International Journal of Social Sciences Bulletin
Volume 2, Issue 4, 2024 ISSN: (E) 3007-1917 (P) 3007-1909

SHAPING A NEW GLOBAL ORDER: THE STRATEGIC DYNAMICS BETWEEN BRICS AND THE G20

Fatima[1], Dr. Muhammad Fahim Khan[*2]

[1]MS Scholar Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bahria University Islamabad.
*[*2]Assistant Professor Department of Humanities and Social Sciences Bahria University, Islamabad*

[*2]mfahimkhan.buic@bahria.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
09 September, 2024	09 October, 2024	24 October, 2024	05 November, 2024

ABSTRACT

This research looks at how the strategies have affected the G20 and other global institutions that have long been in place to govern. It does this because it thinks these nations' goals still have a chance to bring about a more peaceful and stable global order. It also acts as a lens through which to examine and make sense of alterations to such frameworks. After failing to obtain clout at the conventional global financial institutions, the BRICS group of nations has developed other tactics to influence global decision-making. The Contingent Reserve Arrangement and the New Development Bank are two of the alternative financial institutions that the BRICS nations have set up. In her examination of the BRICS group's influence on new G20 policy issues related to climate change, sustainable development, and international trade reform, Jessie Jane Gaillard draws on these and other important points. Disagreements persist not just between the BRICS nations but also between them and the Western G20 members. These provide significant obstacles to reaching an agreement on how to proceed. Nonetheless, the nations of the South must work together. Specifically under the purview of the G20 and the BRICS New Development Bank (NDB), the authors propose that more fundamental regional cooperation can help alleviate this. More input from developing countries should be included in BRICS and G20 discussions, members of both coalitions should work together more closely, and the G20 should use the phrase "working together" to promote world peace and prosperity. These are the building blocks for a new global power structure that doesn't depend on who came out on top in WWII, but rather on how well it serves the needs of the two-thirds of the human population that has been oppressed for ages and is now calling for a voice in international affairs.

Keywords: *BRICS, G20, global governance, multipolarity, financial institutions.*

INTRODUCTION

The BRICS bloc encompasses Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa [1, 2]. They are challenging the traditional international system and portend a significant shift toward multipolarity. BRICS was and remains a concept complementing the G20's goal to address global economic challenges. Besides, these countries are the G20 members with the most dynamic emerging economies. The G20's coming together was an act of serious reform meant to address a root problem of the international financial system: decision-making concentrated in a few Western countries with limited numbers of other states sometimes associated with them [3]. This is the same concern as expressed in the calls for reform of the Bretton Woods institutions, particularly the International Monetary Fund (IMF)[1], and with those

[1] The International Monetary Fund is a major financial agency of the United Nations.

for the United Nations Security Council [2]to have more, and more diverse, members who take decisions. BRICS interacts with the G20, particularly within the areas of cooperation, competition, and reform, the three elements of the mélange that makes up the path to a global incidence of public goods [4]. At the center of this investigation lies the conflict between the BRICS cooperative aims and the long-standing global governance structures and traditions espoused largely by the countries of the G20. Despite the plethora of huge problems that the G20 is supposedly dedicated to solving (huge because the G20 problems are in the trillions of dollars; the U.S. has half of that, or around $8 trillion) [5], the summit's sphere of possible accomplishment seems much less extensive than it has been in the past and its espoused multipolarity seems much less plausible than the kind of polarity that, in the past, the great powers could and did impose on the weaker countries of the world [6]. The BRICS' summit, by contrast, afforded them a platform for becoming not just part of the reordering of the world but also a plausible counterweight to what the G20 has been doing in many crucial spheres of global governance [7].

The main aim of this study is mentioned below:

1. To get a grip on what the BRICS countries are doing to try to ramp up their status inside the G20 system.
2. To make an initial assessment of just how successful the BRICS initiatives have been.
3. To study the impact of these BRICS moves not just in a system perhaps becoming more institutionalized, but also with reference to likely new policy outcomes and responses to the BRICS initiatives.

Literature Review

Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (BRICS) and the G20 are two important groups that help global governance make decisions in several key areas. When the most serious international problems are being handled, when the structures of global governance come under stress or are unworkable, when the main pieces of the international order are in contention, as now with trade and climate change, or when crises loom that threaten the international system as a whole, it is to these two groups that hope looks for renewed vision and creative solutions [8].

The BRICS countries emerged as a grouping in the early years of the 21st century. They aimed to forge a coalition that would be a major force for global change—establishing not just for themselves but for the international community at large—certain new principles of the right way to run things. This emerging and powerful new grouping consisted of (and at the present time still consists of) Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. Together, the BRICS countries now represent more than 3 billion people, or about 40% of the world's population, and more than a quarter of the world's land area. They have a total GDP[3] about equal to or perhaps even larger than that of the United States. Importantly, then, the BRICS countries represent one of the most formidable international forces in existence today [9].

The G20 was created almost 20 years ago as a direct response to the financial crises of the 1990s-2000s. Since that time, it has become a key international platform through which to address the major shared global challenges we face. The G20 is part of what one might call "the top table" at which global decisions are taken. What makes a big difference to people's lives in different parts of the world is indeed decided at this level, affecting not just the 20 countries represented as members but also the rest of us. This is why G20 summits register with a broader public and fuel the large expectation that their outcomes might indeed solve major problems [10].

The relationship shared between the BRICS nations and the G20 isn't always helpful and friendly, but it isn't always contentious and argumentative, either. It is, in reality, a good deal of both. These nations are active inside the G20, using it as a forum in which to drive their important advocacy for substantial reforms of international financial institutions [11]. At

[2] The Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

[3] Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is a monetary measure of the market value of all the final goods and services produced and rendered in a specific time period by a country or countries.

the same time, they're also—to varying degrees and in a variety of ways—participating in a conversation about global governance that's every bit as much a part of a power struggle among themselves as it sometimes is between them and the G20 as a group.

At the same time, the G20 has been acting as an international crisis manager. In the wake of the financial crisis that erupted in 2008, the G20 emerged as a forum where leaders could discuss and coordinate their responses to the global meltdown. Presidents, prime ministers, and finance ministers from the world's major economies began to convene with increasing frequency, and by the end of 2008, they had thrashed out a number of important agreements at a time when the global economy and the global financial system both were in danger of spiraling out of control once again [12].

The G21 proposition has brought a new level of complexity to the global governance debate. The idea to enlarge the G20 group to include the African Union shows a push toward ever more "inclusive" global frameworks (read: greater number of international actors) and underlines a clear political signal to confer more strategic importance to Africa. With the G21, the expansion concept of the G20 crystallizes and takes on an altogether more extensional turn. Dynamized by an African presence, the enlarged G20 would lead, it is expected, from a "LIVE G20" to a "LEADING G20." Above all, the inclusion of the G21 would enhance the legitimacy and efficacy of the G20, the premier venue for international economic governance [13].

The connection between BRICS, the G20, and a possible G21 clearly demonstrates that global governance is changing in the 21st century. As emerging economies come to the fore and the balance of power begins to shift, global institutions need to change, too. They must adapt to the new predominance of some and the anticipated influence of others, while still figuring out how to make decisions in a prominent and convivial manner. In this context, the push for BRICS' reforms and the G20's part in dealing with global urgencies exemplify the expression our particular decade has given to the demand for a different show of global governance [14].

Although the G21 still plays minority roles in key international power arrangements, the group represents a potential catalyst for international change. The reason is that the G21 is a vehicle for its national groupings, the G20 and the BRICS, to mobilize at the international level for democratic processes in global decision-making on issues that affect not just the interest of the global North but also those of other countries. This is classically what is known as power-driven fragmentation, where national processes of globalization allow the representation of the many to find a voice both inside their countries and internationally, which is to be seen and for the views of those many to be considered [15].

In spite of these difficulties, the BRICS and G20 (and maybe the G21) offer substantial potential to influence global governance. The power of these groups to shape global structures, ensure their inclusivity (in plural ways), and see to it that sustainable development does not get short-changed is far from negligible. The payoffs from gaining a better understanding of the conditions BRICS and G20 face, the strategies they adopt, and the impacts they have could be huge. If we get their collective and individual actions wrong, we could very well be in the same catastrophic boat for which we have hitherto blamed the G7[4], G8[5], or G9[6] [16].

Theoretical Framework

BRICS and the G20 start the molding of the world's global governance in the future is a question which can be answered by looking at two different lenses; one lens has its focus on Complex Interdependence Theory for the G20, and the other lens has its focus on the Regionalism Theory of Global Governance [17].

The idea that states and non-state actors are interdependent across a multitude of channels may seem like common sense at first, but it's a

[4] Group of Seven (G7) is an intergovernmental political and economic forum

[5] Group of Eight (G8) is an intergovernmental political and economic forum

[6] Group of Nine (G9) is an intergovernmental political and economic forum

fundamental notion that has given us one of the more captivating theories of international relations: complex interdependence. This theory, developed by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye in the 1970s and 1980s, states that, contrary to realist views, international relations are based not on the use of force but on how and why countries and actors have ever deepening ties to one another's economies and societies. These many ties take on multiple dimensions—social, environmental, and, most importantly, economic. As a result, the theory holds, the many problems and issues that arise internationally are not solvable through the use or threat of military force by one country or group of countries against another. They are, instead, problems that can only be solved through cooperation, coordination, and the use of "soft power". The complex interdependence theorists argue that globalization, in its current phase, holds the potential for many good things and some bad things. On the good side, it holds out, or seems to, the prospect of "global goods" that everyone can enjoy—think of international public goods like clean air and water, for example, or international private goods like software that combines multiple programs in an ever-growing number of ways. On the bad side, it holds out the prospect of negative "side-effects" that everyone, or nearly everyone, suffers because of interconnected decisions that were made by a few powerful actors who thought they were acting in their national interest [18].

Regionalism Theory offers a useful framework for examining the BRICS association and its effects on global governance. From this theoretical perspective, international cooperation is achieved primarily by means of alliances and organizations. Moreover, these mechanisms work best when mostly similar economies band together when labor standards, trade practices, and such are shared, and common "rules of the game" prevail [19].

In fact, from the standpoint of regionalism, the BRICS become even more interesting because they are located in different world regions, and the only thing really "regional" about the BRICS organization is its name. Even so, they serve as a platform for conversation and coordination on global governance especially at the G-20 level where the large emerging economies have a real say in global affairs something they foreshadowed a lot more in 2010 in the year preceding the summit in Seoul [20].

Complex Interdependence Theory and Regionalism Theory both give unique viewpoints on how coalitions like the G20 and the BRICS affect global governance. In the case of the G20, this world forum is seen by both theories as being a necessary part of today's multilateral world. The Complex Interdependence camp sees global politics as going through a phase where interconnectedness is a major characteristic. They argue that the problems the world faces today carry not just their own national consequences but the potential to become truly international crises. Meanwhile, Regionalism Theory shed light on how the world should now be understood through both horizontal and vertical interactions of regulations by states and by coalitions of states [21].

On the other hand, when Regionalism Theory is applied to BRICS, it highlights how the emerging economies are forming regional alliances to boost their global power. The basic principles of regionalism govern BRICS cooperation and solidarity among the five members, unity in the face of global issues, and an intention to create an overarching framework for governance that represents the five distinctive national identities. BRICS advocates using this regionalist strategy not only to infuse the existing Western-dominated global institutions with a South-friendly alternative agenda but also to act as a pressure group against these institutions. The BRICS countries are working through the G20, among other international forums, to try and change global policies and governance structures in ways that reflect their own interests and principles—that is, the interests and principles of the global South [22].

Using these theoretical frameworks, we can gain a good understanding of how the G20 and BRICS interact and the dynamics at work in the contemporary global governance they both seem to be part of. When we look at the G20, it is very much informed by the theory of complex interdependence. And when we look at BRICS, it seems to be guided by the theory of regionalism. It is my contention that when these two groups come together, they really do so to serve their own regional interests and promote a structure of global governance that is very much aligned with those interests. These theories together

provide a base for understanding global governance, which is not a singular power structure but a web of power structures held together by alignments of different national elites for the nebulous purposes of managing global interdependencies that are inseparable both from assertions of authority over those they govern and offensive power toward those they do not [23].

The G20 has been set up as a forum for the coordinated management of global interdependencies across national and regional levels by national and regional leaders, whereas the BRICS countries, following their own "forum of forums" approach, have all tried to set themselves up as alternative national and regional elites that national and regional elites in other parts of the world could align with for the purposes of governing their own people in international affairs [24].

Methodology

This research intend to choose a systematic literature review. This research method is reliable and efficient. It allows for the thorough gathering and analysis of all relevant academic literature. The systematic literature review follows a step-by-step path. The first step is to identify the research question or questions that the study will seek to answer. Then, a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria for the literature to be reviewed is established. Next, an initial search is conducted. This involves selecting from a wide range of possible databases and employing various search strategies. And so on.

At the start, the research questions set the direction of the review. This puts the emphasis on BRICS strategies and the way that they affect global governance, but also on the BRICS-G20 nexus and on the interplay within the G20 deck. Because it is part of the context within which we are obliged to understand the BRICS and their many-headed attempts to influence global governance. The in-study criteria used in our search prioritize the English-language works on BRICS and the G20 that have been listed in the key databases of scholarly reviews, across a reasonable timeframe.

We utilize many academic databases to find the right scholarly articles and books. These databases include Web of Science, Scopus, JSTOR, and Google Scholar. We combine search terms like "BRICS," "G20," "world governance," or "global governance" and "international relations" (very broad, we admit), and "economic strategies," and make our searches as deep and as wide as possible in the four databases. We then refine the search, and the results of the refined search lead us to the articles and books we need to read. We also track both backward and forward citations of articles to identify seminal works and recent studies that might not have appeared in initial search results.

The focus of data extraction is on crucial variables: the theoretical frameworks used, the methodologies, the BRICS strategies, and their influence on global governance within the G20 context. A coding scheme has been established to sort and classify these variables. Doing so enables an even-handed, systematic comparison between studies.

The method of a systematic literature review guarantees a careful, detailed, and impartial accounting of the established body of knowledge. Its first utility is the penetration of that established knowledge, yielding for the serious analyst a grip on the major theoretical angles and methodological vectors brought to bear on BRICS (and post-BRICS) by the mass of serious scholarship in the recent term. Its second utility—because it allows for stepping outside the framework of the old articles that will tend to color the professed understanding of those who are invested in only one side of the arguments that it can usefully identify pillars of argumentation on both sides of the classic G20-versus-BRICS (or similar developing countries) divide in studies of global governance.

Findings

The findings of this research, based on a comprehensive analysis of the literature, are extremely fascinating. They demonstrate that the BRICS countries, using both collective and individual strategies, have had a profound impact on global governance; in particular, the G20 has been influenced in a multitude of ways. Put differently, the BRICS are engaged in a concrete common project: reconstructing the global governance architecture in the direction of a more multipolar world—something that is already unmistakably in motion. The basis for this aspiration and for the BRICS countries' growing influence can be found in a series of mostly positive, cooperative interaction within the G20 [25].

The key strategy used by BRICS is the creation of new and alternative financial institutions. These work as a kind of "parallel" reality to traditional funding organizations like the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund (IMF). They are seen as a response to the fact that these old-established outfits are generally Western-dominated and are therefore often perceived as being subject to the political interests of the rich countries that set them up. At the 6th BRICS summit in July 2014, the BRICS leaders agreed to formally establish the New Development Bank (NDB) and the Contingent Reserve Arrangement (CRA) as the first of these alternative institutions [26].

Institution	Established	Objectives	Key Projects
New Development Bank (NDB)	2014	Provide financing for infrastructure and sustainable development projects in BRICS and other emerging economies	Renewable energy projects in Brazil, transportation infrastructure in India, water resource management in China
Contingent Reserve Arrangement (CRA)	2015	Provide liquidity support to BRICS countries in times of financial stress	Currency swap arrangements among member countries

One major discovery is the way BRICS has come to the forefront, arguing for changes in the international governance system. Above all, they have demanded “fair and just” reforms in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. It's true that there has been some positive movement on that front, such as China's and other emerging powers' being given greater "voting shares." But there, too, the "reformist" argument by the BRICS appears to have not yet entirely carried the day. Or to put it more kindly, the "process" of effecting the demanded reforms has been “slow [27]."

Institution	Reform Proposal	Outcome
IMF	Increase in voting shares for emerging economies	Incremental increases, with notable changes for China
World Bank	Greater representation for developing countries on the Board	Modest increases in representation, ongoing negotiations

The G20's framework is influenced by BRICS in several different policy sectors. Scholars argue that these nations have managed to get their issues onto the platform of the G20, issues they otherwise could not get to that platform. To take just one example, the G20 adopted ambitious targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and targets for investment in renewable energy. And sustainable development experts and climate scientists say that would not have happened without the BRICS. The main reason is not hard to figure out. BRICS are on a trajectory of rapid development and industrialization. They must switch to a low-carbon, climate-resilient path [28].

The outcome of the G20 summit also underscores the major points of debate between the group's participants. Heated discussion arose over many of the policy points. Despite the declared unity, the leading global powers have serious divisions. The sharpest divide was between the traditional Western powers (the United States, Canada, the European Union, and Japan) and the extended emerging economies, the so-called BRICS of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. On many of the most critical global economic and political matters, the Western powers took one position; the BRICS took another [29].

The research also makes it clear that the internal dynamics of BRICS itself are constantly changing. On some issues, the group makes a joint statement, but on others, the internal differences between the members are underscored. The four countries that aren’t China sometimes seem concerned about where China is going, as well as where it is taking some of the BRICS’ proposed initiatives. Indeed, the intra-

BRICS differences on some matters of foreign policy and some matters of economic strategy can sometimes seem as great as the cracks that have developed between the US and its European allies [30].

Below is Table 3, which collates the main areas of cooperation and conflict that have emerged thus far within BRICS while each finds itself under the G20 institution.

Area of Focus	Cooperation/Contention	Impact on G20
Sustainable Development	Cooperation	Increased emphasis on sustainable development goals (SDGs) in G20 agenda
Climate Change	Cooperation	Adoption of more ambitious climate targets and renewable energy investments
Global Trade Reforms	Cooperation	Ongoing discussions on WTO reform, addressing developing countries' concerns
Infrastructure Development	Cooperation	Greater focus on infrastructure investment in G20 discussions
Financial Regulation	Contention	Divergent priorities lead to protracted negotiations and slower progress on financial reforms
Belt and Road Initiative (BRI)	Contention	Mixed support within BRICS, leading to nuanced positions in G20 negotiations

The findings also illustrate how important it is for BRICS to be involved in and allied with regional movements. By intensifying regional cooperation, the BRICS nations multiply their opportunities to advance their policy goals in international settings like the G20, where regional perspectives shape debates. Should regionalism continue to hold sway and be effective in international affairs, it will likely produce not just a few centers of power in an otherwise unipolar world but a more structurally diverse and governing order overall [31].

Conclusion

An analysis of the techniques used by BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and their potential influence on global governance structures, particularly on the G20, highlights the importance of emerging-market economies in creating the international system. The purposeful infiltration of these nations into the inner control of international organizations is evident when examining their intentions and actions over the previous decade. This signifies a significant transformation in the global governance structure that warrants our attention. This transition offers the unmet potential of a "greater China," a "greater India," and similar entities, collaborating instead of competing, in a manner they collectively see as beneficial to the global common good.

The ongoing lobbying by BRICS for changes in global institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, demonstrates their dedication to establishing inclusive and representative governance frameworks. Despite gradual advancements in augmenting voting shares for developing countries, the vigorous advocacy from BRICS sustains the discourse on necessary changes. Simultaneously, inside the G20 framework, the combined power of BRICS nations has enabled them to promote a balanced agenda that addresses the requirements of both developed and developing countries. The policies they prioritize—namely sustainable development, climate change mitigation, and equitable treatment of poor nations in global trade—have profoundly influenced the policy dialogue inside the G20 and have achieved the outcomes most sought by BRICS.

This research demonstrates that negotiating BRICS' unified views inside the G20 is consistently challenging. The primary reason is that the developing countries in the G20, particularly the BRICS, has distinct economic and political objectives that often diverge from those of the conventional Western powers in the G20. This article presents three explanations for the challenges in

achieving a unified voice among the BRICS nations: Their financial systems are governed by distinct regulatory frameworks, they exhibit varying degrees of economic growth, and they possess both overlapping and divergent interests in international politics. Jean Todt, the Secretary-General of the International Automobile Federation, asserts the undeniable complexity.

The study's results underscore the significance of global partnerships and alliances in acquiring worldwide influence. Participating in such a coalition seems to be a matter of common sense. Ultimately, aligning with a "average" global ally would result in a uniform exchange of influence, regardless of the specific choice made. The "BRICS plus regional" strategy, on average, enhances influence; it may be described as a "sum multiplied by the part" methodology for accessing global influence both directly and indirectly.

Recommendation

Global governance should adhere to a series of recommendations to enhance its efficiency. The G20 should consider the viewpoints and goals of the BRICS nations more thoroughly, particularly on financial regulation, sustainable development, and infrastructure investment. Conversely, the BRICS should persist in advocating for changes that enhance the efficacy and efficiency of global institutions while also fortifying their regional organizations and collaboration. Both the G20 and BRICS should prioritize eco-coalitions in their operations due to the considerable significance of our "global" governance concerns.

References

B. Hooijmaaijers, "The brics countries' bilateral economic relations, 2009 to 2019: Between rhetoric and reality," *Sage Open*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 21582440211054128, 2021.

B. Hooijmaaijers and S. Keukeleire, "The BRICS countries and the European Union," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, 2020.

A. I. Czerny, X. Fu, Z. Lei, and T. H. Oum, "Post pandemic aviation market recovery: Experience and lessons from China," *Journal of Air Transport Management,* vol. 90, p. 101971, 2021.

R. Barrenechea and A. Vergara, "Peru: The Danger of Powerless Democracy," *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 77-89, 2023.

H. Dobson, "Unpacking the G20: Insights from the Summit," in *Unpacking the G20*: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2024.

N. A. Sears, "Great powers, polarity, and existential threats to humanity: an analysis of the distribution of the forces of total destruction in international security," ed, 2021.

Rodrik, "Putting global governance in its place," *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 1-18, 2020.

J. Yao, B. Zhang, C. Li, D. Hong, and J. Chanussot, "Extended vision transformer (ExViT) for land use and land cover classification: A multimodal deep learning framework," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2023.

J. Deas, "Do BRICS countries want to shape a new world order?," *Revue internationale et strategique*, vol. 130, no. 2, pp. 75-87, 2023.

T. Busch *et al.*, "Moving beyond "the" business case: How to make corporate sustainability work," *Business Strategy and the Environment,* vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 776-787, 2024.

A. F. Cooper, "China, India and the pattern of G20/BRICS engagement: differentiated ambivalence between 'rising'power status and solidarity with the Global South," *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 1945-1962, 2021.

D. Wójcik and S. Ioannou, "COVID-19 and finance: market developments so far and potential impacts on the financial sector and centres," *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 387-400, 2020.

J. Kirton, "Growing G20 legitimacy," in *The Crises of Legitimacy in Global Governance*: Routledge, 2021, pp. 55-71.

J. N. Rosenau, "Governance in the Twenty-first Century," in *Understanding Global Cooperation*: Brill, 2021, pp. 16-47.

C. Hickman *et al.*, "Climate anxiety in children and young people and their beliefs about government responses to climate change: a global survey," *The Lancet Planetary Health*, vol. 5, no. 12, pp. e863-e873, 2021.

M. Schiltz, *The money doctors from Japan: finance, imperialism, and the building of the yen bloc, 1895–1937*. BRILL, 2020.

R. E. Kim, "Is global governance fragmented, polycentric, or complex? The state of the art of the network approach," *International Studies Review,* vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 903-931, 2020.

R. N. Lebow, "What Is Classical Realism?," *Analyse & Kritik,* vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 215-228, 2024.

S. Danzon-Chambaud and A. Cornia, "Changing or reinforcing the "rules of the game": A field theory perspective on the impacts of automated journalism on media practitioners," *Journalism practice,* vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 174-188, 2023.

M. Reiterer, "The 10th anniversary of the EU-Korea Strategic partnership," *VUB-KF Chair, Policy Brief,* no. 2020/09, 2020.

F. Campomori and M. Ambrosini, "Multilevel governance in trouble: the implementation of asylum seekers' reception in Italy as a battleground," *Comparative Migration Studies,* vol. 8, no. 1, p. 22, 2020.

L. Pereira *et al.*, "Transformative spaces in the making: key lessons from nine cases in the Global South," *Sustainability Science,* vol. 15, pp. 161-178, 2020.

N. Loos, "Concern and contempt: Church and missionary attitudes towards Aborigines in North Queensland in the nineteenth century," *Australian Association for the Study of Religions Book Series,* pp. 21-21, 2022.

M. Kutlay and Z. Öniş, "Turkish foreign policy in a post-western order: strategic autonomy or new forms of dependence?," *International Affairs,* vol. 97, no. 4, pp. 1085-1104, 2021.

J. Kirton and M. Larionova, "Contagious convergent cumulative cooperation: the dynamic development of the G20, BRICS and SCO," *International Politics,* pp. 1-29, 2022.

C. Aleksia and A. R. Bakhtiar, "BRICS as New Alternatives in Reforming International Financial Institutions and Economic Partnerships," *Insignia: Journal of International Relations,* vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 128-143, 2023.

C. Crosland, "The Transition from Capitalism1," in *Democratic Socialism in Britain, Vol. 9*: Routledge, 2021, pp. 33-68.

J. He *et al.*, "Comprehensive report on China's long-term low-carbon development strategies and pathways," *Chinese Journal of Population, Resources and Environment,* vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 263-295, 2020.

F. Petrone, "Three ways to explore the BRICS (possible) impact on the future global order," *The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development,* vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 6-20, 2020.

G. J. Ikenberry, "Why American Power Endures: The US-Led Order Isn't in Decline," *Foreign Aff.,* vol. 101, p. 56, 2022.

M. Lloyd and C. Dixon, "A future multipolar world," *Global Policy,* vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 818-827, 2022.