



ATLANTIC FUTURE

SCIENTIFIC PAPER

37

The Atlantic within the Atlantic

Paula de Castro

Project Manager, CIDOB

ABSTRACT

A regional transformation has taken place over the past decades in the Atlantic, opening a new window of opportunity for rethinking the Atlantic Space. The purpose of this paper is to set out the results of the fieldwork done by the Atlantic Future project between the autumn of 2014 and the spring of 2015 and to provide a regional comparison of what Atlantic stakeholders think about the regional dynamics and the region itself. Specifically, the following pages will set out the results of 488 interviews carried out in 25 countries in Africa, Europe and North, South and Central America and three cities that are hubs of international organisations: Geneva, New York and Washington D.C. The final aim is to give voice to those leaders that are shaping the future of the Atlantic and provide qualitative evidence of the possible emergence of an Atlantic Space beyond the traditional North Atlantic Alliance and the North-South dependency

[The preliminary results of this Scientific Paper were presented at the ATLANTIC FUTURE seminar in Lisbon in April 2015 and several Atlantic Future project dissemination events throughout 2015.]

ATLANTIC FUTURE – Towards an Atlantic area? Mapping trends, perspectives and interregional dynamics between Europe, Africa and the Americas, is a project financed by the European Union under the 7th Framework Programme, European Commission Project Number: 320091.



ATLANTIC FUTURE SCIENTIFIC PAPER

37

Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
2. The road to the Atlantic	3
3. The Atlantic within the Atlantic	5
3.1 The regional evolution of the Atlantic	5
3.2 <i>What united us is also what divides us</i>	7
3.3 <i>Trends that are shaping the Atlantic region</i>	8
3.3.1 <i>Economy and finance: the pursuit of growth</i>	8
3.3.2 <i>The security risks in the Atlantic</i>	10
3.3.3 <i>Political and social challenges in the Atlantic</i>	12
3.3.4 <i>The Atlantic's resources and environment</i>	14
3.4 <i>Interests that could shape the configuration of the Atlantic</i>	16
4. The emergence of the Atlantic Space	17
5. Conclusions	19
References	20

1. Introduction

The Atlantic is not only a biophysical entity. Over the past five centuries the Atlantic Ocean has become a bridge between peoples, cultures, goods and the knowledge seeds of the world's first signs of globalisation. Economic exchanges, colonisation processes, slavery, different waves of migration and the richness of natural resources have marked the complex level of interdependence in the region (Marcos 2015). However, the end of the cold war opened up a period of global reconfiguration that went from local to international level.

Since then, the countries of the North Atlantic have strengthened their transatlantic relations despite moments of uncertainty. Developing countries in the South Atlantic have increased their relevance by the fortification of their economies and the empowerment of their voices in the international forums. Non-state actors have been filling the gaps in those areas where national governments have been unable to act and have reinforced the economic and social interdependences; although despite the spread of non-conventional security threats and the actions of non-state actors states remain the primary actors.

Hence, the regional transformation and the diffusion of power that have taken place over the past decades have opened a new window of opportunity for rethinking the Atlantic Space: to identify those areas where commonalities have been consolidated in the past; to think beyond the traditional scope of transatlantic relations and identify the transnational connections between the South and North Atlantic; and therefore to allow us to start thinking *whether a new pan-Atlantic system of relations is emerging in the Atlantic area beyond the traditional North Atlantic Alliance and North-South dependency*.

The purpose of this paper is not to answer this question, but to show the results of the fieldwork done by the Atlantic Future project between the autumn of 2014 and the spring of 2015. Specifically, the research consisted of 488 interviews carried out in 25 countries on the four continents of the Atlantic and three cities that are hubs of international organisations: Geneva, New York and Washington D.C. Together, they provide a regional comparison and evidence of what stakeholders from Africa, Europe, and North, South and Central America think about the Atlantic region, its trends, challenges and opportunities.

What the reader will find in the following pages is the confirmation that the Atlantic does indeed share a unique hub of common values and interests that could indeed forge collaborative relations in the region. However, it will also show that, even counting on this unique substance, a combination of internal and external factors erodes the political will and the leadership necessary to make an autonomous geopolitical space in the Atlantic.

2. The road to the Atlantic

As mentioned in the introduction, the Atlantic Future project performed 488 interviews in 25 countries in Africa, Europe and North, South and Central America: Angola, Argentina, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Belgium, Brazil, France, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, South Africa, the United States, the United Kingdom and Venezuela. Besides which, interviews were also made in three cities that are headquarters of international organisations: Geneva, Washington D.C. and New York.



Figure 1. Map showing the countries around the Atlantic Space where interviews were carried out.

Each of the 13 institutions that form part of the Atlantic Future project selected around 20 interviewees in each country of study – with the exception of Brussels and London, where 40 interviews were made.¹ For the selection of each of the interviewees, the professional experience in the four Atlantic regions and a balance between gender and professional profiles were taken into consideration. For the public sector, diplomats, heads of units and divisions, and directors and representatives of supra-national organisations were selected. For the private sector, managers and directors of companies, multinationals, chambers of commerce and professional organisations were chosen. For academia, professors and researchers were selected. For the media, analysts, editors and heads of international affairs sections were included in the selection. And, finally, from civil society, associations and non-governmental organisations were consulted as well.

The interview process was made on a face-to-face basis. However, in countries in West Africa, interviews were made by Skype or phone conversation because, during the fieldwork, the Ebola outbreak and the security situation in West Africa made it impossible for researchers to move about safely. The interviews were conducted following a questionnaire developed by the Atlantic Future project that consisted of three sections. The first section was dedicated to regional dynamics and evolution in the Atlantic. The second consisted of gathering information about the challenges identified in previous phases of the project in the areas of economy, security, environment, social and political trends in the Atlantic. And the third section focused on general trends such as: the convergence and divergence of norms, values and interests, regional and interregional relations in the Atlantic and a final question about the possible emergence or not of a pan-Atlantic space. The responses of each of the interviewees were transcribed into a standardised report that was integrated into a

¹ The rationale behind this distribution of interviews lies in the fact that these cities counted on

database that was subsequently codified and analysed with the help of Nvivo Software.²

Finally, it should be stressed that the aim of this study is not to produce exhaustive research about what all Africans, Europeans and North, South and Central Americans think about the Atlantic. On the contrary, the plan was to give a small sample of what the Atlantic community perceives about the Atlantic region. Therefore, the reader should bear in mind that the following papers do not seek to provide a generalisation of what the countries in which the interviews were made think about the Atlantic.

3. The Atlantic within the Atlantic

The following sections outline the results of the fieldwork. The first section will describe the dynamics that stakeholders considered to be shaping the Atlantic. The second section will portray the insights that interviewees made about the existence of a common Atlantic identity. The third section will elaborate on the interviewees' vision of the trends and challenges that affect the Atlantic Space. The last section will point out those areas where the Atlantic community identifies space for collaborative relations.

3.1. The regional evolution of the Atlantic

With the purpose of understanding the dynamics that have taken place in the Atlantic Space, interviewees were asked which they considered to be the most important and least important regions of the past twenty years and the next ten years ahead. Based on their professional experience, stakeholders from the four shores of the Atlantic considered positive and negative arguments when rating the relevance of each one of these regions.

When looking into the past, stakeholders from the four regions converged on the idea that, on the one hand, Africa and South America have been the most relevant regions for both positive and negative reasons; and, on the other, the United States has maintained its global relevance and Europe – or more precisely, the European Union, to which all the interviewees made reference – has lost its role as a global actor.

When it came to Africa and South and Central America, interviewees mentioned that economic growth, the spread of interregional initiatives, demographic growth, their extensive land masses, natural resources and new energy discoveries in Brazil and Angola were the positive notes. However, on the negative side, respondents considered that the spread of the illicit trafficking of drugs, weapons and humans, the rise of terrorism in Africa (Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) or the rise of the Islamic State (IS)), the increasing waves of irregular immigration from the South to the North Atlantic and the relation of all these issues with transnational and organised crime cast a shadow over these continents' potential. Interviewees from Colombia, Mexico and Germany mentioned how risks like the Ebola outbreak in Africa should be considered a security risk that should not be underestimated. As a Mexican respondent stated: *“If Africa can improve hygiene conditions and reduce epidemic death rates along with improved investment, it could be a continent that can finally take off”* (Aspinwall, González & Ruano 2015).

As far as the North Atlantic goes, stakeholders agreed that the United States has maintained its global relevance because of the economic recovery that the country has experienced since the financial crisis of 2008, its security capabilities and the energy

² **NVivo** is a qualitative data analysis (QDA) computer software package produced by QSR International. For more information please see: <http://www.qsrinternational.com/product>

revolution that it is taking place in the country. On a negative note, interviewees from Africa mentioned the loss of importance that the country has had as a global donor in the region.

When referring to Europe, the Atlantic stakeholders based their answers on the European Union and its diminishing role as a global actor. They explained that, besides its role as global aid donor, the impact of the 2008 financial crisis on its economy, its increasing focus on crisis management and the lack of unity of its member states erodes its capabilities.

It is worth mentioning that almost all the interviewees from the four shores of the Atlantic remarked on the influence that China and other Asian countries are having in Africa and South America as a source of investment and technical support for the construction of new infrastructure in exchange for African and South American commodities.

When looking at the future, respondents agreed that Africa, South America and, in North America, the United States, will probably continue to gain importance. African and South American countries will probably do so because of their vast natural resources and economic potential. However, opinions varied between the interviewees when thinking about the “brighter future” since, according to some of the interviewees, this future may not be a bright one. Some Europeans, Africans and representatives of international organisations drew our attention to the possible economic slowdown that African and South American countries could experience in the following years as a consequence of Chinese economic deceleration. Besides which, some interviewees mentioned that “African potential” would depend on the region’s capability to solve its security challenges, irregular immigration flows and governance instability (Aspinwall & González & Ruano 2015).

On the other hand, interviewees were unanimous in considering that the United States will increase its capacity due to the geostrategic implications that the shale, offshore and low-carbon revolutions can have on the region and the impact that the signing of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) agreement with the European Union could have for the Atlantic and global trade map. On a political note, certain European respondents from Brussels, the Netherlands and Warsaw expressed doubts about the course that the next US administration would take on foreign policy: isolationist or interventionist? (Hörst & Piatkiewicz 2015).

To conclude, most of the interviewees agreed on the fact that the European Union could continue losing ground as a global power if it does not manage to boost the European project under a single voice and solve its economic and political instability. German interviewees expressed cautious optimism about the role of Europe in the Atlantic. They mentioned that, for the European Union, strengthening transatlantic relations will probably be a must considering the shift of the United States to Asia, the geostrategic and economic implications of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and, most recently, the security instability generated by the conflict in Ukraine and Russian hostility. In this regard, Spanish diplomats considered that “*the EU was “humiliated” by the Russian annexation of Ukraine, and it was “a mistake” to open NATO to Russia and eastern European countries. After the crisis in Ukraine, the EU has lost confidence and credibility as a global actor*” (Gratius 2015).

On a positive note, almost all the respondents from the South Atlantic recognised the positive role that the EU has had as a defender of environmental policies and, especially for the African and South and Central American continents, as an international aid donor: “*The EU is noted for cooperation surrounding development assistance, governance and human rights. It is a model to aspire to in terms of*

education, health and political system, as well as migration. The EU is perceived as a leader in Atlantic policies with regards to fishery policies, security cooperation, democracy and human rights” (Khorana & Stolte 2015).

3.2 What united us is also what divides us

One of the premises of the Atlantic Future project has been to see the Atlantic as a region in which cultural commonalities unite the four continents. It is our appreciation that these features are the main DNA that renders the Atlantic a unique area, in which interests can meet and cooperative relations are more promptly developed. With the purpose of finding empirical evidence about this common unity of understanding among the four shores of the Atlantic, during the fieldwork interviewees were asked about the convergence or divergence of norms and values. The responses allow us to conclude that: first, certain commonalities inherent to the Atlantic Space do indeed exist; but the way each particular region defines or practises these features has become a source of discrepancy and contention.

Almost all of the interviewees considered that the Atlantic shares norms and values. Specifically, interviewees from Argentina, Brazil, Belgium, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Mexico, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Senegal and the United States considered that the Atlantic shares a common colonial past, slavery history and immigration patterns from which the cultural traits of each continent may be identified in the others.

Stakeholders considered that the Atlantic shares the following values and norms: democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights, free market economies, individual liberty and civil rights, multilateralism, defence of international law, Judeo-Christian culture (with the exception of some countries in Africa), common languages, culture, a defence of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and family structures. Some of the respondents even added that these common traits allowed us to be members of sub-groups, such as the Commonwealth, la Francophonie, the Community of Portuguese Language Countries (CPLP) and the Ibero-American Community (Marcos 2015).

However, the appreciation of this common heritage varied according to the countries. While interviewees from South America, North America and Europe considered this resemblance in a more positive tone, interviewees from West Africa considered these commonalities to be the result of a process of imposition by colonial powers. An interviewee from Cameroon considered that cultural commonalities *“evolve on European and American terms since Western democratic norms are often imposed on Africa by various state and international institutions, often linked to structural adjustment programmes and aid”* (Mattheis 2015). Furthermore, respondents from Cameroon, France, Spain, Italy, Poland and South Africa were more reluctant to believe that all four regions of the Atlantic have the same perception of values. Representatives of international organisations were of the opinion that, even if, in principle, all the countries subscribe to the universal values reflected in the United Nations Charter, there are differences and nuances in some countries’ conceptualisation (De Castro 2015).

Almost all the interviewees agreed on the fact that between the North Atlantic countries there is a greater degree of homogeneity. Almost all the interviewees recognised that since the end of WWII the United States and Europe have built a strong relationship based on a convergence of values and interests, which are *“sustained and buttressed by a variety of institutions, organisations and frameworks and regular meetings to foster transatlantic relations”* (H. Stefes 2015). Yet not everything has been as perfect as it sounds and, as stated in the German, Dutch, Spanish, Belgium, Italian, Poland and Portugal interview reports, there are certain differences that have opened up a gap

between the two regions. The existence of the death penalty in the United States, the divergences regarding the use of force in the two regions, the different role that the state should play, the respect for citizens' rights to privacy, the involvement of religion in state affairs and the balance between security and civil liberties are only a few examples of the growing differences between the two traditional allies.

On the other hand, respondents elaborated on the triangular relations that exist between North America, Europe and South and Central America, leaving the African continent outside the equation. Interviewees from Paris even added, "*if we exclude Africa, we could definitely say that the Atlantic area shares democratic values, economic liberalism and politics*" (Mendroa & Piatkiewicz 2015). Specifically, the major differences identified by the interviewees were: language, religion, family configuration, LGBT rights, polygamy and gender inequality, among others.

It is also worth mentioning Moroccan interviewees' reservations about making generalisations about the wider Atlantic since the identity of the regions is complex. For instance, the interview report stated that: "*Morocco has a problem with its identity and is positioned on a platform of cross-cultural influences (African, European, Arab)*" (Sqalli 2015). Interviewees from South America and Europe with expertise in the region supported this idea when considering that South America is far from being a homogeneous region when it comes to discussing the state of democracy and respect for human rights. As a Spanish journalist mentioned "*In some Latin countries – particularly Venezuela – populist regimes are a problem for democracy and a dividing line between South American countries on the one side and the North Atlantic community on the other*" (Gratius 2015).

Lastly, representatives from international organisations in Geneva made a similar claim, arguing that we cannot even talk about a common vision between the north and south of Europe. Especially nowadays, when protectionist views and the spread of conservative political parties and ideas are spreading as a result of the financial, immigration and refugee crises in Europe (Dessi & Rosselli 2015). Besides which, respondents from the southern Atlantic – particularly Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela – mentioned the disparities that still prevail between the South and the North Atlantic on issues such as the "responsibility to protect" principle and the humanitarian interventionism that the North has pursued in its foreign policy (Sousa 2015).

3.3 Trends that are shaping the Atlantic region

The Atlantic Future project has studied the rationales of cooperation in the Atlantic Space in the fields of economy, security, the environment and social and political issues. Particular challenges were identified in each of these areas and were expressed to the Atlantic stakeholders with the aim of confirming if these issues formed part of the professional agenda, detecting their relevance as well as identifying other possible challenges that we should take into consideration when speaking about the Atlantic Space.

3.3.1 Economy and finance: the pursuit of growth

In the area of economy, the project identified growth in trade and investment flows, the negotiation of new free trade agreements, construction of new infrastructure and new transport routes as the most pressing challenges. Stakeholders from the four continents agreed on the primary importance that the negotiation of new free trade agreements and growth of trade and investment flows have for all the countries of the Atlantic, followed by the construction of new infrastructure and new transport routes, principally when it comes to the United States in North America, Africa and South and Central American countries. Furthermore, most of the interviewees agreed that, in the

Atlantic, regional economic integration has not yet developed, given the importance still placed on bilateral relations and trade agreements because of specific national interests.

Although all the stakeholders in the Atlantic saw the negotiation of new free trade agreements and their link to growth and investment flows as one of the primary issues of concern, the interests of each continent on this particular matter varied according to its needs. Interviewees from the United States, Canada and all the European countries argued that the relevance of these topics lies in the need to overcome the 2008 economic crisis and the consequences that the negotiation of new free trade agreements could have on: strengthening transatlantic relations, bolstering economic global governance and regional integration. Meanwhile, for the interviewees from the South Atlantic the most pressing issue was to open their economies to the global markets, move away from commodities dependency, achieve sustainable development and regain the momentum of the industrialisation that some countries in South America have left behind.

In the case of the North Atlantic, almost all the interviewees made reference to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) agreement, currently under negotiation between the United States and the European Union. For the interviewees, the importance of this type of agreement is as a *“declaration of the willingness of Europeans and Americans to work closer together and counter the growing power of China”* (H.Stefes 2015), it *“answers to the need to deepen transatlantic relations as a means to maintain both EU and US influence in the Atlantic* (Dessi & Rosselli 2015) and *“it could be a life-saver for Europe in terms of repositioning the continent for renewed growth and greater competitiveness in a more diffuse world economy”* (D. Hamilton 2015).

Leaving this optimism behind, some interviewees cited the long path that these negotiations still have ahead of them and the negativity in certain sectors of European public opinion on the conditions of this agreement regarding: the harmonisation of standards, regulations, food security, environmental protection, dispute settlement, quality standards and job protection, as some of the interviewees in Brussels mentioned (Lledó & Piatkiewicz 2015). Moreover, as some French interviewees mentioned, *“the negotiation of this agreement will be a long, rocky path considering the lack of trust that has emerged between the United States and Europe”*. Especially with a United States that is more concerned about security and a Europe that focusses more on individual liberties (Piatkiewicz & Medroa 2015).

Although US interviewees considered that the TTIP could unblock the Doha Round, some Europeans, Africans, South and Central Americans and international organisation representatives mentioned the negative impact that this agreement could have on developing economies in the South Atlantic. As an interviewee from Argentina mentioned *“Will the TTIP be an economic NATO that will jeopardise this South-South cooperation?”* (Sousa 2015).

Following the idea of trade agreements as a geopolitical strategy, some interviewees mentioned the importance that the European Union has given to economic partnerships as a way to promote a model of economic governance. As the report from the United Kingdom interviews mentioned: *“the EU has demonstrated a “normative aspiration” to export its preferred model of liberalisation, economic governance and multilateral regulation through trade agreements that constitute an integral dimension of external policy”* (Khorana & Stolte 2015).

As has been mentioned in other sections of this paper, it is relevant to remark that all the interviewees expressed the importance of the role that Asian countries are playing

in the Atlantic Space. For respondents from the South Atlantic, Chinese investment as a source of economic growth is forged under the following formula: *“China invests in infrastructure while southern countries in Africa and South America execute its commodities demands”* (Sousa 2015). African respondents value the fact that their relation with the Asian country has been built on common economic interest, leaving behind the conditionalities that other actors, such as the European Union, have traditionally required, which erode their credibility in the region. Further, as claimed by the interview report from Cameroon, interviewees from the region believed that African norms and values are closer to those of Asia and particularly to Chinese and added *“that’s why they fit easily into our business environment”* (Mattheis 2015). Additionally, German experts even mentioned that *“countries like Malaysia and the Philippines offer different models of development and are perceived to have more in common with developing countries in Latin America and Africa than Europe and the United States”* (H. Stefes 2015).

Finally, when interviewees were asked which other challenges we should take into consideration, they mentioned: institutions to regulate financial flows, the weakness of the European Union, weak property protection in South and Central America as well as Africa, economic disputes, and a division between two types of economic model in South and Central America and Africa between *“those countries with market-based approaches (e.g. Mexico, Colombia, Peru and Chile), those with socialist-leaning approaches (e.g. Venezuela, Bolivia, Cuba) as well as those lying somewhere in between (e.g. Brazil)”* (Tedsen 2015).

3.3.2 The security risks in the Atlantic

In the realm of security, the Atlantic Future project considered the illicit trafficking of drugs, weapons and humans, terrorism, maritime security and fragile states as the main challenges for the Atlantic Space. The opinions of the interviewees about these issues varied according to the region at stake and the current national or international events that were taking place at the time of interview. As in the previous section, other challenges were added at the end of the discussions.

Almost all the interviewees agreed on the primacy of fragile states as the root cause of instability and the spread of international security threats. There was general consensus on the links between poor institutions and governance of a country and security threats such as: terrorism, illicit trafficking of goods, arms, drugs and persons, and energy and maritime security. Africans, Europeans, North, South and Central Americans and the representatives of international organisations based in New York, Washington D.C and Geneva considered that bad governance, social and economic inequality, lack of justice and lack of development are only some of the challenges that most of the southern Atlantic countries still have to face.

Likewise, Europeans and international organisation representatives mentioned the direct relationship that failed states in the Middle East and Africa have with the growth of flows of irregular immigration and the rise of refugee flows due to the lack of opportunities, intra-state conflicts and the growing presence of terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda, ISIS or Boko Haram in the African region. On the other hand, even if interviewees from the South Atlantic did not feel comfortable with the term “fragile states” because they considered it a *“tedious concept created by the North”* (Sousa 2015), they used this term to define the political, economic and social instability that most of the African countries face. This position was endorsed by African respondents from Angola who said *“African countries have a preference in Africa for strong leaderships instead of strong institutions”* (Seabra 2015).

As far as terrorism goes, there was a diversity of opinions depending on the country and the problem of the conceptualisation of terrorism itself. The interviewees from the United States and Canada felt the need to distinguish between considering the Atlantic Space a terrorist threat – which they not consider to be the case – or as *“a region that should join forces against the influence of some terrorist groups such as the so-called “Islamic State” and other affiliated groups that are taking ground in Africa”* (D. Hamilton 2015). For interviewees in Paris, terrorism was identified as the biggest challenge and it was pointed out as the most challenging threat against the interests of the region (Piatkiewicz & Medroa 2015). Interview reports from Portugal, Spain and Italy added that the spread of terrorist networks in North Africa, the Sahel region and the Maghreb strengthen the idea that Europe’s security problem is dependent on the evolution of security in Africa. Finally, the Spanish interview report raised concerns about the rising numbers of European citizens travelling to war zones to join terrorist groups (Gratius 2015).

On another note, representatives of international organisations in Geneva added that *“terrorism as a concept is one thing and terrorism as a producer of security threats is another”*. In the experts’ opinions *“the designation of terrorist groups has been happening very easily over the past years. It is too easy to put a label that brings other kinds of nuances and problems”*. In addition, the interviewee added *“the way in which we have been dealing with it [the concept of terrorism] and the way we have been applying this concept is creating more of the so-called terrorism”* (De Castro 2015). South and Central American respondents saw terrorism as the least relevant issue in relation with their continent. The interview report from Venezuela mentioned that, since September 11th, *“there has been a shift of relevance from Latin America to the Middle East for security concerns”* (Sousa 2015). They recognised the relevance that terrorism has at an international level, principally for the stability of the African continent; however, they considered that issues such as trafficking of drugs, weapons and humans are more pressing issues for South and Central America.

Interviewees from Brazil, Cape Verde, Angola and West Africa pondered maritime security as one of their security priorities. For some Brazilian security experts maritime security constitutes an opportunity to foster cooperative relations in the Atlantic, given the risk that piracy poses to keeping maritime lines of trade and energy open. In addition, interviewees from Cape Verde and Angola commented on the importance of maritime security for protecting their strategic position in trade flows, on the one hand, and the pending maritime territorial disputes in Africa and South America on the other (Angola with the Democratic Republic of Congo and Argentina with the United Kingdom over the Falklands/Malvinas). Because of this, and in line with its Atlantic strategy, Moroccan interviewees made particular mention of the significance of structuring the Atlantic region around maritime-interested communities. As an example they declared that *“Brazil and Argentina use their maritime power for strategic projections and diplomacy oriented towards Africa and Europe”* (Sqalli 2015).

As advanced in the beginning of this section, interviewees made mention of other challenges with implications for global and Atlantic security. For European and North, South and Central American interviewees, the impact of poverty, epidemics (i.e. Ebola in Africa) and food security were considered amongst the most prominent challenges to be faced. European interviewees made particular mention of the security threat that irregular immigration brings with it and of religious radicalisation (Christian and Islamist) in relation with terrorist groups. It was interesting to see how Polish interviewees expressed their worries about the United States’ pivot to Asia *“considering Poland’s eastern border with Ukraine and the rise of Russian hostility”* (Hörst & Piatkiewicz 2015). Finally, South American countries considered the intervention in internal state affairs on the basis of human rights violations a dividing factor between the North and

South (Sousa 2015). Representatives of international organisations from Washington D.C, New York and Geneva mentioned a range of issues including: the impact of climate change, counterfeiting of goods and medicines and cybersecurity. According to one of the experts, the big problem regarding cybersecurity is that when this issue is raised some *“countries do not want to discuss these matters because they are afraid that it would impact their national security, and, consequently, they block other countries from catching up on basic forms of protecting their people”* (De Castro 2015).

3.3.3 Political and social challenges in the Atlantic

In this category, interviewees were asked their opinion of the state of democracy, respect for human rights, diplomatic exchanges and migration trends in the Atlantic. As with the other categories, interviewees recognised that all these challenges are currently on their professional agendas. In general, for the interviewees, the state of democracy and migration were the most important issues followed closely by – or alongside – respect for human rights and lastly (if mentioned at all), came diplomatic exchanges.

According to African, Canadian, European and South and Central American interviewees and some representatives of international organisations we are living a democracy crisis. On one side, we are experiencing a democratic crisis in countries in which democratic systems were supposed to already be in place; and, on the other, a long path still lies ahead to establish and strengthen democratic institutions in South Atlantic countries and international organisations.

Regarding the first phenomenon, some of the interviewees from Europe considered that democracy in the North Atlantic countries has been put at risk. For instance, in Europe, protectionism and conservative political movements have been growing as a consequence of the economic crisis and the reaction of some right-wing political parties to the increasing flows of irregular immigration. In the case of the United States, representatives of international organisations from Geneva pointed out the erosion that our democratic systems have suffered as a consequence of the political polarisation and the “war on terror” put in place since September 11th, 2001.

On the other hand, Europeans, South and Central Americans and representatives of international organisations agreed on the fact that some *“Latin American countries have followed populist political regimes and aggressively pitch themselves against the West”* (Netherlands 2015). According to the interview reports from Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela interviewees from these countries not only subscribe to this argument, but also add their disenchantment with the democracy deficit in the international decision-making bodies: *“To what extent are people represented in these institutions of international order today? Where is the principle of equality of states represented? How is it that such important issues, which have so much impact on countries outside of these decision-making bodies, are discussed behind closed doors by five states alone?”* (Sousa 2015).

Finally, it is worth mentioning that though Angola and Morocco stated that in Africa democracy is a *“process that needs to be constructed”*, according to the Angolan report, democratic establishment is still *“dependent on how the society admits this change and can culturally adapt itself”* (Seabra 2015). And, with some differences, but in the same line, the interview report from Morocco added that: *“Middle-Eastern countries, along with the Maghreb and Africa do not have enough intellectual maturity to understand the state of democracy and the development achieved by developed countries [...] Arab claims are a far cry from what is called democracy [therefore] Africans and Arabs must find in their roots models apt to guide their actions and dreams”* (Sqalli 2015).

Regarding the respect for human rights, European interviewees considered that in Africa, South and Central America there is a clear deficit in the protection of human rights and good governance. Up to the point that some German interviewees defended the position of the United States and the European Union when adding conditionality clauses based on the defence of human rights to all trade and cooperation agreements (H. Stefes 2015). However, representatives of international organisations in Geneva also regretted the backwards step that the EU has taken since it is *“paralysed by the fact that they have to have a common view on issues, and it is really hard to achieve it when there are so many states involved”* (De Castro 2015). On the contrary, and according to the same interviewee, in South America, countries like Chile, Costa Rica, Argentina and Uruguay have become quite strong when fighting human rights abuses in counterterrorism measures. Unfortunately, this positive note contrasts with the opinion of the Washington D.C. representatives, who stated that some countries like Argentina have seen disturbing new trends towards curbing freedom of expression (Tedsen 2015).

Furthermore, irregular immigration was considered among all the interviewees to be a top priority in the region given the complexity that this phenomenon has acquired over the past years. First, because of the growing flows of irregular immigration directly linked to the insecurity in Africa and South and Central America. Second, because of the violations of the human rights of immigrants at the hands of trafficking networks. Third, as some representatives of international organisations mentioned, because of the continuous movement of people from the South to the North Atlantic in search of better economic and social conditions, but also from Europe to the United States, Africa, South and Central American countries as a consequence of the 2008 financial crisis. Fourth, because of the complexity of dealing with the *“negative side of immigration flows (poor working conditions, difficult integration and security threats) and positive effects (labour force, cultural enrichment and diverse societies)”* that immigration brings with it (Gratius 2015). And, finally, due to the fuel that an anti-migration European sentiment can add to the unsteady economic context that Europe is experiencing.

In this regard, the particular concern should also be added that countries like Venezuela and Morocco risk brain drain through the waves of immigration. According to a Moroccan interviewee, *“We have to keep the human resources capital, efficient and performing elites who take on genuine leadership roles as far as human rights are concerned, along with the protection of people etc., and, of course, the enhancement of economic development”* (Sqalli 2015). Because of this, the interview report added that *“over the last few years, many private and public initiatives have been launched in Morocco to keep people in their own country: leadership training programmes; education reforms; specialised private schools, etc.”* (Sqalli 2015).

The issue of diplomatic exchanges was considered important only for some interviewees in Spain, Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela. Specifically, some Spanish diplomats stated that Spain could play a valuable role as a link between the European Union, the United States and South American countries (Gratius 2015). Interviewees from Argentina indicated that the country has been investing in new diplomatic representations in the countries of South America and Africa where interests converge (Sousa 2015). Brazilian interviewees gave importance to diplomatic exchanges because of the weight that southern countries want to gain in international forums. Lastly, Venezuelan interviewees mentioned the issue of diplomatic exchanges when referring to the relationship that the country has built with Central American countries through so-called “oil diplomacy” (Sousa 2015).

To conclude, Atlantic stakeholders added some challenges that were not included in the questionnaire. European interviewees mentioned the need to foster cultural

exchanges, their concern about the growing European intolerance to race, nationalities and, in certain cases, sexual orientation, as well as the spread of religious radicalisation (Islam in the Sahel, North Africa and the Middle East, and Pentecostal Christianity in Brazil and Africa). European respondents also added the increasing rates of youth unemployment as a consequence of the economic crisis in Europe and structural problems in Africa. Other representatives from Africa, working in civil society sectors, pointed out the challenges that demography will pose to the continent – resource depletion, lack of education and food security over the coming years.

3.3.4 The Atlantic's resources and environment

To conclude this section Atlantic stakeholders were asked about transformation of the energy sector, and the impacts of climate change and resource depletion. From the interviews we can extract three conclusions: i) the transformation of the energy sector is one of the most important trends in the Atlantic; ii) the South Atlantic considers the impact of climate change a North Atlantic story; iii) resource depletion is mostly a concern for the countries of the South Atlantic.

The transformation of the energy sector was considered to be of the most importance because is directly linked to sustainable development and energy security in the region. According to almost all interviewees, the relevance of this challenge varies between industrialised countries (mostly North Atlantic) and non-industrialised countries (South Atlantic). For countries like the United States, Brazil and Angola, the transformation of their energy sectors arises from the discoveries of oil and gas and the development of new technology – hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” and deep-water drilling – that is likely to lead to what some Atlantic Future researchers have called the “energy renaissance”. For the countries of the European Union, the importance of the energy sector comes from their need to diversify their sources of supply away from Russian resources, given the disruptive consequences that conflicts like the Ukrainian invasion have on the energy supply. Furthermore, some European interviewees showed their concern about the lack of a common energy market because national interests seem still to be a priority on member states’ agendas. According to some experts from Portugal, “*EU member states represent a major obstacle to a common energy policy. [...] they are highly protectionist and still define energy security in strictly national terms*” (Marcos 2015).

In the South Atlantic, the question of the transformation of the energy sector comes from the energy poverty of some southern Atlantic countries and the need to invest in the exploration, extraction and industry of the countries that hold the natural resources (Pereira da Costa 2015). Besides this, respondents from Paris expressed their concern about the increasing tendency of countries like Brazil and South Africa to look to nuclear energy as a space where they can become major actors along with other BRICS countries (Piatkiewicz & Medroa 2015). Also, interviewees from Cape Verde and Morocco made explicit mention of measures that their countries have been putting into place to eliminate the dependency on fossil fuel energy systems. Moroccan interviewees mentioned that in their country, “*solar energy has increasingly gained importance over the last few years, as well as the importance of their phosphate as a source of uranium as a strategic commodity*” (Sqalli 2015).

Climate change was considered alongside the transformation of the energy sector as one of the most demanding issues. In this regard, almost all Europeans and representatives of international organisations mentioned the leading role that the European Union has taken over the past years in investment in renewable energies and environmental policy. However, they showed caution about the ongoing capability and willingness of the EU to be at the forefront of this endeavour. As the German interview report made explicit “*there was no consensus on whether the US and the EU*

would still dominate the agenda in the foreseeable future or would lose some power to emerging economies like Brazil and Mexico” (H. Stefes 2015). Further, the report from London added that: *“Developments in the field of renewable energy policies are directly related to the price of oil and the availability of affordable technology. With the current oil price at a historically low level, the transformation of the energy sector would therefore be slowed down as there would be less pressure to develop alternatives to expensive fossil energy sources”* (Khorana and Stolte 2015).

It is worth mentioning the view from some African countries, who regarded climate change as a problem of the countries of the North Atlantic. Despite recognising that the African continent is being deeply affected by the consequences of climate change, some of the interviewees considered that the work that remains to be done in order to mitigate this threat should be done by the countries of the North, as they are the ones that generate the most impact on climate change. *“From an African perspective, climate change is the least of our concerns, it’s an industrialised world-induced problem and our greatest concern will be depletion of biodiversity with deforestation”* (Mattheis 2015).

Atlantic interviewees also converged on the relevance of resource depletion in terms of water, arable land, dependency on extractive industries, food security and fishery stocks in the wider Atlantic. Most of the interviewees and, in particular, the representatives of international organisations, identify the depletion of fishery resources as a growing challenge *“since they provide livelihoods for many in the Atlantic and overfishing impacts relations between, for example, Europe and North Africa”* (Tedsen 2015). Interviewees from the United States and Canada agreed on the impact that this challenge can have *“on the day-to-day life in people’s access to power, access to energy, to food, to water, especially in Africa”* (D. Hamilton 2015). A Brazilian interviewee addressed this issue by saying that the biggest challenge in this area is the impact that international subsidies for fishing fleets have on the overprotection of these common resources (Sousa 2015). Therefore, given the preoccupation that these challenges induce in the Atlantic, some interviewees from Italy, United Kingdom and the international organisations considered that the *“richness of natural resources in the Atlantic calls for a need for more cooperative governance institutions* (Dessi & Rosselli 2015) and the *“challenges of resource depletion or the impact of climate change are dependent on whether or not countries have successfully transformed their energy sector towards more sustainable models* (Khorana and Stolte 2015).

Lastly, interviewees from the four shores of the Atlantic agreed that one of the Atlantic’s biggest problems is to invest in a united and common energy, climate and environmental policy within the Atlantic Space. The interview report from Portugal also emphasised the relevance that the extension of continental shelves could have for the Atlantic: *“The scarcity of land resources and the improvement of operating capabilities in the greater deep ocean will reinforce the interest of the Atlantic Basin riparian states in the exploitation of resources in the Atlantic continental shelf and may increase the competition between states on this issue”* (Marcos 2015). In line with this, interviewees from Argentina remarked on the *“need to secure maritime delimitation with regard to continental shelf limits and to achieve a point of understanding with the UK in terms of the exploitation of the hydrocarbons in the country* (Sousa 2015).

The interview report from Brazil mentioned the concern that Brazilians have about deforestation and the potential environmental impact of China’s levels of consumption. And, to conclude, the report from Morocco declared the relevance that research and innovation in the agricultural industry could have in reducing dependency on the more technologically advanced nations of African countries.

3.4 *Interests that could shape the configuration of the Atlantic*

The 488 interviews performed in the Atlantic Space made clear that no individual country could, by itself, face the common challenges that the region and the world face nowadays. Thus, in the respondents' view, it is paramount to establish a balance between national and international interests and multilateral partnerships based on common areas of interest. Atlantic stakeholders considered the areas of the economy, security and the environment to be the main realms in which collaborative relations could be built. Therefore we can say that: yes, the Atlantic regions share particular interests, but the measure, intensity and scope of each region's willingness to engage differentiates the position of the four continents.

In the area of the economy respondents agreed that trade liberalisation, economic growth, sustainable development and the promotion of economic governance are the most pressing issues for the Atlantic. As mentioned in the section "Trends that are shaping the Atlantic region", countries from the North Atlantic see the current negotiation of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) as an opportunity to boost transatlantic collaboration between the United States and the European Union. Yet, as mentioned before, the positive outcome of this trend will be marked by the capacity of this agreement to include the southern countries of the Atlantic. On the contrary there would be the risk of shaping an "*Atlantic Space with exclusions*" (Sousa 2015).

In the area of security, the transnational character of challenges such the trafficking of drugs, weapons and humans, international terrorism and piracy calls for transatlantic cooperation according to most of the interviewees. Furthermore, issues such as cybersecurity, the need to establish a coordinated response to the increase in irregular immigration from the South to the North, the rising numbers of refugees flowing from conflict areas in the Middle East and the Sahel area, as well as the conflict in Ukraine and the Russian position on global affairs were all seen by the North Atlantic countries and representatives of international organisations as potential areas for further collaboration.

Another area of interest considered by almost all the Atlantic interviewees was the need to create an "Atlantic energy system" considering the geostrategic implications that shale and the low-carbon revolution could have for the global market. Unfortunately, as mentioned in the previous sections and defended by interviewees from Belgium, Spain and Italy, there is a lack of unified vision in the Atlantic in this regard. On the other hand, interviewees from the North Atlantic and representatives of international organisations were especially inclined to consider climate change as an area of special interest for the region in which all four continents could join forces to mitigate its negative impact.

Finally, on a political and economic level, there are two factors identified by the interviewees as potential triggers for future collaboration or even conflict in the Atlantic depending on the political will of Atlantic leaders. The first concerns the interest that some interviewees from Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Honduras, Mexico, South Africa, West Africa and Venezuela have in promoting South-South horizontal cooperation: "*the "global South" is growing and there is the political will to strengthen South-South ties*" (Mattheis 2015). However, it could be perceived in the interviewees' answers that the narrative of the South is being built, essentially, in opposition to the North, as is the case for Brazil, the ALBA countries and South Africa, among other southern countries. Therefore, how this boom in the South will translate into more cooperative relations in the Atlantic will probably be determined on an issue-by-issue basis.

The second trigger relates to the interests and concerns that the presence of Asian powers, in particular China, raise in the South and North Atlantic. As we have already seen, for African and South American countries the presence of Asian powers is a synonym for investment and economic growth without the conditionality clauses imposed by traditional commercial partners. Nevertheless, the fact that US and European interviewees considered the presence of Asian countries in their “backyard” a source of concern added to the concern of interviewees from Argentina, Brazil and Honduras, who expressed their worries about the long-term effect of the Asian presence on the sustainable development of South America and Africa (Sousa 2015). It is also possible to infer that the presence of Asian countries in the Atlantic opens a window of opportunity for future collaboration. As the Atlantic Future project has mentioned on other occasions, not only is the Atlantic shifting towards Asia, Asia is also looking to the Pacific (D. Hamilton 2015). Therefore, how the countries of the Atlantic answer this shift with a collaborative effort would also be a matter of having the political will and effort to look beyond the national interest.

4. The emergence of the Atlantic Space

Prior to this section we have gone over the seeds of what unites the Atlantic societies, the trends that are shaping the region and we have identified possible areas of cooperation. Now we will deal with the part of the fieldwork in which interviewees were asked for their perception of the emergence of a pan-Atlantic space and, if one does not exist, the circumstances under which they considered that this pan-Atlantic political and social identity could be established.

The results of the interviews lead us to establish: first, that the idea of the Atlantic Space is still not in the imaginary of most the Atlantic community; second, that even when asked to consider the existence of this social and political construct, respondents were quite sceptical and focused more on the obstacles to the formation of such a space; and, third, the fact that national interests once again loom over international concerns.

Out of the 25 countries where interviews were conducted, respondents from 18 showed scepticism about the emergence of a pan-Atlantic space: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cameroon, France, Ghana, Germany, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Spain, the United Kingdom, Senegal, South Africa and Venezuela. This scepticism was supported by the representatives of international organisations in Geneva, Washington D.C. and New York. On the other hand, interviewees from Angola, Cape Verde, Colombia, Honduras, Portugal and the United States were more inclined to consider the emergence of this Atlantic Space, given their strategic position and Atlantic interests. Meanwhile, interviewees from Morocco had mixed feelings because, on one side, the country has developed and invested in an Atlantic strategy, but on the other, some respondents confessed to be sceptical about the possible viability or emergence of this Atlantic idea.

For the sceptics, the emergence of an Atlantic Space is a “*great idea but not realistic*” (Khorana & Stolte 2015). All of them considered the existence of a North Atlantic space in which the shared values and interests of the United States and Europe are the foundation of the transatlantic connection. Interviewees even considered the existence of a plurality of Atlantic spaces formed on an issue-to-issue basis (i.e. trade). Most of the respondents cited the following obstacles when referring to the existence of this pan-Atlantic region:

- **The need to address global challenges with global answers instead of looking at the world from a regional perspective.** As the interview report from Washington D.C. and New York stated “*In light of an increasingly globalised world, an expansion of*

regionalism seemed a non sequitur to many interviewees. Connections between people, and the velocity of exchange of ideas and information are expanding rapidly, and beyond physical (regional) barriers. According to a number of interviewees, globalisation is the primary driving force behind the trends and dynamics witnessed in the Atlantic, not regional relations. Traditional linkages of language, history and more cannot be replaced, but have become far less important in the face of globalisation” (Tedsen 2015).

- **The fact that in the Atlantic region different levels of economic, social and political development co-exist and bilateral relations dominate based on particular needs and bilateral relations.** According to the interview report from Geneva, *“In the pan-Atlantic space we have unequal partners. When you move to the other side of the Atlantic Space – to Africa and to some South American countries – you find different norms and values. Mainly because there the issue is not about common standards, it is about basic needs: education, poverty, and security” (De Castro 2015).*

- **The inward-looking process on which some Atlantic countries seem to concentrate makes it impossible for them to think in Atlantic terms.** For some regions this is a reaction to the economic crisis, for other – southern – countries it comes from the reluctance to transfer national smallholdings of power. In the views of the respondents: *“Europe is preoccupied by keeping their own house in order and preventing Africans from coming to Europe [...] the United States is looking towards Asia [...] and Brazil is investing in the BRICS groups” (H. Stefes 2015).* Interviewees from Brussels considered that the *“European Union should stick to its nearest neighbourhood and concentrate on resolving the disorder on the eastern and southern European borders rather than trying to be present in the entire world” (Lledó & Piatkiewicz 2015).* Meanwhile, a private consultant in Mexico felt that it was irrelevant to even consider a pan-Atlantic vision because *“regions should look to strengthen internally instead of expanding” (Aspinwall, González & Ruano 2015).*

- **The predominance of North-South divides in the Atlantic.** For the northern countries, cultural differences with the South were said to be the most considerable issue; whereas for southern countries, the changing interest of the northern powers and their paternalistic view towards the South was considered to be the main problem. Several interviewees from Africa and South America insisted that the North must change its position and start treating them as equal partners. Otherwise, the mistrust that originated in colonial times would continue to be an obstacle for the Atlantic. As some experts on Africa interviewed in Brussels highlighted *“as long as the North Atlantic fails to see Africa as an equal or to talk about polices rather than aid donor/recipient relations, nothing will change in the wider Atlantic” (Lledó & Piatkiewicz 2015).*

Now, according to the interviewees the circumstances that could lead to the emergence of an Atlantic Space are: i) the North should start seeing southern countries as equal partners; ii) the European Union has to work on a common foreign policy where member states act in unison in order to regain its global credibility; iii) African and South and Central American countries should foster their regional integration and reinforce the state of their democracy to strengthen their role in the Atlantic; iv) the narrative of the emerging global South should be strengthened but move further away from positions that are adversarial to the North; v) more dialogue should be fostered in the Atlantic Space through formal and informal forums and the movement of people and goods in order to facilitate interregional flows; vi) the promotion of the Atlantic Space should not be based along the lines of the North, but instead be built on a wider transatlantic scope.

5. Conclusions

The pages above have given us an appreciation of what the stakeholders of the four shores of the Atlantic think about the Atlantic Space. These pages have touched upon the identity of the Atlantic community and given an insight into the foundations on which stakeholders are building the future of this region. We have discovered that, yes, the Atlantic shares common values that could possibly distinguish this region forged on a common heritage. Nevertheless, we have also discovered how the ways of acting upon these common values have continuously diverged due to the levels of development and consequent needs of each particular country. Up to the point that countries from the South Atlantic have felt more inclined to identify themselves with countries from Asia with which they share the same needs and problematics than with countries from the North.

From the interviews it has also become clear that, given the global nature of the challenges nowadays, the Atlantic Space has the opportunity to align its common interests and boost collaborative relations. And yet the main obstacle to cementing this vision comes from internal and external factors that have reinforced protectionist views and inward-looking foreign policies that feed the traditional approach of a powerful North Atlantic dictating the rules to a dependent South.

Therefore, we can say that, based on the interviewees' responses, the idea of a possible emergence of an Atlantic Space seems still to be far from the Atlantic imaginary. Nevertheless, the perception of challenges and the recognition of areas of interest also confirm to us that certain trends are taking place in the Atlantic and new narratives are emerging. Therefore, the important question is whether the stakeholders in the Atlantic can turn the differences into opportunities and find the necessary political will and leadership to pull the dispersed threads that link the Atlantic together.

References

ASPINWALL, Mark and GONZÁLEZ, Elsy and RUANO, Lorena. Perspectives from Mexico, Colombia and Honduras, *Atlantic perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 02.

DA COSTA PEREIRA, Katarina. Perspectives from Cape Verde, *Atlantic Perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 07.

DE CASTRO, Paula. The Atlantic within the Atlantic. *Scientific paper, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 37.

DE CASTRO, Paula. Perspectives from International Organizations in Geneva. In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 17. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 128 - 141.

DESSÌ, Andrea and ROSSELLI, Chiara. Perspectives from Italy. In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 16. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 113 - 127.

GRATIUS, Susanne. Perspectives from Spain (Madrid). In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 15. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 97 – 112.

H. STEFES, Christoph. Perspectives from Germany. In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 08. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 4-18.

HAMMAD, Sqalli. Perspectives from Morocco, *Atlantic Perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 06.

HÖRST, Corinna and PIATKIEWICZ, Danielle. Perspectives from Poland (Warsaw). In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 13. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 73 - 82.

KHORANA, Sangeeta and STOLTE, Christina. Perspectives from the UK (London). In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 10. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 34 - 48.

LLEDÓ, Elisa and PIATKIEWICZ, Danielle. Perspectives from Belgium (Brussels). In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 11. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 49 - 60.

MARCOS, Daniel. Perspectives from Portugal. In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 14. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 83 - 96.

MATTHEIS, Frank. Perspectives from Cameroon, South Africa and West Africa, *Atlantic Perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 04.

PIATKIEWICZ, Danielle and MEDROA. Bruno. Perspectives from France (Paris). In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 12. *Atlantic Future*, 2015, pp. 61 - 72.

S. HAMILTON, Daniel. ADELLE, Camilla. ISBELL, Paul. KOTSOPOULOS, Jon. MCGLADE, Katriona. SMITH, Lucy Olivia. Changing intra-Atlantic interdependencies: Implications for the EU and its major partners, *Report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 01

S. HAMILTON, Daniel. Perspectives from Canada and the United States, *Atlantic Perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 03.

SEABRA, Pedro. Perspectives from Angola, *Atlantic Perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 05.

SMITH, Lucy Olivia. Perspectives from the Netherlands. In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations, *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 09. Atlantic Future, 2015, pp. 19-34.

SOUSA, Inês. Perspectives from Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela, *Atlantic Perspectives: interview report, Atlantic Future*, 2015, 01.

TEDSEN, Elizabeth. Perspectives from International Organizations in New York and Washington, D.C. In: CIDOB. Perspectives from the EU and International Organizations. *Atlantic Perspectives: Interviews report*. 18. Atlantic Future, 2015, pp. 142 - 154.