

DISINTEGRATION OF GLOBAL SECURITY GOVERNANCE

Georgy Toloraya¹

Victoria Panova²

Since World War II, with global breakdowns and new world orders, one of the topics that have constantly worried several countries is global security. As countries have evolved and modernized over time, due to globalization, the international system has become increasingly polarized, and increasingly fragmented. However, in the current context, one of the goals of countries has been to prevent the collapse of the world's most fundamental institutions and the dismantlement of world security governance. This paper focuses on BRICS actions towards the topic of global security, on how it should contribute on the maintenance of peace and security in the world, working in joint actions. The article also highlights the security management position of each constituent member of the bloc, showing possible pathways to protect and develop the BRICS.

Keywords: BRICS; security management; peace; cooperation; global security.

DESINTEGRAÇÃO DA GOVERNANÇA DE SEGURANÇA GLOBAL

Desde a Segunda Guerra Mundial, com rupturas globais e novas ordens mundiais, um dos assuntos que constantemente têm preocupado diversos países é a segurança global. À medida que os países foram se desenvolvendo e modernizando ao longo do tempo, devido à globalização, o sistema internacional se tornou cada vez mais polarizado e cada vez mais fragmentado. Entretanto, no contexto atual, um dos objetivos dos Estados se voltou para a prevenção do colapso das instituições mais fundamentais do mundo e da desintegração da governança mundial em matéria de segurança. O artigo tem como foco as ações do BRICS em relação ao tema da segurança global, sobre a forma como deve contribuir para a manutenção da paz e da segurança no mundo, trabalhando em ações conjuntas. O artigo também destaca a posição de gestão da segurança de cada membro constituinte do bloco, mostrando possíveis caminhos para a proteção e o desenvolvimento do BRICS.

Palavras-chave: BRICS; gestão de segurança; paz; cooperação; segurança global.

DESINTEGRACIÓN DE LA GOBERNANZA DE LA SEGURIDAD GLOBAL

Desde la Segunda Guerra Mundial, como consecuencia de los colapsos mundiales y los cambios sucesivos en el orden mundial, la seguridad se ha transformado en un tema de gran preocupación para muchos países. A medida que los países se han ido desarrollando y modernizando como

1. Professional diplomat (rank of minister) with experience in Asian affairs. Member of the Panel of Experts of Sanctions Committee 1718 of United Nations (UN) Security Council and leader of the Russian National Committee on BRICS Research; professor from MGIMO since 2002, collaborat with a number of academic institutes (among them IMEMO and Institute of Economics), he was visiting fellow at the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., and has published many articles and books on East Asia and global governance issues.

2. Vice-president for International Relations of the Far Eastern Federal University (FEFU) and scientific supervisor of the Russia's BRICS Expert Council. She serves as acting director of the Russian National Committee on BRICS Research and since 2003 and acts as regional director for Russia of the G8 Research Group based at the University of Toronto (Canada). Co-chair for the Civil BRICS process initiated by the Russian civil society; permanent member of the Jury for the Youth 8, 20, BRICS. Member of the governing board of the Russian International Studies Association.

consecuencia de la globalización, el sistema internacional se ha polarizado y fragmentado cada vez más. Sin embargo, en el actual contexto mundial, uno de los objetivos de los países ha sido evitar el colapso de las instituciones más fundamentales del mundo y la desintegración de la gobernanza de la seguridad mundial. El artículo analiza las acciones del BRICS en relación con el tema de seguridad, cómo el bloque debería contribuir al mantenimiento de la paz y la seguridad en el mundo, desarrollando acciones conjuntas con los demás países. Destaca además la postura de cada miembro con relación a la gestión de la seguridad de presentando posibles vías para la protección y el desarrollo del BRICS.

Palabras clave: BRICS; gestión de la seguridad; paz; cooperación; seguridad global.

JEL: F50.

Data de envío do artigo: 10/3/2020; Data de aceite: 24/3/2020.

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen increased turbulence in international relations and de-facto rearrangement of the previously existing “liberal” world order, including its security component.

This order was born on the remains of post-WW2 (World War II) bilateral system. As it disintegrated, questions arose of the former blocs members inclusion into the new configuration, and exclusion of some, organizations and coalitions sought new missions, new international actors emerged, and new conflicts and issues (often long dormant) appeared on the international agenda. Differently from the era of bilateral confrontation of superpowers and their “clients”, the world system had to deal with a greater diffuseness of power and control. Other international centers of power and influence have grown and become more significant (for example, the European Union and the Asia-Pacific). Regional issues were becoming much more important for many nations, replacing the pervasive East-West global issues of the previous era. Nations, large and small, were faced with taking more responsibility for dealing with and managing issues and potential conflicts in their neighborhood. The US wanted to solve these new challenges by introduction of a unicentric system of governance with itself and its allies at its helm. However, with the advent of the major 2007-2008 financial crisis, undermining US authority, the deficiencies of such a system became obvious and its disintegration started, while the security governance architecture is crumbling.

The 2018 report of influential Russian think-tank *Valdai Club* noted:

after 1991, the West had a unique opportunity to establish relative order in world affairs – but the belief that all of the major players would embrace a common ideological and political paradigm turned out to be utopian. The global paradigm is now marked by mutability, fluidity, and situation-based considerations. In addition, unforeseen “black swan” changes in leadership have a ripple effect on everyone.³

3. Available at: <<http://valdaiclub.com/files/20155/>>.

“Dominant” powers so far have not developed the strategy of how to incorporate the new “revisionists” of the old system. Different options are on the table – from war to peaceful repartition of spheres of influence or even creation of a new model of global governance and interstate relations. So far, they prefer to use the model of “divide and govern” and to play on contradictions between rising countries.

2 WHAT ARE THE BASIC FEATURES OF THE “BRAVE NEW WORLD”?

Russian experts quote among the features of the brave new world the Brexit, the Arab spring, the “Gilete Jaunes” events in France, the meltdown of Bretton-Woods dollar-based financial system, the sharp politicization of trade wars, the widespread use of the methods of economic warfare (so-called “sanctions”); information becoming an important tool of control and confrontation; uncontrolled migration flows; challenges for security rooted in the changes in productive forces (4th Industrial Revolution) and in the ways of life.

There no longer exists a universally accepted behavior to solve these and other security issues. The concept of “rules-based order, promoted by the West, is only used to mask the fact that these rules are in the interests of the “collective West” while the United States unilaterally decides what will be expedient for their national interests. It can be seen by the example of Middle East, where, according to Russian foreign minister Sergey Lavrov, “The impression is that the Americans are trying to maintain a situation of controlled chaos in this huge geopolitical region, hoping to use it to justify the open-ended US military presence in the region within the framework of their unilateral agenda”.⁴ The US’s unilateral withdrawal from the Iranian nuclear deal and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) and the disputes over the extension of START III rises concern about the future not only of strategic stability, but the established “terms of reference” in international affairs as a whole.

The decline of unipolarity, especially as USA re-examines its international commitments, gave room for a host of other players, including non-state actors, to act more freely and independently. One of the manifestations of the unpredictable character of transformation is the undeniable tendency of one-sided decision-making, which leads to the confrontation of all against all. The danger lies on a visible tendency that violence and military options are increasingly seen as a method for managing international conflicting interests.

Paradoxically, the existing global governance system is at this point of time challenged by its current “hegemon”: the USA in a quest to change the rules to its advantage and prevent the rise of new centers of power. The current US president noted that “We [the USA] reject the ideology of globalism, and we embrace the

4. Available at: <http://www.mid.ru/press_service/minister_speeches/-/asset_publisher/70vQR5KJWWmR/content/id/3153953?p_p_id=101_INSTANCE_70vQR5KJWWmR&_101_INSTANCE_70vQR5KJWWmR_languageId=en_GB>.

doctrine of patriotism. Around the world, responsible nations must defend against threats to sovereignty not just from global governance, but also from other, new forms of coercion and domination”.⁵ At the same time, the “pretender”, China, is trying in vain to preserve the “rules-based order”. China is reluctant to produce its own force-based approach and would agree to a new bilateralism.

That means we have *de facto* entered the “multipolar”, polycentric world, where different, but not equal, centers of power compete. Such a system would not necessarily be more just or more secure than the previous one. Last time the humanity had what could be called “international polycentric system” was around 1913, when different countries in Europe competed, but nobody believed this competition would end in war, as they were interconnected by trade and even blood relations among the elites. This is the lesson not to forget, as the newly emerging centers of power, now united in opposition to Western dominance, also have contradictions between themselves, which could deepen along with increase of volatility in global system. The danger of a new world war, quite recently unthinkable, is now openly discussed not only by marginal experts, but in political circles.

Instead of the “end of history”, promised thirty years ago, we have the return of geopolitics, with the danger of a major war between nuclear powers becoming a threatening possibility and the biggest challenge to global security. In fact, the rules of competition/cooperation between the existing and new centers of power as well as their hierarchy are not determined, as Western powers cling to their privileged position. As a result, new formats appear outside the old system and new stake-holders tiers are formed. States increasingly aim their foreign political and economic policies at accomplishing tactical objectives, rather than at forming a stable alliance or regional subsystems. Is it possible to accommodate the newly emerging actors into existing security order – or change it completely – is a crucial question for 21st century – or at least its first half.

All above mentioned suggests the failure of an attempt of a managed transformation of the world order. As Hamlet would have put it – “history is out of joint” and who can “set it right”?⁶

Can it be BRICS?

3 WHAT IS NEXT FOR BRICS SECURITY MISSION?

How can BRICS contribute to set up a more stable and predictable rule-based peace and security maintenance system? What “layers” should such system

5. Available at: <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-73rd-session-united-nations-general-assembly-new-york-ny/>>.

6. Available at: <<http://shakespeare.mit.edu/hamlet/full.html>>.

consist of? Which areas should be of priority for BRICS and in which areas its joint efforts can maximize “added value”?

The very concept of “polarity” in the international system – that is, the functioning around specific poles and centers of power – is now diluted. How will the regionalization process influence ongoing transformations? There is also a danger of moving to a world without poles – chaotic and rapidly changing order, a war of everyone against everyone else, accompanied by the collapse of the world’s most fundamental institutions – from the nation-state with its sovereignty to classical market economy.

All this presents new challenge for BRICS countries in the area of international peace and security management, essential for their own development and protection. The BRICS countries do not agree with the existing unjust order in world politics and the world economy associated with the Western dominance in the world arena and strive for unification so that new growing economies can develop at a faster rate.

Their responsibility is even more substantial as they represent civilizations – far more durable than nation-states – that should play a greater long-term stabilizing role in maintaining international peace security and development. They can and should cooperate across the old dividing lines between East-West or North-South to create a concept “concert of civilizations” for the better future of the mankind. BRICS countries should act as a collective actor protecting established international law on the globe and become a hub of working out and defending rules of international behavior and law norms.

The forces that shape BRICS dynamics related to international security are conflicting. The centripetal one results in convergence of actors expectations and more cooperation in norm-taking. The centrifugal one grows out of differences in the interests of member countries, including those related to rivalry between the individual countries and their relations with external centers of power. In order to successfully promote globalization and counter its negative consequences, the BRICS countries should agree on the goal and then work out responsible strategies for themselves.

BRICS countries throughout the first decade of the bloc’s existence have worked out and invariably supported basic international order principles, such as:

- commitment to shaping a more fair, just and representative multipolar international order to the shared benefit of humanity;
- indivisible nature of peace and security, prohibition of the use of force;
- commitment to the United Nations (UN), as the universal organization with the mandate for maintaining international peace and security;

- the purposes and principles enshrined in the UN Charter;
- importance of working towards an international system based on international law;
- peaceful settlement of disputes through political and diplomatic means;
- unacceptability of unilateral coercive measures outside the framework of the UN Charter;
- countering terrorism under the UN auspices on a firm international legal basis;
- upholding rules, norms and principles of responsible behavior of states in ensuring security in the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs);
- working out comprehensive rules, norms and principles of peaceful use of outer space, unacceptability of its weaponization; and
- upholding principle of reasonable sufficiency of military potential and countering reverse of disarmament process.

They also share common positions on the broad range of specific regional conflicts and problems in the Middle East, Asia and Africa (Syria, Israel-Palestine, Yemen, Afghanistan, Korean peninsula etc.).

The BRICS countries are ready to solve these problems in a way of a gradual, natural filling of the vacuum of power that arises now. Chinese leader Xi Jinping, in 2017, called BRICS as a “community of advanced joint action”.

BRICS is now on the plateau of its development curve, while critics, including those in the West, increasingly see BRICS members, or some of them, as competitors and revisionists. Attempts to undermine BRICS vitality can be traced. So is it true that BRICS is inept to deal with security issues even when they concern their vital issues or immediate vicinity? What are the positions of BRICS individual members on that?

4 POSITIONS ON SECURITY MANAGEMENT: BRAZIL

The modern vision of security is reflected in the updated *White Book of Defense*,⁷ where poverty, uncontrolled population growth, disproportionate distribution of national income, protectionism in trade, environmental damage are highlighted as threats to the world, as well as drug trafficking, terrorism and crime, religious and ethnic conflicts, arms race, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction,

7. Available at: <https://www.defesa.gov.br/arquivos/2017/mes03/livro_branco_de_defesa_nacional_minuta.pdf>.

natural disasters. Brazil notes that preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping operations involving three elements – conflict prevention, peacemaking and peacebuilding – should be tools for conflict prevention. The use of diplomacy allows to identify the root causes of conflicts, most of which are political, and requires political decisions. Recently the situation in Venezuela is of concern for Brasília.

The country notes the need to increase the participation of civilian specialists in UN missions. Development assistance is an important tool for ensuring security. The White Paper notes the link between defense, diplomacy, and trade. Among the goals of national defense, along with the guarantee of sovereignty, territorial integrity and the protection of national interests, the promotion of regional stability and contribution to the preservation of universal peace stands out. Brazil actively supports the expansion of the UN Security Council, wishing to become a permanent member, and improving the activities of multilateral bodies, for disarmament and arms control, control of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, for the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons, space, for the control of illicit trafficking in small arms. Brazil has an active interest in cooperation in cybersecurity, in the fight against drug trafficking and illegal money laundering.

5 POSITIONS ON SECURITY MANAGEMENT: RUSSIA

According to the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation, from 2015, Russia's domestic and international activities are based on building up its economic, military and spiritual potentials, as well as enhancing the role of the Russian Federation in the emerging polycentric world. Russia is upholding the principles of multilateralism, justice, equality and the rule of international law in dealing with international crises.

Having abandoned the international system based on bloc confrontation, Russia turned to the principles of multi-vector diplomacy. Considering the UN and its Security Council as a central element capable of ensuring the stability of the system of international relations, Russia calls on countries to build up cooperation in multilateral formats such as the G20, BRICS etc.

Russia sees as the most dangerous challenges the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, illegal activities in the cybernetic, biological and high-tech fields, as well as the intensification of global information confrontation, growth of nationalistic sentiment, xenophobia, extremism, exacerbation of the demographic situation, environmental problems, illegal migration, drug and human trafficking, epidemics, shortage of fresh water and the struggle for energy resources. Russia insists that all countries should work together to solve these problems, exchange experiences, technologies and resources to prevent the emergence of new ones. One of the key advantages of Russia is its resource wealth, which have expanded the possibilities to strengthen its influence on the world stage.

At the BRICS leaders' meeting on the margins of the G20 in Argentina, in November 2018,⁸ Russian president Vladimir Putin stressed that today it is necessary to focus on risk factors such as increased global debt, volatility in stock markets and deepening trade contradictions. He described them as examples of unfair competition, protectionist measures and the policy of unilateral sanctions, which is contrary to the principles of justice and equal relations, upheld by the BRICS. The aggravation of economic contradictions leads to political destabilization and to the threat to international security, which is expressed in the form of regional crises (primarily in the Middle East) and in the spread of international terrorism. Russia is actively involved in the fight against terrorist activity, which is manifested in its military presence in Syria in order to maintain the integrity of the Syrian Republic and its sovereignty. International information security is also of utmost importance.

Crumbling of the legal basics of strategic stability (as the arms control treaties and mechanisms are subject to unilateral revision and abandonment by the United States) has cast a shadow of a new arms race. Russia offers its partners an equal dialogue and cooperation to overcome the current crises.

6 POSITIONS ON SECURITY MANAGEMENT: INDIA

India does not want to become a hegemon and does not seek to find a hegemon for itself. In an effort to assert its position in world markets, India is trying to accelerate the "reform of global political and economic governance" in order to maintain peace and security. India is also interested in revising the list of members of the UN Security Council, hoping to join the expanded composition of the new UN Security Council.

The United Doctrine of the Armed Forces of India, from 2017, defines India's position on a wide range of issues, ranging from the threat of nuclear war, terrorism to issues of internal security. In the new doctrine, the existing threats and challenges to national security are divided into external and internal. External threats include the traditional ones such as problems of disputed territories, increasingly fierce competition for natural resources, cross-border threats sponsored by certain state and non-state actors of terrorism, and the influence of global geopolitical players on the situation in the Indo-Pacific region. In the National Security Concept, Pakistan has traditionally been considered as a central element in defining threats and challenges, while the problem of Jammu and Kashmir remains central to the list of issues of national security in India. The need to deepen cooperation with the countries "big and small" is stated – it implies the expansion of cooperation in logistics, communications and intelligence with various countries (USA, Japan, Australia, Southeast Asian countries etc.).

8. Available at: <<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/59272>>.

India is closely watching its immediate vicinity, although being now interested in a broader concept Indo-Pacific region, promoted by USA. Being concerned about the proliferation of threats from neighboring countries, as well as conflicts related to water resources, non-traditional threats to India include: indirect or proxy wars, ethnic conflicts, illegal financial flows, arms trade, people, drug trafficking, climate change, natural disasters, energy security problems, security problems for the Indian diasporas.

Internal threats and challenges include the ongoing mediated war in the territory of Jammu and Kashmir, political and social unrest in certain states of the country, and organized crime. Left-wing extremist organizations (implied by the Maoists and Naxalites), as well as illegal migration flows continue to be a serious threat. Terrorism also appears to be a serious internal threat from the standpoint of the possible spread of extremist ideologies in the eastern states of the country, especially among young people.

7 POSITIONS ON SECURITY MANAGEMENT: CHINA

China singles out such global challenges and threats as lack of resources, climate warming, terrorism, environmental pollution etc., that can be solved only by joint efforts. The BRICS is considered as key platform for that. In addition, China sees in the BRICS one of the opportunities to expand its leadership in the global economy by 2020-2025, and the policy of combining the efforts of the BRICS countries can be a counterbalance to the protectionist policies of Western countries. A new challenge was the US trade war against China in 2018.

The central problem, traditionally and for many centuries constituting the core of China's national security, is lack of resources and adequate measures to maintain social order and well-being of citizens. Another problem is to ensure the defense capability and maintain stability in the border regions and regions that are in the direct sphere of the geopolitical influence of China: "preventing local war in the region". In recent decades, the main principle of the Chinese approach to ensuring national security is self-reliance. The main condition and basis for successful economic development is called "creating a peaceful environment" (military-political aspect of security) and "economic integration with neighbors in the region" (economic aspect).

China's energy security concerns are forcing it to strengthen its position on contentious issues with its neighbors (Japan, the Philippines and Vietnam) in the South China Sea and the East China Sea, accompanied by increased investment and active construction abroad. Beijing is participating and investing in energy facilities that are being built in more than fifty countries located on almost all continents.

The White Paper of China on Military Strategy, from 2015, focuses on the peaceful development of the country and the military strategy of “active defense”: “We will not attack unless we are attacked, but we will surely counterattack if attacked”.⁹ It is indicated that China does not set goals to expand or establish hegemony.

The White Paper entitled *China's Policy on Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region*, from 2017, draws attention to the importance of multilateral international cooperation, although until recently the bilateral interaction format was more preferable, and this may indicate China's desire to strengthen its role as a “responsible world power”.

In recent years, the Indian ocean has become of greater interest to China in accordance with “One belt-One road” strategy.

The concept of “The community of with a shared future for mankind” (人类命运共同体), in essence, proposes to abandon the thinking of the “cold war” in the name of a new world order based on the development of multipolar processes in order to form a global political and economic system that meets the interests of all countries.

8 POSITIONS ON SECURITY MANAGEMENT: SOUTH AFRICA

The security challenges for South Africa primarily stem from the situation inside the country. In recent years, the South African economy has faced a number of problems: low gross domestic product (GDP) growth, high unemployment, a growing gap between the rich and the poor. Taking into account the mixed ethnic composition of the population, the high level of property stratification and the scale of illegal immigration, the social situation in South Africa can be called quite complicated. Many problems are associated with an uncontrolled population increase, including due to the influx of migrants, which entails social, economic and environmental issues. Thus, the problem of water resources shortage in a number of regions is still acute. Waves of illegal migrants destabilize society, increasing the level of crime and violence.

Crime prevention is one of the priority goals of the National Development Plan (NDP) as this topic attracts special attention from the international community and the media. Highlights of the 2017-2018 Victims of Crime report show that aggregate crime levels increased in 2017-2018 compared to 2016-2017 (over 1.5 million incidences of household crime, while crime on individuals are estimated to be over 1.5 million).

When estimating population growth, it is necessary to take into account the effects of excess mortality from AIDS, since its distribution can lead to

9. Available at: <http://eng.mod.gov.cn/Database/WhitePapers/2015-05/26/content_4586711.htm>.

lower life expectancy, higher infant mortality, higher mortality rates, lower population growth rates and changes in the distribution of the population by age and sex than can would expect otherwise. Thus, the problem of the spread of HIV is also one of the threats to the country's internal security and for its further sustainable development.

9 THE WAY FORWARD FOR BRICS

There are several areas, where the efforts of BRICS member countries', as well as BRICS as whole, can generate synergy, multiplying their influence.

9.1 BRICS as a decisive force in the UN and international organizations

The desired world order – or, rather, the rules without double standards – should be based on the time-tested principles of mutual respect, sovereign equality, democracy, inclusiveness and cooperation with healthy competition. The principle of inclusivity and indivisibility of security for all, cooperative and sustainable security behavior and sovereign equality are essential. The international system should be based on the supremacy of international law and norm rather than use of force and BRICS should take efforts to promote international law and can play a major role as a “hub of innovation” in rule-making and in sharing best practices.

In order to have the authority for that and accomplish the mission for the to increase of multilateral impact of these principles BRICS should become a platform for promoting the interests of the majority of humanity. A BRICS+ system involving new developing nations into the orbit both to help the development and to help them act by the rules in a responsible manner may be the answer. Thus, a system of esoteric circles could be created where the “friends of BRICS” countries can derive from the experience of BRICS and use the good offices in addressing the essential issues of peace and security.

In such a world, UN still has the central role and its main task is to guard and enforce international law, determine the guidelines of the states behavior.

The BRICS+ arrangement would help to not only strengthen the role of the UN but also invigorate and give in with the developing nation's new channel of access to decision-making in international and vital global peace and security issues.

However, these days the need to prevent a direct military conflict between the great powers has become relevant once again. This makes it vital that all parties exercise extreme caution in responding to calls to change the procedures for the functioning of the Security Council, which plays the central role for that, such as the recurring idea of abolishing the veto.

At the same time some kind of comprehensive reform of the UN would be needed in order to make it more representative, effective and efficient. BRICS

countries and their representatives should act together on principle issues, creating a mechanism of consultations between themselves, which would guarantee the unanimity in addressing the conflicting issues.

The BRICS countries should work to step up cooperation and coordination on major international and regional hot spot issues, speak up for international equality and justice on multilateral platforms including the UN, advocate political settlement of hot spot issues through peaceful means such as dialogue and negotiation, and oppose the use of force and the arbitrary use or threat of sanctions in international relations.

9.2 BRICS and peacemaking

Regional conflicts are raging, while new threats and challenges appear with limited possibility to counter them. Geopolitical competition is back with “proxy wars” becoming a reality.

A new model of joint management of issues of peacekeeping and conflicts prevention assisting the UN, is essential. According to UN information, peacekeeping architecture fails: from UN-sponsored previously in average two peace deals a year we came to two in decade. The rules and practices of conflict resolution and peacekeeping are no longer observed, as there is an increasing lack of mechanism to enforce them. Formal diplomacy is less and less effective as public reaction and electoral consideration increasingly influence the behavior of politicians. Thus, the role of Track-2 (expert) and Track-3 (civil society) diplomacy is increasing, but they are not well coordinated and sometimes run counter to state interests.

Can BRICS become a platform for peace-keeping, peace-building and peace-making? These issues tend to be more and more central to BRICS discourse and are increasingly discussed at leaders’ meeting and below: at foreign ministers level, high representatives on security, vice-ministers specializing on sensitive area, information security and counter-terrorism tracks etc. However, implementation mechanism is still lacking. Accordingly BRICS peace-building activity (confidence building, early warning, crisis management, and preventive diplomacy) and peace-keeping role is still marginal.

How to increase BRICS role? The pilot project could be BRICS prevention of conflicts institution-building under the sponsorship of UN. The principal new suggestion is that it should address local conflicts in the “area of responsibility” of BRICS members (like Africa, CIS-Eurasia, Latin America, South Asia and East Asia etc.). The efforts might concentrate in territories historically connected to each of BRICS countries, where conflict parties are reluctant to address global conflict-resolution institutions (heavily influenced by USA) or a single “dominating” power.

These efforts can start with Track-2 process, bringing together representatives of conflicting parties in a neutral setting and conflict resolution as well as area experts. The project may be called BRICS Conflict-Resolution and Conflict-Prevention Advisory Center, financed by each rotating presidency of BRICS. Regular activities under the auspices of such center could help create a network of officials and experts from conflicting countries (especially young officials and next-generation leaders are important) and lead us to the possible creation of a working group or conflict prevention center.

9.3 Promotion of disarmament and the prevention of the uncontrolled use of a new type of weapon

One of the most pressing issues today is the issue of arms control and growing crisis in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. After the United States withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and then from the INF Treaty, the future of agreements designed to control the arms situation and prevent a new arms race became unpredictable. In this regard, the BRICS countries should promote their own political agenda, while remaining committed to current agreements.

Another area for BRICS attention is control and use of new weapons, where the arms race has already begun, and the temptation to gain an advantage in the field of new weapons is too great for countries to seriously, rather than declaratively, take into account general humanitarian considerations. Such an “acceleration race” between nuclear powers potentially carries with it a significant threat to world stability, since it will leave less and less time to assess the reality of the threat of a missile attack and the expediency of retaliatory actions.

In August 2018, a Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons in Geneva adopted ten guiding principles for emerging technologies in the area of lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS). It was established that autonomous weapons fall within the scope of international law. Responsibility for the use of autonomous combat systems is superimposed on the person who applied it. In addition, the convention on inhumane weapons was supplemented by a protocol on new weapons and the requirement of human responsibility for the development, deployment and use of new weapons systems. Thus, within the framework of the adopted principles, the main attention was paid to functional issues: the most important are the actions, results, chains of responsibility, not processes within the machines or moral and ethic.

The BRICS countries have repeatedly stressed their commitment to the legal resolution of complex international issues, so the BRICS countries need to take a clear position and develop a legal framework for the use of autonomous systems and artificial intelligence (AI).

9.4 Drawing a BRICS strategy in ICT security

Over past few years, the BRICS countries have put a considerable effort to shaping the common agenda of cooperation on ensuring security in the use of ICTs. The directions of proposed cooperation on ensuring security in the use of ICTs include the following.

- Activities in the information domain, determination to adopt and promote the rules, norms and principles of responsible behavior of States in the field of use of ICTs under the auspices of the UN.
- Call to stronger, more efficient, universal and legally binding mechanisms for cooperation against transnational cyber-crime.
- Adherence to effective cross-border cooperation and coordination of actions to combat transnational terrorism, including combating the use of the information space and the Internet for recruiting people to radical movements and terrorist organizations.
- Promotion and support of the Internet governance evolution process, based upon multilateral approach, involvement of relevant stakeholders in their respective roles and responsibilities, and participation of states in the Internet governance on an equal footing with a strengthened role of the UN.

A more detailed agenda and action plan was elaborated by the Working Group of Experts of the BRICS States on Security in the Use of ICTs: in 2017, the BRICS Roadmap of Practical Cooperation on Ensuring Security in the Use of ICT was adopted or any other mutually agreed mechanism as was declared in the 10th BRICS Summit Johannesburg Declaration.

Latest proposals from Russia to its BRICS partners include support and promotion of Russia's project of a UN Convention on cooperation in combating information crimes, and the project of a concept of the UN Convention on safe and secure operation and development of the Internet.

A number of options might be available, assuming that the leaders of the five nations will demonstrate certain political will, eagerness to reach compromise and consistency in their achievement.

- *First*, the BRICS states should act together to fill in the vacuum in the global volunteer responsible state behavior norm-building process in the field of use of ICTs. It is important for BRICS countries to promote its approaches in the framework of an open-ended working group (OEWG) because OEWGs have much bigger memberships: any of the 193 UN member states can participate in its deliberations, and their open-ended nature means that they can go on forever or until member

states agree to dissolve it. In addition, BRICS may include the idea of creating a permanent mechanism in the final report of the UN GGE.

- *Second*, the BRICS states need to introduce practical mechanisms of cooperation on tackling trans-border cyber threats and exchanging information on them. Those might include signing a memorandum on cooperation between the forum countries' major national computer security incident response teams (CSIRTs)/computer emergency response teams (CERTs).
- *Third*, in addition to information sharing among national CSIRTs, the BRICS states' ICT security could significantly benefit from establishment of a common BRICS-wide repository of technical data related to ICT security threats. Such BRICS repository might accumulate data from member states and their technical bodies.
- *Fourth*, since the relations between certain BRICS states also lack trust when it comes to security issues, another mechanism might be useful to reduce the risk of conflicts stemming from the use of ICTs and to build trust between the BRICS members. The five BRICS nations could engage in a format of trust and confidence building measures (TCBMs) probably focused on ensuring security and protection of critical information infrastructure (CII) objects. For some BRICS countries, signing similar agreements might be a sound strategy of reducing mutual mistrust related to the countries' activities in cyberspace and prevent uncontrolled escalation in case of a major cyber crisis. A common TCBM framework for all five BRICS countries would also help them to exchange best practices on CII objects protection, preventing and mitigating major information security incidents.
- *Fifth*, one particular infrastructure project that could increase the trust and ensure technically reliable and protected communications between the BRICS governments and crisis management bodies, is deployment of quantum communication channels between neighboring BRICS countries (China, Russia, India). Joint work on quantum communication channels would allow all participants to advance in research of this major digital technology – and provide them with a trusted and near-impossible-to-compromise channel for high-level, strategic and crisis communications.
- *Sixth*, the BRICS countries have tremendous potential for cooperation in the field of information security education, training and capacity building. There should be a double promotion and network degree educational programs between leading BRICS universities well versed in the area of cyber, digital development, AI and Big Data.

9.5 Elimination or significant limitation of international terrorism

In accordance with the study provided in the *Global Terrorist Index* report, while absolute number of lives lost from terrorist attacks have somewhat decreased over the past year, other tendencies remain alarming, mostly due to ongoing crises in the Middle East and North Africa, with major source of potential future terrorists coming from militants of Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and other similar international terrorist networks. Number of countries that suffered at least one terrorist attack increased by 12 over the year, from 65 to 77 states. Terrorism remains unevenly spread throughout the world with Central America and the Caribbean being least affected and regions of the Middle East, North and sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia accommodating 94% of total terrorist attacks. Thus, India occupies 8th place on the list for terrorist incidence index, China and Russia getting 31st and 33rd, respectively. Nevertheless, while earlier we observed next to zero influence of terrorist activities on the other two countries of BRICS and rather regarded cooperation with the authorities from the point of view of non-use of their respective territories as training bases for international terrorists, latest research saw small (in absolute numbers), but considerable psychological uplifting from 111th and 116th for South Africa and Brazil to respective 47th and 87th places.

What makes the situation comparable though for all the BRICS countries, is the *significant external source of terrorist inflow*, mainly from ISIS, seen as the deadliest terrorist group, and followed by Boko Haram, Al-Qaeda and the Taliban, as well as other transnational terrorist networks.

While there's ongoing working level cooperation between BRICS countries on the issue, including regular meetings of the high level security council officials, fulfilling one of the earlier stated goals of creating mechanism of cooperation between law enforcement and national security agencies, BRICS have moral obligation and responsibility to reach the situation when global community comes out with the unified stance on terrorism definition and stop dividing terrorists into radicals and moderate opposition depending on the status of relations between the client and sponsoring state, but also political goals of the latter. First step before general UN resolution offering *universal legal framework and single definition for terrorism* could be signing BRICS agreement open to other countries of the world, interested in fighting this common global threat.

9.6 Security across the global commons

Today it becomes obvious that only through collective effort it is possible to develop the so-called global commons that are vital to humanity's survival – the world's oceans, atmosphere, outer space, Antarctica region, and the environment as a whole, which has become the essential global security challenge.

World ocean as a source of energy and nutritional potential of the planet, as well as a key transportation and communication platform (with about 80% of world trade traffic carried by sea-lanes, but also intensive military-political cooperation across the oceans) cannot be underestimated.

At the time of the ongoing formation of the *global oceanic governance*, BRICS countries carry special responsibility in securing democratic, equitable and inclusive system of cooperation between states in this domain. *World ocean* exploration makes vital part of the socio-economic development strategy in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goals 2030. BRICS countries are to promote further economic activities, including but not limited to deep-seabed mining and other relevant projects, as part of their general efforts as foreseen in the BRICS Economic Partnership Strategy.

Serious challenges lay in the domain of *traditional and new military threats* to the use of high seas such as piracy, maritime terrorism, proliferation of weapons and materials of mass destruction and dual use technologies, illegal migration. Among destabilizing features of today's world one might name rise in rhetoric and intensification of maritime territorial disputes as well as further militarization of the world ocean as part of geopolitical competition of naval states. BRICS have significant role to play in offering and promoting cooperative inclusive mechanisms that are effective in avoiding military dominance of one single naval power globally aiming at curbing unlimited power projection and potential threat of use of force by hegemonic powers in the world ocean.

Outer space also keeps one of the top priority places on the global political agenda, especially due to evolving tendencies towards weaponization of space. Special concern arises from the fact that certain countries are attempting at establishment of the international legal regimes of outer space use, aiming at securing one state/group of states dominance over the rest of the participants. BRICS should firmly oppose such tendencies and, having in mind that those countries are responsible for nearly two thirds of global space launches, take the lead in establishment and sponsorship of the international outer space governance regime.

In addition to securing common stronger position at the international negotiating table, it is clear that BRICS should continue advanced research and development (R&D) cooperation in space, elaboration of joint scientific projects. That is why it is a welcome initiative by the Russian Federation to create BRICS ERS (Earth Remote Sensing) satellite grouping. At the same time, all bilateral obligations of the countries have to be reviewed carefully and assure that they pursue the common goal of non-weaponization of space and indivisible security for all.

A welcome move is the bilateral space cooperation program adopted for the period of 2018-2020 by Russia and China, who remain most active protagonists of space collaboration activities.

10 QUO VADIS, BRICS?

During the first decade of BRICS existence, its members, despite a number of internal and external challenges, have not only pursued economic priorities, but, over time, consolidated common values, developed synergic attitudes and approaches to the changing international order and peace and security preservation paradigm. Expressing their joint positions at each summit, meanwhile, the five countries do not take on active political responsibility. On one hand, they avoid creating an image of a competitor to Western organizations like North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). On the other hand, developing countries are not yet ready to challenge the hegemon in this crucial area, which dictates its own terms.

While BRICS achievements are most noticeable in economic sphere, in the security sphere, although it lags behind, BRICS also reached a number of results – there is permanent cooperation mechanism on different horizontal levels, incorporating not only interested governmental bodies of BRICS countries, but also introducing all types of outreach cooperation schemes.

BRICS over the time of its existence has turned into a deeply imbedded net of consultation processes, institutional links, projects and task forces, which ensures sustainability of the initiatives discussed and viability of ideas promoted. Constant mechanism of consultation of security officials ensures headway on counter-terrorism, cyber-security and other security areas, even though such a headway remains insufficient and needs substantial progress, including in elaboration and adoption of globally (at least by the majority of states, as was accomplished with the Russian initiative of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution on Treaty on Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space supported by 126 countries) accepted international documents (e.g. on definition of terrorism, earlier suggested by Brics Think Tanks Council (BTTC) legally binding Non-Aggression and Peaceful Coexistence Treaty etc.).

BRICS countries urge other countries to create a broad international antiterrorist coalition, as well as speed up the adoption of a comprehensive convention on international terrorism at UNGA, they also work together to counter cybercrime, information terrorism and extremism. During the summit held in Johannesburg, the heads of the BRICS countries signed a declaration on cooperation in various fields, including a paragraph on the creation of a unified cyber police. The mutual exchange of states' experience will make it possible to quickly and effectively solve problems in the field of international information

security, and may contribute to increasing the level of protection of national information space.

Developing of a non-western theory of international relations and joint approaches to international security governance and cooperation is on the agenda, but it remained more of national search in each of the BRICS countries without attempts for synergy of existent philosophies and approaches. Some work is still to be done on institutional building of BRICS, including that of creating a Virtual Secretariat or other relevant mechanism of continuity and register, and fully-functional research institution for joint analysis on a number of areas of common interest.

If we consider the activities of BRICS at the “regional level”, then the achievements will be indisputable. If we rise to the “global level”, it is necessary to ask ourselves: is BRICS able to increase its political power and take responsibility in its own hands? What place is reserved for BRICS in a world where an unpredictable transformation of the international order is taking place, and its former “keeper” has not only withdrawn himself, but also performs actions that put this order at risk?

The BRICS countries have consistently criticized the unilateral approach to resolving international issues and crises, insisting on expanding the core mandate of the Security Council, citing the emergence of a polycentric system of international relations. Does such an approach endanger the political decision-making mechanism itself – where five countries of the UN Security Council cannot find a consensus, can fifty or one hundred countries find it? There is a saying “Be careful what you wish for, it might come true”. The lack of a detailed concept, as well as the lack of political will for its subsequent implementation, turns all discussions into empty conversations that have no real incarnation. For the next years, BRICS should set itself the task of not only assessing its own political potential, but also ways of implementing collective political initiatives, as well as mechanisms for upholding collective political interests at international platforms.

COMPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABDENUR, A. E. Can the BRICS cooperate in international security? **International Organizations Research Journal**, v. 12, n. 3, p. 73-93, 2017.

ACHARYA, A. After liberal hegemony: the advent of a multiplex world order. **Ethics and International Affairs**, v. 31, n. 3, p. 271-285, 2017.

DABHADE, M. S. India's pursuit of United Nations and Security Council reforms. **Observer Research Foundation Occasional Paper**, n. 131, Dec. 2017. Available at: <https://www.orfonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/ORF_Occasional_Paper_131_UNSC_Dabhade.pdf>.

HAAS, R. N. **Liberal world order, R.I.P.** New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2018.

HUIFANG, T. The role of BRICS in global governance. **East Asia Forum**, 2016. Available at: <<https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/09/03/the-role-of-brics-in-global-governance/>>.

IEP – INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMICS AND PEACE. **Global terrorism index 2017: measuring and understanding the impact of terrorism.** Sydney: IEP, 2017. Available at: <<http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/11/Global-Terrorism-Index-2017.pdf>>.

MALAMUD, A.; ALCANIZ, I. Managing security in a zone of Peace: Brazil's soft approach to regional governance. **Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional**, v. 60, n. 1/e011, p. 1-22, 2017.

MIRACOLA, S. **The Indo-Pacific “encirclement”**: how is China reacting? Milan: ISPI, 2018. Available at: <<https://www.ispionline.it/en/publicazione/indo-pacific-encirclement-how-china-reacting-20716>>.

PANT, H. V. Rising India and its global governance imperatives. **Rising Powers Quarterly**, v. 2, n. 3, p. 7-17, 2017.

PRIME minister Manmohan Singh leaves for Durban BRICS summit, to push growth. **NDTV**, India, 25 Mar. 2013. Available at: <<http://www.ndtv.com/article/india/prime-minister-manmohan-singh-leaves-for-durban-brics-summit-to-push-growth-346467>>.

SLONSKAYA, M. **The role of BRICS in global security.** Moscow: MGIMO University, 2015. Available at: <https://mgimo.ru/upload/2015/10/The_Role_of_BRICS_in_Global_Security.pdf>.

STUENKEL, O. **The BRICS and the future of global order.** Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015.

TOLORAYA, G. BRICS peace efforts: steps to new global normality. **BRICS Academic Forum Book**, p. 27-28, 2018. Available at: <<http://sabtt.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/BRICS-Academic-Forum-Book-Publish.pdf>>.

ZÜRN, M. **A theory of global governance: authority, legitimacy, and contestation.** London: Oxford University Press, 2018.