

March 17, 2013

Brussels Forum

The Global Atlantic: New Actors in an Old Sea

Dr. Ian O. Lesser: Good afternoon, everyone. Good afternoon. For those of you who might not have been with us earlier this morning, I'm Ian Lesser from the GMF office in Brussels. Before we start this session this afternoon, we wanted to give you just a little bit of context on the reason for this conversation. Two years ago, the GMF, in partnership with the OCP Foundation in Morocco, launched a major initiative looking at the wider Atlantic. And the purpose of this, really, is to try to reset mental maps, if I can put it that way, to get people thinking about Transatlantic relations, not just in terms of the north-north access between Brussels and Washington, but actually in north-south terms and south-south terms. In other words, to think about the Atlantic Basin as a whole, very much including Latin America, including Atlantic Africa and including the Caribbean.

We have a number pieces of this work and you see some of them around the room here, in fact. We've done a lot of research over the last two years and you see some of these products here. For next year, we're going to be looking very heavily at the geo-economics of the region, how trade and finance patterns are changing and changing north-south relations in the Atlantic.

Another big aspect of this, and you see that, as well, is something we're calling the Atlantic Dialogues. This is a big, new forum. It's now going to be in its second year at full scale. And we're very grateful, again, for our partnership with the OCP Foundation to make this possible. It happens annually in Rabat, it's patterned on Brussels Forum, this scale, this set up. And the next one will be October 25-27 in Rabat again, and we hope to see many of you there with us.

Let me say, before I turn it over to our moderator, that there's another important piece to this, which is the role being played by emerging actors in the

Atlantic, especially in the South Atlantic. Brazil, Mexico, South Africa, but also, as we've tried to incorporate in this panel, important actors and stakeholders from outside the Atlantic Basin itself, like China and India.

So we're very pleased to have this discussion this afternoon. We're very pleased to have Lisa Mullins from public radio with us to moderate it. So please, Lisa, over to you.

(Video): As political developments and the spread of capital and technology empowers southern Atlantic societies, South Africa, Brazil, and Mexico, among others, are looking for new venues of influence through the Atlantic highways. What are the political and economic implications of a more global Atlantic? Are new trends strengthening cooperation or creating conditions for future conflicts?

Ms. Lisa Mullins: I have to say it is a total privilege to be here hosting a panel. I was in Rabat, Morocco. That was my first experience with the German

Marshall Fund and I am thrilled to be back here today with such an esteemed group of panelists, and especially to be moderating the final panel of the Brussels Forum. We are talking, of course, about a fragile world, but mostly, we are here to see, to witness, to be inspired by the commitment of all of you who are committed to nurturing this fragile world and figuring out how to heal it in the broken places.

On this panel, we're going to be talking about challenges and I hope you will also help us talk about meaningful solutions before we part today. I know that journalists often get accused of forgoing issues of nuance and focusing on black and white and things that are too practical. I intend to do just that, and I hope that you'll join me. Forgive me and then join me.

And I'm going to be coming to you fairly soon for questions, so please think of questions, please keep them very short and address them to any of the panelists who you wish. And I've invited the panelists to also respond to each other.

So for our esteemed panel, first, starting from the far left here is Victor Borges. He is from Cape Verde, Africa, President of the Foundation for Development and International Exchanges. And then next to him is Dr. Jorge Castaneda, professor at New York University. He is originally from Mexico, but now in that little land above the border, and he gets voted best socks of the Forum. From Brazil, the Honorary Tatiana Prazeres, who is the Secretary of Foreign Trade at the Ministry of Development Industry and Foreign Trade. And then on the far right, from China, Dr. Shi Yinhong, Professor of International Relations and Director of the Center on American Studies at Renmin University of China.

Okay. And as you probably know by now, there are many people who are joining us on the web live. So for those listening on the web, the new actors who we are speaking about, as we talk about new actors in an old sea, the old sea, of course, being the Atlantic, they are not new countries, but they are newly energized countries. In some cases, quite literally energized.

Brazil, Mexico, some of the countries of Africa and countries that have growing influence in Transatlantic affairs, including China and India and beyond.

Tatiana, I would love to begin with you first. What is your characterization of where Brazil sits on the international stage right now, because from most accounts, it's sitting pretty? What do you say?

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Well, Brazil is willing to play an even more important role in international scenario, and we are confident that we can contribute positively to the world's prosperity, increase democracy, the world security. We know that it entails responsibility. We are doing our part.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: And there are many factors to that, and you're going to be talking about them, as well. It's kind of a multi-layered situation and I hope that many people respond to Brazil's posture, in terms of transatlantic affairs, as we go on.

Jorge Castaneda, through your American-based lens now, talk about whether you see America on the decline,

whether you see Europe on the decline and what the current state of affairs means for Mexico and Latin America, as they're on the ascent.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: Well, I certainly don't think the United States is on the decline. If they were, they couldn't make socks like these, so I think they're--

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Are you sure they were made in America?

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: Absolutely (inaudible) but--

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yes.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: --that said, I think that American design, American imagination, innovation and cultural and ideological hegemony, I think is still the proper word, is more reality than ever before. That doesn't mean that there aren't new actors in individual aspects. Clearly, China has an immense--plays an immense economic role today in the world because of sheer population. India has an extraordinarily important role to play. Brazil, in the western hemisphere, has also very enormous impact. But this

notion of American decline; if you look at it a little more objectively and beyond newspaper headlines, in tribute to what you said about journalism, Lisa, I think that there is less decline there than meets the eye.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: And what about Mexico on the rise, on the ascent?

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: Well, I think we're doing about as well as we did before. Someone said a few weeks ago in Mexico, with a group of friends from the German Marshall Fund who visited us, "When Brazil was doing great and we were doing lousy, where we're growing at three percent, now that Brazil is doing lousy and we're doing great, we're growing at three percent." I think that's a fair appraisal of it.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: I think there might be other people representing Mexico here, or from Latin America, who might disagree with that, and I would love to hear from them.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: I'd love to hear from them.



The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Let's get them.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yes, excellent. Okay. Dr. Yinhong, where does China sit on the international stage? Because we know, for one thing, it takes up a lot of space.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: I think that after the, especially in the new years, and everyone said that China is everywhere. China's sitting in every chair. I don't think so. And, of course, China's, you know, overseas, you know, presence is (inaudible) most apparently and most widely economic front. And we have equal presence and the newly establishing in Africa (inaudible) Middle East and Central Asia and so and so. But diplomatically, also, because China is a big country, because China is a (inaudible) member of Council of Nations, maybe our diplomat could represent it all around the world.

But strategically, I think that China still--and if you take a global perspective, very, you know, modest, very--they're prudent and they're low-profile player. I

don't think that China have any strategic presence in Latin America, for example. I think China have absolutely no strategic presence (inaudible) in Africa and nothing almost in Indian Ocean. And what China (inaudible) is only in East Asia and along our, you know, (inaudible) and we also have some limited strategic (inaudible) in our, you know, the border and with our great friend India and also in Central Asia.

But generally, I think that if you take a global picture, China definitely is not a strategic (inaudible), but we are economic and diplomatic (inaudible), maybe economical (inaudible) this is the greatest, you know, China national achievements since Xi Jinping's great reform and opening up. And finally, and maybe a little too much, but roughly speaking now everywhere is meeting China and everywhere is Chinese.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yeah, didn't we hear in one of the earlier sessions on China that the new president is saying, "We do not--we intend to move forward, but incrementally." So you're saying that China does not

represent--does not have strategic designs on other partners, including Africa, in terms of asserting itself hegemonically? You're saying that that doesn't exist?

Prof. Shi Yinhong: I think that a strategy is some, you know, magical, you know, word.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: It's what?

Prof. Shi Yinhong: Strategy is a magical word. Sometimes you, you know, define very (inaudible) and I think that China maybe have a very broad, you know, strategic interest. But if we're defined as, you know, in its strict meaning and (inaudible) I think that I can very confidently say that at least in the next five years, even perhaps in the next ten years, I don't think that China will have any strategic, you know, (inaudible), strategic bases or strictly defined in, you know, (inaudible).

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. One of the things that I learned talking with so many of you throughout this conference is that you can get multi-polar opinions,

that I would talk to one person who was very vociferous about what he or she was saying, and then I find somebody else who is equally vociferous in the opposite direction. I'd like to turn it over to the audience right now. And perhaps if there's anyone who--why don't we start--do you want to start with China? Is that your main point? If we can get a microphone right here. Is there anyone who disagrees with that right now? And then we'll move on to the other regions as well.

Mr. Emile Myburgh: Yes, my name is Emile Myburgh. I'm an attorney from Johannesburg. First of all, I must just make a comment that I don't see any South African on this panel, which I find a bit funny. But having said that, Professor, I cannot honestly agree that China--or understand how China can say that it has no strategic interests in Africa. Could you please explain that? Because--and I ask this question to you in rebut--China's activities in Africa is causing resentment towards other investors going into Africa because China is not creating jobs for Africans.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: Answer?

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yes, if you don't mind.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: Yeah, I think I--of course, and I said that China know strategy, but we not have strategic presence in distant continents, and strictly speaking, in the military, you know, China still uses (inaudible) except for in the U.N.'s peacekeeping troops on the Security Council's mandate. And, of course, in the China's search for minerals, gas, oil, for example, in Africa, and these are, you know, have a strategic meaning. But generally direct motivation is not strategic. It's economic deployment. You shall shake off your hands. And I think after the--you know, you can provide evidence what is China, strictly speaking, strategic presence in Africa.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: So this raises the question of, you say, bringing in Chinese instead of Africans in its African investments. And, of course, we know that much of this is based on domestic economics. You're

disagreeing with that. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Yes, and then we'll go to Victor Borges right after this.

Mr. Peter Kellner: Peter Kellner from YouGov polling company.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Sorry. Give me your name once again.

Mr. Peter Kellner: My name's Peter Kellner. I run a polling company in Britain called YouGov. But my question is this. We've heard about employment with Africans. Let me raise two other sort of equivalent issues. There are also Western governments and agencies feel concern about things like human rights in African countries and environmental impact of development. It strikes me that China has made inroads into Africa by not worrying about either environmental or human rights issues, so two related questions. Do you see the time coming in the near future when China will be as concerned with these issues as Western agencies are? Meanwhile, do you think we're idiots for considering

the issues when you can ride in, not worry about them, and do a lot more business?

Prof. Shi Yinhong: And I think that the China government never, you know, not worry about local conditions in Africa, including in some human rights violations, some corruption and--but Chinese government really, and according to our own principle, not publicly declare it. Sometimes behind a door, and even in governments who govern diplomatic dialogues. China talk with some, you know, African governance where China have investments, even have diplomatic interests, and we advise them. Maybe (inaudible) should do things in this way and not necessarily that way.

But I don't think that China have rights and have self-confidence and have experience. Surely, you know, in frequent cases, to impose our will upon them. Of course, on the other end, China's a newcomer. And before--I think before 19th century, China exactly and have not any contact at least Atlantic, you know,

countries, so China is a newcomer. And China have shortcomings, but we all learn something.

But we're still searching. And we don't think that we are in a position to impose some--you were suggesting advice upon local people, local governments. And, of course, China is a security member, a permanent member of Security Council of United Nations. And sometimes China vetoes some resolution, but sometimes China vote yes for some resolution which this resolution has some meaning to improve social and political situation in some African countries.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Victor Borges from Cape Verde, you wanted to comment.

The Hon. Victor Borges: Thank you, Lisa. I want to say first of all that I'm not speaking on behalf of African countries. I'm speaking on my own name, because anytime I speak, people tend to associate my thoughts to African countries. That's not the case. I will comment on the question of my friend from South Africa and the response of Professor. Well, perhaps China do



not have a strategic favor, but it acts strategically. You have a lot of people in the world that perhaps do not know the word strategy, and yet they act strategically.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Is that necessarily a bad thing? I mean, shouldn't it have a strategy?

The Hon. Victor Borges: I'm not judging. I'm just trying to make it comprehensible for me. And you have people speaking all the time because it's fashionable to use the word strategy. That never acts in a strategic way. So we must--and I don't want to make a debate on semantics, but in my view and of serving, China presence in Africa, I believe that somehow they have elements of strategy for trade, for investment. And I also believe that when you have trade, investment, this can be translated in political and security issues. And these we cannot deny.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. Yeah, actually, I do want you to go on. Just very briefly on the end, I mean,

yeah, so your take is that the aims in these Chinese investments are good or not, deleterious or not?

The Hon. Victor Borges: You know, I don't want to judge. What I think is that China's presence in Africa is not a bad thing. And it is an opportunity for African countries to diversify their partnership. When you listen to people from United States and in Europe, they are concerned about China presence in Africa. And I'm not judging, but for African countries, it's an opportunity to diversify. And Europe and United States are challenged to find a new way of dealing with African countries in terms of development because development is the main challenge for Africa.

Let me give you one example. After having a good idea for a project with the World Bank and managing the project cycle from identification, preparation, evaluation, et cetera, until the moment of starting the implementation, you need to count on four or five years sometimes, because there's a lot of procedures, a lot of rules. And for African countries that are in need of

infrastructure for their own development, this new approach can represent a lot advantage.

This said, I believe that African countries, but also China, Brazil, Mexico, and United States and Europe, must assess the past experience of their relationship. And I'm not so sure that we did a good assessment. Most of time, we hear people expressing political emotion or judgment. It was good and it was not--it was not good. But judgment are not evaluation or assessment.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yes. Yes. Okay. So aside from just denigrating, figuring out what went wrong and what can be changed, you're saying. Tatiana, you wanted to add to that.

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Yeah, I'd just like to build on that to say that, for Brazilians, it's quite clear what is the Chinese strategy in terms of trading investment in Brazil. At first, Chinese were interested in natural resources. A lot of investment in the oil sector, in the mining sector, strategic

minerals. Then more recently, China's more interested in Brazil's internal market.

By 2020, Brazil should be the fourth largest consumer market in the world, and Chinese quickly realized that. So they're investing in Brazil in areas such as the automotive sector or telecommunications sector. This is fine. I mean, we're just trying to identify where our interests meet. But it's clear for us, for Brazilians, generally speaking, that China's having a strategic approach towards Brazil.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. Thank you. Jorge Castaneda.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: I rarely agree with my Chinese friends, but on this occasion I do. I think the point that the professor's making is very well-made point. In the long term, it is possible that these very narrow specific economic interests in Latin America and in Africa will require a broader strategic Chinese projection; military, ideological, cultural, political, in the long term. Today they don't. There are those people who think that this is inevitable. But today

it's not only a question of them not wanting to. China does not have the capability of that type of projection. It does not have a military projection capability. It does not have any cultural projection capability. And it has very little ideological projection capability.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Can you define that, projection capability?

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: Yeah, you guys should do what we do. That's--call it ideological capability. What the Americans have been doing for about 150 years, that. What you guys should do is what we do. Okay. We have the best system in the world, the best political system, the economic system, the best every system. Everybody in the world should be like the Americans. That's what the Americans say. The Chinese don't say that. They don't say--we don't care what you guys do. This is what we do, and you guys can go and do whatever the hell you want, even wear socks of a different color.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yes.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: Yeah, I think I have a little disagreement with you. And the proof is not--

Ms. Lisa Mullins: He was just agreeing with you.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: He doesn't like the socks part.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: Problem is not capability. I think if China have the intention, have motivation, then China will send some--at least to move the soldiers or some military advisers or even (inaudible) with some fleet. But the problem is that, or that the China advantage is that, and (inaudible) history, China literally have no intention to do things (inaudible) and militarily in distant continent.

Of course, I don't say that there is no possibility in the future. Military future, (inaudible) future, China will not do something just to have downward, you know, diplomacy. And China also have a possibility go (inaudible). We are in ancient times. Some of years,

Chinese empire, but the Chinese (inaudible) history and leaders and (inaudible) and remind ourselves.

Now, you look at (inaudible) empire and the cost, failure, and so we shall be careful. So in this stage of history, our strategic plan in Brazil, in Africa, in Latin America are all, you know, general strategic plan for investment and the trade and so and so.

Well, of course, there's something (inaudible) and some minerals and oil and gas have strategic values, but in the state of history and why China go to this continent to search for oil and gas and mineral, because domestic economy had to. It could, it might lead us go to so-called expansion, and military even. But as you state obviously, and China still determined, not going this way.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Let me ask you actually, if you don't mind, Victor, if I ask you from a different path. And that is, if we look at Africa, is it necessarily the recipient of investment from China and elsewhere? And is it ever going to become the driver when we talk

about Africa's emergence as a continent, obviously, with all of the disparities in Africa?

I spoke to the gentleman who was here from Senegal earlier. Unfortunately, he couldn't be here, but he said, there is no way, with all the problems that we have in Africa, from food supply to corruption to conflict, that we could be the driver at this point. And I am totally paraphrasing him. But what about Africa not just as the recipient?

The Hon. Victor Borges: This is the huge challenge for African leadership. And most of times, because of lack of leadership, African countries do not develop their own perspective of the relationship with the world, with China, with Brazil, et cetera, and they just follow the perspective of partner countries. And the big challenge for Africa, for me, is to develop their own strategy to deal with those partners.

But in doing so, you have the problem of leadership, capacities that sometimes do not exist. You can have elected government, but elected government



does not mean that you have democratic governors, that you have government committed to development. And if Africa, and we are not far away from 2015, and it's a sad thing to see that most of African countries are not going to meet the millennium development goals.

So in a situation of lack of development, with a lack of human capacity and leadership, it is very difficult to manage this relationship with China, but also with the United States, with Europe, et cetera, et cetera. And this is the huge challenge, in my view, for Africa. It is capacity building to deal with this complex issue and have their own perspective and not adopting the perspective of a partner.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: To establish its own projection capabilities, then. But doesn't that leave a huge void if it's dealing with its own problems and doesn't have the ability, then, to have its own strategy and own projections?

The Hon. Victor Borges: Some countries have. When you go to South Africa you see that there is strategy.

And South Africa is in a pivotal situation because it's Indian Ocean, it's Atlantic, and there is this partnership between South Africa, India and the Brazil. And South African is in a situation that can play a positive role in this relationship between Africa and Europe, China and the United States. But South Africa also needs to achieve a lot of internal goals, as much social peace, less social economic (inaudible) and that is a lot of challenge. You have Angola that can play a very important role, Nigeria, et cetera, et cetera.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: I wonder if, excuse me, Kerry McNamara is here. Are you, Kerry, possibly? Yes. Do you mind if I call on you? You're being called on right now.

Mr. Kerry McNamara: Do I have a choice?

Ms. Lisa Mullins: You gave some interesting figures last night at the dinner where we were, appropriately over dinner, talking about food and food security issues. I wonder if you can repeat those with regard to Africa because one of the things that you said was that

African farmers, small farmers being those who provide most of the food for Africa, are the solution, not the problem. The problem was not capacity. The problem is being able to get things, for instance, to market. And, again, I don't mean to oversimplify what you're saying, but you had some very interesting figures. Could you tell us about them?

Mr. Kerry McNamara: Yeah. Well, you know, it's well known that African agriculture has much lower yields than agriculture in most other areas. And it's known that there are a variety of reasons for that, only one of which, only one of which, is very low use of fertilizer compared to other continents.

But what I was saying last night is that when you look at Africa's enormous opportunity for being a driver of food security going forward, it's a very complex problem that has to be addressed in all its complexity. It's not enough just to have small holder farmer produce more crop on their land, increase their yields, as we say, because if they can't get that

larger crop to market and get a good price for it, they're not going to increase their yield. They're smart people. They're survivors. Especially if they have to buy several months in advance the inputs that would make possible those greater yields.

So it's not just, you know, increasing yields which is a thing we hear about a lot. It's infrastructure. It's market linkages. It's helping small holder farmers become more organized so that they can have more market power. And it's creating the entire link between the farmer and national and global markets.

The reason I emphasize small holders is that, you know, tragically, the international community and African governments badly neglected, underinvested, disinvested in agriculture in Africa for over 20 years. And they're finally coming around just in the last few years.

And the reason that small holder farming is important in Africa is because, as we've seen in too many other places, if you strip out the rural areas of

large countries what you end up with is populations that are largely concentrated in cities where a lot of them don't have jobs. And so developing small holder agriculture in Africa is not only about answering food security, it's not only about using agriculture as an engine of broader economic growth, inclusive economic growth in African countries, it's also fundamentally about stability. Because it's about creating rural livelihoods and rural economies that are sustainable.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: I wonder if we can move to Tatiana. In terms of the agricultural boom that's happening throughout South America, but particularly in Brazil, and to what extent that influences right now Brazil's stability and Brazil's abilities on the new stage in the Atlantic.

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Sure. Well, Brazil has invested hugely in research and development in the agricultural sector and we are very competitive in different agricultural products, for example, soy and corn. Last year we reached record highs of exports

in soy and corn as well, but of course it's for different kinds of products and, well, ethanol, just to get to the energy sector as well.

We have infrastructure problems. We are addressing those problems. We have just launched a plan to attract private investment for ports and railroads in Brazil. This is very important to improve even further our competitiveness in that area. We're very proud of what we've been able to build in the agricultural sector.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Mm-hmm. And if you look at the larger picture of Brazil right now, let's talk a little bit about ambitions. I mean, we're talking about Chinese ambitions, getting different opinions on that. What does Brazil want in terms of its place on the international stage? You focused primarily on economics, on trade, I understand. So take it from that perspective. And then also if others want to express perhaps their own interest on this or concerns as well. But you start off, Tatiana.

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Thanks, Lisa. Let me further focus on the economic aspect, maybe trade aspect of that. Yesterday I listened with a lot of interest to the U.S. and the European Union dialogue, discussions about the possible trade and investment agreement. And there was a lot of discussions about ambitions, and about how ambitious such an agreement would be. And I asked myself if that would be the most ambitious approach, that (inaudible). And definitely there would be not, there would be not in case this venue is at the expense of the efforts in the multilateral trade system, at the expense of the broader comprehensive and non-discriminatory trade liberalization.

Some would think, would say, and I'm not quoting anyone here, that maybe if the European Union and the U.S. get together and define common standards, unified regulations, et cetera, et cetera, and then get back to the WTO members and say, "Well, here's what we have. Maybe if you want you can join us," that would sound

very, very ambitious. But I tell you, that wouldn't work in today's reality.

That narrative somehow reminds me of the 1992 Blair House Agreement where the U.S. and the European Union sat together and finished the--and closed the unfinished business (inaudible) in Uruguay Round. That, on that occasion, paved the way for the conclusion of the Uruguay Round that comprised 123 members. That wouldn't work today.

That wouldn't work today for many reasons, one of them being Brazil is more important. India is more important in multilateral matters. The breaks that didn't exist then now bring to the WTO not only Russia but China, mainly, that were not part of the game on that occasion.

Well, there are so many aspects that, I mean, would prevent that narrative to happen again. And it's important for us to be aware of the consequences of creating a gap that probably wouldn't be breached again. And the result of that, creating a gap, you



know, not being able to get back to the multilateral track, would result in a multilateral system limited to maybe a trade court. They would judge our policies, everyone's policies, against rules that were defined. The best scenario in early mid-90s, the worst scenario in 1947.

I think it's not very ambitious to get to that kind of result. That's something very important to have in mind.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Excuse me. There were some comments over here, I think, on Brazil's ambitions? Oh, whatever. Go ahead. Can you identify yourself?

Nora Fisher Onar: (Inaudible) I just wrapped up my Asmus fellowship with the GMF and I teach international relations in Istanbul, Turkey. I want to pick up on this theme of African and (inaudible) African ambitions, vis-à-vis the continent. Because we've heard China's role downplayed and maybe it's a question of Asian modesty, but--

Prof. Shi Yinhong: No, no, no, no.

Nora Fisher Onar: Okay.

Prof. Shi Yinhung: Our people are not crippled by modesty. This is fact.

Nora Fisher Onar: Nor are Turkish people. And so when one is based in Istanbul, one hears a lot about Turkey's ever more proactive Africa policy. I mean, this may be a response to having been burned in Syria, but you have the Turkish Foreign Ministry opening up 15 new embassies this year. You have the Turkish Development Agency increasing aid to over 100 million, which is still paltry, but it's there.

You have Turkish faith-based organizations opening schools across the continent in very hard to reach areas. They're performing 60,000 cataract operations for free in East Africa alone. You have the Turkish prime minister going on several whirlwind tours and making these the centerpiece of his U.N. speeches in a clear attempt to amplify an African presence into sort of a global governance role.

And so my question is when one listens to discussion of this in Turkey, one would think that Turkey is all over Africa and everyone is aware of this. And are the Chinese and are the Brazilians and are the South Africans aware of this Turkish presence and ambition? And if so, are interests convergent or is other (inaudible) interest at play?

Prof. Shi Yinhong: I think in China and the government and especially, you know, internet scholars in (inaudible) years and began very keenly to aware a new phenomenon in (inaudible) economy, especially in one (inaudible) Turkey. And we know that Turkey is very, you know, aspiring and sometimes is ambitious. And Turkey's active, you know, the performance on international stage. And it is almost (inaudible) government career increased and expanded. And we welcome this. Also, I think about Turkey is just like China and we are newcomers. Sometimes we're going to have mistakes. Sometimes we could have, you know, (inaudible) aren't reasonable in our eyes and others in

the complaints or something just like that. So I think that we expect it.

And the next phase of world politics is the age of rising powers and the Indians, Chinese, Brazilians, Turkey, and other countries, I think, after the (inaudible) in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and they will increase. And the people and nation's voice and even (inaudible) decision. And who's, you know, the political and the (inaudible) in the modern world and before, you know, today is quite, you know, law and underestimated.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Victor, I know you wanted to respond.

The Hon. Victor Borges: Just to react to this intervention about Turkey. Yes, we speak about Brazil, about China and India, but there are a lot of new actors in Africa, in southern Atlantic. And Turkey, it has been noticed and Turkey has been very, very aggressive in showing presence in Africa. And Turkey fight a lot to have a lot of United Nations conference on Africa, Istanbul. And the last conference on less

developed countries was held in Istanbul.

So it's Turkey, but it's Japan also, it is South Korea. You have a lot of countries trying to play a role in Africa, which is a huge challenge for African governments and African leadership, how to manage this diversity of partners and not being eaten away.

Just a last comment for the issue of food security that I think is related to the issue of development. It's true that Africa has this huge challenge of (inaudible) every culture as an economic solution for its development. The problem is that during 80s, 70s, in spite of (inaudible) I think I should mention it was Jack (inaudible), the former Director General of (inaudible) that advocate a lot for agriculture. But the problem we have now is that there is this investment, but there is also a mindset in African leadership in the use that every agriculture is not (inaudible), that agriculture is synonymous of poverty.

So the challenge is investing much more money to agriculture, supporting the small farmers, but also,

changing mindset of use to make them make peace with agriculture as a root solution for development, for food security and for employment.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: (Inaudible) wants to speak.

Unidentified Female Speaker: And just about the (inaudible) diplomatic positions taken at the Security Council, Brazil, in particular, probably was after the permanent seat in the Security Council as the speaker of reform, so maybe that drove the position. But the (inaudible) really blocked a solution on Syria. And two years later we don't know what the individual countries are doing towards the refugees, 800 million of them, 800,000 of them children, the catastrophe that's happening as a consequence of doing nothing at the Security Council.

And I'm wondering for our Chinese professor if he would kindly address the strategic interest of China when it comes to twice or three times using the veto together with Russia, and whereas you're relationship with the GCC countries, oil, of course, is part of the

strategic interest of course. I wonder if you dismiss their concern and their anger about your position.

And I'm wondering if you have really processed what does it cost you in the long run with the public, or at least half the public, of the Arab region to see you three times using a veto against something that they feel is something their interest. Do you really care at all strategically or strictly, or not strictly, do you care?

Prof. Shi Yinhong: I think (inaudible) country. And not only, you know, (inaudible) of Security Council is solving country. China have independent foreign policy. China have its own, you know, principles. And, of course, often we have no disagreement on some issues with our American friends and European friends. And sometimes also (inaudible) solving country. Sometimes you can take a different position with China.

(Inaudible) and the Chinese volatile record in Security Council in five times, vetoes three times. Why veto? And I don't think (inaudible) change its

position. And if Security Council resolution just about Syria is (inaudible) this is bad guy, this is good guy, then I think in the past three times can veto it. And in the future we still veto (inaudible).

But another time, two times China will say yes in Security Council because--and the chapter resolution have not, you know, based on assumption this is bad guy, this is good guy, and focus on, you know, support (inaudible), focus on, you know, the efforts of political solution and the dialogue and the process.

And I think I off course. And the China's this kind of position is often very popular among many countries. But I don't think I have to do in this kind of (inaudible), first of all, is not (inaudible) and, first of all, is you know, the principle and equal part to do and as Chinese understand.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. Thank you. And Tatiana and then also Jorge and then we have some questions back here. And I'm going to take a couple of questions very quickly. So maybe if we can start the microphone there,



but Tatiana you go first.

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Yeah, three quick comments in reaction to this last question. First, we are very much concerned with the situation in Syria. Second, there is no single voice for Brit countries at the U.N. Third, we do not have the state permanency that Security Council.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yeah. Sure. Yes.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: Well, it's a good thing they don't because when they did on Libya they abstained together with the South Africans and the Indians. So what do you want a permanent seat for if all you do is abstain all the time? You want a permanent seat, you have to take stands. And Brazil does not want to take stands. It wants hands off. It wants to be nice and get along with everybody, which is wonderful. Stay away from the Security Council if that's what you want to do. The South Africans--

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Tatiana, you don't have to be nice yourself.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: The South Africans did the same thing.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: China sometimes also vote abstain (inaudible). It's very complicated.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: But they already have a seat. They've had a seat for 50 years.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: Sometimes (inaudible) taking position.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: The Brazilians, the Indians and the South Africans did not take a stand on Libya. And had they been members on Syria, they would not be taking a stand, because they would be inventing the same story, excuse me, that the Chinese and the Russians have said, which that Libya mission creep has made it impossible for the council now to act on Syria, which is why there is no Security Council action on Syria.

If that is what they want to be members of the Security Council for, it's not worth it. And that, I think, is one of the reasons countries like Mexico and

many others do not think it's a good idea for the P5 to be enlarged. Let's stick with the P5. They're the ones who have the veto. They're the ones who have been there for 60 years, and they're the ones who have a true capability, some more than others, to truly act in places like Syria, like Libya, like others.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Tatiana.

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Yeah, I must respond to that definitely. Let me say that maybe Mexico, I mean, would be willing to be there, but since there's no capability for Mexico to be there, you stay with the five because it may be more convenient to stay with the five than to have an enlarged Security Council without Mexico. So this is something to keep in mind.

Another aspect to be considered is that sometimes Brazil is a country able to build bridges, to connect some countries to others. This is a very important capacity that Brazil has been able to build and it can be of great value. Same for Turkey, same for other countries, but this is an important capacity that

Brazil has been able to build, and we are confident that this can be very useful in finding solutions that the P5 are able to find so far.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: It was especially useful with Iran and Turkey.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. Let's hear a couple of very quick comments. Here, why don't we take three comments, actually one, two, three, and then we'll go around.

Mr. Hamer Akee: My name is Hamer Akee of the Toyoko Foundation (inaudible). And my question is not from Atlantic, but from a Pacific Ocean perspective, which is about the TPP addressed to Dr. Shi Yinhong. What do you think of the TPP? Are you suspicious that this might be a fight led by the United States to exclude Chinese economic influence or, you know, even that (inaudible) anti-China national security implications? Or rather, do you think that your government might express its intention to join the TPP in the near future eventually? Thanks.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: And just briefly for those who

are on the web who don't know what TPP is.

Mr. Hamer Akee: Trans Pacific Partnership. FTA among that of Asia Pacific countries.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Thank you. If you could pass that down.

Mr. Patrick Worms: Patrick Worms from the World Agroforestry Center. I want to come back to the comment you made that African leaders and African youth consider agriculture to be uncool. There's a reason why they do that. That is because small holder agriculture leads people into the classic poverty trap that's been so ably analyzed by (inaudible). But agricultural science has not stopped. In the days of 50 or 60 years ago when the green revolution was first (inaudible), it has progressed. And agrological principles now lead to success stories in places like Mali, (inaudible) where farm productivity increases so much that we have tantalizing signs that men are choosing to come back from the slums to the villages because the economic life they can build there is becoming more attractive

than what they can make in the cities. This is bringing people out of the poverty trap and it is going to make African agriculture more productive.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Thank you. And one more point here.

Mr. Marcus Freitas: Two things. I just wanted to correct Professor (inaudible) here that because we have to consider--I'm Marcus Freitas from Brazil, that Brazil has a large Syrian population, which is Catholic, Catholic Syrians, who kind of support the regime. So you have to understand that there is an internal constituency that you also need to think about. So that's something that I just wanted to emphasize from beginning because I think there might be a mistake there. You have to understand that there is a local constituency, which is very important in Brazil because if you look into the Brazilian political environment you see many Syrians descendants. So that's issue number one.

Now, the second thing I wanted to ask is that, now

that Chavez is gone, and I think the topic is not China today, that was the Atlantic. My focus is this. Now that Chavez is gone, is there any way in which Brazil and Mexico could eventually work together to be the leaders in the region? Because, effectively, Brazil is a country without leaders and also is Mexico. So how can you both work together to make sure that Latin America has one single voice? And, you know, as you negotiate with Europe and the United States you become more effective into making this still a western hemisphere country. That's my question.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Let's take the last question first then. Thanks. Either Tatiana or, no, sorry. The last question first. About Brazil and Mexico working on the together.

Dr. Jorge Castaneda: On the Syrian constituency, I think that it's a very valid concern in many cases in Brazil and in other countries, but every country has domestic constituencies, and every country has domestic politics, especially all countries that aspire to

either a regional or a world role. And although sometimes one can wonder whether the Americans, for example, are able to put their long term national interests above the importance of the Jewish community in the United States, and one can wonder if that's case, nonetheless, one hopes that that would be the case.

And what many people in this room and I think elsewhere, for example, would hope is that now that President Obama is going finally to Israel and to the Middle East, he will be able to put American strategic, national, long-term interests above those right now of the Jewish community and of the United States. I think that should be a worthwhile reflection.

On the other question, I mean, I think, despite what Tatiana may wonder about, I think Brazil is right on the Brazilian Mexican rivalry and we Mexicans are wrong. Why are we wrong? Because we are the ones who insist on having a Latin American role and we have no role to play in South American. This is just Mexican



nostalgia. We like to think about these things, you know. Oh, there was a time when we all spoke Spanish. Of course, the problem is the Brazilians speak Portuguese, but well, complicated.

We don't have a role to play in South America. I think we have a very important role to play in Central America and the Caribbean, which used to be called the Caribbean Basin, together with the Americans. But Brazil is more reasonable than us with a few silly exceptions like Honduras, but other than small (inaudible) of that sort, Brazil has been much more reasonable and not aspired to a major role in Central America or the Caribbean and has concentrated its regional efforts in South America, which I think makes a lot of sense.

So I don't think we should have a common Latin American voice. I think there are two Latin Americas, very clearly. Central America, Mexico, and the Caribbean on the one hand with one type of economic and international integration with North America and South

America with a large Brazilian influence. Much more commodity exporting, much more diversified in the world in trade, investment and everything else than we are.

All of our relations, the Central Americans, the Caribbean countries, and Mexico, the rest of the world for us is called the United States period. The rest of the stuff is stories. This is not the case for South America, not the case for Brazil. I don't know what's better or what's worse, but I do know that these are facts, which are relatively rigid, which we have not really been able to modify over the last hundred odd years and I have serious doubts that we will be able to modify them.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Tatiana, should Brazil and could Brazil?

The Hon. Tatiana Lacerda Prazeres: Let me first say that I don't want to get into the specific stories of the region, et cetera, it's not time for that. Let me get to Marcus' question. And in that sense, I would say that it's too early to say what the consequences of

Chavez's death for the region. I would say that it wasn't Venezuela that prevented Brazil and Mexico to strengthen its relations. I understand there's a new administration in Mexico, the new Mexican president went to Brazil, had a very good meeting with President Duma and I understand this can open new veins for strength and cooperation between the two countries.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: PPP, yes, and (inaudible) that China have suspicion about President Obama initiative to launch, suddenly launch PPP and such a comprehensive, you know, free trade negotiation plan and put it in China and most of the scholars, most of the, you know, public opinion have suspicion, does have suspicions. Why? Because and in despite of President Obama's repeated declaration that China is American's one of most important trading partners, China is, you know, the nation where the United States is most important in bilateral relation the United States has in the 21<sup>st</sup> century--have not informed the China government in any degree before he launched this plan.

And after that he has not consulted with the Chinese government. And so we have possible scholars and we have possible leaders to, you know, have some suspicion about, you know, not economic motivation, but some fibers of strategic motivation.

And also I've seen (inaudible) that Chinese is quite firm and anyway, and China's first objective is to push to promote a more practical sub-regional economic lateral immigration plan. And especially us and (inaudible) China, Japan, Korea. And also Chinese come to even deal in this very incandescent confrontation over (inaudible). And the Chinese government and also, you know, take oppose to action and you negotiate with Japan, you negotiate with the Republic of Korea for this, you know, more practical sub-regional plan. And of course the Chinese have, you know, Chinese government have no any rights to prevent or precede any other governments, to take party in the PPP and, you know, PPP negotiation.

But of course the Chinese scholars and Chinese media also have some suspicion and why Prime Minister Abe and in despite of, you know, domestic division, especially, you know, complaints of even Japanese farmers to declare a little too hurried to, you know, take part in the negotiations with the United States of Japanese miners for PPP. There is a strategic (inaudible) motivation. China still have no any rights to interfere with other people. Even when PPP is established, okay, even if PPP is established, and whether China decided to take part in is still China sovereign rights. We will consider very seriously.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Thank you. Question here.

Mr. John Richardson: John Richardson from the German Marshall Fund. One of the books which was shown up on the screen earlier is about maritime challenges in the Atlantic. It comes to a conclusion that economic activity is going to increase off-shore in the maritime sphere, particularly energy and trade, and therefore shipping. But so will illegal activities as a result of

that--illegal activities such as piracy, such as smuggling, drug trafficking, people trafficking and that there is a bit of a vacuum because very few of the countries around the southern Atlantic basin have the capacity to interdict such illegal activity.

It comes to the obvious conclusion that southern Atlantic countries need to cooperate on this for increased domain surveillance, with increased Coast Guard cooperation and such a cooperation would need leadership. One of the obvious countries to lead that would be Brazil.

And so I have two questions for the panel. Would such Brazilian leadership on such a project be acceptable to the rest of the south Atlantic countries? That's for at least two gentlemen on the left. And, of course, for Secretary Prazeres, would Brazil have the will to do that and would it have the resources to put into the Naval and Coast Guard capability, which would be needed?

Ms. Lisa Mullins: And hold off on the answer, excuse me. I'm going to bring this here. Thanks.

Ms. Mina Apalacia: Thank you. Mina Apalacia from Spain and an addict to GMF's conferences. Allow me to start by a footnote to what Jorge Casteneda said about the would-be new members of the Security Council. And I would say that even if there was another relevant member that abstained, Germany. Germany bearing in mind that both Great Britain and France took a very clear position and bearing in mind that we have something that is called a European Union with all of us. But this is just a footnote, and frankly I think that, yes, that there is a trajectory to have an active foreign policy and an active foreign policy means an active policy and I fully agree with you that just abstaining is not an active foreign policy, in general. There have been some cases.

My question, and I'm sorry that it's quite late, was about foreign investment. The world today is about foreign investment and, in particular, there is no

development without foreign investment. However, before foreign investment meant rich countries, which means the United States Europe, Japan investing in developing countries. Today that's not the case. Today there is a lot of soft, soft investment. However, there is the same preconceived ideas about international protection of foreign investment. We have clear cases in Latin America, not to speak of other in Bolivia or in Argentina and, of course, in Africa.

I would like to see more of a debate, especially if you allowed me to make my last comment, is that China, which is a rising power, is not at all in this business of international law. It's much more bilateral negotiations. What is the role for international law in investment protection?

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. We're going to stockpile. So keep in mind, I'm sorry, we're going to need short answers. We have about eight minutes left. Just hold on one second. Sorry, one more point.



Mr. Gian Giacomo Migone: My name is Gian Giacomo Migone and I come from Italy and Italy's a middle-sized power. Most of us are, but the difference is that the Polish foreign minister says some of us know it and others don't know it. So there are two ways we can go. Either we can try to move upwards to be part of the directorates, you know, or be against them where we are excluded from them and be in favor of them when we are included. And I don't think this is very useful.

We could use our middle-sized prefecture, also newcomers, you know, to think if there is a common good with which all the world of international organizations that we want to strengthen and our international interests coincides in that case in making Europe and such stronger, the United Nations and such, and maybe start looking, rather than joining, you know, permanent membership which we cannot do. Rather, look critically at the privileges of the permanent members and then open a new discourse about, shall we call it democratization of international organizations?

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Good comment and a couple of questions, if we can hit them fairly briefly. I apologize for that. And then I'm going to go to this side of the room and we'll wrap up. Did you want to go first?

The Hon. Victor Borges: Concerning this issue of leadership, and Brazil could play a role in the South Atlantic, but I believe we have leaderships and not one leadership and sure enough Brazil could play a very important role, but I believe also that Brazil this challenge of understanding the past experience of, for instance, African relationship with Europe, where if it doesn't understand this, there is new risk. I'm not saying that it's ripening, but there is the risk of taking the same old ways leading to the same old problem.

And as expectation in Africa, as I see it, concerning Brazil are very, very high. Brazil must understand this. Someone was speaking about African culture. A lot of African countries are trusting on

Brazil to bring technology, to bring a lot of savoir faire to help them with this renewal of African culture, so because you have on African side Nigeria, you have the regional MTTs, you have South Africa, you have Bengali, you have countless death.

We want to play a role concerning the Paris issue. We go back to this issue, someone raising the (inaudible) environment also, and development because if you go to the death of Niger in Nigeria, it's not Chinese enterprise. You will find mass environmental, agriculture, fishing, etcetera, it's finished. So it's not just to say China, it's a lot of company does concern and that's why it's important for Africa and its relationship with China, assessing with accuracy their past experience concerning direct investments.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Very briefly.

The Hon. Victor Borges: Yes. I believe that all African countries is working on creating legislation and regulation that protect foreign direct investment in spite of what you said about China.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Yes, Dr. Shi.

Prof. Shi Yinhong: I think China's understanding of international law generally have one of two forms. One is bilateral agreement between sovereign states and international law treatment. And also multilateral. And sometimes China has preferred to go bilaterally because it just can't avoid some suffocations and complicities and to make things more effectively and more quick.

But of course China never opposed an international treaty to have some international protection of foreign investments. But (inaudible) not, you know, quick and effective and for--is on Bolivia. And since, you know, (inaudible) the Security Council passed the American, you know, one of the resolution the next day and there is war and China have to withdraw in a very emergency basis. And so they saw in the Chinese, you know, workers and great investment. Well, of course, in the future and there's internet discussion (inaudible) within the Security Council and China will actively participate in.

But China will be prudent because China (inaudible) and have some 19th century, you know, record and some international, you know, protection of investments becoming imposed upon, you know, NATO countries and China, you know, will try to avoid that. And of course you can say China is more very conservative. Yes. China is conservative.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. I promised this woman one final comment and then we'll move on.

Ms. Terri Givens: Terri Givens, University of Texas at Austin, and I've heard a lot--this conference is about the fragility of the global system and I haven't heard--there's been some reference to some of the conflicts going on, but I'm wondering how some of these conflicts in Northern Africa and Africa may impact the global Atlantic, including the fiscal crisis going on in Europe, as well.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Okay. If you want to take that, Victor, very briefly.

The Hon. Victor Borges: I believe that when you speak about fragility, people tend to think about security issues, military issues, but the fragility while living in France, in Africa, will impact the world. It's poverty. It's the issue of development, of disease, et cetera, et cetera. That's a huge challenge for Africa, for African countries, but also for the international community and we see that most African countries are not going to achieve the millennial development goals. First of all, it's an African problem, it's an African leadership responsibility, but it's a world challenge also because globalization is mobility and all this situation can be translate in tracts for security. So development issue is on the center of this fragility theme.

Ms. Lisa Mullins: Thank you. I just want to say that so much of what we have talked about during this entire conference has pertained to human capability and natural resources and I would just like to say that the Brussels Forum, and I think many of you will agree,

provides food for the mind, fertile ground for relationships to take root and grow, which as we know is key in this interconnected world, and the energy to jolt us into coming up with creative solutions to the complex problems we're facing. Power up. Thank you.

Mr. Craig Kennedy: Thank you, Lisa. What a great session. Thank you so much. It was really terrific. We're going to take a break now and then come back for our last session, but I want to do one quick quiz. How many people can tell me what's changed on the backdrop over the last three days?

Unidentified Male Speaker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Craig Kennedy: Yes, and? So it started out with--they started out at the beginning of the tight rope. Yesterday they were sort of in the middle and looked a little shaky. And by the time you get to the Global Atlantic and you have Brazil and Mexico and China and Africa represented, you see that they're getting to the top and they're across the chasm. So we'll see you back in another 30 minutes. Thank you.