion. Speaker names and abbreviated biographies are provided below, with full biographies and videos of the speeches available at http://www.sfu.ca/dialogue/reconciling-injustices:

- **Naveen Girn**, cultural researcher for SFU’s Komagata Maru Journey project and community engagement specialist.
- **Judge Maryka Omatsu**, Canada’s first East Asian woman judge, key NAJC negotiator, 1988 Japanese Internment Redress Agreement, author of Bittersweet Passage.
- **Dara Parker**, Executive Director, qmunity, BC’s Queer Resource Centre.
- **Robbie Waisman**, Buchenwald survivor, Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre Speaker.
- **Dr. Henry Yu**, UBC History Professor, Co-Chair of City of Vancouver’s “Dialogues between Urban Aboriginal, First Nations, and Immigrant Communities” Project, 2010-2012.

The majority of the day was spent in a large conference room with participants seated at tables of eight. Places at the sixteen discussion tables were pre-assigned based on participant registration preferences and to maximize interaction across communities and sectors. A facilitator guided the discussion at each table and a student note-taker from SFU’s Semester in Dialogue program recorded areas of agreement and disagreement. Participants also were asked to write down and submit key ideas from the morning and afternoon programs.

This combination of physical layout and multiple recording mechanisms provided a large sample size of findings, created some redundancy to ensure that key ideas were captured, and reduced the influence of dominant personalities. Although the names of participants are published in this report, the event was held under a shared agreement of confidentiality, where the participants agreed not to attribute particular ideas to individuals so as to allow for candid discussion.
INRODUCTION TO EXERCISE

The initial exercise of the day, What is Reconciliation?, was designed to capture the full range of participant ideas about what reconciliation can mean in different contexts. Participants were seated at sixteen tables of eight participants each. Participants at each discussion table focused on one of five potential topics that were developed based on common themes identified during the outreach process:

**The Apology**
What makes a good apology, and in what context can apologies be beneficial or harmful?

**The Day After**
Does reconciliation end with a policy change, apology or compensation? What, if any, ongoing issues might continue to exist?

**Inter-Generational Relevance**
What does reconciliation mean in an inter-generational context, when many years have passed since the end of an injustice?

**From Truth Commissions to Inquiries**
What different processes exist to achieve reconciliation and what are the advantages and disadvantages of each in different contexts?

**Between Punishment and Forgiveness**
How should the life-changing impact on affected individuals and communities inform efforts towards reconciliation?

Participants were pre-assigned seating at tables of eight based on their registration preferences and to maximize diversity at each table. To help inform the discussion, each table was provided a copy of two diagrams from the event Discussion Guide. These diagrams drew upon the research already completed during the event scoping and outreach phases, and provided a common structure and vocabulary from which participants could begin their discussions.
Reconciliation outcomes, ranging in intention from addressing the past to planning for the future. This list is neither exhaustive nor intended to suggest preference. Developed with assistance from Gary McCarron.
Partial list of methods commonly used during reconciliation efforts. Developed with assistance from Gary McCarron.
Before the exercise began, all tables were asked to jointly develop a set of discussion norms to be used throughout the day. Each participant also was provided with a pocket guide containing standard norms for intercultural dialogue. A facilitator guided the discussion at each table, and a note-taker recorded all comments without attribution.

The dialogue format was generative, in that participants were encouraged to brainstorm within the discussion topic and did not need to agree upon their ideas. Near the end of the exercise, each participant was asked to write down on an index card one key idea they had heard from someone else in their group. These cards were used in conjunction with the note-takers’ records to identify the ideas that participants felt were most important to highlight in this report.

OUTCOMES

The Apology
Participants described two major aspects of an ideal apology: a culturally appropriate acknowledgment of past wrongs and a commitment to a more respectful future. Participants agreed that if an apology is given, it must meet the needs of those to whom it is directed. Participants also warned that an apology has the potential to be misused to advance personal or political agendas.

A number of participants raised the question of who benefits from official government apologies: the individual, the community, or the government? More specifically, participants discussed who the apology should address. Some suggested that only direct victims and survivors should be involved. In cases where those directly affected by the injustice are no longer living, some participants argued that their descendants should be invited to inform and receive government apologies in their place.

Key to a meaningful and effective apology is intention. The apologizer must have a breadth and depth of knowledge of the injustice, including its historical context and the harm it caused, to be able to sincerely take responsibility. Participants cautioned that apologies can come too early and too quickly, not allowing sufficient time for the affected community to process. Participants used words like genuine, inclusive, committed, timely, accountable, and respectful to describe a meaningful apology.

Some participants explained that the process for reconciliation must consist of more than “I’m sorry,” including, but not limited to, policy changes and efforts to prevent the reoccurrence of injustice. Additionally, most participants agreed that public education to increase historical and cultural awareness is a fundamental requirement for a meaningful apology. Most participants agreed that formal apologies or culturally appropriate alternatives are necessary for reconciliation, but disagreement persisted about the necessity and benefit of financial repayment or compensation.

The Day After
Many participants argued that reconciliation is an ongoing process with no clear end point. Action to prevent future injustices, ongoing legacy projects, and continued support for victims were all viewed as aspects of reconciliation that do not end the day after official government action. A number of participants felt that any ongoing reconciliation process must continue to involve the affected community and must be tailored to that community’s needs.
PRINCIPLES

SHARE COMMON VALUES:
- Trust that reconciliation can be achieved.
- A belief in the core goodness of people.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE / CREATING ENTITY
- Entity groups involved in reconciliation
- Be inclusive
- Be welcoming

LEADERSHIP
- Creating space for people to come forward
Participants suggested that healing can only begin once the negative effects of injustice are ended. Even after conditions improve, healing remains a personal process that may not coincide with the timing of official government actions, such as apologies. Individuals affected by injustice therefore require open-ended opportunities to engage in the process of reconciliation.

A number of participants emphasized the importance of teaching youth about past injustices in order to prevent future injustices. Participants strongly held that Canada’s national history needs to be accurate and free of revisionism, requiring ongoing work to update education curriculum and materials.

“What we do the day after depends on how sincere we are.”
—Participant

Inter-Generational Relevance
Participants agreed on the importance of teaching younger generations about past injustices so they may retain cultural memory and apply that knowledge to prevent future injustices. Many participants felt challenged when relaying the history of injustice to younger generations, understanding that this becomes increasingly difficult over time and especially when those directly affected are no longer able to tell their stories. A number of participants also shared the fear of passing on hurt, guilt and victimhood along with knowledge of past injustice.

Many participants thought that the education system should include information about historical injustices, and connect those issues to present-day conflicts and injustices. Funding, resources and professional development opportunities for educators were viewed as key, but often missing enablers for this form of education. Some participants expressed distrust of the formal education system, believing that official historical narratives about injustice often carry bias.

Participants suggested several alternate models for education, such as introducing empathy-building exercises into the education curriculum to teach younger generations the skills to navigate difficult topics. Other suggestions included: inviting Elders to share firsthand experiences, using ceremony and ritual to share stories across generations, redesigning museums and public space to tell the non-Eurocentric histories of Canada, and including alternative modes for sharing information, such as recorded oral histories, music, art and technology.

“There are many histories and stories, and we need to listen to them and seek them out before we can understand how to live well together going ahead.”
—Participant
From Truth Commissions to Inquiries
A number of reconciliation processes were discussed by participants, including truth commissions, consultations, formal apologies, and memorialization projects. Participants agreed that the goal of any reconciliation process must be to empower affected communities and restore the dignity of marginalized voices. This requires the reconciliation process to be driven by the affected community itself.

A majority of participants expressed support for memorialization projects that provide a physical place that can be visited to learn, grieve or remember. Many participants supported processes that empower the victims of injustice to share their stories, such as truth commissions and consultations. However, a number of participants also cautioned that if no concrete actions result from such processes, affected individuals can potentially become re-victimized.

Many participants stressed that reconciliation efforts must exist without a tie to a particular political party or leader to avoid being used for political gain. Some participants viewed the government’s primary responsibility as acknowledging the history of the injustice and communicating this to the public. A number of participants felt this role was unfulfilled by governments within Canada, and expressed concern that this had negatively affected the general public’s support for reconciliation.

For a number of the participants, the process of apology was controversial. Some believed that an apology can offer great emotional value, especially when the affected community is involved in drafting the apology. In contrast, many participants expressed skepticism about the outcomes of official apologies, especially in absence of widespread public awareness about the injustice.

Between Punishment and Forgiveness
Many participants disagreed about the relative merits of punishment and forgiveness. Some felt that between forgiveness and punishment is a grey area, an opportunity for progress and reconciliation. Others strongly advocated for punishment, arguing that wrongdoers must be held accountable for injustice and take responsibility for their actions. Participants described a tension between the goals of creating unity in Canadian culture and maintaining cultural distinction and diversity.

A large proportion of participant discussions focused on education and connection through storytelling. A number of participants discussed the role of ongoing suffering and its potential to punish future generations. Many participants suggested that by creating safe spaces within Canadian communities, individuals would be better equipped to tell their own stories, learn from each other, and move beyond paradigms of ‘us versus them’.

“How we interpret our history has a bearing on how we see our future.” —Participant
KEY THEMES
The following themes summarize key ideas among all morning discussion groups. Together, they provide a series of considerations that help to explore potential meanings for reconciliation.

**Who is Reconciliation for?**

A reconciliation process must clearly define its intended beneficiaries, those who are accountable to these beneficiaries for the injustice they experienced, and what role, if any, other stakeholders should play. Participants had varying opinions about the intended beneficiaries, with proposals including individuals directly impacted by injustice, their descendants, as well as members of their wider communities. Additional stakeholders potentially include elected officials, the government and members of the general public, although the roles of many of these groups were not unanimously agreed upon.

**Education & Informed Action**

There is a demand for an accurate representation of historical injustices without revisionism. Education has the potential to empower all Canadians with knowledge of past injustices and tools to prevent reoccurrence. Participants suggested various education methods, including storytelling by Elders from all cultural backgrounds, revising public education curricula and updating newcomer/immigration education to include information about injustices. Education also is important to inform the actions of those delivering a formal apology or implementing a reconciliation process on behalf of government. To be effective, the representatives of government must have a depth and breadth of knowledge about the historical intentions behind the injustice being addressed, as well as the intentions of the present-day apology.

**More than ‘I’m Sorry’**

Many participants felt that high profile apologies receive disproportionate attention compared to other forms of continued action that are more important to affected communities. Policy changes to prevent current or future injustices, widespread education about past injustices, and other substantial legacies should accompany apologies to make them meaningful.

**Sharing Personal Narratives**

The need to speak, be heard, and hear from others is a necessary part of the healing process, explained participants. Storytelling is important not only for the affected community, but also as a means of educating the greater public so that it understands the reasons behind reconciliation efforts. Participants would therefore like increased opportunity for inter-generational, inter-cultural story sharing in public spaces.

**Power & Leadership**

Reconciliation must empower those who have been historically disempowered. Affected communities should play a leadership role in the reconciliation process, and government should recognize the historically harmful roles of its power and use its influence to communicate accurate information to the public.
PURPOSE

After the lunch break, participants attended one of five Skills for Reconciliation breakout workshops. The workshops were designed to provide a mid-sized forum for participants to share skills and ideas about specific approaches toward reconciliation, and to provide opportunities for interaction among diverse communities and reconciliation issues. The topics of the five breakout workshops were:

- **Challenging Power Structures**
  What grassroots actions and strategies can help to combat ongoing discrimination and power structures in Canadian society?

- **Opening Minds, Building Bridges**
  How can organizations raise the consciousness of Canadians-at-large by identifying shared values and inspiring communities to do better for each other?

- **Institutionalizing Remembrance**
  How can communities work with museums, art galleries, libraries and educational institutions to sustain a national conversation about injustices?

- **Passing the Baton**
  How can communities connect with 2nd and 3rd generation descendants to make reconciliation meaningful to the next generation of leaders, and to ensure the retention of collective memory?

- **Communicating to the Public**
  What is the best way to accurately communicate reconciliation issues to the public through mainstream, cultural and social media?

Between two and three speakers opened each workshop with five-minute presentations to stimulate further dialogue among all participants. Full biographies of the workshop speakers are available at [http://www.sfu.ca/dialogue/reconciling-injustices](http://www.sfu.ca/dialogue/reconciling-injustices). Because the primary focus of the workshops was for interaction and skill-sharing among participants, minimal formal outputs were generated from these sessions. This section provides a short summary of some of the discussion themes covered at each workshop, but does not attempt to provide a comprehensive record of discussion.
WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

Challenging Power Structures
The workshop began with short presentations by Barbara Findlay, Sid Tan and Grace Eiko-Thomson. The discussion focused on how institutionalized power structures can have devastating human impact, and how acknowledging injustice and providing redress is an important part of changing these norms. Participants discussed the complexities of power structures and oppression, including the fact that individuals often have multiple identities and therefore can experience both oppression and privilege in different aspects of their lives.

Opening Minds, Building Bridges
Presenters Karen Joseph, Ali Solehdin and Adara Goldberg provided opening remarks for the Opening Minds, Building Bridges workshop. The discussion highlighted the importance of acknowledging our shared heritage to understand different points of view and engage in meaningful dialogue. It also emphasized the need to create spaces that allow people of different cultural backgrounds to learn from each other’s histories in a sacred and safe environment. One participant proposed the idea that pluralism is an ongoing process rather than an end product, and that honouring differences, asking questions, and creating partnerships are part of this framework.

Institutionalizing Remembrance
Institutionalizing Remembrance began with short presentations by Karen Henry, Gerry Lawson and Kalwant Singh Nadeem Parmar. The workshop examined the way in which communities institutionalize history and the importance of sharing personal histories between generations. Participants discussed how remembrance projects should prioritize cultural health over research goals and use participatory processes to demonstrate respect. Additional discussion focused on the use of dialogue as a tool to share historical details that might otherwise be forgotten, and the importance of identifying missing voices from historical narratives and making these visible.

Passing the Baton
Angela White, Caroline Wong and Sukhvinder Kaur Vinning opened the Passing the Baton workshop with short presentations. Participants discussed how intergenerational teaching provides an opportunity to move beyond apologies to a constructive future that leaves behind misunderstandings. Participants discussed the need to maintain collective memory, and the challenges of doing so when younger generations begin to lose a distinct sense of cultural identity. Further discussion focused on the importance of learning history from multiple perspectives and not losing sight of the humanity that exists on the other side of an issue.

Communicating to the Public
Presenters Scott McLean and Tina Song provided opening remarks for the Communicating to the Public workshop. Participants discussed the need to communicate messages and stories that reflect a community’s full depth of experiences and intentions. They discussed the challenge of creating coherent messages that provide the level of information, quality and engagement required by the target audience. They also discussed the need for authentic relationships between communities and traditional media, as well as increasing opportunities for communities to speak directly to the public through social media.
The final exercise of the day, Solutions for Reconciliation, was designed to move the workshop from the generative nature of the morning discussion to a deliberative discussion that yielded concrete, generalizable principles for communities and government to consider during future reconciliation efforts. Participants were pre-assigned to groups of eight people selected to maximize diversity within each group. Half of the discussion groups were asked to develop principles for government, and half were asked to identify principles for communities affected by injustice.

A facilitator at each group posed a series of standardized, exploratory questions that participants could consider. These questions were based on common challenges during past and current reconciliation efforts in Canada. The primary output from each discussion group was a set of three principles the group endorsed by consensus. A student note-taker recorded the full range of participant ideas during the discussion, with special emphasis on noting major areas of disagreement, since these would not be reflected in consensus statements.

The notes in this section describe the major themes that emerged among the sixteen discussion tables. These themes were developed by analysing and grouping the consensus principles that emerged from each table. Where possible, qualitative and quantitative information is provided to indicate the extent to which each theme had broad-based support, as well as any major disagreements that emerged related to that theme. The consensus principles developed by individual tables were not deliberated outside of those tables, and therefore lack any formal endorsement by the dialogue participants-at-large.

In some cases, the ideas of individual participants have been used to provide specific examples and context, although these individual ideas do not necessarily have broad-based agreement from other participants. For this reason, the ideas of individuals are separated from the body of the report under the label, “Voices from the room.” In cases where individual participant perspectives have been included within the main text to provide context or clarity, they have been clearly labelled as such.
EXERCISE A: GOVERNMENT

Eight discussion groups focused on principles for governments to consider when responding to injustice. These groups began by exploring the following framing questions:

- **Spokespeople**: Who should speak for a community affected by injustice, especially if internal disagreements exist within that community?
- **Politicization**: How can governments ensure that reconciliation efforts remain sincere and principled rather than partisan or polarizing?
- **Consistency**: What principles should dictate when and if governments should officially respond to a past injustice?

**Spokespeople**

Groups developed a number of principles about who should speak on behalf of a community affected by injustice, especially when internal disagreement exists within the community. Several principles emphasized that the full range of community perspectives must be represented within its leadership. In this context, community leaders were viewed as acting in service of their constituents, possessing attributes such as humility, responsiveness, ethics and transparency.

Several principles expressed a desire for improved methods of engagement and consultation when facing internal community disagreement. Some groups called for a community forum that would allow community members to discuss their perspectives at greater depth and respond to each other’s ideas in dialogue. A few participants contrasted these ideas with less dynamic public hearing-style formats, where stakeholders speak their viewpoints to government representatives but do not respond to each other or co-create solutions.

**Voices in the Room**

Several participants suggested specific strategies to engage communities. These included making better use of technology to collect widespread feedback, staging public hearings, holding formal elections for community leadership and conducting focus groups.

One participant expressed concern that, during previous government consultations on righting an officially imposed injustice, the government chose to consult with the community group that demanded the least financial compensation and did not engage equally with other groups that disagreed.

One participant described her experience participating in government consultations on developing an official apology. Each participant had a maximum of two minutes to speak, leaving a feeling of being rushed through emotional material. The format emphasized community members speaking to the government rather than two-way dialogue or opportunities for community members to respond to each other. Translators were available to relay the remarks of individuals who couldn’t speak English, but not to translate back the English language remarks of others.
Outcomes
Many groups chose to develop principles about appropriate reconciliation outcomes, even though this topic did not relate to a specific discussion question for the government-focused groups. The most widely mentioned outcome was education, with approximately 25% of all principles mentioning this in some capacity. Individual tables proposed principles that included leveraging the reconciliation process itself to generate public awareness, as well as providing affected communities with ongoing funding to autonomously oversee education and memorialization projects.

Several principles included words such as “redress,” “reparation,” “compensation” and “restitution.” These shared a common message that a successful reconciliation process should repair harm through a range of potential means including group compensation, individual compensation, and non-monetary forms of redress. A related principle indicated that reconciliation is achieved when all communities are able to reach their full potentials. Additional principles focused on outcomes that would provide ongoing legacies from reconciliation efforts, such as community facilities or legislative changes to end ongoing injustices or prevent future ones.

VOICES IN THE ROOM
One participant expressed concerns that individuals affected by injustice are not always able to access the resources that may be created for them through a reconciliation process. This participant cautioned that efforts are necessary to address structural barriers to accessing these programs.

One participant observed the need to extend educational efforts beyond the formal education system, because this does not reach the majority of the adult population. Another suggested that shared principles learned from past Canadian injustices should be included in citizenship information for new immigrants.

Some participants expressed a desire to use knowledge gained from past injustices to review present-day government policies. Examples provided by individual participants include Canada’s temporary foreign workers program, barriers to obtaining permanent residency, and restrictions on family reunification.
Process
Some groups proposed principles about the process of reconciliation that lay outside the initial discussion questions. Several of these focused on the idea of participatory, shared, or community-driven models, where affected communities have increased control over design and implementation of reconciliation processes. Additional groups emphasized the need for reconciliation processes to be culturally appropriate for the affected community. Another group proposed that reconciliation processes should have built-in flexibility to respond to individual circumstances.

VOICES IN THE ROOM
One participant cautioned that several common reconciliation processes, including commissions and inquiries, sometimes end without leading to any substantial actions to repair harm, such as providing reparations or returning stolen land.

Another participant suggested that reconciliation discussions between government and Aboriginal communities should take place within the community itself using its cultural traditions, rather than requiring that Aboriginal leaders travel to the government.
**Consistency**

Few groups decided to develop principles for how governments can consistently choose which injustices require official action. One group suggested that future reconciliation efforts should build upon past precedents, and that communities that have already been through a reconciliation process could help to provide guidance. Another group suggested that Canada’s constitution should include a requirement to respond to past injustices.

**Voices in the Room**

Several participants proposed ideas that were not endorsed by their groups as consensus principles, often due to internal disagreement:

- A few participants raised concerns about the cost and resources required for a potentially unbounded number of reconciliation initiatives.
- Some participants indicated that the degree of impact of past injustices should govern whether governments officially respond, potentially limiting redress to injustices that were systemic in nature, affected large numbers of people, and/or were unreasonable based on information available to decision-makers at the time. Other participants felt that the government should be accountable to respond to any injustice for which it was responsible.
- A few participants suggested creating some form of central government agency to oversee reconciliation efforts. Other participants cautioned that too much bureaucracy could prevent the flexibility required to respond to individual circumstances and could remove the human dimensions of reconciliation and healing.
EXERCISE B: COMMUNITY

Eight discussion groups focused on principles for communities affected by injustice. These groups began by exploring the following framing questions:

- **Consensus**: Are there common factors within communities that lead to disagreement around reconciliation? How might communities move toward agreement?
- **Leadership**: Who should lead communities that often lack an official structure?
- **Measurability**: How does a community know when it has achieved reconciliation?
- **Outcomes**: How can affected communities effectively define outcomes that are reasonable and just?

**Consensus**

Groups developed a range of principles emphasizing the need for dialogue and consensus building within affected communities, with almost 20% of all principles contributing to this topic. These principles indicated that internal community dialogue would require resources and opportunities at the beginning of any official reconciliation process, before detailed discussions or negotiations with government. The benefit would be that community members could develop a shared understanding of the process and outcomes they would like to achieve when working towards reconciliation.

A number of groups developed principles to emphasize that communities affected by injustice are not homogenous in experience or perspective. Participants provided examples of common differences among community members such as age, economic success, personal beliefs and place of residence.

Participants noted that even individuals directly subjected to the same injustice may have been impacted differently, and may be at different places in their personal healing journeys when a reconciliation process begins. This means that different members within the same affected community might have vastly different opinions about what is needed for reconciliation because they have legitimate and logical differences in their individual needs.

**VOICES IN THE ROOM**

One participant suggested that communities should start their internal dialogue by creating agreed upon protocols for conflict resolution.

Some participants cautioned that reconciliation processes that do not first make space for internal community dialogue risk fracturing rather than healing communities. In such a scenario, different stakeholder groups within an affected community might begin to view themselves in competition to become the community’s spokespeople to government, leading to internal conflict. Others expressed concerns that government might use differences of opinion within a community as an excuse for inaction.

One participant described how some members of the Japanese Canadian community had been so impacted by internment that they were unable to attend public meetings. Instead, the community held home-based meetings so that the voices of these individuals could be included.
Leadership
Few groups chose to explore the question of who should speak on behalf of communities that lack an official leadership structure, and there were no consensus principles developed in this area.

Some individual participants felt that a single defined leadership structure would provide increased leverage for communities when liaising with government, while some feared this would reduce the diversity of perspectives considered. Some participants suggested that widespread community support and the inclusion of a broad range of voices are requirements for any leadership to be considered legitimate. As well, a few participants suggested that community members directly affected by injustice should have more prominent roles in representing the community.

“[Leadership is] a collective, well-held idea in the moment.”
—Participant

Measurability and Outcomes
One third of all principles addressed the healing of relationships between communities affected by injustice and Canadian society at large. More than half of all groups proposed one or more principles focusing on the values of reconciliation, using words like integrity, shared truths, sincerity and compassion. Additional principles emphasized that reconciliation requires a long-term commitment, and that apologies or similar gestures must be accompanied by substantive actions and legacies to be meaningful.

The most commonly agreed upon forms of legacy were education and remembrance, with more than 20% of all consensus principles focusing on these areas. Many of these principles expressed a desire for affected communities and Canadian society at large to share a common understanding of the history behind past injustices. Such a common understanding was believed to be a key first step for affected communities and Canadian society to begin envisioning a common future together, as well as for preventing Canadians from repeating similar injustices.

Several disagreements arose during discussions, including the role of the public. Some participants viewed engagement with the Canadian public as important for creating political willpower to implement reconciliation programming, while a few participants viewed reconciliation discussions to be a bilateral process between the affected community and government, with no role for the public. While most participants discussed official apologies in a positive light, a few participants expressed disagreement with government apologies for various reasons.
One participant suggested implementing a formal monitoring process to evaluate the success of a reconciliation initiative over time.

One participant described efforts to have the University of British Columbia grant honorary degrees to former Japanese Canadian students who never completed their degrees due to internment. A significant amount of advocacy work led to this outcome, including a letter writing campaign, a petition and interest from the news media. The granting of honorary degrees led to significant publicity and awareness among the broader Canadian public and even outside of Canada, showing the potential impact of symbolic actions.

Several participants discussed the relationship between individual healing and formal reconciliation processes. One participant suggested that individual healing might need to come before formal community reconciliation with the state. Another participant cautioned that formal reconciliation programs must leave space for individuals to voice their anger and tell their stories, rather than being tempted to silence the voices of those who are not healed or are not ready to move forward.

The following principles reflect the most widely supported themes between the government-focused and community-focused tables.

1. **Values-based decision making**: Rebuilding relationships between affected communities and Canadian society requires trust, shared intentions and long-term commitment. Lacking these, a reconciliation process risks causing further harm rather than healing.

2. **Acknowledging shared history**: Recognizing the full scope of past injustices is a necessary first step toward reconciliation. Witnessing stories, incorporating past injustices into the official narrative of Canadian history, and educating the public are critical elements of this.

3. **Accountability**: Governments must be accountable for past actions and take substantive actions to repair the resulting harm. The form this takes is circumstance dependent.

4. **Opportunities to work through conflict**: Space for comprehensive dialogue must be built into any reconciliation process, including upfront space for consensus building within the affected community and the mutual exchange of perspectives between members of the community and government.

5. **Balanced community representation**: Reconciliation processes must engage the full range of actors within the affected community, recognizing that communities are diverse and legitimately include different interests. Where community leadership exists, it must demonstrate the extent to which it accomplishes this goal of balanced representation.
To end the day, participants were asked to write on an index card the answer to the question:

Think of an injustice that occurred within Canada that is important to you. Imagine it is 2030 and Canadian society has taken major steps to reconcile and resolve this injustice. What is the one single most important step that has led to reconciliation?

This exercise allowed participants to explore how the principles they developed during the afternoon could translate to concrete, positive actions. The individual nature of the exercise also allowed participants to express the ideas that were most important to them without being constrained by the need for consensus with other group members. Participant ideas largely fit within the following major themes:

**Education, where educators and all parts of the education system fully communicate the truth of past injustices, and all Canadians understand a common history.**

Where participants provided specific examples, these included: mobilizing the elementary, high school, and post-secondary education systems; providing education to new immigrants; involving the affected community in deciding how injustices are described; asking universities to create specialized courses and preserve archival information about past injustices; publicizing information about injustices in public; and communicating knowledge through the arts.
Substantive legacies, such as policy changes to specific legislation and resources, are provided to communities to correct and compensate for past injustices.

Where participants provided specific examples, these included: ensuring that apologies be accompanied by concrete actions; changing immigration laws such as Bill 31c; acknowledging Aboriginal treaty rights and titles; providing training for the police and court system workers; providing early childhood education, care, and housing for Aboriginal children; and removing gender markers on government identification.

Responsiveness by government and Canadian society, where power structures evolve to ensure they reflect the needs of all communities, especially those that are marginalized or lack political power.

Where participants provided specific examples, these included: increasing government use of dialogic engagement methods; creating a new government body to manage reconciliation initiatives; and finding new ways for Canadian society to acknowledge and take responsibility for injustices.

Mutually-held values and support, where all Canadians embrace ideas such as diversity, inclusivity and a shared sense of humanity.

Where participants provided specific examples, these included: proclaiming a day to recognize past injustices; holding public forums; and promoting the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Self-empowerment and advocacy within communities affected by injustice, leading to broader changes within society.

Where participants provided specific examples, these included: helping youth to reconnect with their culture; mobilizing voters within affected communities; creating participatory governance models; and building grassroots support networks.
The principles contained in this document are not a recipe book. Rather, they provide a series of ideas that are useful to consider when customizing a reconciliation initiative to the circumstances of an individual injustice. Although these principles are known within specific fields of study, it was clear from participants’ comments that they are not yet fully reflected in many past and present reconciliation initiatives. Ideas such as identifying the full range of stakeholders affected by an injustice, consciously examining the roles of power structures, and creating space for all parties to hear and respond to each other’s viewpoints, could radically transform the way Canadians approach the process of reconciliation.

This is not to say that reconciliation is easy. Many difficult subjects remain unresolved within Canadian society, such as the appropriate role of financial compensation, and criteria for when apologies are or are not appropriate. Although accountability was a recurring theme for many participants, agreement as to what this meant was not as universally understood as the meanings of several other principles.

Because the impacts of reconciliation initiatives can be so large—both positive and negative—Simon Fraser University’s Centre for Dialogue sees value in follow-up work to the Reconciling Injustices event. Further efforts to explore the perspectives of government officials would be beneficial, since issues of liability and public relations make it difficult for government to speak candidly at public events. The Centre for Dialogue would also see value in a formal research project to identify practices from past reconciliation efforts that could help to inform future initiatives. In the spirit of the principles highlighted in this report, we recommend that such a project proceed as a partnership between government and communities affected by injustice.

Throughout Reconciling Injustices, participants expressed an expansive range of ideas about what reconciliation means, from reparations to remembrance. If an agreed upon definition remains elusive, one participant’s quote, attributed to the Truth and Reconciliation efforts in South Africa, especially caught the attention of the dialogue facilitators: “When our past no longer invades the present but informs the future.”
During registration, the 109 participants were asked to voluntarily identify a limited amount of demographic information about their relationship with past injustices. While not comprehensive, this information allowed the Centre to ensure sufficient diversity in attendee composition, and helped verify the degree to which individuals impacted by injustice were included in the dialogue.

Table 1 itemizes participant responses to the question: “Which of the following injustices affects you most, if any (optional, select as many as apply).” A number of participants from government, institutions and the public selected most or all of the listed injustices, presumably to indicate their interest in the general topic of injustices. For this reason, we have excluded participants who indicated four injustices or more from the totals of individual injustices and reported these as a separate line item. The total number of responses listed does not equal the total number of participants because participants could indicate more than one injustice. In addition, 27 participants either were not associated with any specific injustice or choose not to answer the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injustice</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion of Jewish refugees from the Holocaust</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Canadian Internment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Head Tax</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komagata Maru</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and legal exclusion of the LGBTQ communities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicated 4 or more choices</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional (free text) responses</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full list of additional (free text) responses: Injustice and inequality; Current GoC policy for refugees; All of the above; Problems associated with children in care system; The Chinese exclusion act; Issues related to ethnicity, age and poverty; Age, gender and class injustices; German POW; The perception by most Canadians that Sikhs are violent people.

Table 1: Answers to “Which of the following injustices affects you most, if any? (optional, select as many as apply).”
Participants also were asked to voluntarily identify their relationships with the injustice(s) affecting them, with final data shown in Table 2. In total, 57 of the 109 participants identified as being affected by injustice, having selected one or more of: “directly impacted”, “family directly impacted” and/or “self-identify with affected community”. 24 of the participants who were not affected by injustice indicated they were members of advocacy organizations and/or had professional interest in the subject. The remaining 28 participants either had no relationship to injustice or chose not to answer the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Injustice(s)</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly impacted</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family directly impacted</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identify with affected community</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of advocacy organization</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional (free text) responses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Answers to “Relationship to injustice(s) (optional, select as many as apply)”. 
Appendix B: Participant Names & Affiliations

This section contains the full list of the 109 participants who attended the Reconciling Injustices dialogue. Individuals who signed up online but did not check-in at the registration table on the day of the dialogue have been excluded from this list. Names, titles and affiliations are displayed as self-identified through the online registration system, with minor edits for clarity. Where participants did not indicate any affiliation, we have appended the word ‘citizen’ to indicate that the individual was acting in this capacity. All participants were provided the option during online registration to exclude themselves from this published participant list, and fourteen names have been withheld for this reason.

The information presented in this report represents trends within participant opinions, and is not a consensus statement. The purpose of providing the list of participants is solely to demonstrate the breadth and depth of individuals who contributed ideas at the Reconciling Injustices event.

Seema Ahluwalia, Faculty, Kwantlen Polytechnic University
Jolene Andrew, Aboriginal Youth Programmer, Frog Hollow Neighbourhood House
Catherine Bargen, Restorative Justice Coordinator, British Columbia Ministry of Justice
Lori Baxter, Lori Baxter Consulting
Asenaca Nata Belcham, Burnaby Association for Community Inclusion
Rachel Berko-Gabay, Citizen

Perry Billingsley, Director General, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
William Booth, Downtown East Side Adult Literacy Coordinator
Anita Boscariol, Director General, TAG-Negotiations West, Aboriginal Affairs & Northern Development Canada
Moninder Bubber, Community Liaison Librarian, Komagata Maru Website Project, Simon Fraser University Library
Mathew Bulford, Student, Vancouver School of Theology and Iona Pacific Inter-Religious Centre
Allan Castle, Executive Lead, Justice and Public Safety Secretariat, British Columbia Ministry of Justice and Attorney General
Tung Chan, Board Chair, Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21
Winnie Cheung, Director, Laurier Institution
David Choi, National Executive Chair, National Congress of Chinese Canadians
Ann Cowan, Citizen
Paul Crowe, Director, Simon Fraser University David Lam Centre
Peter Cunningham, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Aboriginal Relations & Reconciliation
Michael Dallaire, Citizen
Jean DeDieu, Director, Neighbourhood Care International
Lauren Dobell, Director, Partnerships, Vancity
Jackie Drozdowski, Citizen
Sylvie Epstein, Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre
Jacky Essombe, City of Vancouver Multicultural Advisory Committee
Reconciling Injustices in a Pluralistic Canada

barbara findlay, Citizen
Paul Friedman, Citizen
Naveen Girn, Community Engagement Specialist / Curator
Stephanie Goldberg, Community Relations Manager, Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs (CJIA)
Aliya Hirji, Student Leadership Coordinator & Program Analyst, Iona Pacific Inter-Religious Centre
Dale Hunter, Dean, Vancouver Community College (retired 2013), consultant, vcc, Dale Hunter Consulting Inc.
Daniel Iwama, Director, Powell St. Festival Society (& Advocacy Committee)
Chief Robert Joseph, Reconciliation Canada
Karen Joseph, Executive Director, Reconciliation Canada
Nicki Kahnamoui, Executive Director, ArtsHealth BC
Frank Kaplan, Citizen
Steve Kelly, Regional Director, Accommodation and Portfolio Management, Public Works and Government Services Canada
Mary Kitagawa, Greater Vancouver Japanese Canadian Citizens Association (JCCA) Human Rights Committee (HRC)
Uma Kumar, University of British Columbia
Jenny Kwan, MLA, Vancouver - Mount Pleasant, NDP Opposition Caucus
Alvin Lau, Program Officer, Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Gerry Lawson, Coordinator, Oral History and Language Lab, University of British Columbia, Museum of Anthropology
Howe Lee, President Emeritus, Chinese Canadian Military Museum Society
Daniel Lipinski, Citizen
Christine Little, Director, New Way Forward Development, Reconciliation Canada
Sonia Lotay, Citizen
Mary Lum, Citizen
Patrick MacKenzie, Assistant Director, Communications, Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Eric Magnuson, Regional Director General, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
Greg Masuda, Citizen
Fikir Zerai Mengistu, Manager, La Boussole
Judy Meyer, Citizen
Shiva Mojtabavi, Programming Director / Consultant
Janet Moore, Assistant Professor, Simon Fraser University’s Centre for Dialogue
Heidi Nutley, Powell Street Festival Advocacy Committee
Lorene Oikawa, Vice President, BC Government and Service Employees’ Union
Maryka Omatsu, Judge, Ontario Court of Justice
Hazel Orpen, Citizen
Dara Parker, Executive Director, QMUNITY, BC's Queer Resource Centre
Kalwant Singh Parmar, Khalsa Diwan Society (Vancouver BC)
Josh Paterson, Executive Director, BC Civil Liberties Association
Tamara Pearl, Daniel Pearl Foundation
Shiraz Ramji, Simon Fraser University
Helene Rasmussen, Project Facilitator, Public Library INTERLINK
Paulette Regan, Senior Researcher, Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krystal Renschler</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Reynolds</td>
<td>Manager, Policy, Strategy &amp; Reporting, Aboriginal Relations, BC Hydro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Rivkin</td>
<td>Jewish Federation of Greater Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Rolston</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasina Samji</td>
<td>Epidemiologist, BC Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharanjit Sandhra</td>
<td>Coordinator, Centre for Indo-Canadian Studies, University of the Fraser Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Sevy</td>
<td>Research Associate, Iona Pacific Inter-Religious Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Shimizu</td>
<td>Powell Street Festival Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Smith</td>
<td>Program Director, Simon Fraser University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Somjee</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa St. Cyr</td>
<td>Coordinator, The Bloom Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stein</td>
<td>Research Associate, Iona Pacific Inter-Religious Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Somjee</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela White</td>
<td>Indian Residential School Survivors Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vive Wong</td>
<td>Youth Coordinator, Collingwood Neighbourhood House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Wong</td>
<td>President, Alma Mater Student Society of UBC Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosef Wosk</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia Wu</td>
<td>Business Officer, Western Economic Diversification Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Yip</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Yu</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freydis Welland</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Wadolna</td>
<td>City of Vancouver Seniors Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayne Wai</td>
<td>Past President, Chinese Canadian Historical Society of BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie Waisman</td>
<td>Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukhvinder Vinning</td>
<td>Leadership Council Member, United Religions Initiative North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Weinstein</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajwant Toor</td>
<td>Descendant of the Komagata Maru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Eiko Thomson</td>
<td>Former President, National Association of Japanese Canadians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stevenson</td>
<td>Executive Director, Ministry of Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Eiko Thomson</td>
<td>Former President, National Association of Japanese Canadians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Yip</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Yu</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Wong</td>
<td>President, Alma Mater Student Society of UBC Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosef Wosk</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia Wu</td>
<td>Business Officer, Western Economic Diversification Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Yip</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Yu</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Wadolna</td>
<td>City of Vancouver Seniors Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayne Wai</td>
<td>Past President, Chinese Canadian Historical Society of BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie Waisman</td>
<td>Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukhvinder Vinning</td>
<td>Leadership Council Member, United Religions Initiative North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Weinstein</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freydis Welland</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Centre for Dialogue is grateful to the following individuals who volunteered to facilitate breakout discussions throughout the event:

**Laurie Anderson**, Executive Director, SFU Vancouver

**Sean Blenkinsop**, Associate Professor, SFU Semester in Dialogue

**Michelle Cho**, Director of Marketing and Communications, Reconciliation Canada

**Adara Goldberg**, Education Director, Vancouver Holocaust Education Centre

**Ginger Gosnell Myers**, Aboriginal City Planner, City of Vancouver

**Lizzie Gross**, Director of People Engagement, Reconciliation Canada

**Claire Havens**, Program Manager/Policy Analyst, SFU Carbon Talks

**Elodie Jacquet**, SFU Carbon Talks

**Shelley Joseph**, Community Engagement Lead, Reconciliation Canada

**Marissa Lawrence**, Research Program Coordinator, SFU Centre for Dialogue

**Chitha Manoranjan**, Alumni, SFU Semester in Dialogue

**Sebastian Merz**, SFU Public Square

**Gary McCarron**, Associate Professor, SFU Faculty of Communications

**Brenda Morrison**, Associate Professor and Director, SFU Centre for Restorative Justice

**Robin Prest**, Program Analyst, SFU Centre for Dialogue

**Alisdair Smith**, Deacon & Business Chaplain, Christ Church Cathedral

**Ali Solehdin**, Director, The Laurier Institution

**Carly Teng**, MA Candidate, University of British Columbia

**Janet Webber**, Program Manager, SFU Public Square

**Mark Winston**, Academic Director, SFU Centre for Dialogue

**Baldwin Wong**, Social Planner, City of Vancouver