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**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães: 00:08**

Okay. Good morning. Good evening, everyone. Welcome to this panel about BRICS that we are organizing with the Quincy Institute from the United States. It is a pleasure to have Sarang Shidore, Professor David Monyae, And Professor Marta Fernandez here with us. This is the first panel that we are organizing with the Quincy Institute and their new global south program, and we couldn't have picked a better time to do. It is tomorrow or today actually, is starting the BRICS summit in Johannesburg, South Africa. And BRICS has become for Brazil, at least a very important form of international relations, one of the most important forums, and this morning here in Brazil, all the media, all the media outlets are talking about Brazil's position and what's going to happen to BRICS or the global implications of BRICS, nowadays, and many, many aspects. So we joined this. We put together this panel, exactly to discuss what's going to be BRICS for the next couple of years. Right. And we have here with us. First Professor Marta Fernandez from the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, and also Program Director of the BRICS Policy Center in Rio, which is Brazil's most important thing, think about BRICS. We have also professor David Monyae, a professor at University of Johannesburg and co director of the Center for African Chinese studies, and as an international relations and foreign policy expert, Dr. Monyae. He previously served as a section manager, international relations policy analysis at the South African Parliament, providing strategic management and parliamentary foreign policy formulation and monitoring and analysis services. He has extensive experience as a member of South African academic delegations, that means of India, Brazil and South Africa, it's dialogue for only BRICS sevens as well. And we have Sarang Shidore, Director of the Global South program at the Quincy Institute and a senior non resident fellow because the Council on Strategic Risk. He's also adjunct faculty at the George Washington University in Washington, DC Sarang has collaborated and published with multiple organization amongst which the Asian Peace program in Brookings Institute. So again, thank you very much for being here with us. We had more than 300 registered, we have a lot of people here with us today. This session, we're going to do format of q&a. So me as a moderator, we're gonna go on to start questioning Professor Marta, then Professor David and Sarang. And we go from there. So Sarang, I give the word back to you. Thank you very much.

**Sarang Shidore 02:43**

Thank you very much, Feliciano, it's such a pleasure to be here with you and all our distinguished panelists. This is the first event that we are doing jointly between the Quincy Institute in February. So here's to many future such events and a partnership for the future. I'm sitting here in Washington, as Feliciano said, and the director of the Global South program, a new initiative from the Quincy Institute. And we had the Quincy Institute in Washington, are focused on transforming American grand strategy in the vein of restraint that is away from endless war and towards a focus much more on diplomacy, economic engagement, and combatting existential threats, such as climate change. This is our mission. So we do research and we do advocacy. And today's topic breaks is very much aligned with what not just the news media is saying, but also what we hear are increasingly focusing on over to you fellas.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães: 03:47**

Thank you, so ROG so Professor Martin, first question here for our panel. Is Brazil perspective on the BRICS group evolved under the new administration, they started the beginning of this year and what notable differences or similarities exist compared to his previous tenure? Professor Martin, please.

**Marta Fernandez: 04:06**

Okay, good morning, and good afternoon, everyone. First, I would like to thank you for the invitation to participate in this discussion. related to the question. First, I can say that Lula is trying to connect his act to our administration, with the previous one from the Moto Brazil is backing which brands you is this and how it differs from for example, Bolsonaro, Brazil. Now we have him after four years of diplomatic insulation on the party of the former president Bolsonaro and unconditional alignment with Trump’s United States. Lula’s Brazil is seeking to regain its low STI international prominence reaffirming its position as a major global player. One of the central forum for this has been exactly the BRICS Adobo saneras, Brazil hosted the BRICS summit in 2019 Guaran guarantee in the block survival. This something was small and empty since President Bolsonaro restricted participation to the five BRICS countries, in contrast to the tradition of inviting countries from the surrounding region. As evidence of the Brazilian code of government contempt for multilateral action via international organization Bolsonaro, the government left to adapt to five billions highs with international organizations such as the UN, and the New Development Bank or the Bank of BRICS. On the other hand, Bolsonaro view of the bricks has always been quite contracted, contracted Tory on the one hand, Bolsonaro was ideologically aligned with Indian President Modi in easing Russian President Putin, with whom Bolsonaro identify in terms of conservatives, they fight against so called ideology of gender, and the reinforcement of a toxic masculinity. On the other hand, the Bolsonaro government was marked by hostility towards China, especially during a NASA Huzhou time as the head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the context of the COVID 19 pandemic. Political hostility towards Sheena China contradicted Brazil commercial interest is given that China is the country's leading trading partners of Brazil and Bolsonaro. Has this commitment to advancing the interests of the Argos wooziness sector, whose exports to China in 2022 accounted for 32% of the total Veilleux of our exports. One of the main difference between the two governments is that while we think of Bolsonaro government as they finding a low profile the Greeks the Lula government project for breeks is a stroke instructor or since Lula thinks of the block as a central player in advancing allays. On Nico in exclusionary word, the issue of attacking inequality runs through President Lula entire agenda. And in this sense, BRICS is seen as a bloc capable of contributing to a more equitable distribution of economic, political and ideological power in the world. The Brazil of Lula in the party have a clear agenda, favor a multipolar order and in an inclusive system of global governance. In this sense, Brazil has been demanding the reform of international financial institution in Democrat sizing the global governance system, giving Diffic difficult facing and reforming international institutions from within Brazil has been supporting alternative mechanisms from outside as in the case of BRICS Bank to ensure greater control by emerging countries over the Deaf developments, financing and avoid the content. Gap Analysis and blackmail imposed by developing countries added these summits is a central team for Brazil has been there they'll dollarization of the economy to reduce global dependence of the dollar in commercial translate transactions. Although Operacion operationally complexity, the discussion has the potential to advance in the sanity due to the new scenario that emerges with the Crimea war. Russia particular interesting. rosepath particularly interested in the issue is due to the militarization of the dollar. We see the United States aggressively using the dollar in the international international financial system to make your political games against Russia by freezing its reserves in dollars in expelling Rousseff from the Swift payment system in the sense that their dollarization is being seen as a one off, among other proposals, that team to build the Allies a symmetrical word, both economically and politically in a mood, Ammar moved to St q1, so that he or single power can no longer impose impose its eel unilaterally on the others.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães 10:34**

Thank you, Professor Martin. Now, Professor David. So what is the significance of BRICS for the global south specifically for South Africa in the hosting of the summit in Johannesburg, thank you for being here with us again, Professor David.

**David Monyae 10:50**

Thank you very much. Firstly, I'd like to thank the organizers for putting up what is indeed great discussions. I think BRICS summit is starting at the backdrop of high tension at a global level. In answering the question directly, I think we need to give a historical background that the post 1945 World Order was constructed without the active participation of the bulk of the international community, particularly Africa, Latin America, in Asia, the rules that were set in 1945, and continuously applied fairly and unfairly, somehow has always been a problem. And therefore, the developing countries registered that dismayed with this order, not in this summit, as the world tend to see it. I think these registered the very first marked registration of dismay with the order was 1955. With the Bandung Conference where Asian and Latin American heads of states and people are gathered to say there's inequality at the global level, there is lack of trunk technology transfer, culture, racism, imperialism, and number of issues that are registered in Bangladesh, 1945. And if we look the history of the world that we lived, since 1955, those issues remain unanswered, the developed world led by the United States and Western world, in entrench their power. And over represented in a number of key institutions of global institutions of global governance. Beyond that, the manner in which they use what we see as global public goods, has always been problematic, I think my colleague has touched upon. So these are issues that Africa, Latin America and the bulk of Asia, are demanding for change. So having said that, I think we need also to say something that brakes is not anti West brakes does not want to smash the system. I think what the brakes wants to do is to renegotiate the very same system, and ensuring that the developing world is centered. While trying to do that we also have seen in the post cold war, that in the rise of BRICS, that it also becoming somehow a an elite group of countries within the developing countries. So while they're complaining about the issues at the global level, if you look within the global South, that also disparities and the issues that need to be looked at. And therefore, I would like to just clear the view that BRICS is not anti United States is not anti the West, nor is it anti the dollar. I think what BRICS members want to ensure that they increase the number of currencies in the global currency basket so that they can trade among themselves without having any other currencies, not only the dollar, whether it's Europe, all Yuan, for that matter, should not be at the center of in terms of mediating that trait. Because there's a lot of unfairness in the manner in which bigger hegemonic powers are managing that domestic issues in policies that are taking the United States whether it's Treasury has a huge impact issue in the world, whether it's Argentina or South Africa, that if the dollar appreciate overnight, the data that the developing countries carrying its massive, and a number of issues, the war that my colleague is also mentioned. In Ukraine, we also have seen the increased weaponization of these, the dollar itself, sanctions applied the abuse of the SWIFT system. So we see a number of reckless policies coming from Washington, that the bulk of the developing countries in Africa in particular, would want to ensure that the UN is reformed, it becomes truly democratic. The IMF World Bank does not belong to United States in Europe alone. And also the power of countries in the world economic and otherwise, is constantly changing the g7 for instance, you take Italy or any other smaller members of g7, are much more smaller compared to Brazil, compared to India compared to Russia, compared to China, and therefore the ranking of states need to be looked at. It has been long since 1945. So this is the question that most Africans with this certain contradictions within Africa that South Africa is the only member. And therefore, the expansion is to bring you have Nigeria, which is the biggest economy with the largest population, you have Egypt, you have Ethiopia, more than 100 million people. And you have Kenya rising powers, and therefore South Africa cannot continue being the only African voice, there is a need to expand and ensure that it becomes more an equitable, better world that we live in. This is in line with the policy of South African government of expanding its own trade, maintain strong relationship with Western countries, but expand trade to Latin America to Asia, and ensure that should there be any crisis, we are not overly dependent on one power. So in a nutshell, BRICS is critical to South Africa. It's for the lack of a better term, I'll use the word bed welcoming. South Africa is a tiny small power in the bigger picture of things. And therefore it sees itself that its voice can be reinforced can be strengthened if it speaks. And right on this breaks with Brazil, India, Russia and China, within multilateral, global multilateral institution, and UN agencies, its voice its demands will be received much better than if it speaks on its own. So in a nutshell, brings is critical for the Africa and Africa agenda, agenda 2063. I must end on that. Thank you.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **18:28**

Thank you, David. Thank you very much. Just like to remind we have 189 people online and we have already received a number of questions. Many of those questions is about BRICS expansions. But Sarang. Now, with you, what is the significance of the same more or less the same spirit of David's question? What is the significance of BRICS for the Global South? There's a significant return to the promise of Bandung Conference. Sarang you have the floor. Thank you.

**Sarang Shidore: 18:54**

Thank you, Feliciano. So I think my panelists have done a fantastic job in laying out the background and also the relevance of BRICS at the moment. But just going back to the second part of your question on Bundanoon, and David Manya mentioned Bandung as a foundational moment, it certainly was, was the first time that global south leaders got to know each other in a sort of a collective format in a Asian country at that time in Indonesia. But Bandung was a very different moment from where we are now. Bandung in many ways was a moment of in the shadow of decolonization, decolonization was not even completed, had started, it still had another 15 years to go before completion. In the case of South Africa, that moment arrived even later. So we had a different time, a different set of economic strengths of these powers who collected they were very much in the mode of wanting that sort of technology transfer and aid from the West. and also the presence of China had a different significance, China, at the time was very much a marginal country, far poorer, and very much a part of the global South, where we are now is rather different. What we have today is that China is one of the major powers of the world, the second largest power, indeed, it's a pole. It's one of the poles of the global order. And BRICS also includes Russia. So what we have in BRICS, as different from Banda, although many similarities exists, but the difference is that we have in BRICS more of an East South coalition sitting in the room, the Global South, represented by the three powers, India, Brazil, in South Africa. And if I could use the term global east, represented by Russia and China, and they are together in the room, especially the global south countries are in the room not because as Professor Moniz said, they're anti West and far from it. India is a very close partner of the US, Brazil and South Africa have excellent relationships with Washington. They want America to be at the table to play a role. But they look at the world and they have drawn some conclusions. One conclusion they've drawn is about the future. They see since the War on Terror since the end of the Cold War, they see the diffusion of power away from Washington towards other capitals, it's slow. It's still in the middle stages, perhaps. And it's certainly not complete. But they do wonder, a future where the world becomes much more multipolar. And it's a good hedging strategy to have coalition's with the ease to have an alternative structures of articulating what they want. Should the world transform continue to transform the way it is transforming. So it's a sort of hedging strategy, but it's also about the present, because the present order that is led by the US and has done a lot of good in many instances, like the Marshall Plan, for example, but nevertheless, today has some serious shortfalls, it doesn't meet the needs of much of the Global South, as my co panelists pointed out, there are issues to do with equitable development, there are issues to do with climate change, and how that is seen. Whether we stick to the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, or we just tell that the global South states that you're equally, you have to do the same as the wealthier countries, although they are they're not responsible for a lot of the emissions. It's also about bringing peace in Ukraine. If you look at the g7 statements, and you contrast them to the BRICS, you see a very stark difference on the way the g7 articulates the war, and what the BRICS is called for peace talks between Russia and Ukraine. So a number of issues like that the BRICS states are sending a message the global South, in this forum is sending a message that we want the global order to change so that it better aligns with our interests. And that is a message that is coming louder and more clearer as we as we move forward in this summit. Read presents with the expansion on the agenda it presents maturing of that of that demand. Thank you, Sarang.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **23:29**

Thank you very much. Now, Marta, back to you. So since we're talking about expansion, a garden the potential of expansion of brakes with inclusion of additional member countries, how does Brazil position itself on this matter? How controversial is this position within Brazil? Martin? Firstly,

**Marta Fernández 23:49**

The fact that the summit is being held in South Africa. I think it offers a symbolic round for the this expansion, given that South Africa itself was the first beneficiary of the grounds in 2011. The agenda for expanding the BRICS is today being led above all by China in Russia, revealing to some extent the influence of these two powers in the grouping after the last BRICS summit in 2022, hosted by Beijing and held online expanding the group was the strength in primarily dictated by current geopolitical configurations. I have been arguing that they will Crimean War was functioning as an invisible or unspoken agenda, because the members of the grouping have to avoid it and have to avoid it because Russia invading power is one of the five Greeks powers at the same time. Time is the issue U is avoided seen since the BRICS is committed to respecting the sovereignty of states, which Russia has violated the war in the will. Krainer has been on the agenda of the leaders taking part in the summit here in South Africa, in what much way as a result of the war in Ukraine in the ground, with tensions between the United States and China, resulting in what has become known as the Cold War 2.0. It has became attractive for both countries for China and for Russia to extend the BRICS members countries, both countries have seen the expansion as a way of enlisting geopolitical alliances from the global south in opposition to the west. The issue today is not the lack of applicants to join the group since 23. Countries have already formally submitted applications either for economic your email or ideological reasons, revealing in some way the political capital of the Greeks, but it is still unclear how do ought to order then the entry of new members without compromising there's so much a claim that unity in diversity of the Greeks or whatever the mission Greek criteria should be prioritized, there is a fear that they enlarge it bricks could be blended by problems of political coordinate or coordination, as well as becaming in operat inoperable since the entry of new members would make it extremely difficult to reach a consensus only issues that today with only five members are already the subject of many negotiations, such as the very issue of bricks expansion, adding new letter to the acronym, which are rabid gainer letter, now with the entry entry of South Africa could ultimately turn all the members into a big plus, just as happened with the g7 fairing. But you will also know from our experiences based on their justification offered by the permanent members of the Security Council for postponing its reform, how much these certifications such as the risk of the body being frozen, due to the expansion of the verb to abate our day to day are true, they also masked the political interest is involved with regarding these political, interesting involved with their doubts as to whether such expansion will favor Brazil, for example, which two days enjoys eight in prominence in the bricks, but which could have its influence dilute dilute, which think entry of new members, as several political analysts and diplomats have warned, however, denying them the entry of new countries has considerable political costs above your all because it could see going out to the world that BRICS is more of the same, in other words, more of an exclusivist club. And then a family based on solidarity as has been claimed by its members, in the sense not accepting new members goes against one of the group's central agendas Democrat sizing international decision making process, it works highlighting this in reality of this agenda for Brazil itself. Given its historical claim to permanent membership on the Security Console, Brazil red seems to have realized that it can play these cards in the Bricsys expansion process, not only by the money in Ammar, in fact position from China, which in napro, Arad declared its support for a more democratic and Representative Security Council. As a diplomat, Interviewer one of the criteria defended by Brazil would be the commitment of any candidate for membership to support a broad reform of the global governance system, especially its Security Council.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **29:38**

Thank you very much. Thank you very much about very much part about the issue of expansion. I always remind my students that a lot of countries asked me to join BRICS, I don't remember very much if there are a lot of countries are asking to join the g7 but that sends the little bit of the signal a different coalition's that we're talking about here. So now, back to David. Professor David, how does Sarah Africa in Africa more broadly views BRIC value, this is something that you already touched upon, in what is the South Africa's view and expanding BRICS membership, especially when it comes to Africa. This is something that you already mentioned. I'd like to elaborate the US elaborate more on that. Professor David, please.

**David Monyae: 30:16**

Thank you. I think my starting point is to go back to the conceptual issues, I think our understanding of bricks SP, Jim O'Neill, the main person that came up with this name is that that is much more of a near liberal understanding of what Briggs is, it is born out of the Wall Street, understanding numbers, markets and farming, it is devoid of the people. So I think what is being constructed in what we see coming before us, for us to understand in the shift in our thinking, it is that there is a construction of a people centered bricks, a development of bricks, that is a representative of all regions. So it's not just how much money you have, how big is the economy, it is the people you represent, and the aspiration of the global south people the need to develop infrastructure, question of health, COVID 19, vaccine nationalism that we saw coming in, and all these things put together some of the issues that are driving a number of countries, particularly my own country, in joining BRICS, and it is a democratic, a liberal democracy with a very, very strong, vibrant, constitutional liberal constitution. And therefore, the notion, a very simplistic notion that coming from the west of democracy and authoritarian, that's a very minimum, a simplistic way of looking at things. BRICS is much more bigger than just me. democracies and authoritarianism. It's looking at more issues of the development of states, and how do we drive them as engine of growth in terms of bringing more energy in a much more climate sensitive way? How do we bring in women? How do we deal with conflicts? And how then do we become truly democratic without really choosing people based on ideological democracy and all the kinds of issues that are being peddled in today's world?

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **32:55**

Thank you. Thank you, David. Now, Sarang, I have a question for you. From your and I think it's an important question, since we're talking about the relationship between bricks and the West. And so from your perspective in Washington, DC, how has the United States viewed bricks? And how should respond it? Sarang, please.

**Sarang Shidore 33:19**

I think it's interesting as as, as Professor David said, it was coined by a sort of Wall Street oriented figure. And it was about emerging markets at the time. And these were seen as sort of these emerging markets for investment and so forth, and stock for portfolios and FDI. Now, I think that's still still relevant in the sense that economic power does translate into influence in many ways in the global system. That's just a reality of it. In the United States, though, outside of those who come from from that world that originated the concept that the US government has not said a whole lot about the BRICS, they generally has been sort of quiet watching, if you will. The commentators now have had their own views. Some commentators have dismissed the BRICS as being sort of more of a talk shop, not having a lot of impact, not doing very much, if you will, but many have simply ignored it. Now. I see that changing. I see that changing after the Ukraine war, this BRICS summit is getting a lot of coverage in ways that I don't recall for earlier Summit. So I think there is some shift happening. The problem is fundamentally that the United States looks at the world, at least in the Foreign and Security spaces in terms of its regional commands. So you have the CENTCOM, you know, the Indo PAYCOM and you have the African and these defined in many ways have the US structures its policies from the security side, but they also sometimes bleed over into other areas. So for example, they indo PAYCOM starts in India and goes all the way across Asia to Japan. CENTCOM starts from Pakistan and goes all the way west to Egypt and so forth. BRICS is interesting because it's transcontinental.

It spans three continents in ways that crosscut American ideas of the world order, which has substantially security driven. So there is a bit of that misalignment in evolving policy. So both taken together means that the US hasn't had much of a response. I think that's a mistake. I think the fact that BRICS, as you mentioned, there are 20 plus countries lining up when a club has a waiting list, it's doing something right. Right. So the club, clearly a lot of countries want to join the club, it may not have had a huge impact as yet of reforming the world order. But these things never happened overnight. These things happen over a long period of time. And the fact that we are seeing an accretion of the brakes, the fact that we are seeing them taking on even impossible agendas like D dollarization. Even as talking points, and the fact that they are asserting certain norms, if you look at the joint statements from the last summits and so forth, they're quite different from the g7 joint statements, not just on Ukraine on many issues. At the same time, the BRICS wants to work with the West, for example, on terrorism, there's a very strong statement on it that aligns perfectly with what Washington might might prefer. So there are areas of commonality that areas of difference, I think the way forward is for the United States to start actually responding to some of these demands. In terms of actual policy, we have seen some good signs in terms of President Biden's team saying very clearly, many times in Southeast Asia elsewhere, that we don't want countries to choose. We want countries, we want to offer a choice. Now that's a good thing to say. It would be good to walk the talk fully on that. It would be good to say to various states that we can offer you these solutions. We have not been very, let's say adventurous on climate, we have not been so adventurous on looking at peace in Europe that's affecting food security, for example. And we have not been, we have in many ways not been helpful on the WTO system, we have held up the appellate body and so forth. So things of that sort serious steps in that direction will go a long way in strengthening the goodwill the US already has in these capitals.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães: 37:37**

Thank you, Sarang. Now we're gonna go for the last round of questions for our panelists. We're accumulating more than 30 questions in the q&a we're going to while Professor Mark, David Sarang responded last round of questions. I will, I will tabulate the questions here and try to bring back to them. So Professor Mark has some some experiences, sir, that China's increasing influence within breeks might be disproportionately affecting other member nations you touched upon on that a little bit. What is your assessment of the situation? How what is the China's role within BRICS nowadays beyond the issue of expanding?

**Marta Fernández 38:14**

Exactly. In some way, this issue is directly related to the question of expansion, about the entry of new members of the BRICS, because while the entry of the members could diminish Brazil's relative influence, on the other hand, it could accentuates Sheena Aranda, exact exacerbating influence in the group by incorporating members that are commercially and financially dependent on China, creating the opportunity to project its influence in key areas of the world. However, to political situation should raise alarm bells in China. First, Brazil recent tests we post on our government in Argentina projective filtery, with governments host times, China, recently their favorite candidate in the Argentina elections have you emulate the clarity the intention to freeze relations with China based on the argument or do you trade with a murderer, as well as advocated the dollarization of the economy of Argentina. But the inequality of power within the BRICS is exemplified, for example, by the very case of the Brazil China relationship, given that China buys 70% of the Brazil soya and 68% of the iron ore war. The risk of this inequality of power within the BRICS is that China, China will increasingly be able to impose its agenda On the other members, as in the case of Brazil, although China like Brazil rejects the idea that you are leaving to a new Cold War, you are in grisly seeing Chinese, onto me Americanism and anti Western rhetoric, which is highly seductive for countries that have been victims of colonial histories, such as Brazil, India, in South Africa. However, however, these anti Western rhetoric could jeopardize Brazil desired role, for example, for mediating the peace process between Russia and Ukraine against the cold war logic that divides the world into antagonists. Paul is organizing the court on his terms, good versus evil, because he was interesting in move there are the tour multipolarity and a geological atmospheric that open space for politics. I think Brazil can contribute to the seas collating the conflict by moderating the CSTs. And see it is of both sides, and it still has the advantage of not being perceived as a direct treat craps it to the west, Brazilian foreign policy has been resisting affiliating unconditionally to one of the poles to move with autonomy, and boom to man maneuver, through the poll is based on analysis of each team according to principles such as the defense of democracy, or the Amazonia with Biden and the interests of the countries such as Brazil's commercial interests with Russia, its main supplier of fertilizers, in this sense why Brazil, as well as South Africa, as Hamas, further declared yesterday is more connected to a large coffee activity, normal alignment, the great power disparity between bring Rick's members can draw can force the system to or illogical, illogical of the polarity in both material in ideological terms diminish in some way the freedom of action of Brazil?

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **42:26**

Thank you, Marta. Now, Professor David. How high South Africa handled the issue of Russia participation in the summit considered a major media speculation early on to put to put things possible visitors so he even here in Brazil with the media, in the media, you could there was a lot there was a lot of discussion about that on the condemnation of Vladimir Putin International Criminal Court and the fact that South Africa is a full member of it and and good and there will be complications if President Russia visited South Africa. So how can you elaborate on that for us, Professor David?

**David Monyae 43:02**

Thank you. I think, look, the South African government made a lot of blunders, I think it got punished for things that has nothing to do with South Africa. The South African position is quite clear on the wall. That, indeed, the move by Russia, into Ukraine, it's violation of the territorial integrity of Ukraine. But having said that, South Africa's major issue has to do with the application of international law, and how we look at interventions, not just the Ukraine intervention. We're very much mindful of Libya, and the killing of Muammar Gaddafi. The destruction of the state in Libya that is caused massive havoc in the Sahel region with all endless schools that had taken place was the making of the United States and European countries. Massive violation of human rights bombardment from the air locking up African air space. I think South Africa and Africa is mindful of what happened in in fact, chopping out the destruction of Iraq. very mind of what happened in Syria, what happened in Afghanistan, and therefore, I think majority of South Africans and Africans in general, are of the view that we should not isolate issues that we look at Ukraine, at the expense of other crises, such as Yemen, and how the international community is responding. And then there is a need of fairness in terms of how to handle so if Russia is as bad as the US in terms of the men Energy to intervene in a number of these issues. So that is the first issue just to clear that it's human rights driven foreign policy. However, when it comes to the application of that foreign policy, and the head of states, we took kind of tardiness in terms of our as members of brakes and strategic partner to all these BRIC countries, South Africa had military Navy exercise, and the timing was terrible. I mean, this is my own personal view, if I was the president or advisor own have allowed the Navy drills to take place at the same day of anniversary of the war. It was insensitive, in my own view. But anyway, the government carried on, and there was a backlash from the west. But the lessons are that President Putin won't have come to South Africa with or without, so called Lady up. Because if we look at the history of President Putin in the post Ukraine invasion, he did not attend Indonesia g 20. Meeting, for obvious reasons, it's not safe to move for him, and that crisis at home and is the commander in chief, the country at war. And we got we as Africa got bogged down in these issues, without clarifying them from the word go and be assertive and set our agenda. But having said all what I've saved, I need to return back to the manner in which US has treated South Africa, which is perceived as anti South Africa's membership of BRICS bully, and the manner in which message was sent the misbehavior of the US ambassador in South Africa with a heavy cost in terms of our parents, how it reacted to his statements. And a lesson to the West in general, that don't look at BRICS country or small countries in Africa, as countries that do not think on their own. These are states that are rational state actors, they have interest, and they carry their interest. And it doesn't matter how small they are, and therefore to treat them be with us, or else we won't give you bread tomorrow, be with us or else in an arrogant language is if this is 1945, the US position in the world as powerful as it is in Germany, its power on a decade by decade is declining. And I do not think in the next 2030 years, it will command the same power. Therefore there is a need of rethink within the US where to maximize areas of convergence in terms of interests between South Africa, Africa, with the United States on a number of issues where democracy we are a number of things, and invest and intervene on the African continent in a way that is mutually beneficial to United States and Africa. As it stands, it's not the case, it's just a question of us, us get rid of the dragon, get rid of China, get rid of Russia. And that won't win the case, one win the argument, it's really black males United States is nothing else other than an imperialist power that is pulling its way through on the African continent. So there's a lot of thinking within the US Elite, US governing elite to really think, than just the view that is so offensive to most Africans, that China is an it's a NEO colonial, it's a colonial power. I really do not think that Africa has issues with China. But those issues are handled differently. And therefore I think United States needs to find constructive way of playing its own game in its Africa policy. Thank you.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **49:32**

Thank you, David out, sir. Thanks for for the last question for you. How does the India China rivalry impact BRICs? Could it sabotage its rise? Or at least raise it? Sir, I'm pleased. Yeah.

**Sarang Shidore: 49:45**

Just before I answer that one comment on us Africa policy, at least on this ahead. We are seeing perhaps US policy that's more reasonable than the French approach. There has been some attempt to reach out there has been some attempt to engage. Obviously, it is not yet in a way that perhaps can bring a solution. But there is a more complex thinking in the administration, on looking at the Global South, there are different voices that are contestations. There's a long way to go. But there is a difference, I think, between now and where we were in the 90s, or the Nazis, when there was really a Unipolar Moment internalized in Washington. Now, very slowly, there is a sense emerging that we have to play this differently. Now, how it translates to policy, we will see on the India China question, that is absolutely one of the dividing line lines and breaks perhaps the most significant one because as we know, India and China are engaged with in a very serious geopolitical rivalry. We have had deaths of of troops in 2020, in in a clash in the high in the mountains. Since then, we have seen a huge buildup of troops on both sides that remain largely in position, there has been some easing, some Confidence Building Measures are being discussed at the moment. In fact, Briggs provides a forum for leaders like those of India and China to sit in the same room without drawing plaque, because they are in a multilateral setting in a neutral setting. And they can they can talk on the sidelines. So if they choose to. So in a sense, there is a rivalry, but there's also this, these spaces like bricks create avenues for that conversation. But more relevant to bricks, they also create incentives to manage those differences within the bricks agenda. So we are not seeing India and China making a huge issue of the bilateral differences within the bricks format. They are working in many fora, there are multiple for an hour within bricks on various issues, from climate, to finance, to health, and so forth. They're working in those in those fora. And I am relatively optimistic that these differences can can be managed, I think, at the end of the day, brick states don't need to be all close friends, but they need to have a common interest on certain issues. And if that common interest is there, then there will be cooperation in the long run. So India and China, for example, agree on issues like climate change, they agree broadly on issues like Ukraine, although there are differences there. But nevertheless, they don't want the war to continue. They also agree on the form of international finances and financial institutions. So there's more than enough there that's in common for them to continue working together in the future.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **52:49**

Thank you, Sarang. We have received more than 30 questions here of various issues, which also shows how people are interested in the issue of breaks and we have 180 participants is still with us. I mean, if I could divided his questions about how we divide into groups, the first I think the bulk of the questions about the issue of expansions to say it made me mentioned a couple of candidates like Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, Iran, Argentina, so on so forth. But the other group of questions is about the concrete results of bricks. I think there are many questions about so what are the concrete results in terms of diplomatic results economic real financial results in even rebuilding of international order. And if I may use my power of moderator here, I'd like to, to speculate a very short very, very fast on ation of of concrete results. The most common concrete results you get from bricks, usually from the literature is a

new developed the construction of the New Development Bank, right, which now has two new members, the bank, Bangladesh, Egypt and the Emirates, which might be my hence the becoming a member of NDB. It's the first step to become a full member of breaks up that will wait for the summit to the to the side. But the second, the second type of concrete results that I usually talk about is if you look at an example that happened to Brazil, if you look at Brazil, India relations, so Brazil and India have never been closed partners, and they were closed any multilateral forum, but had never had a very strong and close bilateral relationship. If you look now, the bilateral relationship between India Brazil has never been so I mean, it's very, very good. Brazil has positioned itself in a very better position comes to India, India, towards Brazil. And the reason for that is BRICS is because the Brazilian leaders and Indian leaders have been meeting year after year this summits and that thing that meaning trickles down to all parts of government and intrapreneurs and diversity so on and so forth. Now, Brazil is in a very if India becomes too much tomorrow, a very big importer of foodstuff. Brazil is in a very good position to be one of the main suppliers. So when if you look at we think BRICS in itself, the relationship between Brazil and all Big mixed numbers included in Africa is much, much closer exactly because of BRICS, it happened probably the same with the g7. Right? If you're all the time there meeting with the g7 countries will be going to be much because despite the differences that we have amongst ourselves, and the second aspect, I think, as relates to the second aspect, which is the most most common narrative of Brazil justification to be a member of BRICS is more or less what Martha braid portrayed in her answers is the narrative of construction of the building a multipolar order in which Brazil is one of the poles and which is a more equitable, multipolar order. But I think it's also a matter of political access. What India, China and Russia offered to Brazil when the creation of BRICS is a political axis in a level that they never zoom has never had with United States or Europe. And the highest level possible. Right, with the president of Brazil meeting the President of China, the Prime Minister of India, the President of Russia, in a way in a consistent that we never had with the West, the West has never offered it never hinted an offer. We have all the BRICS members, maybe Brazil is the only country that can be both at BRICS member in a g7 member g8 member that was never under the table. There was never the table has never been an offer on that regard. Right. So that's something that India, a China and Russia have offered countries like South Africa and Brazil. Well, why would we say no to that? If we had said no to that will be the biggest mistake one of the biggest mistake of our of our foreign policy in history. So that's something to be always I mean, I tell them to my American, American diplomats, friends that I have here in Brazil, and sometimes I meet with them is that look, what we want at the end is acknowledgement. Right, so that's what China offered. The United States is, you know, offering the same level, right, acknowledgement leads to concrete results. So we are it's already 12 o'clock, we have just a few minutes. So I'd like to add the final words and moralized to speculate on the issue of concrete results. I will start with Martha then I'll go with David and then sir and Martha please.

**Marta Fernández:** **57:07**

Okay, my internet is a little be unstable, but I try to hope to have my final remarks. I think one one thing that is important say about this expansion, is that some countries that are trying to entry to in the BRICS, like Iran, Saudi Arabia, etcetera, are countries that have a Now historically have gender oppression. And so, there is a kind of diplomatic movement also, to try to do in some way to strengthen the power of, for example, Eva's iba there that he is composed by South by South Africa by India, but that there is more potential to advance some Damascus, for example, because, of course, BRICS is very, in some ways very attached to the, to confirm the inequalities, but he some inequalities are omitted. Now, for example, the question of gender inequality. And so there is this movement also that, in some way, is, is leading by by diplomacy and academic is that are afraid of this expansion, also, because of this question related to the gender equality and other rights. And if I understood, because my internet is so unstable. I agree with the one that said that Brazil has not have lots of advantage to be near the west. And if you think and I think they've talked to this man the system since the end of their second world war since 1945, is structured by the West, now, the UN, the finance, international financial institution. So in some way, I think that he Rick's murdered, precisely to say, now this system did not offer to us the police for economical gains that in some way we do we represent in the woods, especially today. So these institutions are not a representative of these, and there is this kind of difficult to reform these institutions. So what, what I think is that he, the very idea of the creation of the bank of the BRICS, the BRICS Bank is is stimulated by the idea that they in some way are tyrants, to try to, to reform this institution from within. So, they are in some way searching for alternative mechanisms, that he can in some ways function in the more equality terms, for example, name promoting the development, helping to finance the development of the emerging countries without the condition conditionalities that are characteristically of the, of the Western donors, for example, or the Western international institutions.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães:** **1:01:32**

Thank you, Martha. Professor David, your last words, and thank you again for being here with us.

**David Monyae: 1:01:37**

Thank you. Yeah, my concluding remarks. I think when we look at bricks, a we have to be mindful of what what drives South Africa, what drives the African continent into joining a body, such as BRICS, it opens up a number of opportunities. I think what is coming much more, it's less of bricks, more of what is it that Africans can do to build more infrastructure take advantage of changes taking place at the global level, and the competition that is there. And the tension that we see. I think what is key is that Africa is minerals, rich minerals, and not just ordinary minerals, strategic minerals, whether it's uranium in Asia, whether it's lithium, in Zimbabwe, Namibia and Nigeria, and quite a number of Ghana. So the bigger question here where China is taking advantage, realizing the unhappiness of Africans with the Western world will come in and extract minerals to the west, China has started building a beneficiation kind of setup in Zimbabwe, on lithium, I think it will be high time for United States to understand some of these dynamics and demands. Resource nationalism is on the rise. And therefore think instead of fighting the Chinese and the Russians, I think it would be much more better to meet Africans halfway. And building an ensured that they benefit in the whole value chain of the minerals without this naked exploitation by the very same powers that advancing democracy and the like, and pushing of pricing. What Africans want that development as cell phones, access to cell phone, to move tomatoes from rural areas to urban area, and for markets that are less interested when that cellphone is a Huawei or Swiss American, they give no worry about all those things. They need a cheap cell phone. So instead of wasting time talking about China, take advantage of building affordable cell phones for Africans infrastructure, the so called debt trap, spent more time in understanding Africa's agenda to end this. It's certainly the wish of Africans to connect connectivity to trade among themselves and take advantage of those issues. I think that will be a much more better global soft agenda for the United States instead of using a military vehicle in dealing with more military bases in Africa, more aid that is not reaching people. As it goes to corrupt leaders and opening runways in deserts that people really don't even worry about that. So in a nutshell, BRICS is important. How we understand BRICS and the West, the way they're responding, perhaps you need to find an area where we converge and understand what is it that we can do together with the West? And what is it that we can do with the east? I think that's what drives South Africa, and most of Africans. Thank you for inviting me. And thank you for cheering.

**Feliciano de Sá Guimarães: 1:05:34**

Thank you. Thank you, Professor David Sarang, you have the floor. Now, final words, please.

**Sarang Shidore: 1:05:40**

I'm just going to spend a minute since we are over time, I'm just gonna say one thing. The United States is a large country. It's not a monolith. And there are debates emerging more than in the sidelines on how to deal with this vast region called the Global South. These debates have to be seeded with more information, better perspectives, like we have on today's panel. And I think the idea is, I think the United States doesn't want to lose this game. The question is, will it have the right strategy to win this game in a way that it retains influence in a world where it may not be dominant for the long haul? So that's the sort of questions we look at it the Quincy Institute, and we do think that such a policy correction is possible. And in a way that working with partners like South Africa, India and Brazil, which are not rivals of the United States, they are partners. I think this can be moved forward. Thank you, Sarang.

**Feliciano de SÃ¡ GuimarÃ£es: 1:06:41**

I'd like to thank everybody Professor David ammonia from University of Johannesburg Professor Marta Fernandez from university the councilmembers of Rio Santa Sridhar, director, director of Global South program at Quincy Institute, and name of Sabri as an academic director said we'd like to thank everybody from the audience we had up to 180 people now we have a still one and 50 people with us. And good luck for the summit in Johannesburg for the South African. Hosting the summit there. So, bye bye. See you next time. Bye. Thank you. Jojo.