“Other Diplomacies” and the Making of Canada-Asian Relations: An Interdisciplinary Conversation

How have societal interactions constituted Canada-Asia relations historically and up to the present? What understandings of Canada-Asia relations emerge if we focus on the diverse connections between Asian and Canadian societies at multiple levels rather than solely on state-to-state interactions? These questions were the starting point for a March 15, 2012 workshop organized by the York Centre for Asian Research (YCAR) with support from the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada. The workshop brought together scholars as well as practitioners from a range of disciplines (see Appendix 1). Discussions centered on preliminary case studies of Canada-Asia societal interactions in the realms of business, education, culture, migration and diaspora, labour markets, scholarly and technical experts, and NGOs and across local, national and transnational spaces, and the everyday realm. The goal was to begin to identify important research questions and empirical evidence that could illuminate the contemporary character of Canada-Asia societal connections and their wider implications. The workshop also explored the concept of “other diplomacies”, which workshop organizers Susan Henders and Mary Young (Forthcoming, 2012) offered as an analytical tool for framing the study of Canada-Asia societal interactions. This paper offers selected highlights from the day-long workshop conversation.
The concept of “other diplomacies”

As Young and Henders use it, the concept of “other diplomacies” tries to capture the ways that societal interactions are functionally similar to official, or state, diplomacy, whether intentionally or otherwise. Like their state counterparts, non-state actors in Canada and Asia: (1) build and maintain relationships with each other; (2) create and disseminate understandings of Canada/Canadians and Asia/Asians; and (3) (re)produce and legitimize or challenge norms that regulate how societies interact. According to Young and Henders, although state policies and support often shape these other diplomacies, the latter typically occur in everyday realms where the limits of state reach are also evident. A focus on other diplomacies reveals the diversity of diplomatic agency across borders, by actors whose understandings of Canada and Asia—and related identities, values and interests—may differ from and even challenge those of the state. As such, Canada and Asia are exposed as complex, socially constructed and spatially contested ideas, identifications and places, as are the norms that govern interactions across the Pacific.

The concept of other diplomacy should be situated within a growing body of scholarship that takes issue with the assumption that the state has a monopoly on diplomatic agency and legitimacy. In particular, it builds on an important edited volume of critical perspectives on Canadian foreign policy that titles as “other diplomacies” a section of articles on non-state actors that challenge the state’s monopoly (Beier and Wylie 2010). There is also a relevant body of literature that examines the importance of societal cross-border roles for the public diplomacy efforts and soft power of the Canadian state (e.g., Potter 2009). At the same time, Young and Henders emphasized the distinction between other diplomacy and public diplomacy. They stated that the former refers to the diplomatic nature of some of what Canadian non-state actors do in their everyday interactions with Asian counterparts, whether or not the state supports or attempts to use these societal actors for its own strategic purposes. By contrast, public diplomacy refers to attempts by states to influence the publics of other states, including by instrumentalizing certain
types of cross-border societal ties.

Workshop participants explored both the strengths and limitations of the other diplomacies concept. According to discussants Derek Hall and Steve Penfold, the term helps the analysis of Canada-Asia societal interactions move beyond the superficial and begin to capture some frequently overlooked characteristics and effects of inter-societal relationships. However, a number of questions remain. Hall and Penfold both pointed to the need clearly to identify what societal activities or interactions do not involve other diplomacy, while panelist Margaret Walton-Roberts suggested the need to further clarify differences between other diplomacy and concepts such as “soft power” and “global civil society”.

Lorna Wright drew attention to the need to determine how much societal interaction is sufficient to produce an impact considered analytically significant. The case studies also sparked discussion of a number of other conceptual as well as empirical issues involved in researching Canada-Asia societal connections.

**The historical moment**

Several participants stressed the need to further specify why other diplomacy may be particularly important to study in the current historical moment (e.g., the current nature of globalization) and how contemporary other diplomacy may be similar or different from its historical precursors. As Penfold argued, societal interactions between Canada and Asia are far from new. Missionaries were the primary early interpreters of Asia to Canadians as early as the nineteenth century, while the intermediary roles of diaspora and business people are also long-standing. Panelist Diana Lary pointed out that not only were missionaries and their families for decades virtually the only Canadian presence in Asia, some missionary children were among the first Canadian state diplomats in Asia when Canada developed a foreign policy separate from Britain from 1931. As Penfold noted, this means the Canadian state has been an independent diplomatic actor in Asia for less than a century. He reminded researchers that there have been societal ties that are older and ongoing, although they
have intensified and changed over time. He thus cautioned researchers not to overestimate the state’s historical strength when trying to understand the weakening of state agency within contemporary neoliberal global order.

**The relative power of states**

The character and relative political and economic power of the Canadian state in Asia affects the impact of societal interactions. Charles Krusekopf suggested that the weakness of the Canadian state in some parts of Asia relative to that of the United States or China is significant. For instance, the Canadian government presence is relatively weak in Mongolia. However, as Sara Jackson discussed in her presentation, Canadian mining companies have been major investors in the country and, from the Mongolian government perspective, are important counters to the presence of Chinese corporate and government actors.

**Competing representations of Canada and Asia**

Several presentations drew attention to the ways that societal actors use representative practices to produce understandings of Canada and Asia, which in turn, challenge the ways that states and other societal actors constitute these entities. In this way, an other diplomacy framework reveals “Canada” and “Asia” as socially constructed and internally and externally contested. The presentation of Susan J. Henders on scholarly “other diplomats” illustrated the point. Henders focused on selected Canada-based scholars of multicultural and multinational accommodation and federalism, whose publications appear to have circulated more widely in Asia since the early 1990s. She argued that the circulation in Asia of Canadian scholarly understandings of this Canadian experience cannot be separated from the contested political project of legitimating Canada and the Canadian political system within Canada. Meanwhile, research is needed to better understand how the Canadian experience of multicultural/national accommodation has been received and inflected in Asian societies that, like Canada, struggle over
issues of the citizenship of indigenous peoples and of national and immigrant minorities.

The production of Canadian and Asian identities through societal interactions extends beyond questions of cultural difference to also include matters of economic inequality and the public-private divide. Mary M. Young’s presentation on the historical involvement of the Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO) in development work in Asia was a case in point. Young drew attention to the representative practices through which Canadians and Asians learn about one another in the most ordinary of interactions. Her focus was on the building of everyday relationships between CUSO staff and volunteers and their diverse Indonesian interlocutors, from peasants to local officials. Young stressed the need for fine-grained studies of these everyday interactions in order to understand the formation and significance of both representative practices and norm-making by societal actors. Lorna Wright, referring to her own experience as a CUSO volunteer in Thailand in the 1970s, emphasized that the effects of these other diplomatic activities need to be studied over time, as their significance may not be immediately apparent. Peter Vandergeest, who also volunteered with CUSO in Thailand, commented that during his own orientation training before going overseas, he was explicitly told by CUSO staff that he would be “representing Canada”.

According to Vandergeest, NGOs often actively create alternative diplomatic spaces where different notions of Canada can be represented to Asian societies, notions that explicitly challenge the values and identifications promoted as Canadian by government officials or other societal actors (e.g., some corporations). Contestation over the values legitimated by Canadian mining in Asia is a case in point. Vandergeest said that NGOs, more than companies or states, often legitimately claim to speak for a broader public interest. Diana Lary reminded participants that transnational religious links between Canada and various Asian societies was another place where dominant understandings of Canadian and Asian values have sometimes been challenged, while at other times reinforced. Margaret Walton-Roberts called the former type of
other diplomacy, “counter” or “contrapuntal” diplomacy.

The presentation of panelist Connie Sorio, of KAIROS Canada, revealed how the diplomacy of NGOs and civil society organizations can be a high stakes game. Sorio said that it was the organization’s contestation of official Canadian diplomacy and policy with respect to the Global South that possibly led to its defunding by the Canadian government in 2009. According to Sorio, KAIROS bases its “people-to-people diplomacy” on the common desire and shared values of some Canadians and Asians to critique the emphasis on profit-making ties in current official and corporate Canada-Asia relations. KAIROS instead aims to build ties that benefit the less powerful. She urged researchers studying Canada-Asia societal relations to think about how their work can help empower those who do not have a voice. Attention should be paid to power inequalities amongst different societal actors, for the resources of many corporations tend to be larger than the shrinking resources of states and of NGOs trying to help the poor and less powerful. That Henders and Young defined other diplomacy as encompassing a range of societal actors with disparate powers and conflicting values, raised questions for Jay Gonzalez. Asking whether corporations really fit, he alluded to the possibility of narrowing the concept to include only those actors and actions that challenge dominant power relations and the values of the powerful.

Some indigenous community leaders in British Columbia and leaders from northern Canada are also actively creating diplomatic spaces where they can represent their own identities and values to Asian mining investors and government officials, the subject of a presentation by Jean Michel Montsion and Heather Kincaide. In seeking direct diplomatic relationships with Asian investors, these leaders aim to be self-determining with respect to the norms that regulate development in the extractive industry sector, so as to manage the benefits, harms and risks for their communities in ways that reflect local identities and locally defined priorities. Montsion and Kincaide described the representational practices at work in the diplomatic encounter in two regions: between communities in the Baffin Island district of Nunavut and Chinese investors and between the B.C. First Nations
Energy and Mining Council and Chinese counterparts. In interviews, leaders drew on discourses that emphasized the genetic, cultural and historical commonalities between Chinese and indigenous and northern communities, including a shared sense of a long history in a certain place as well as a history of Western colonization. As a result of these perceived affinities, leaders spoke of the Chinese as being more inclined than mainstream Canadian investors and officials to respect local communities. Such claims of affinity may also serve as a claim on the good behaviour of Chinese mining companies and as a means of mitigating the unequal power relationships that exist between capital rich companies and many First Nations communities, Montsion and Kincaide said.

Producing agency and power

Societal diplomatic practices, like those of the state, are embedded in and may help reproduce the structures of power that constitute global political and economic order. Young’s discussion of CUSO illustrated how the relationships between CUSO staff and volunteers and their Asian interlocutors have mainly focused on the transfer of “expert knowledge” from Canada to Asia. Therefore, these societal relationships rely on reproducing shared understandings of knowledge creation and knowledge possession/utilization along with the power inequalities that this implies. These regular interactions can be found on an everyday basis, routinely (re)producing the norms that govern what is considered appropriate behavior in the world of development aid.

Discussion of scholars engaged in other diplomacy also raised similar concerns about other diplomacies having orientalist, neocolonial effects when they represent Asian societies and states as inadequate and requiring of outside involvement, including Canada’s. Aparna Sundar asked why, given the long historical experiences that Asians have of living with difference, Canadian scholars have not paid more attention to what Canadians can learn from Asian experiences of multicultural/national accommodation. Henders noted that the academic literature has begun to consider the political effects of assuming that the Canadian experience is a “model”
for other societies. Although, given the Sri Lankan president’s claim, asserted after the 2009 war, that there is a Sri Lankan “model” for dealing with cultural diversity, similar questions need to be raised about the political effects of claims that there are Asian “models”, too, she said. The point is that Canadian scholars in their interactions with diverse Asian interlocutors, are very much implicated in a high-stakes, often violent global political process of contesting the norms that govern how states should legitimately treat claims of cultural difference within their borders.

Maggie Zeng suggested that rather than just seeing pre-existing knowledge flowing between Canada and Asia, research should consider how societal interaction involving Canadians and Asians may produce new knowledge and identities. This production of knowledge and identities can occur in various levels, including at the local level and in ongoing changing contexts with players having different interests and perspectives interacting through their daily routines at both individual and institutional levels.

Contesting Canadian-ness and Asian-ness

The workshop also discussed the analytical challenge of studying something as indeterminate and contested as “Canadian-ness”, “Vietnamese-ness”, “Pakistan-ness” or “Asian-ness”, not least because of intensified transnationalism. Several participants emphasized the need to recognize that some individuals and organizations are neither exclusively “Canadian” nor “Asian”. As Gonzalez put it, diaspora members are often actively transnational, moving back and forth between societies whether bodily or virtually. Eric Li stressed the need for an analytical framework that captures the recursive and two-way nature of societal interactions and related identifications.

The difficulty of pinpointing the “national” identifications of corporate actors sparked discussion and further questions about whether business firms fit the concept of other diplomacies. Sundar noted that many corporations are not strongly associated with a particular country even if headquarter there. Jackson pointed out that many of the
people employed by Canadian mining companies in Mongolia are not actually Canadian and that Canadian firms may often sub-contract work to companies based in other countries. The transitory characteristics of identity were also highlighted. Jackson noted that although the Oyu Tolgoi gold and copper mine in Mongolia’s Gobi Desert was originally developed by Canadian-based Ivanhoe Mines, it is now owned by Australia-based Rio Tinto. In these complex circumstances, researchers must assess the ways that the identities and values produced through the everyday activities of these extractive industry firms are identified as Canadian or associated with Canada in other ways, and the circumstances where this does and does not occur.

At the same time, values claimed as “universal” or “Western” may also contribute to producing understandings of Canada and shape the rules that govern global politics and Canada-Asia relations. There is a long history of Canadian societal actors promoting “universal” values in Asia, including nineteenth-century missionaries preaching a universalist Christian message and extending to human rights activists today. Vandergeest also discussed current Canadian involvement in the development and enforcement of universalist product certification standards in Asia. These standards aim to protect the environment, labour and livelihoods, and consumer health. Vandergeest noted that these standards amount to new forms of private governance of Asian agricultural, forestry and fishery products. Canadian-connected NGOs and corporations, including those that own many of the supermarkets where Canadians buy their groceries, are amongst the actors from the Global North involved in these rule-making activities. Jackson also noted that Ivanhoe Mines helped introduce Corporate Social Responsibility norms to Mongolia, although these were not necessarily constructed by Mongolians or Ivanhoe as “Canadian”, and enforcement often depended on sub-contracted firms and other third parties with no direct connection to Canada.

Several participants stressed the need to pay attention to how race and ethnicity as well as class, gender and sexuality may intersect with Canadian-ness in different spaces and
over time. They were particularly interested in how the involvements of Canadians in other diplomatic activities may be differentiated because of racialization. Similar questions could be raised about Asians differently situated in interacting fields of power related to race, ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality.

**Diasporas and other diplomacy**

In his presentation, Philip F. Kelly explored the crucial role played by the children of immigrants in maintaining ties between Canada and their parents’ countries of origin. Drawing on his research on Canadian youth of Philippine heritage, Kelly said that how these youths make sense of the Philippines as a cultural space and identity significantly affects how they understand their belonging and identity with respect to Canada, including their aspirations and dreams. Often these young people have an inherited “cultural shame”, because of the specific colonial history and legacies of the Philippines and because of the stigmatization of Filipino identity in Canada through association with deprofessionalized service-sector work. While this situation is aggravated by a lack of positive recognition of Philippine history and experiences in Canadian school curricula, some Philippine Canadian youth groups and organizations are working to overcome these representations, by creating empowering counter-representations through critical history courses and through art.

In discussion, Roland Sintos Coloma stressed the importance of theorizing and empirically capturing the affective dimensions of the contact zones and relationships that bring Canada and Asia together. The dreams, fantasies, shame, and hope, whether unconscious or conscious, that often characterize societal encounters are rooted in diverse experiences of empire and neocolonialism in Asia and in Canada, which produce the latter as a white settler colonial nation and empire. “Brand Canada” is a dream, a desire, he said. Coloma suggested that third-space actors such as Filipina/o Canadian youth are particularly interesting in this regard. Their experiences suggest that the complicities and resistances involved in producing Canada or particular understandings of Asia are not always clear cut.

“Brand Canada” is a dream, a desire ...
Faiza Hirji’s presentation discussed the influence Bollywood film has had on how Canadian youth of South Asian Muslim heritage understand themselves and represent themselves to others, as well as how they understand India. The films, created in response to global markets including in the diaspora, illustrate some of the ways that commercial cultural products are central to the societal interactions that link Canada and Asia. The films have been criticized for having strongly Hindu nationalist and middle-class biases. The youth often have feelings of ambivalence about the content of the films, which they know to be an unrealistic portrayal of India. None the less, the films still affect how these young people make sense of their identities and positions within Canada. In particular, the popularity of Bollywood for wider Canadian audiences has made it more acceptable to be of South Asian heritage, helping some youth feel more comfortable with their hybrid position.

Educational ties

The education sector is one of significant interactions between Asian and Canadian societal actors dating back to the nineteenth century. Ann H. Kim noted that there is a long history of Canadian “educators” in Korea, beginning with missionaries in the late nineteenth century. These ties led to the first Koreans coming to Canada as missionary students. The two-way movement of people linked with education continues today. Kim is interested in understanding how the contemporary flow of Canadian ESL teachers to South Korea influences the migration of Koreans to Canada, particularly as students. In her current study of Korean educational migration to Canada, she found that 20 per cent of the individuals interviewed said they had had contact with a Canadian or a Canadian organization prior to migrating. Of these, 40 per cent said that they had had contact with a Canadian teacher. This finding underlines the importance of learning more about how the everyday interactions of Canadian ESL teachers with Korean students and parents shape understandings of Canada and South Korea, and how these, in turn, affect migration decisions. She noted that the Canadian embassy in South Korea has encouraged Canadian ESL teachers to
become unofficial marketers of the Canadian educational brand in ways that attempt to bring more Korean students to Canada. However, it is less clear whether or how Korean students and families view the teachers as Canadian cultural brokers. Research is needed to assess the effects on migration decisions of other diplomatic interactions in ESL classrooms, compared to factors such as interactions with return migrants, immigration brokers and the staff of Canadian offshore schools.

The presentation by Ruth Hayhoe and Qiang Zha explained the ways in which the CIDA-sponsored Canada-China University Linkage Program (CCULP, 1988-1995) had inter-societal dimensions that the concept of other diplomacy may help to capture. While the purpose of CCULP was to assist post-Mao China in developing its higher education capacity, Hayhoe and Zha’s research aims to understand some of its wider and longer-term societal impacts. These include the ways in which Canada-China university partnerships could forge mutual understandings of Canada and China. Universities draw on extensive networks, members of which include governments, private enterprises and community groups. As a result of these networks and links, the outcomes of Canadian-Chinese university linkages can often have far broader influence than originally planned, and help to forge lasting relationships, exchange and cooperation on a people-to-people level.

In discussion, Coloma argued that Canada-Asia interactions in the education sector need to be understood in light of the unequal relations between Canada and Asia and within both. He asked whether Canadian ESL teachers in Asia should be seen as “linguistic missionaries” and asked who benefits from the flow of some of Asia’s best and brightest to Canada to take up Canada Research Chairs. Elena Caprioni noted the ironies produced by the power relations at work: China’s Confucian Institutes are sometimes labeled imperialistic by outside critics, while Canadian teachers in Asia are not usually similarly described.
Other diplomacy, the role of the state, the role of place

Several of presentations highlighted the impossibility of entirely separating the other diplomatic activities of non-state actors from state influences. As Hall stressed, it is often the everydayness and autonomy of Canada-Asia societal interactions that makes them useful to states, even while also ensuring that the state cannot fully instrumentalize and discipline these societal connections. While states are often conscious in their attempts to do so, non-state actors are often not conscious of the ways that their activities are diplomatic in nature or effect. Their other diplomatic roles may be unintended.

Hall cited ESL teaching in Japan as a case in point. In recent decades, the Japanese government has promoted and funded the hiring of foreign, including Canadian, ESL teachers for Japanese classrooms. One aim of this program has been to use the everyday interaction of these teachers with Japanese children to mould the Japanese character in ways that support Japanese prosperity in the global economy. As such, the teachers may well be unconscious of their other diplomatic roles and the instrumentalizing of them by the Japanese state.

Der-yuan Wu’s presentation on China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development (CCICED) drew attention to the challenges of analytically separating the state from the non-state in contexts where both types of actors are closely involved and where they may be closely connected and even form a hybrid. CCICED is a state-sponsored policy advisory body that involves both the Canadian and Chinese governments as well as representatives of epistemic communities. Its additional secretariat is based at Simon Fraser University. While the CCICED appears to have allowed the governments involved to “discipline” non-state actors, Wu argued that there is also evidence of an autonomous diplomatic space for Chinese and Canadian societal actors to articulate understandings of environmental values that sometimes challenge state policies. These inter-societal interactions appear to at least implicitly constitute understandings of Canada and China. They also fit the concept of other diplomacy because they engage in processes whereby the norms of global and Chinese environmental governance...
are constructed and challenged.

In the end, a focus on distinguishing state and non-state actors and on understanding their relationships is important. It helps to clarify the particularities of other diplomacies, the extent and the limits of state power and authority, and the ways that societal actors are used by the state and influenced by state policies and support. Yet, as many of the presentations pointed out, the analysis of Canada-Asia societal interactions should not begin with or only focus on the state/non-state distinction and relationship. As already noted, a focus on history would help avoid the shortcomings of presentism, while the insights of postcolonial and cultural studies would highlight the political and cultural legacies of (neo)colonialism and imperialism that continue to shape other diplomatic encounters, and a political economy approach would highlight the power inequalities structured into global order, to name but a few alternative starting points. Walton-Roberts also pointed out the insights that may come from starting with place. She suggested that this would help clarify how the scale of analysis makes visible different actors, interactions and issues. Scaling up the analysis could help capture the activities of NGOs and such processes as rule-making and engagements between the state and non-state; scaling down the analysis could help to identify such interactions as diaspora relationships with home towns, regional and local interests, and inter-regional ties; scaling the analysis around the state would illuminate the nature of the diplomacies of indigenous and other autonomous political communities, the representatives of which focus on building direct relationships with Asian governments and societal actors. Walton-Roberts also argued that a focus on place would allow the analysis to get away from methodological nationalism and categories.

In summary, the workshop presentations and discussion underlined the importance of research that draws from the strengths of multiple academic disciplines to better understand the nature and significance of inter-societal relations in the making of Canada-Asia relations, broadly understood. Such an approach could both contribute to thicker and deeper descriptions of the historical and contemporary nature of these relations. This approach also contributes
to our understanding of the many questions of power and of social justice at work as well as the complex and often contested identities and places at play.
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Ann H. Kim (Assistant Professor, Sociology, York University)
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Ruth Hayhoe (Professor, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) and Qiang Zha (Associate Professor, Education, York University)

Canada-Asian Transnationalism Among the Children of Immigrants
Philip F. Kelly (Associate Professor, Geography; Director, York Centre for Asian Research, York University)
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Chair: Mary M. Young (Adjunct Faculty, Geography, York University)
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Diana Lary (Professor Emeritus, History, University of British Columbia)
Margaret Walton-Roberts (Associate Professor, Geography, Wilfrid Laurier University)
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Partnerships, KAIROS Canada
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Eric Li (Instructor, Faculty of Management, University of British Columbia-Okanagan Campus)
Regina Lam (PhD Candidate, Ethnomusicology, York University)
Sai Latt (PhD Candidate, Geography, Simon Fraser University)
Hannah Prabhu (MA Candidate, Political Science, York University)
Aparna Sundar (Assistant Professor, Politics and Public Administration, Ryerson University)
Erin Williams (Project Manager, Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada)
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Maggie Zeng (Consultant, Toronto)
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