Patterns of Reterritorialization

Having analyzed the main traits of the practice of paradiplomacy in the Mediterranean, we must now turn to the finality, the telos of these diplomatic practices. Why do substate governments decide to engage in diplomacy? On a fundamental level, one could say that people feel the need to engage in contacts, to enter into relations with other people. This surely applies for all kinds of groups of people. Diplomatic history shows us that diplomacy is the second-oldest profession in the world, because it answers the much-felt need for human contact(s).

This is, however, too generic an answer. We need to refine our search for the teleology of paradiplomacy in the Mediterranean by looking at the tangible (or at least observable) effects or results of paradiplomacy. Paradiplomacy results in discrete or less discrete patterns of reterritorialization. These are the reverse side of the deterritorialization complex that characterizes our current global environment and that is caused by a multitude of factors, ranging from compression of the time-space continuum because of technological and communication revolutions, to cultural and economic globalization, as well as regional integration processes such as the EU. The European Union is particularly prone to deterritorialization dynamics, with its internal borders slowly withering away, its member states increasingly transferring their competences and sovereignty to the Union, and its external borders at the same time diffusing and hardening.

Reterritorialization is, as already mentioned, often perceived as the “developments which occur when certain territorial entities lose their importance, in favor of other territorial configurations,” or the emergence of “new centers of power alongside the old ones.” Reterritorialization, however, is more than the simple emergence of new centers of power and new polities. Reterritorialization is also the result of the process of political questioning and reassessing that leads to the old order changing or disappearing and a new order or orders replacing it. It also entails another coding, a (re)covering of
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these new centers of power, these new Selves, \textit{vis-à-vis} their international interlocutors, their Other(s). Diplomacy as a means to manage these relations is also the tool \textit{par excellence} to reach new patterns of territorialization.

This chapter will investigate the attributes of reterritorialization. We can distinguish here four categories of reterritorialization:

1. The emergence of new geographies – that is, new territorial conglomerates on different governmental levels. On the macrolevel, there is the – granted, only limited – contribution of paradiplomacy to the largely top–down constructions that are the various Euro-Mediterranean policies. On the microlevel, substate entities are producing new territorial units, largely from the bottom–up, such as the Euroregions.\footnote{For more on the interaction between macroregions and microregions, see De Lombaerde, P. (2010). “How to ‘Connect’ Microregions with Macroregions? A Note.” \textit{Perspectives on Federalism} 2(3): 29–37.}

2. Diplomatic and territorial mimicry, whereby the identitary form of paradiplomacy leads to an almost state-like behavior, aimed at emulating the state’s prerogatives and attributes, including in the diplomatic realm.\footnote{Paquin, \textit{Paradiplomatie identitaire en Catalogne}.} This diplomatic mimicry can best be observed in the case of Catalonia, but is also observable in the other substate entities that are researched in this book.

3. A division of labor, which enables substate entities and the state, but also lower-tier authorities such as provinces and cities, to distribute these prerogatives and attributes among themselves. A diplomatic division of labor can take two forms. On the one hand, it can relate to what Ivo Duchacek calls the partitioning between states and substates of “high politics” and “low politics” issues on the diplomatic agenda. This is what regional diplomats from PACA have labeled the distinction between the little things (\textit{les petites choses}) and the things that madden (\textit{les choses qui fâchent}).\footnote{Duran, “French Regions as Diplomatic Actors”: 348.} On the other hand, it might be the way in which substate entities function as diplomatic mediators between states to overcome political or historic tensions between those states.

4. Homo-diplomacy, or the diplomacy of both people-to-people contacts or the diplomacy of sameness that amounts to a territoriality of sameness. Homo-diplomacy, by stressing what binds instead of what divides, reaches a new take on diplomacy as the mediation of estrangement or separateness. Paradiplomacy can become a homo-diplomatic practice, in