INTRODUCTION

In 2000 Charles de Gaulle International Airport announced that its air traffic control personnel would abandon the French language in favour for the more widely-spoken English language. And although safety measures in aviation are usually met with understanding, this particular move was met with protest and disbelief. The French government has maintained a strict policy on promoting the French language whenever and wherever possible, and French society is generally not well known for its embrace of the English language. Still, the voice that was able to convince Charles de Gaulle Airport to overturn their decision was not a voice that belonged to a Frenchman.
Even after France lost the colony of New France to the British, the local people in that area have stayed proud of their French roots. New France, now called Quebec, eventually became a province within the Canadian federation, but still insisted on a strong connection with France. That connection grew into a 'special relationship', and that relationship formed the basis of Quebec forming its own foreign policy, focused on France. So, when Charles de Gaulle made their announcement, Quebec was able to convince them that safety was not harmed by the French language. Not only had the airport in Quebec excellent safety grades, it also operated entirely in French. And how could the airport of the French capitol ditch their native tongue, while the Quebecois embraced it?

The case of Quebec is perhaps the most explicit example of the rise of paradiplomacy (Lecours, 2002: 105). Paradiplomacy refers to the idea that sub-national actors can and do intervene in international affairs, even though that is generally considered to be the prerogative of the national government (Cornago, 1999: 40). Thanks to globalisation and governance, the responsibilities of politics in general, and foreign policy in particular, have shifted from the national government to a wide variety of actors. This gives considerable freedom for sub-national actors to shape their own authority (Stoker, 1998). Nearly all scholars that have touched upon this concept agree that there is a large amount of potential power in so-called ‘paradiplomacy’ (Chan, 2016; Curtis, 2011; Acuto, 2013). But even if paradiplomacy has become an international phenomenon, it does not seem to be uniformly present. And although the theoretical concept of paradiplomacy becomes clearer and clearer, the more practical use of paradiplomacy remains quite obscure. The knowledge deducted from real life cases are often based on singular and unique cases, making the universal nature and practical elements of paradiplomacy severely understudied. This thesis aims to take the existing theoretical knowledge and test whether or not it holds up in practice.
1.2: RESEARCH QUESTION

As mentioned in the introduction, this thesis aims to explore and expand our knowledge on how, why and when sub-national actors develop paradiplomacy. To that end, this thesis will try to answer the following research question:

*What factors determine the development of paradiplomacy?*

The development of paradiplomacy refers to the way in which paradiplomacy is set-up, conducted and brought into fruition. The factors that this thesis wants to identify refer to the basic elements that determine how that paradiplomatic endeavour will develop. The ultimate goal of this thesis is to induce how paradiplomacy develops and how uniformly this development is. By attempting to find out how uniformly paradiplomacy develops, this thesis can battle one of the notable blind spots in the research on paradiplomacy; that knowledge is based on one particular case, that is often already renowned for their paradiplomacy. This contribution would help us better understand why, where and how paradiplomacy develops the way it does.

2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Paradiplomacy can be described as the involvement of sub-national actors in international affairs (Cornago, 1999: 40). Paradiplomacy has a lot of overlap with multi-level governance which is originally a description for paradiplomacy conducted within the framework of the European Union (Dickson, 2014: 694-5). A similar claim can be made regarding city diplomacy, which is essentially paradiplomacy conducted solely by cities (Gutierrez-Camps, 2013: 50). Sub-national actors then are defined as being levels of government below the central national government. Usually, ‘sub-national actor’ refers to municipalities and cities, federal states and provinces. For the purpose of clarity, I will refer to the country that
contains the sub-national actor in question as the ‘host nation’, in opposition to the ‘foreign nation’ with whom the paradiplomacy is conducted. Broadly speaking, paradiplomacy can manifest itself in five ways; though cultural bonds, by making economic and commercial agreements, by sub-national actors banding together against their host nations, though soft-power manipulations of the socio-economic and political system, and by using local policies to indirectly influence foreign policy.

In the first use of paradiplomacy, sub-national actors build their paradiplomacy on cultural, ethnic, linguistic ties between them and foreign actors (Cornago, 1999; Keating: 1999; Lecours, 2002). An often reoccurring case study in this corner of paradiplomacy is the province of Quebec, which maintains close ties with France, and in some cases even influencing the French government on its policies regarding the French language (Lecours, 2002: 105). The reason why Quebec is such a regularly discussed case is because it is an already autonomous sub-national actor which a clear link to a foreign national state, something that sub-national actors like Catalonia or Scotland lack. The case of Quebec is also a good example of the use of protodiplomacy, a form of paradiplomacy in which a sub-national actor is attempting to gain international legitimacy for its eventual independence by building strong bilateral ties with foreign national governments. As Lecours points out, Quebec has been a perfect example of protodiplomacy with its relationship to France in the run-up to its independence referendum in 1995 (Lecours, 2002). As this use of paradiplomacy seeks to establish cultural ties between a sub-national actor and a foreign power, a considerable amount of pressure is put on the host nation, especially if the sub-national actor is seeking independence, or when the foreign nation tries to blackmail the host nation.

The second use of paradiplomacy is for economic benefit. Sub-national actors seek contact with foreign states in an attempt to find foreign investments, trade deals or other business
related relations. This is usually done when the sub-national actor in question finds that the national government does not enough to promote a specific local industry abroad (Hocking, 1984: 483). Likewise, the existence of certain valuable resources in a given sub-national actor raises the chance of said actor using paradiplomacy to promote trade in that specific resource (Tatham, 2013: 83). Lecours, in the meanwhile, identifies four steps of free-trade promotion between sub-national actors and national states. These forms are, in order of impact; visits, formal bilateral agreements, multilateral forums, and eventually the earlier mentioned trade-focussed protodiplomacy (Lecours, 2002: 108-9). One of the more interesting aspects of this form of paradiplomacy is how it changes the dynamics among different sub-national actors, their host nations and foreign countries. In Australia for example, a number of federal states competed against one another for profitable trade deals with Japan. In doing so, they not only gave Japan the ability to play these sub-national actors off against each other, but also undermined the national trade policies of Australian national government towards Japan (Hocking, 1986: 482-3).

The third use of paradiplomacy is to build relationships between sub-national actors in order to counterbalance their national government’s policies. Some sub-national actors with shared values will cooperate with other sub-national actors in order to pursue a common goal. These likeminded sub-national actors are bound by a common discourse, will often exchange information and services and are usually active in “issues where there are easily identifiable principled positions” (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2006: 146-7). In some specific cases, this cooperation is a form of opposition to the policies of the host nations. This ‘paradiplomatic counterbalancing’, as I refer to it, is seen most vividly in the cooperation on fighting climate change by a large number of large cities across the world, as they feel that their own countries do far too little or nothing at all (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2006: 143). This tendency to counter the national policy is strengthened as cities have more practical knowledge and/or different experiences in some areas than the national state has, making
it likely that cities differ from opinion on those issues with their national governments, and will seek to cooperate with cities in similar situations in order to address those issues together. It should be noted that a significant amount of scholars point to environmental and climate change policy as fields in which this paradiplomatic counterbalancing occurs frequently (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2006: 147; Chaloux, et al. 2014; Eatmon, 2009).

The fourth use of paradiplomacy is through soft power held over the socio-political and economic system. Influenced by the work on economics of urbanisation, John Friedmann introduced the world city theory in 1986. The world city theory, which is more of a collection of statements than an actual theory, focusses on how the world economy became concentrated in urban areas, and how world cities became the dominant actors in said world economy as multinational businesses, financial institutions, trading and communication all became concentrated in a small number of urban centres since the 1970's (Friedmann, 1986; Curtis, 2011). Sadly, the observations of Friedman and his fellow-world city theorists are quite limited to the field of economics. For this research, the fundamental issue that cities have become the absolute dominant factor of the world economy is the main issue that should be taken away from this. Other world city theorists have pointed out that Friedman's initial observations were indeed too narrowly focussed on economics, and forgot that cities also dominate our (popular) culture, entertainment and news (Hill & Kim, 2000; Abu-Lughod, 1995; Friedmann, 2001). And it is with this claim that we enter the paradiplomatic side of the world city theory. Taken together, the world city theory might be used as the fundament for a form of paradiplomacy though soft power specifically, shaping the culture, economy and socio-political system itself, and influencing the actors within that system though more subtle methods.

The fifth use of paradiplomacy is through the various ways in which sub-national actors participate in international politics indirectly. In these cases, the sub-national actor makes
policies that are predominantly focussed on the local level, but are still fundamentally though indirectly linked to foreign policy. To give a few examples; sub-national actors can declare themselves nuclear free, meaning that they won't allow any nuclear weaponry on their soil which can have a significant effect on the foreign policy and defence policies of their host nation. Similarly, sub-national actors can evict a consulate from their territory (as San Francisco did to the Soviet consulate after the 1983 Korean Airlines incident). If US courts sentence a foreign national to death, the foreign governments can only plead with the state government in charge of the execution, and not with the US State Department who is usually in charge of such diplomatic affairs (Shuman, 1986: 154; Ku, 2006: 2386-90). These indirect forms of paradiplomacy influence international affairs in two ways. “First, by pluralising the actors engaged in the governance of security (forcing us to question who does foreign policy) and second, by blurring the boundaries between [...] domestic and international (forcing us to question where foreign policy happens)” (Dunton & Kitchen, 2014: 192). In each case, the sub-national actor in question does something that is well within their jurisdiction, but has indirect effects on international affairs and the foreign policy making of their host nation.

Examining these five manifestations of paradiplomacy, we can conclude that paradiplomacy has a wide range of possible policies in roughly three fields of subject matter. Paradiplomacy based on cultural ties and paradiplomacy based on economic benefit are both strictly dedicated to culture and economics. A third field, political paradiplomacy, can be seen as the basis of paradiplomacy though networking, paradiplomatic counterbalancing and even protodiplomacy. These three fields, which will be explored in the coming chapters, will be used to gauge the paradiplomatic endeavours throughout this thesis.

3: RESEARCH DESIGN
In order to find out how paradiplomacy develops in sub-national actors, three sub-national actors will be examined on three fields of paradiplomacy. The case studies, Quebec, Scotland and Quebec, are among those sub-national actors who are most likely to develop paradiplomacy. All three have a history of independence or independence movements, and all three are part of federal or devolved countries. Sub-national actors in federal systems have more autonomy than those in more unity states. This is especially the case if the sub-national actor pre-dates the host nation and thus can claim to be “more sovereign” than the host, as is the case with all three cases discussed here\(^1\) (Hocking, 1986: 483-4). The fact that all three cases are part of Anglo-Saxon countries, and are all capable enough to maintain a paradiplomatic endeavour, should minimalise cultural and practical differences. So, theoretically speaking, these sub-national actors should have a similar views and experiences with the use of paradiplomacy. If these similar cases do not have similar experiences, than it can be concluded that paradiplomacy does not develop uniformly, but instead is subject to a wider array of determining factors.

How these sub-national actors engage in paradiplomatic activities will be explored by dividing those activities into three categories; cultural, economic, and political paradiplomacy. These three forms differ from one another on the topics they address, the methods they use, and the goals they try to achieve. This separation between cultural, economic and political forms of paradiplomacy is derived from the sources in the literature review, and on similar distinctions made by other scholars\(^2\). Each category has a number of specific uses of paradiplomacy that will be discussed; the creation of an international personality and the availability of a special relationship in cultural paradiplomacy, the constitutional ability to sign trade agreements for economic paradiplomacy, and

---

1. Scotland was an independent kingdom until the Acts of Union in 1707. California was a short-lived independent republic in 1846 before joining the United States. The Province of Quebec was a British colony almost a century before Canada was founded.
2. These scholars being Keating (1999), Cornago (1999), Lefevre & d'Albergo (2007), and Criekemans (2010)
protodiplomacy and climate change policy for political paradiplomacy. These specific uses are, according to the literature, common for sub-national actors, and should therefore be a good way to measure the basics of paradiplomatic development. The following chapter will discuss these forms of paradiplomacy in detail, with the study cases being explored in the subsequent chapter.

The goal of these three case studies and categories is to get a sense of how uniformly developed paradiplomacy is in most likely cases. This level of paradiplomatic development is based on if the sub-national actor is actually willing to make policy on that topic, and if international actors recognise and engage that sub-national actor on those policies. So, for example a highly developed economic paradiplomacy means that the sub-national actor attempts to, and is successful in, making international trade deals with foreign actors. A developed paradiplomatic endeavour has both willingness and success. When a sub-national actor shows willingness, but has not achieved any successes, it can be labelled as paradiplomatic endeavour ‘in development’. An undeveloped paradiplomatic endeavour means that the sub-national actor has no willingness to make paradiplomacy. All three study cases will be classified as either developed, in-development or under developed on each of the three categories.

4: FORMS OF PARADIPLOMACY

4.1: CULTURAL PARADIPLOMACY

The first category is paradiplomacy based on culture, history, linguistics or ethnicity. This form of paradiplomacy is commonly used for sub-national actors to make friendships with actors with whom they share some form of shared or similar cultural, historical, linguistic or ethnic identity. More specific, cultural paradiplomacy is a strategy for sub-national actors
whose identity sets them apart from the rest of their host country. This strategy is used to strengthen their own culture and identity via a foreign actor with some shared cultural identity (Keating, 1999: 4-5). This tactic is closely related to protodiplomacy, where a sub-national actor tries to find international support for its independence movement by strengthening cultural ties with foreign actors. Because protodiplomacy is using culture for political efforts, we will count it as political paradiplomacy, though the overlap is significant. Cultural paradiplomacy is frequently expressed through official “sister bonds” that officially link sub-national actors with one another, student exchange programs, cultural festivals, and tourism (Kirby et al, 1995: 273).

The creation of an international personality is an important first step in the establishment of a successful paradiplomatic effort. Because the national government usually limits the sub-national actor’s access and legitimacy in international politics, sub-national actors first have to establish some distance between the host nation and themselves. By creating an image of a somewhat independent actor, sub-national actors can put pressure on their host nation to acknowledge this more independent status by broadening the sub-national actors’ responsibilities, while simultaneously getting recognised by foreign actors as an independently operating actor (Lecours, 2002: 104). And as Keating points out, cultural paradiplomacy is usually focussed on foreign actors with a similar cultural identity. So, the research on cultural diplomacy will explicitly discuss the existence of an international personality (or lack thereof), and the relationship between the sub-national actor and its culturally-similar foreign connections.

4.2: ECONOMIC PARADIPLOMACY

In this second category, sub-national actors seek general economic benefits through “investments, markets for their products, and technology for modernisation” (Keating,
1999: 4). Nowadays, these efforts are usually achieved by pushing for free trade, and by inserting the sub-national actors own regional economy into the international economy (Keating, 1999: 4). This can make economic paradiplomacy slightly more intimate than cultural diplomacy, as it relies on a higher degree of international engagement and on binding agreements on trade. Other forms of economic paradiplomacy include the opening of trade offices in foreign countries, or sending trade missions across the world. Of course, matters of economics and culture can overlap. Tourism can easily become an attempt to make money via cultural identity. Likewise, economic opportunity and cultural understanding can precede one another. This is common with sister cities, where cultural motivations tend to pave the way for more commercial activity down the road (Baycan-Levent et al, 2009). All things considered, this category covers roughly the same topics and methods as economic paradiplomacy discussed in the literature review.

4.3: POLITICAL PARADIPLOMACY

This form describes the policies and actions undertaken by sub-national actors in order to achieve or satisfy a certain political principle or goal, rather than gain economic benefit or strengthen cultural ties. This makes this category more complex than the others, and includes a wider variety of possible actions. The literature review addressed a wide range of manifestations of political paradiplomacy, including protodiplomacy, indirect paradiplomacy, cooperation through networks and paradiplomatic counterbalancing. Protodiplomacy is a form of political paradiplomacy of particular interest for analysing the three case studies. All three have some form of independence movements, and protodiplomacy is specifically used to strengthen the ties to foreign nations in order to gain political support for the sub-national actors’ struggle for independence. In addition, this research will explicitly look at the use of networks and paradiplomatic counterbalancing in climate change policy. This seems to be a common form of political paradiplomacy,
according to scholars like Betsill and Bulkeley. So, whether or not the case studies use this form of paradiplomacy is therefore likely to tell us something about their level of paradiplomatic development in general.

5: RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

The following chapters will deal with the actual research and analysis of the cases. The cases will be discussed one by one, during which all the three categories will be explicitly examined. First is the province of Quebec, and its cultural, economic and political paradiplomacy. Then, in a similar manner, the cases of Scotland and California, followed by the chapter in which the findings are compared and discussed.

5.1: QUEBEC

The Canadian province of Quebec is generally seen as ‘the master’ of paradiplomacy. Quebec has a de facto independent foreign ministry, including a foreign minister, since the mid 1980’s. This paradiplomatic service has 30 offices in 18 countries, and is better funded and has more personnel than all the states in the neighbouring US combined. The core of this paradiplomatic activity is the French language, and the connection to the French heritage that comes with it. This helps Quebec set itself apart from the rest of the Anglo-Saxon Canadian federation, and sees itself as one half of a binational nation (Mark, 2010)

The Quebecois paradiplomacy finds its roots in the Quiet Revolution of the 1960’s. During this period, the Quebecois civil society transformed itself from a “state-less, insular, conservative, catholic polity to a modern, open, secular and outward-looking state”. The transformation of the civic culture during this period brought both a more nationalistic and international character to the province, and solidified the idea that Quebec was a polity
distinct from the rest of Canada. The notable Quebecois politician Gérin-Lajoie declared that Quebec was “from a political point of view” a state (Mark, 2010: 70). The same Gérin-Lajoie gave birth to the so called Gérin-Lajoie Doctrine, which states that “the constitutional competence of Canada’s provinces over their exclusive spheres of jurisdiction extended even into the international realm, giving Quebec the absolute right to establish its own international contacts and conduct its own international affairs in fields such as (...) cultural policies” (Gendron, 2016: 225). In other words, if Quebec has the constitutional right to make domestic policy on a given issue, it has the right to make foreign policy on that issue. This doctrine forms the legal basis of Quebec's paradiplomacy (Hillmer, 2008).

The distinctive character of Quebec finds its apex in its independence movement and its two independence referenda in 1980 and in 1995. The 1980 referendum was quite decisive, with only 40% voting for secession, and 60% voting against. In the second referendum, however, this 20 point gap was brought down to just over 1%. Although the separatists lost, they did so by only a hair, highlighting how popular the independence movement had become (Lemieux & Noël, 2006).

5.1.1: QUEBEC AND CULTURAL PARADIPLOMACY

Quebec's paradiplomacy, as mentioned earlier, is heavily grounded in matters of culture, linguistics, and identity. According to the Quebec Ministry of International Relations, the province has signed 306 binding international agreements on cultural and educational matters, and another 31 non-binding agreements and multilateral conventions on the same issues (Ministère des Relations Internationales et de la Francophonie, 2017).

The French language and heritage form the core of Quebec's distinctive character, and therefore of its cultural paradiplomacy. The province has a so-called ‘special relationship’
with the French Republic and is an avid member of the Francophonie. The dominant place of the French language in Quebec is displayed by the fact that only a mere 40% of all French-speaking Quebecois are also able to speak English (Cornut, 2016; Statistics Canada, 2016). As Lecours mentions, establishing an international personality is a key step in setting up a paradiplomatic effort. And indeed, during the Quiet Revolution of the 1960's, Quebec managed to change its personality from a closed and conservative province to a open and modern state. Quebec began stressing that Canada was a binational country, with Quebec being one half of the two polities in the federation. In response, the federal government of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau attempted to frame the Canadian federation differently, stating that Canada was a multicultural country, with Quebec being one of multiple different cultures. In another attempt to temper the distinctiveness of Quebec, Trudeau established French as the official second language for entire Canada. In doing so, he made sure that, on paper, the French language was not limited to Quebec (Mark, 2010: 70-5). And though Quebec remains a province within the Canadian federation, Trudeau was not able to halt Quebecois nationalism all together. To this day, the French language remain the fundament of Quebec’s cultural character and its paradiplomacy.

5.1.2 QUEBEC AND ECONOMIC PARADIPLOMACY

The legal basis for Canadian provinces ability to conduct economic paradiplomacy is quite complicated. There are two phenomena at play that allow the province of Quebec a rare degree of freedom in establishing economic policy. First, is what Kukucha refers to as ‘constitutional ambiguity’ with regard to matters of economic as well as environmental paradiplomacy. Most of this ambiguity, Kukucha suggest, comes from the complex web of rulings by the constitutional court (Kukucha, 2005: 129-37). The second phenomenon at play is the earlier mentioned Gérin-Lajoie Doctrine, that allows the province of Quebec to engage internationally on its domestic matters. Aside from economic matters that fall
within the jurisdiction of the province, Kukucha argues that global trade is being perceived as such a fundamentally impactful matter on the province's domestic affairs, that having an economic paradiplomatic policy would be both morally and legally justifiable (Kukucha, 2004: 114). These phenomena result in a situation in which the province is able to operate essentially independent from the rest of Canada in regards with economic paradiplomacy (Rioux Ouimet, 2015: 110). This autonomous position of Quebec includes that the province has to approve international agreements made by the federal government on matters that are the jurisdiction of the province. As of 2017, the Quebec Ministry of International Relations claims to have signed at least 142 separate, binding international agreements on matters that fall within the field of economic paradiplomacy³, while acknowledging only 9 international agreements made by the federal government on the same matters (Ministère des Relations Internationales et de la Francophonie, 2017). That means that of all the binding international agreements on economic matters in the province of Quebec, only 6% are made by the federal government.

### 5.1.3: QUEBEC AND POLITICAL PARADIPLOMACY

France, and to a lesser degree the Francophonie, play central and pivotal roles in Quebec's political paradiplomacy. During the Quiet Revolution, French President Charles de Gaulle visited Montreal and declared to a square filled with applauding protesters “vive le Quebec libre” (Axworthy, 2013). Understandably, this caused a diplomatic squabble between the federal Canadian government and the French government. And after this initial expression of support, France has remained more discreet in its attitude towards Quebecois independence, adopting a principle of non-interference. Nevertheless, the ‘special relationship’ between the two remained, not only as the target for cultural paradiplomacy,
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³ The Ministry of International Relations of Quebec has a database of all its 732 international agreements, which can be explored by category. It can be difficult to establish which agreement constitutes economic paradiplomacy and which does not. However, in order to get an estimate on the number of agreements, I have considered the categories of agriculture, commerce, economic development, finances, communications, transportation and taxations to fall within economic paradiplomacy.
but also as the basis for its protodiplomacy (Cornut, 2016: 171). In the run up to the 1995 independence referendum, the Quebecois premier visited the French president in Paris, and was welcomed in a fashion usually reserved for the leaders of actually independent nations. During this visit, then-President Chirac said that “in the event that this referendum would be positive (...) France should immediately stand alongside Quebeckers” (Lecours, 2002: 108p). Then-premier of Quebec, Parizeau, operated with the assumption that if and when France would provide the new Quebec state with international support and legitimacy, it would not also push the rest of the Francophonie to do so, but also the United States. The United States would, was the argument, not accept that the French would “make a crucial diplomatic move in its immediate sphere of influence” (Lecours, 2002: 108). By relying on its relationship with France, Quebec could legitimise both its quest for independence, and, if it happened, its existence as an independent state as well.

Aside from its significant use of protodiplomacy, Quebec also uses political paradiplomacy in the field of environmental policy. Despite being one of the initial supporters of the Kyoto Protocol, Canada left the protocol under the leadership of Conservative Prime Minister Harper in the mid 2010’s. As a federation, Canadian provinces are free to pursue climate change policies of their own accord. Quebec frequently sends its own delegates with the national Canadian delegation to international climate negotiations, it participates in forums held surrounding those negotiations, and implemented a shared carbon market with California. As of 2017, Quebec has signed a total of 46 binding international agreements on environmental matters, with another 25 non-binding agreements and multilateral conventions on the same subject (Ministère des Relations Internationales et de la Francophonie, 2017). By the mid 2000’s, even before actually leaving the Kyoto Protocol, there was “no such thing as a single Canadian voice on climate change, neither international nor domestically. As an international actor, Canada had become a fragmented entity” (Chaloux, et al. 2014: 307).
5.2 SCOTLAND

The case of Scottish independence is one of the more prominent contemporary secession causes in Europe. Scotland was its own country until the Acts of Union in 1707, with Scottish nationalist movements gaining some steam with the rise of British nationalism during the 1970’s, and with subsequent Conservative governments and neoliberal policies in the 1980’s. These conservative and neoliberal policies were felt as damaging to the generally more social and left-wing identity of Scotland, and were a factor for many Scots to favour a more independent position from the relatively right-wing Westminster parliament (Law & Mooney, 2012).

Since 1999, Scotland has its own parliament and government, and has the ability to make policies on every political matter except the so called ‘reserved’ powers. As of 2017, these reserved powers include defence, constitutional matters, immigration, trade policy, and foreign affairs (Scottish Parliament, 2017). Though the first Scottish governments were led by the unionist Labour Party, the Scottish Nationalist Party have been in power for the last decade, and declared a referendum on its independence. Although the referendum was won decisively in favour of the unionists, and was supposed to be the only one in a generation, the idea of a second referendum popped up again after the Brexit referendum. While the Westminster government is pushing for a hard Brexit, the Scottish government wants to remain in the EU if at all possible. Scottish First Minister Nicola Sturgeon declared that her government wants more devolved powers in order independently pursue Scottish national interests in the Brexit-age (The National, 2016). The coming years might prove to be pivotal for Scotland’s development of paradiplomacy.

4 Unionist favour a united Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and therefore oppose the independence of any of the four countries that make up the United Kingdom.
5.2.1: SCOTLAND AND CULTURAL PARADIPLOMACY

Although Scotland has a strong cultural image, the actual cultural policy was mostly a centralised matter for the Westminster government until devolution in 1999 (Orr, 2008: 310). After devolution, then-First Minister McConnell stated that culture stood at the core of Scottish government activity (McConnell, 2003). This was perhaps a logical and expected step, as cultural policy was the foremost matter in which Scotland wanted to make a difference from the past decades under Westminster rule. And although this focus on culture has prevailed, the quick succession of different governments in the early years of the new Scottish government did hamper the development of such policies (Bonnar, 2014: 145).

When it comes to creating an international personality, Scotland strengthens its image by being the polar opposite of England. Whereas England voted for Brexit, Scotland voted against. Especially in the wake of the Brexit referendum, Scottish nationalists framed the Scottish support for the EU as a sign of Scottish cosmopolitanism. First Minister Sturgeon repeatedly stressed the value of international cooperation, the contributions made by foreigners in Scotland, and Scotland's commitment to social liberties. This, in a sense, creates the idea that Scottish separatism is entwined with cosmopolitanism, and stands in opposition to Brexit-voting England (Knight, 2017). But also in more subtle ways, Scotland can also provide an antithesis. The devolved Scottish government has made sure that there were no university fees for Scottish students in Scottish universities, whereas other UK universities still require a 15,000 euro student fee per year (Hunter Blackburn, 2015: 33-4; New York Times, 2011). All these policies are attempts to establish Scotland as more socially egalitarian and cosmopolitan than England.
Still, we must also conclude that Scottish cultural policy seems to focus mostly on matters of tourism and promotion of local culture for economic purposes. Though this might be good for business, it doesn’t allow for the development of solid transnational relationships with foreign actors. Scotland declared 2009 the ‘Year of Homecoming’, focusing on its diaspora (Orr, 2008: 315). As some scholars have noted, a diaspora can be a strong mechanism for cultural paradiplomacy, as it gives the actor in question the ability to engage internationally with its own people (Cantir, 2015). However, Scotland did not take this opportunity, but kept its diaspora activities limited to its tourism industry. In that prospect, Scotland limits its own cultural paradiplomacy to economic benefit. However, Scotland has created a strong international personality which can be the groundwork for a strong paradiplomatic endeavour in the coming years.

5.2.2: SCOTLAND AND ECONOMIC PARADIPLOMACY

As trade policy is one of the reserved matters, the Scottish government does not have any right to make international trade deals or agreements of the sorts (Scottish Parliament, 2017). Aside from not having the appropriate devolved powers, Scotland is a member of the European Union, which covers matters of free trade. However, as the UK prepares to move out of the European Union, a new motivation for economic paradiplomacy arises.

In the aftermath of the Brexit referendum, Prime Minister Theresa May made it clear that the British government would attempt to negotiate a so-called hard Brexit. This means that the UK would also leave the European single market and customs union. However, First Minister Sturgeon, citing the fact that Scotland overwhelmingly voted remain, is adamant in her view that Scotland should remain within the European single market. In order to achieve that, Sturgeon argues for the UK, or an either independent or autonomous
Scotland, to enter the European Free Trade Agreement\(^5\) (Gallagher, 2017). It seems that, as the Conservative government is aiming for a hard Brexit, Scotland might attempt to enter the EFTA on its own. However, Scotland does not have the constitutional rights to enter the EFTA as a constituent country of the UK, and EFTA-member Norway states that only fully independent countries can become members of the EFTA (von Ondarza, 2017). Still, the current situation is more complex. Prime Minister lost her parliamentary majority in the 2017 snap election, hurting her mandate in the run-up to the Brexit negotiations. Currently, different stories circulate regarding May's position on Brexit. Some sources state that her recent fall from grace will soften the Brexit (Guardian, 2017b), others say that Brexit will remain hard (Telegraph, 2017), and others argue that a parliamentary-wide approach to the negotiations must take place (Guardian, 2017c). If May opts for (and succeeds in getting) a softer Brexit, Scotland might feel reassured, as it keeps some connection to the European Union. However, opponents of the SNP argue that First Minister Sturgeon is hell-bent on holding a second independence referendum anyways (Davidson, 2016). If a second referendum will be held, the hardness of the Brexit and the options for re-entering the EU are likely to become major considerations for the Scots. It is also possible that the Westminster government, mirroring its actions during the 2014 referendum, would try to keep the Scots aboard by offering more devolved powers. Scotland's economic paradiplomacy is not only in development, but stands at a crossroads.

### 52.3: SCOTLAND AND POLITICAL PARADIPLOMACY

Similar to its economic paradiplomacy, Scotland's political paradiplomacy has been curbed due to the lack of constitutional abilities, the short amount of time since devolvement, and a lack of political stability and continuity in the first years since devolution. An early and

---

\(^5\) The European Economic Area is the area containing the European Internal Market, and contains the countries that are either member of the European Union or the European Free Trade Agreement. In other words, Scotland could remain in the internal market if it left the EU but could get a seat in the EFTA.
minor attempt at political paradiplomacy related to the so called ‘Arc of Prosperity’, suggested by First Minister Salmond. This arc would unite a number of relatively small but prosperous countries in Europe's northwest; Ireland, Scotland, Iceland, Norway, Denmark and Finland (Criekemans, 2010: 50). Salmond argues that countries like Iceland, Norway and Ireland are all relatively new and affluent, just like an independent Scotland would be (The Scotsman, 2006). Scotland would also fit in relatively well in the members of the arc on other grounds, as it shares both the general geographical location as well as a general taste for social-democratic politics with the Scandinavians. Even so, the idea of a Scottish-Scandinavian relationship has failed to developed into anything tangible. Despite the similarities, there seems to be no real interest in adopting or re-imagining Scotland as a Scandinavian country (The Guardian, 2014).

The run-up to its independence referendum in 2014 might have been the ideal time for Scotland to engage in protodiplomacy. First Minister Salmond’s Arc of Prosperity had failed, and there is no proof that the Scottish government had attempted something else in the run-up to the referendum. It would be quite sensible if Scotland had attempted to strengthen their ties with Brussels, or individual EU members. The Scottish separatist camp made it clear that Scotland would to become (or remain) an EU-member state if it became independent, something which was disputed by the ‘Better Together’ campaign. A solid political paradiplomatic endeavour towards Brussels might have given Scotland the needed support for their membership claims.

That being said, Brexit has provided Scotland with new motivations to operate more independently from the UK. Scotland sees the EU as a bulwark against Westminster’s power in the UK, and thus has a serious interest in remaining politically engaged in the EU (Gallagher, 2017: 32). This dynamic follows roughly the same argumentation as with Scotland’s economic paradiplomacy; Scotland wishes to remain in the EU, and might go so
far as to hold a second referendum on its independence in order to achieve that goal. At this stage, it is hard to gauge how the political paradiplomacy of Scotland will develop. It seems that throughout the Brexit negotiations, First Minister Sturgeon will push for the softest possible Brexit. If Westminster keeps steering towards a hard Brexit, then Scotland will possibly adopt a protodiplomatic endeavour, with the aim of paving the way for Scottish independence. That being said, Scottish Conservative leader Davidson points out that support for independence after an initial Brexit surge is back at pre-Brexit level, and that Scots might not want to “double down” on political uncertainty with their own independence shortly after Brexit (ECFR, 2016). A significant change relative to the 2014 referendum has come from the EU itself instead. The Spanish government has stated that it will not veto Scotland’s EU membership, and if the EU wants to make the UK suffer for its withdrawal, it might be more than happy to assist Scotland in becoming independent (Guardian, 2017a). In other words, it is hard to see what the future will bring for Scottish independence, but it is probable that the current Scottish government will use paradiplomacy in an effort to remain as much in the EU as possible.

5.3 CALIFORNIA

In many ways, the State of California both resembles and deviates from Scotland and Quebec. On the one hand, California has a history as an independent nation, and has secessionist movements. On the other hand, the independent California Republic was unrecognised and only lasted for 22 days. Meanwhile, its independence movement is far less influential than similar movements in Scotland and Quebec, and seems to be mostly motivated by the recent election of Donald Trump as president of the United States (NBC News, 2016). However, California might have a strong political motivation to use paradiplomacy to go its own way. A more autonomous, if not entirely independent, California could finally push through its more radical ambitions regarding gun ownership,
drug laws, and immigration policy (Poulos, 2017). As one of the liberal bulwarks, the state steps out of line with the more conservative parts of the country. And together with highly international industries like high-tech and cinema, it would be reasonable to assume that the state is motivated to engage in paradiplomacy.

5.3.1: CALIFORNIA AND CULTURAL PARADIPLOMACY

As the home of America’s film, music and technology industries, Californian products and popular culture represent the Golden State throughout the world. The state does not really need to rely on a government-led campaign to develop an international personality. According to Starr, the 20th century saw California becoming somewhat of a leading state of the United States, and a socio-cultural and economical trendsetter. It presented its own version of the American Dream that was more promising in its prospects for everyone who moved to the Golden State, giving the state an almost glamorous appeal to most Americans (Starr, 2009; The Atlantic, 2009). Whereas Quebec and Scotland have attempted to modernise their international image, California essentially determines what is considered to be modern in the first place. The state has such a strong hold on American culture that it does not need to distance itself from it in the way that Quebec needs with Canada. However, paradiplomacy is not a product of artists or industry, but a centralised governmental endeavour based on cultural identities. So, when it comes to the establishment of an international personality, California is in a weird position. Despite being a cultural superpower, California’s paradiplomacy in this field is highly underdeveloped.

When it comes to actual policies, two different observations can be made. First, Californian cities themselves seem to be keen to use paradiplomacy (both political and cultural) outside of the framework of the Californian state. This issue will be discussed in the section
on political paradiplomacy. Second, California does maintain some international, paradiplomatic cultural policies. It has 28 sister state relations, which operate similarly to sister cities, and connect regions across the world based on their historic, cultural, or societal similarities. These relationships include the Spanish province of Catalonia, famous (or infamous) for its independence movements; and South Korea and Taiwan, two sovereign countries (California State Senate website). And although this presents the idea that California is as powerful as some sovereign nations, it does not seem to actually tie into a larger paradiplomatic strategy.

5.3.2: CALIFORNIA AND ECONOMIC PARADIPLOMACY

The ability of California to engage in economic paradiplomacy seems to be limited. According to Bilder, the national government “is the sole representative of the United States in its dealings with foreign nations, that it is entrusted with full and exclusive responsibility and control over our nation's foreign relations (...) Thus, states are expressly forbidden to make treaties (...) and they may make other ‘agreements or compacts’ only with the consent of Congress”. Despite these very clear terms, there is some room for economic paradiplomacy outside of formal agreements.

Sub-national actors are entirely free to open trade or investment offices, or engage in trade or investment missions to foreign actors (Bilder, 1989: 823-6). Indeed, California has a trade and investment office in Shanghai (Governor's Office of Business & Economic Development website). And the governor has partaken in 22 different trade missions to at least 12 different countries since 1984 (Calchamber website). However, a somewhat confounding aspect of economic paradiplomacy is presented by the National Governors Association for Best Practices (NGA), who states that at least 24 out of the 50 states, including California, maintain “cooperative trade, cultural and/or educational agreements with Israel” (NGA, 2003: 12). It is possible that these “cooperative” agreements might be fair game for states,
as long as they are not binding. Another possibility is that these agreements have been approved by congress, meaning that there is plenty of precedent for congress allowing paradiplomacy to take place. Or the US government could feel that cooperation between US states and the state of Israel, a close US ally, might not pose any risks. This would mean that the US government has no intention of blocking paradiplomacy, as long as it is with trusted allies. And indeed, blocking such cooperation would come across as intrusive interference in local matters by the federal government, and might be seen as inhospitable behaviour towards Israel (Shuman, 1984: 171). It does seem that California is making an effort to extend its economic strength by the use of economic paradiplomacy, though it remains limited in its abilities by the federal government.

5.3.3: CALIFORNIA AND POLITICAL PARADIPLOMACY

There are two political paradiplomacy efforts within the state of California; one operated by cities, and another based on international environmental policy. First are the large cities, mostly San Francisco and Los Angeles, engaging in cultural and political paradiplomacy. Shuman points out that San Francisco has negotiated trade pacts with Shanghai and Haifa, has divested hundreds of millions of dollars in funds supporting apartheid, and its city council voted to evict the Soviet consulate in 1983 (Shuman, 1986). More recently, both San Francisco and Los Angeles are members of climate change combating networks as the ICLEI and C40, and the international network of Mayors for Peace (Zaffos, 2016; Schroeder, 2011). The fact that California has two very internationally active, paradiplomatically-able cities within its territory could demonstrate the value of paradiplomacy. These cities could inspire the state to become more paradiplomacy active as well, either in its own right or as a platform for the cooperative paradiplomatic efforts of San Francisco and Los Angeles. However, the central question is if the actions of a sub-national actor's own sub-national actor count as paradiplomacy. As these actions and policies are initiated by sub-national
actors that operate independently of either the state’s legislature or executive, they should not be considered to be the paradiplomacy of the state.

The most overt way in which California engages in paradiplomacy itself is on climate change policy. The state is a member of the Western Climate Initiative, creating a common emissions trading market with a number of American States and Canadian provinces, including Quebec (CBC, 2015). Prior, it moved to establish a similar shared emissions market with the United Kingdom in response to then-President Bush’s lacklustre climate policies (Washington Times, 2006). And more recently, after President Trump pledged to step out of the Paris climate agreements, Californian governor Brown stated he would seek deals with China and Germany in an effort to continue his state’s commitment to the international agreement (Reuters, 2017; Independent, 2017). Here we see that California is willing and successful in defying the national government directly, and maintain a well-developed political paradiplomacy.

6: ANALYSIS

Regarding to cultural paradiplomacy specifically, Quebec stands out due to its French language and its special relationship with France. It is thanks to this distinct character as a francophone nation in an Anglo-Saxon federation that Quebec can establish relations with the Francophonie and France on its own. The relationships with France and the Francophonie gives the province a level of international legitimacy that forms the groundwork of Quebec’s entire paradiplomacy. Like Quebec, Scotland has been able to emphasise its distinctive character from England, and adopt an international personality. Still, the political instability in the early years of Scottish parliament did not do the development of cultural paradiplomacy any favours (Bonnar, 2014: 145). Also limiting its development of cultural paradiplomacy is Scotland’s lack of any sort of ‘special relationship’, like Quebec has with France. Scotland does feel strongly about its membership of the EU,
but is not able to make the cultural and ethnic arguments that Quebec can make. California, however, has even more interesting handicap. The Golden State is a socio-cultural and economic behemoth that plays an important role in how the United State sees itself. Because of this, it cannot effectively distinguish itself from the national culture. This also limits the state abilities in creating a special relationship, as any country with a cultural bond with California would have an almost equally strong bond with the entire United States.

When it comes to economic paradiplomacy, Quebec again comes off as the most developed of the three. The big difference between the cases here is that Quebec has the authority to make binding international agreements, which neither Scotland or California have. However, the Scottish nationalists-controlled government seems to be determined to start serious economic and political paradiplomacy. Though California is also limited to engage in trade policy, it is more active in sending trade missions throughout the world. So while Scotland and California are trying to develop economic paradiplomacy in specific places, they both remain stifled by constitutional limitations.

When considering political paradiplomacy, the willingness and successes of the sub-national actors become more diverse. Again, Quebec takes the lead in the development of paradiplomacy. Whereas Quebec relies heavily on its special relationship with France, Scotland lacks such a relationship, and failed to establish a protodiplomatic effort in the run-up to its independence referendum. It does seem that the current nationalist government is considering a protodiplomatic relationship with the EU, to maintain the possibility of re-entering the EU as an independent Scotland. This form of paradiplomacy is simply absent in California. However, the Golden State uses paradiplomacy to counterbalance the American climate change policies. It maintains a number of international environmental agreements, an effort it’s seemingly strengthening in reaction
to the Trump administration. A more vigorous display of paradiplomatic counterbalancing can be found in the case of Quebec, which took its entire environmental policy into its own hand during the Harper administration. Scotland is developing protodiplomacy but no environmental policy, California has a developed environmental policy but no protodiplomacy, and Quebec has a very developed paradiplomacy on both matters.

So, we can conclude that these similar case studies do not yield similar results. Quebec has well-developed paradiplomatic policies across the board, while Scotland is currently in a developmental stage. California is the most diverse in its developments, with a solid political paradiplomacy on international environmental matters, but seemingly no real willingness or ability to commit to paradiplomatic efforts on protodiplomacy or cultural paradiplomacy. The question that remains is what factors can explain this divergence in paradiplomatic development. The research has identified four of such factors; distinctiveness, constitutional ability, foreign connections, and administrative set-up.

The first identified factor is distinctiveness, or how culturally different the sub-national actor is from its host nation. A sub-national actor with a cultural identity that stands in contrast with the national culture has more leverage to demand more administrative freedom, and can use that identity to signal to foreign actors that it is willing to engage with them independently from its host nation. This is why the first step of paradiplomacy is the creating and expression of cultural identity and distinctiveness. The Quebecois have used the French language for this purpose, the Scots might use its pro-European and social democratic values, and Californians might use their liberal mind-set to achieve the same goal. It should be noted that the more politically oriented argument by Scotland and California (falling back on cosmopolitan and liberal values) is less convincing than the cultural identity of Quebec. The fact that California is essentially the cultural hegemon within the United States, makes it nearly impossible for it to set itself culturally apart from
the rest of the country. The more distinctive the culture of the sub-national actor is from the host nation, the stronger the paradiplomacy can become.

The second identified factor is constitutional ability, which is the level to which the sub-national actor is legally able to engage in foreign affairs. National government want to keep in control of foreign policy, but might allow sub-national actors to conduct paradiplomacy based on the distinctive identity discussed above. This means that sub-national actors can take an active role to push for paradiplomacy, and the more autonomous the sub-national actor becomes, the more it can stress its distinctive identity. The Gérin-Lajoie Doctrine forms the legal basis for Quebec’s highly developed paradiplomacy, and is a good example of how sub-national actors can give themselves more autonomy.

The third identified factor is foreign connection, which is the availability of a special relationship to build paradiplomacy on. Quebec has greatly benefited from the role of France and the Francophonie in its paradiplomacy. These foreign connections tapped into the heart of Quebec’s cultural identity, legitimised that identity, and functioned as the anchor of Quebec’s foreign affairs. Scotland might attempt to make such a special relationship with the EU, in order to maintain it as a counterweight to Westminster and for support for its possible independence. However, such a special relation is built upon strong cultural or ethnic kinship, which Quebec has with France, but Scotland lacks with the EU. Because California lacks the cultural distinctiveness that Quebec and Scotland have embraced, it might be impossible for the state to really find a special relationship. Countries that share such a cultural identity with California share that equally with the rest of the US.

The fourth identified factor is administrative set-up, which describes how the local political and executive environment. The research has shown two clear examples of this factor at
play. The first case is that of Quebec, which maintains its own ministry of foreign affairs, which employs more paradiplomatic personnel than all fifty US states combined. The second case is that of Scotland, which had to endure unstable governments for its first years since devolution, making it hard for a coherent paradiplomatic policy to take shape. The way that the government itself is set-up can play a role too. The more centralised Quebec government is better able to form a coherent paradiplomatic policy than the Scottish, who has a more coordinating role over various agencies (Criekemans, 2010: 40-1). Quebec shows that a strong bureaucracy can make strong paradiplomacy, while Scotland shows that a weak government can only make weak paradiplomacy.

7: CONCLUSION

This thesis has looked at how cultural, economic and political paradiplomacy has developed in Quebec, Scotland and California, in an attempt to find what factors influence the development of paradiplomacy. The research shows that even in similar cases, paradiplomacy does not develop similarly. Quebec is by far the most well developed across all three categories, while Scotland is mostly still in a developmental phase. California is the most irregularly developed, with a strong international climate change policy, but a very undeveloped protodiplomacy and only haphazard efforts in matters of cultural paradiplomacy. The fact that paradiplomacy is so unevenly developed in these three sub-national actors teaches us that paradiplomacy is not a given, and that for many sub-national actors, paradiplomacy is still in its infancy.

Still, despite or even thanks to its uneven development, this thesis identified four broad factors that determine the development of paradiplomacy. First, paradiplomacy is usually dependent on the sub-national actor’s distinctiveness from the host nation. The more different the sub-national actor is from its host nation, the more autonomy it can claim.
That autonomy can be used to start a paradiplomatic effort, and indicate to foreign actors that this sub-national actor is willing to engage with them directly. Second, paradiplomacy is determined by the autonomy of the sub-national actor. As obvious as this sounds, it does not mean that sub-national actors without much authority are doomed to remain without paradiplomacy. By using the lessons learned from the first factor, the sub-national actor can develop itself into an internationally recognised personality, and use that personality as leverage to push for more autonomy. Third, a sub-national actor with a special relationship has a better developed paradiplomacy than others. The development of paradiplomacy is dependent on how foreign actors allow to develop. If a sub-national actor has a strong cultural connection to a foreign actor, it can use that bond as a springboard for the development of its paradiplomacy. The foreign actor can provide initial legitimacy to the sub-national actor, while the sub-national actor has a friend on whom the paradiplomacy can be built on. Fourth, the way the sub-national actor’s government functions can determine the efficiency and success of paradiplomacy. The infrastructure on which paradiplomacy is built is naturally an influence on the strength of that paradiplomacy. If a sub-national actor has its own foreign ministry, its infrastructure is relatively strong. While if the sub-national actor has a string of unstable governments, it becomes harder to form a coherent paradiplomatic policy.

However, there remains much to be explored. This thesis only looked at how paradiplomacy develops in three fairly similar cases, and found that these development differ significantly. This means that further research in more diverse cases should result in much more information in the ways how paradiplomacy is developed. Instead of Anglo-Saxon, federal or devolved counties, other cultures and forms of government ought to be discussed. And as this thesis only looked at states and provinces, further research would need to look at cities and municipalities. Likewise, more research is necessary on the types of paradiplomacy. Even though this thesis looked at the most promising and common
expressions, paradiplomacy includes an almost limitless array of policies. This research
might have found a different set of factors if a different set of paradiplomatic policies had
been analysed.

Even with these limitations, this research has given us a springboard for further research.
The way that paradiplomacy has developed in these three cases, and the four determining
factors that formed its groundwork, have given us a glimpse into the emerging new world of
paradiplomacy.
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