



UNIVERSITY OF THE
WITWATERSRAND,
JOHANNESBURG

THE ROLE OF BRICS LARGE IN SCALE-ARMED CONFLICT: BUILDING A MULTIPOLAR WORD ORDER

PROF MALTE BROSIG



NEW SECURITY CHALLENGES
SERIES EDITOR: GEORGE CHRISTOU



The Role of BRICS in Large Scale Armed Conflict

Building a Multi-Polar World Order

Malte Brosig

palgrave
macmillan

WHAT IS BRICS?

- It is no international organisation
- It is no international regime
- It is a foreign policy grouping:

Grouping “refers to actorness, understood as independent decision-making and subsequent action taking, as primarily resting on the constitutive parts of the group which are the member states. In this vein a group exists predominately because it can be compartmentalized and disentangled into its constitutive parts.”

HOW DOES BRICS WORK?

Semi-codified principles:

- Sovereign equality
- Rules based order
- Primacy of UNSC
- Opposition against unilateral (western) military interventions
- Promote a non-Western identity
- Favouring multi-polarity

Un-written principles:

- Sovereignty first, ideally unconstrained, state-led process
- Do not openly criticise a member, avoid contestation
- Mutually accept national interests in international relations (carving out of regional backyards)
- Do not talk about domestic opposition/problems
- Provide a safe international environment for leaders
- BRICS is no strategic alliance
- Consensus rule

WHAT FOREIGN POLICY VALUE?

Four benefits stand out:

1. Promoting domestic regime stability
2. Protection from un-wanted external interferences
3. Flexible alignment in foreign policies
4. Boosting regional authority

WHAT ROLE FOR BRICS IN LARGE-SCALE ARMED CONFLICT?

Aims of the research:

- Showing to which extent BRICS countries are involved to building order (security) beyond formal institutions
- Emphasis is on responses to armed conflict which is constitutive to order
- Develop a typology of responses (next slide)
- Overview of in-put factors for choice of response
- Four case studies: Libya, Syria, Ukraine, South Sudan

IDEAL RESPONSE TYPES

Cooperative

Hegemonic

Neo-Imperialist

Passive

Active

Leading

Dominant

Temporary
intrusion

Direct
permanent

Instruments and Means

- Broad based multilateralism
- Use of force within legal constraints
- Response is primarily international, multiple leadership
- Emphasis on legitimate action
- Neutral stance to conflict parties
- Exiting conflict when its over

- Mini-lateral intervention
- Forming of coalition of the willing
- International consultation for strategic purpose
- Supporting proxies in conflict
- Legitimacy seeking for strategic goals
- Exiting conflict but keeping control

- Unilateral, use of force
- Reliance on own power resources
- International consultation as appeasement
- Occupation of territory
- Legitimacy seeking to cover rights violations
- Being a conflict party

Most cooperative



Most coercive

HOW RESPONSE TYPES ARE SELECTED: SOME EXPLANATORY VARIABLES

1. **Proximity** to conflict (broadly understood) in terms of inter-connection to conflict affected areas
2. **Capacity** to act in combination with **will** to act (strategic relevance)
3. **Conflict type**, local/domestic conflict vs regional/global order question
4. **Economic** interests, FDI, natural resources, trade, market access
5. **Resonance** with BRICS normative agenda
6. Responding to conflict in order to act upon global **humanitarian norms**

BRICS AND LIBYA

Country	Russia	China	South Africa	Brazil	India
Response type	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (active)	Cooperative (active)	Cooperative (passive)
Main motivation	Opposing military intervention and regime change	Evacuating Chinese nationals, pragmatic politics, opposing military intervention and regime change	Multilateral conflict mediation, opposing military intervention and regime change	Favor criminal justice, opposing military intervention and regime change	Evacuating Indian nationals, opposing military intervention and regime change
Proximity	+	-	---	---	-
Capability	-	+	-	---	--
Interests					
Type of Conflict	++	++	++	++	++
Economics	+	++	---	---	++
BRICS agenda	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Humanitarian norms	--	--	+	++	+

SYRIA

RESPONSE TYPES AND TRIGGER VARIABLES

Country	Russia	China	South Africa	Brazil	India
Response type	Neo-imperialist (temporary)	Hegemonic (leadership)	Cooperative (active)	Cooperative (active)	Cooperative (passive)
Main motivation	Reclaiming great power status, strategic interests, occasional multilateralism	Sovereignty and non-intervention, occasional multilateralism	Upholding multilateralism based on sovereignty and non-intervention	Upholding multilateralism, humanitarian concerns	Upholding multilateralism, non-military, non-interventionist solution
	Russia	China	South Africa	Brazil	India
Proximity	++	+	---	---	+
Capability	++	+	---	---	-
Interests	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Type of Conflict	+	++	---	---	++
Economics	++	++	+++	+	++
BRICS agenda	--	--	+	++	+
Humanitarian norms					

BRICS AND UKRAINE

Country	Russia	China	South Africa	Brazil	India
Response type	Neo-imperialist (direct, permanent)	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (passive)
Main motivation	Dominating post-Soviet region	Investment saving rhetorical support for multilateral peace negotiations	No genuine interests, rhetorical support for multilateral peace negotiations	No genuine interests, almost no response	No genuine interests, rhetorical support for multilateral peace negotiations
Proximity	+++	+	---	---	---
Capability, Interests	+++	-	---	---	---
Type of conflict	-	-	-	-	-
Economics	++	+	-	---	--
BRICS agenda	++	++	++	++	++
Humanitarian norms	--	--	+	+	+

BRICS IN SOUTH SUDAN

Country	Russia	China	South Africa	Brazil	India
Response type	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (active)	Cooperative (active)	Cooperative (passive)	Cooperative (passive)
Main motivation	No genuine interests but using conflict as opportunity for politicking	Investment saving through multilateral peace negotiations, facilitator role	Champion of African solutions, modest economic interests, facilitator role	No genuine interests but providing declaratory support for multilateral peace talks	Reluctant hegemon, economic interests, seeking multilateralism solutions
Proximity	---	+	---	---	+
Capability Interests	-	++	++	---	++
Type of Conflict	--	--	+	---	--
Economics	--	+	+	---	+
BRICS agenda	+	+	+	+	++
Humanitarian norms	--	--	++	+	+

MAPPING BRICS RESPONSE TO ARMED CONFLICT

B	L S	SS U				
R		L SS			S	U
I	S	L U SS				
C	SS	L U	S			
S	SS L S	U				
Total:20	7	10	1	0	1	1
Response types	Active	Passive	Leading	Dominant	Temporary	Permanent
	Cooperative		Hegemonic		Neo-imperial	

L=Libya, S = Syria, U=Ukraine, SS=South Sudan

TRIGGER VARIABLES AND RESPONSES

Proximity	4x--- 2x+	6x--- 3x+ 2x-	1x+	1x++	1x+++
Capability Interests	2x--- 2x- 2x++	5x--- 1x-- 3x- 1x+ 1x++	1x+	1x++	1x+++
Type of Conflict	1x++ 3x+++ 1x+ 1x--	4x++ 4x- 2x-- 1x--	1x+++	1x+++	1x-
Economics	3x--- 2x+ 1x++	3x--- 2x-- 1x- 2x++ 3x+	1x++	1x+	1x++
BRICS agenda	2x+++ 1x++ 3x+	4x+++ 5x++ 2x++	1x++	1x++	1x++
Humanitarian Concerns	3x+ 2x++ 1x--	1x++ 6x+ 4x--	1x--	1x--	1x--
Response types	Active	Passive	Leading	Temporary	Permanent
	Cooperative		Hegemonic	Neo-imperial	

SOME HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses with empirical coverage:

H1: The greater the proximity to conflict and the greater the capacity to project power, the stronger, more coercive, the response.

H2: The larger the distance to the conflict and the more limited the capabilities to project power the more cooperative the behavior.

H3 Cooperative behavior increases with the absence of economic interests.

Also true:

H4: The larger economic interests but smaller capacity to project power, the more cooperative the response to armed conflict.

H5: The larger economic interests and the greater the distance to the conflict, the more cooperative the response.

H6: The more relevant humanitarian norms are for BRICS countries the more likely they are to respond cooperatively to armed conflict.

H7: The less relevant humanitarian norms but shorter the distance to the conflict and the more power capabilities are available the more likely are hegemonic or neo-imperial responses