



Paradiplomacy

Stéphane Paquin

The neologism “paradiplomacy” appeared in scientific literature in the 1980s, during a revival in the study of federalism and comparative politics. It was basically used to describe the international activities of Canadian provinces and American states in the context of globalization and an increase in cross-border relations in North America (Paquin 2004).

The concept’s inventor, Panayotis Soldatos, defined paradiplomacy as “a direct continuation, and to varying degrees, from sub-state government, foreign activities” (Soldatos 1990, 34). Ivo D. Duchacek also espoused the concept, finding it superior to his idea of microdiplomacy, to which a pejorative meaning could be attributed. For Duchacek, adding “para” before “diplomacy” adequately expressed what was involved, namely a sub-state’s international policies that could be parallel, coordinated, or complementary to the central government’s, but could also conflict with the country’s international policies and politics (Duchacek 1990, 32).

S. Paquin (✉)

École nationale d’administration publique (ENAP), Montréal, Canada
e-mail: Stephane.paquin@enap.ca

© The Author(s) 2020

T. Balzacq et al. (eds.), *Global Diplomacy*,
The Sciences Po Series in International Relations and Political
Economy, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28786-3_4

Although the concept of paradiplomacy tends to be the most widely used, it nonetheless remains contested by several authors. Some prefer to use the expression “regional sub-state diplomacy” (Criekemans 2011) while others favor multi-track diplomacy or “multi-level diplomacy” (Hocking 1993). In France, the expression “decentralized cooperation” is sometimes used.

This article is divided into four parts. In the first part, I present the debate around the concept of paradiplomacy. In the second section, I address the issue of the phenomenon’s magnitude in the world. In the third part, I examine how foreign policy skills are formed and shared, and in the last section, I strive to describe what kinds of international actors represent non-central governments in world politics.

THE CONCEPT OF PARADIPLOMACY

According to Brian Hocking, the concept of paradiplomacy was created to reinforce the distinction between the central government and sub-national governments, thereby increasing aspects of conflict between the two levels of government. For Hocking, however, that approach is incorrect. It would be preferable to situate sub-national or non-central governments in their “diplomatic complex environment” (Hocking 1993).

In Hocking’s view, diplomacy cannot be seen as a segmented process between actors within the same state structure. Diplomacy must be perceived as a system intermingling actors from different levels of government and ministries. Actors change according to issues, interests, and their ability to operate in a multi-tiered political environment. Hocking’s rejection of the concept of paradiplomacy is based on “imperatives of cooperation” that exist between central governments and federated states. Thus, rather than talking about paradiplomacy, it would be preferable to refer to it as “catalytic diplomacy” or “multi-level diplomacy” (Hocking 1993). A similar argument is put forward by authors interested in multilevel governance, notably in the context of the European Union. The concept strives to describe the role of Europe’s regions in the process of European construction (Hooghe and Marks 2001).

These concepts are interesting and useful in particular contexts, but they remain limited as they tend to underestimate the autonomy of regions, non-central governments, or federated states in pursuing their own international policies. Bavaria, for instance, is not active solely in Europe. It is deeply involved in activities within the conference of heads of government

in partner regions. This group includes seven regions of sub-state governments (Bavaria, the Western Cape, Georgia, Upper Austria, Quebec, São Paulo, and Shandong) on four continents; they represent around 180 million inhabitants with a total gross domestic product of 2000 billion euros and are working toward economic and sustainable development. The conference of heads of government also strives to create a network that will enable them to deal with the international challenges regions are facing on the international level.

The concept of paradiplomacy should also be distinguished from that of “protodiplomacy” and of “identity paradiplomacy” (Paquin 2002, 2005). Protodiplomacy refers to international strategies designed to promote diplomatic recognition as a way of preparing the establishment of a sovereign country. It is by definition a transitional phase. The concept could define the Catalan government’s strategy in 2017 or that of the government of Quebec before the 1995 referendum on sovereignty-partnership.

The concept of identity paradiplomacy occurs on another level. It represents the international policies of a nation without a sovereign state, such as Quebec, Scotland, Flanders, Wallonia, or Catalonia, when the governments of those nations are not seeking independence (Paquin 2002, 2005; Paquin et al. 2015). Thus, one of the fundamental goals of these nations is to work internationally to further the strengthening or building of their nation within a multinational country. The identity entrepreneurs’ objectives are to promote exports, attract investments, seek resources they lack domestically, and try to gain recognition as a nation in the global arena, a crucial process in any attempt at nation-building. This situation tends to be highly conflictual if the central government is hostile to the “other nation’s” identity-based demands, such as with Catalonia and the Basque region in Spain or with Quebec in Canada.

The concept of identity paradiplomacy is useful in explaining why the Quebec government, for instance, has adopted different international policies from other Canadian provinces. There is a strong identity-driven element in the Quebec government’s international policies. The government’s goal, whether run by federalists or sovereignists, is to reinforce the French language, to support the development of Francophonie, as well as to gain recognition from foreign governments that it forms the “nation” of Quebec. The Quebec government’s bilateral relations with the French government are greater than those between Canada and France and perhaps between Canada and Great Britain. Former Prime Minister of Quebec Jean

Charest met French President Nicolas Sarkozy more often than any other head of state, with the exception of the German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

Furthermore, a distinction should be made between “networks of government representatives” and paradiplomacy. According to Anne-Marie Slaughter, networks of government representatives are governmental or paragonmental actors who exchange information and coordinate their activities in order to manage shared problems on a global scale (Slaughter 2004, 2). Among these actors are financial regulators, police investigators, judges, legislators, and central bank directors, for example. These international governmental networks are a key feature of the current world order according to Slaughter and are increasingly concerned with areas of jurisdiction on all levels of governments. When the Canadian and American police forces coordinate their activities to prevent terrorist attacks, for instance, it involves networks of government representatives rather than bilateral paradiplomacy.

In the case of paradiplomacy, an actor—for example, a ministry—is formally mandated by a federated state or sub-state government to defend the state’s interests and promote them in the international arena. The ministry represents the government as a whole and speaks on its behalf. For example, the empowering legislation for the Quebec government’s Ministry of International Relations and la Francophonie entrusts the ministry with the task of establishing and maintaining relations with foreign governments as well as with international organizations. The ministry must safeguard Quebec’s interests in international negotiations and oversee the negotiations and implementation of “agreements” and international treaties. It attends to the implementation of Quebec’s international policies and handles its 32 representation abroad.

MAGNITUDE OF THE PHENOMENON

A marginal phenomenon in the 1960s and 1970s, paradiplomacy was not only in evidence in North American federated states. It also developed in Europe and elsewhere around the world and even became widespread within unitary states or ones with decentralized or devolved governments such as France, Great Britain, and Spain. It was also increasingly present at the municipal level, notably in global cities like London, New York, Paris, and Shanghai.

Nowadays, the paradiplomatic phenomenon is large, intensive, extensive, and permanent despite the sizeable decline after the 2008 crisis.

The actors of paradiplomacy, protodiplomacy, and identity paradiplomacy have a considerable degree of autonomy, numerous resources, and increasing influence in international politics (Paquin 2004; Aldecoa and Keating 1999; Tavares 2016).

Quebec already had offices in Paris and London in the nineteenth century, despite the fact that very few cases of federated states have been identified as active in the international arena before the 1960s. Since then, things have evolved quickly, to the point where the phenomenon has become quite ordinary. In the United States, for instance, only four states had foreign offices in 1980, compared to 42 with 245 representatives in around 30 countries in 2008. Due to the recession, that number went down to 212 in 2015. In comparison, the American federal government has 267 embassies and consulates around the world (Fry 2017). Germany's Länder have created around 130 political representations around the world since the 1970s, including over twenty in the United States. In Spain, Catalonia has 4 delegations (France, Belgium, Great Britain, Germany) as well as 34 trade bureaus, 4 cultural and linguistic representatives, 9 overseas development offices, 10 tourism centers, and 5 cultural industries representatives. In 2019, the Quebec government had 32 political representations in 18 countries, including the Quebec General Delegation in Paris whose status is akin to that of an embassy. Flanders has had 100 economic offices since 2004 although its activities mainly concern export and investment issues. Wallonie-Brussels international is the institution with the greatest number of trade offices per capita in the world. The phenomenon is also present in more centralized countries. In France, for instance, the Rhône-Alpes region and its partner *Entreprise Rhône-Alpes International* have several economic representations abroad. The same phenomenon can be observed in Japan, India, Australia, Austria, Switzerland, Brazil, and several other countries (Paquin 2004; Aldecoa and Keating 1999; Crikemans 2011).

The international policies of federated states are an important phenomenon involving all international spheres of action, including economic and trade policies, promoting exports, attracting foreign investments and decision-making centers, science and technology, energy, the environment, education, immigration, and the movement of people, bilateral and multilateral relations, international development, and human rights, which are the major paradiplomatic issues. Paradiplomatic actors are also taking an increasing interest in non-traditional security issues such as terrorism, respecting human rights, cybersecurity, pandemics, and public health (Paquin 2004; Lequesne and Paquin 2017).

Some examples of non-central governments participating in various international arenas are: the creation by the governments of California, Quebec, and Ontario of the second largest international carbon market in the world after the European Union; the presence of Australian states in the Australian government's delegation at a UN conference on development and the environment; the presence of representatives from Texas at meetings of OPEC member countries, whereas the United States is not a member of the organization; Jordi Pujol's one-on-one discussions with all the G7 heads of state (with the exception of Canada) while he was President of Catalonia; and the Mexican state of San Luis Potosí's activities to facilitate money transfers sent by immigrants in the United States (Lequesne and Paquin 2017).

Regarding security issues, one may observe: Baden-Württemberg's participation in peacekeeping missions in Bangladesh, Russia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burundi, and Tanzania; the sanctions imposed by the state of Maryland against South Africa in 1985, or the 1996 Massachusetts Burma Law, since invalidated by the US Supreme Court, forbidding public contracts for companies working in Myanmar (Burma); the pressure exerted on the state of Victoria, Australia, to cancel contracts with French companies to protest against the nuclear tests carried out by France in the South Pacific in 1995; national guard officers from American states participating in international military exchange programs, etc. (Paquin 2004).

CONSTITUTIONS AND NON-CENTRAL GOVERNMENTS

Non-central governments hold asymmetrical powers in matters of international politics, which has a considerable effect on their ability to act. That asymmetry exists between countries as well as between regions within them. As a rule, the more decentralized a country, the more non-central governments have constitutional responsibilities that increase their ability to act in the international arena. The more expertise a non-central government has, the more financial resources and a large civil service (Paquin 2004; Michelmann 2009; Crikemans 2011).

In unitary states like Denmark or Israel, non-central governments have very little autonomy. In unitary states with a more decentralized structure like France, or in devolved states like the UK, or quasi-federal ones like Spain, non-central governments have more autonomy, despite the central state's powers remaining dominant (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Typology of various political regimes in relation to the autonomy of non-central governments

<i>Unitary States</i>	<i>Decentralized and Devolved States</i>	<i>Federal States</i>
Denmark	France	Belgium
Finland	Netherlands	Canada
Greece	Portugal	Germany
Ireland	Great Britain	United States
Sweden	Spain	Australia
Israel	Italy	India

Source Author

In federal countries, sovereignty is constitutionally divided between a central government and federated states, such as with Australian and American states, German *Länder*, Canadian provinces, and Belgium's regions and communities. To be designated a federal government, a central government cannot unilaterally modify the constitution to its advantage. In such countries, federated states hold a very high number of responsibilities. In Canada, provinces are responsible for issues of health, education, work, culture, and municipal policies. They are also partly responsible for issues relating to economic development, environmental protection, and even justice.

India and Malaysia have constitutions that explicitly assign exclusive competence in international relations to the central state. But in several other federal countries, such as Canada, Australia, and Belgium, many specialists have highlighted the difficulty for central governments to negotiate and implement international agreements when the latter involve areas of federal jurisdiction (Twomey 2009). In Australia and Canada, the courts have ruled that the central government could negotiate agreements on all subjects, including those pertaining to federal jurisdiction in domestic law, but did not have the power to force states to implement them, which can create major problems with regard to respecting those countries' international commitments. Other constitutions, including those of Australia, Germany, Switzerland, and Belgium, grant explicit powers to regional governments in matters of international relations. The Swiss, German, and Belgian constitutions even grant states the power to sign actual treaties by virtue of international law (Michelman 2009, 6–7).

The Belgian constitution goes even further. Since 1993, Belgium has been a federation that allows states to become true international actors. The division of powers in matters of international relations follows the division

of jurisdiction by virtue of the constitutional principle: *in foro interno, in foro externo*, which can be translated as an international extension of domestic jurisdiction. According to that constitution, there are three kinds of treaties in Belgium: (1) treaties within federal jurisdiction; (2) treaties within the individual states' authority; and (3) combined treaties involving two levels of government that require cooperation between the two in being negotiated and implemented. Furthermore, there is no hierarchy between levels of government, meaning that in reality a Belgian ambassador is not superior in rank to a Flemish diplomat (Paquin 2010).

WHAT KIND OF INTERNATIONAL ACTORS?

What kind of international actors are non-central governments? Their status is halfway between that of a sovereign country and a non-governmental organization (NGO). Their status is ambiguous due to being both sovereignty-bound and sovereignty-free, as James Rosenau has stated (1990).

Since non-central governments are sovereignty-free, they are not recognized actors in international law. Apart from certain exceptions provided for in the domestic laws of countries such as Belgium, these governments cannot formally sign real international treaties as defined by international law. Nor can they have real embassies or consulates.

That said, their status as sovereignty-free actors, thus not formally recognized by international law, does not take away their entire ability to act. Their means of action are more on the level of NGOs. Indeed, non-central governments send fact-finding and outreach missions abroad, take part in trade fairs and certain international forums such as the Davos World Economic Forum, and finance public relations campaigns to increase exports and attract investments. The Canadian province of Alberta was very active in Brussels during negotiations on the EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement in order to make sure that oil from tar sands would not be subject to sanctions by the European Union. Alberta was also highly active in Washington to pressure American officials to approve the Keystone XL pipeline project.

It is also easier for non-central governments to adopt idealistic international positions, and they have greater latitude to take a strong stance on delicate topics. For example, they can more easily condemn the non-respect of human rights. Countries, on the other hand, must take a more nuanced tone and a more diplomatic approach in order to take into account

a number of political and economic factors. Sub-state governments can also defend their interests in foreign courts. The government of Ontario brought the issue of acid rain directly to American judges, as did British Columbia on the subject of the “salmon war” pitting Canada against the United States.

Non-central governments are also sovereignty-bound actors, in that they have partial sovereignty over their territory. Several non-central governments have a minister in charge of international relations and a corresponding ministry. Furthermore, the range of tools available to federated states for international action is nearly as great as for sovereign countries, with the exception of the use of military force. Indeed, several non-central governments have organized official visits with other regional leaders or those from sovereign countries, such as the alternating visits of the prime ministers of France and Quebec. They have representation or “mini-embassies” abroad, establish bilateral and multilateral relations with sovereign countries and other federated states, create institutions for regional or transregional cooperation, and can sign international agreements. In this regard, the government of Quebec has signed 751 of them, including 385 still in effect. Over 80% of these agreements have been signed with sovereign countries. In certain cases, such as the Belgian federated states, it involves actual international treaties (Paquin 2010).

Their localization within a sovereign state gives federated states access to decision-makers from the central government, including actors in the country’s foreign policy. Sharing sovereignty with a central government gives non-central governments a reason to establish an international presence and develop their means of influence. Thus, contrary to NGOs and multinationals, for instance, the government of a federated state may enjoy special access to international diplomatic networks if the central government agrees, and may take part in international negotiations within their country’s delegation (Paquin 2004; Lequesne and Paquin 2017).

The phenomenon is growing. Since the end of the Second World War, there has been an increase in multilateralism and international negotiations. While in the late nineteenth century only one or two conferences or congresses involving official representatives were documented, today there are around 9000. The register of UN treaties provides access to about 250,000

treaties.¹ Multilateralism and international negotiations have therefore become an indissociable component of globalization (Paquin 2013).

Parallel to the above, there has been a substantial increase in federal governments around the world. Within the European Union, for example, only two countries had federal governments after the Second World War whereas today 19 of the 27 countries in the EU have experienced a significant increase in regional governments and several have real federal governments. The Forum of Federations estimates that 40% of the world's population live in federal countries (Lequesne and Paquin 2017).

The consequence of these two phenomena has been that all fields of government activity, even in federated states and municipalities, may enter into the jurisdiction of at least one intergovernmental organization and often of several (Paquin 2010; Lequesne and Paquin 2017). Thus, in the framework of international organizations and thematic conferences, topics are addressed regarding the environment, free trade, procurement contracts, education, public health, cultural diversity, corporate subsidies, treatment of investors, the removal of non-tariff barriers, agriculture, services, etc. In this context, federated states are increasingly aware that their political power or sovereignty—in other words, their ability to develop and implement policies—is the subject of negotiations within multilateral international forums.

Since international negotiations are having a growing effect on federated states' sovereignty, the latter have become crucial actors in negotiations. In the negotiations on climate change, for instance, the UN formally recognized the importance of such actors. According to the UN Development Programme: “[...] most investments to reduce GHG (Greenhouse gas) emissions and adapt to climate change – 50 to 80 percent for reductions and up to 100 percent for adaptation – must take place at the sub-national level”.² Furthermore, at the 16th Conference of the Parties, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in Cancún in December 2010, the importance of the role of non-central governments was stipulated in article 7 of the Cancún Agreements. During his speech to the delegates, the Canadian representative, John Baird, explicitly recognized the role of Canadian

¹From the following website: https://treaties.un.org/Pages/Overview.aspx?path=overview/overview/page1_en.xml (visited June 19, 2018).

²Sabban Michèle, “Réchauffement climatique: les régions veulent avancer,” *Le Monde*, December 29, 2009.

provinces, notably Quebec, on the issue of climate change (Chaloux et al. 2015).

In terms of trade negotiations, the same trend can be observed. The provinces played a greater role during Canada's trade negotiations with the European Union, the largest since the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement in the late 1990s. The European Union demanded that the Canadian government include the provinces in its delegation, with the aim of starting negotiations for a "new generation" free trade agreement. The main reason being that the issue of public procurement contracts in Canadian provinces and cities was of special interest to the European Union in the negotiations.

In that context, the European Union deemed that, for the negotiations to succeed, they had to include representatives from the provinces at the negotiating table, since the latter are not required to implement agreements signed by the federal government in their areas of jurisdiction (Paquin 2013).

There are many precedents in which representatives have taken part in meetings of international institutions—the European Union, the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the World Health Organization and Unesco, or again at the Conference of the Parties, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change—both within a country's delegation, and at times outside it, as with Quebec, New Brunswick, and the Wallonie-Brussels federation regarding la Francophonie.

When central governments block non-central governments' access to international negotiations, the latter may try to influence the negotiations by going on-site. To make its voice heard, the government of Quebec sent several representatives to the conference of the parties on climate change despite the objection of Stephen Harper's climate-skeptic government. Another strategy consists in joining networks of non-central governments and creating an accredited NGO at the negotiations, which is entrusted with the mandate of defending the interests of those actors at the negotiations. This was the case for the NGO Network of Regional Governments for Sustainable Development, which represents the regions' interests in climate change negotiations.

* * *

The paradiplomatic phenomenon, although not generally spectacular, certainly represents an important change in the study of foreign policy and

international politics. It is an extensive, intensive, and permanent phenomenon. The international interests of sub-national governments are highly varied and substantial. These governments have considerable leeway and resources in their international initiatives, despite the asymmetry. In short, the phenomenon can no longer be ignored, even in centralized countries such as France or Sweden.

Although paradiplomacy has progressed a great deal in the last thirty years, and case studies are increasingly numerous, there are still several blind spots. There are few studies on paradiplomacy and security issues analyzed in the broad sense, for example. Moreover, few studies exist on non-central governments and international negotiations, in particular on negotiations and the implementation of international treaties.

REFERENCES

- Aldecoa, Francisco, Keating, Michael (eds.), *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relations of Subnational Governments*, London, Frank Cass Publishers, 1999.
- Chaloux, Annie, Paquin, Stéphane, Séguin, Hugo, "Federalism and Climate Change Negotiations: The Role of Québec," *International Negotiations*, 15 (1), 2015: 291–318.
- Criekemans, David (ed.), *Regional Sub-State Diplomacy Today*, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2011.
- Duchacek, Ivo D., "Perforated Sovereignities: Towards a Typology of New Actors in International Relations," in Hans J. Michelmann, Panayotis Soldatos (eds.), *Federalism and International Relations: The Role of Subnational Units*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 1–33.
- Fry, Earl H., "The Role of US State Governments in International Relations and International Negotiations (1980–2016)," *International Negotiation*, 22 (1), 2017.
- Hocking, Brian, *Localizing Foreign Policy: Non-Central Governments and Multi-layered Diplomacy*, New York (NY), Palgrave Macmillan, 1993.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, Marks, Gary, *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*, Lanham (MD), Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.
- Lequesne, Christian, Paquin, Stéphane (eds.), "Federalism and International Negotiation," *International Negotiation* (Special Issue), 2 (22), 2017.
- Michelmann, Hans (ed.), *Foreign Relations in Federal Countries*, Montreal, McGill University Press, 2009.
- Paquin, Stéphane, "Paradiplomatie identitaire en Catalogne et les relations Barcelone-Madrid," *Études internationales*, XXXIII (1), 2002: 57–98.
- , *Paradiplomatie et relations internationales. Théorie des stratégies internationales des régions face la mondialisation*, Brussels, PIE/Peter Lang, 2004.

- , “La paradiplomatie identitaire: le Québec, la Flandre et la Catalogne en relations internationales,” *Politique et sociétés*, 23 (3), 2005: 176–194.
- , “Federalism and Compliance with International Agreements: Belgium and Canada Compared,” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 5, 2010: 173–197.
- , “Federalism and the Governance of International Trade Negotiations in Canada. Comparing CUSFTA with CETA,” *International Journal*, 68 (4), 2013: 545–552.
- Paquin, Stéphane, Kravagna, Marine, Reuchamps, Min, “Paradiplomacy and International Treaty Making: Quebec and Wallonia Compared,” in Min Reuchamps (ed.), *Minority Nations in Multinational Federations: A Comparative Study of Quebec and Wallonia*, London, Routledge, 2015, pp. 160–180.
- Rosenau, James, *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*, Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie, *A New World Order*, Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Soldatos, Panayotis, “An Explanatory Framework for the Study of Federated States as Foreign-Policy Actors,” in Hans J. Michelmann, Panayotis Soldatos (eds.), *Federalism and International Relations: The Role of Subnational Units*, Oxford, Oxford Press, 1990, pp. 34–38.
- Tavares, Rodrigo, *Paradiplomacy: Cities and States as Global Players*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Twomey, Anne, “Commonwealth of Australia,” in Hans Michelmann (ed.), *Foreign Relations in Federal Countries*, Montréal, McGill University Press, 2009.