

The Distinction Between Brics And G7 In Responding To

The Ukraine-Russia Crisis: G20 Multilateral Crisis?

Ica Cahayani¹; Ahmad Mujaddid Fachrurreza²;
Agata Nina Puspita³

10.22146/globalsouth.81003

Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia
icacahayani2998@mail.ugm.ac.id*¹, ahmadmujaddidfachrurreza@mail.ugm.ac.id²,
agataninapuspita@mail.ugm.ac.id³

Introduction / Main Objective: This research discusses the differences in BRICS and G7 responses to the Ukraine-Russia conflict, where these two groups consist of countries with different political interests. Following the results of the G7 and BRICS Summits, both responded differently to the Ukraine-Russia crisis. Background Problem: Differences in response are proposed because the G20 has the vision to achieve the resolution of policy issues on problems that hinder world economic growth, one of which is the food crisis caused by the Ukraine-Russia conflict. The selection of the G7 and BRICS's different responses is the right strategy to determine how much potential the G20 has. It is difficult to achieve its goal of providing solutions for the world economy thanks to the structure of its members, who have diverse interests and responses to the Ukraine-Russia crisis. Novelty: This study uses interest-based theory to analyze the differences in the responses of the G7 and BRICS. This theory seeks to explain the formation of the G20's international regime by dismantling aspects of the fundamental interests behind the cognitive states that decided to establish the international regime of the G20. Method: The method used in this research is the discourse analysis method in a case set because this study wants to see changes in discourse related to the multilateral G20. Findings/Results: The complexity of trading, namely the BRICS and G7, with different responses and interests in responding to the Ukrainian crisis, can encourage a multilateralism crisis in the G20. The research results prove that the complexity of reporting generates different interests, so the response to the Ukrainian-Russian crisis tends to differ. Conclusion: The G20 has not been able to overcome the different interests of its members in solving the problem of the world food crisis because the discussion of the world food crisis is linked to the discussion of Ukrainian-Russian security politics.

Keywords: G20; G7; BRICS; multilateralism crisis; Ukrainian-Russian crisis

Introduction

G20 is a cooperation forum with an agenda to increase world economic growth. The G20 has a membership system consist-

ing of 19 countries plus the European Union. The G20 has a membership structure consisting of developed and developing countries. Informally, the G20 at each G20 Summit

*Corresponding Author at Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jalan Sosio Yustisia, No.1 Caturtunggal, Depok, Sleman, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia E-mail address: icacahayani2998@mail.ugm.ac.id (Author#1),

will involve many other countries and several other international organizations that fully support the agendas held by the G20 at each Summit. Views on the G20 tend to differ significantly depending on their ability to solve a problem. The success of the G20 in achieving policies that provide equality without differences among member countries, for example, in climate change mitigation policies. The G20 as global governance does not only accommodate but represents the interests of all member countries. The G20 focuses on the interaction of governance equality, divided into three dimensions: political governance, economic governance, and institutional governance (Wen et al., 2022). The G20 facilitates studies on global climate change and provides practical settings for closing gaps in the Paris Agreement (Report Climate Transparency, 2018). The G20, as a cooperation forum with a complex network, as an international economic cooperation forum, takes a central position with the actors involved, including the International Governmental Organization (IGO). The G20 plays a leading role in promoting central issues. This shows that the G20 is cooperative governance (He, 2019).

The complexity of G20 membership is considered regime complexity that produces inclusive policies. The G20 succeeded in uniting key countries and developing countries into an integrated forum to achieve common interests, especially in solving world problems that hinder global economic growth (Berger, Cooper, & Grimm, 2019). The G20 is even considered a relevant focal point that emphasizes forum connections at

various levels of actors in the global governance agenda. The G20 acts as a liaison for various stakeholder networks to inclusivity (Cooper A. F., *The G20 is dead as a crisis or steering committee: Long live the G20 as a hybrid focal point*, 2020). The G20 understands the complexity of its membership because, from the start, it has been an entity with a cross-forum feel. The G20 has a broader scope, not just a meeting of world leaders with substantive progress in networking through structured dialogue with various levels and even the community level (Slaughter, 2019). The G7 and BRICS have pro-global order policies on health and environmental issues in several situations. However, they still have the same commitment and emphasize equality by adopting a rights-based approach (McBride, Hawkes, & Buse, 2019). Referring to Rosenau's opinion, the G20 as global governance emerged to solve problems of inequality, exploitation, and class struggle (Soederberg, 2006).

Nevertheless, apart from this discourse, the G20 has another side, challenging the complexity of membership, which is considered a weakness and triggers a crisis of multilateralism within the G20. The complexity of membership in the G20, especially the G7, dominated by the West, especially the US, is considered power-based policy making. While on the other hand, there are BRICS with different membership components and, even on a large scale, have different policies responding to global issues (Garret, 2010). Thus the G20 can be said to have a tendency to experience multilateral crises, which is illustrated by the policies and re-

sponses of its members in various world crises, one of which is regarding the world food crisis as a result of the Ukraine-Russia conflict. The G7, with all of its members, has a policy response to support sanctions against Russia.

In contrast, the BRICS and all of its members provide force support to Russia to fight against sanctions imposed by the US and European Union countries. Therefore, the author is interested in further discussing how BRICS and G7 membership in the G20, but both BRICS and G7 member countries have different responses to the food crisis arising from the Ukraine-Russia conflict. At the G20 Summit, Indonesia pointed out that both the G7 and BRICS, the two groups agreed to restore the food and economic crisis due to the conflict. At the G20 Summit, Indonesia emphasized that global food security policies are a major concern because Ukraine and Russia are food supply countries and energy supply routes to Europe. So that the conflict that occurs will hamper world economic growth, which is still in the recovery process due to the Covid 19 pandemic (G20, Indonesia, 2022). The G20 was able to align the goals of different groups, such as the G7 and BRICS, because they have inclusive governance (He, 2019).

The complexity of the membership of the G20 Summit seeks to resolve the Ukraine-Russia conflict that caused the world economic crisis. The G20 shows a significant policy trend in responding to the Ukraine-Russia conflict. G20 Indonesia succeeded in holding a global communication forum that resolved the causes of damage to

the world economy. Even though at the G20 Summit meeting, Indonesia experienced tension due to discussions on the Russia and Ukraine conflict, which became the center of attention, with most members strongly condemning the military action. Responding to this, the Russian foreign minister said that the G20 Summit was not the place to discuss security issues, but what must be prioritized were world economic problems (Aljazeera, 2022). Thus, in the discussion at the G20 Bali Summit, Indonesia concentrated on the conflict between Russia and Ukraine, which triggered economic problems. Geopolitical and geoeconomic tensions will make it more difficult to overcome the challenges of the global food crisis (World Economic Forum, 2022).

G20 with a consensus policy-making system, the presentation of compliance, if the difference is too significant, then the potential for success and state compliance in implementing policies taken at the Summit will likely be small. At the G20 Indonesia Summit in Bali, the Indonesian government's efforts as the G20 presidency provided the answer that not all differences in response would fail because several members were neutral and balanced a complicated situation. Indonesia is negotiating with the Russian government to open access points to be able to distribute food ingredients throughout the world. Even though the G20 Summit provides an economic communication forum, specifically discussing world food issues that have pushed back the world economy, the Russia conflict still exists today.

The condition of being unable to answer the reality of the end of the world food crisis so that the existence of the BRISC and the G7 in the G20 was extensive in determining the end of the world food crisis due to the conflict. The two political camps have different political directions; even in several situations, the two groups show threats to each other. The contribution made by this article is to: provide a more inclusive and up-to-date analysis of the complexity of the G20 membership, which includes two country-level groups that have different interests.

Method

This article uses a qualitative method concerning discourse analysis in the case of settings because it sees a change in discourse related to how to see the complexity of membership in the G20, which consists of two large groups with different interests. The existence of the G7 and BRICS in the G20 has made it difficult for the G20 to formulate a consensus regarding the world food crisis caused by the Ukraine-Russia conflict. The special significance of using this methodology is to assess power based on increasing multilateral crises in the G20 due to differences in the responses of G20 members to the food crisis due to the Ukraine-Russia conflict. In conducting the analysis, the resources studied revolved around the official G20 documents, G20 Summit reports, books, journals, and the G20 official website. Other sources are also used to enrich the analysis, such as newspaper articles in the mass media. This article interprets the information gathered from these various sources to understand

how the complexity of the G20 membership and the power-based of each of the G7 and BRICS affects the G20 multilateral crisis.

Literature Review

In this research, the researchers use two research variables, namely the G20 multilateral crisis and the power-based of G7 and BRICS. The G20 is a significant international forum that brings together leaders from the world's major economies. At the same time, the G7 and BRICS countries, which have diverse economic, social, and political interests, can create challenges in coordinating actions within the G20. As such, it significantly impacts global economic policies and decision-making processes. Understanding the factors that influence the G20's ability to respond to crises is therefore crucial for policymakers, academics, and other stakeholders interested in the power dynamics of the G20. However, research highlighting multilateralism's failure, as exemplified by the recent development in G20, still needs to be developed in more in-depth research. Therefore, this literature review discusses previous research to understand the G20 policy directions.

First, Jokela, through his writing entitled "The G20: A Pathway to Effective Multilateralism?" also conveyed the tendency of interest-based multilateralism in the G20 because of its legitimacy and explicit commitment to reforming multilateral arrangements that have been established (Jokela J., 2011). This can be seen through the initiatives of the G20 members to address global challenges, such as the involvement of the US in providing a platform to overcome the challenges

of a multipolar world together with Europe. However, Jokela's writing views that the US considers the failure of G20 to overcome the main challenges of global problems, such as China's monetary policy and global imbalances. Furthermore, the involvement of developing countries in the G20 has shown a strong relationship in the degree of multilateralism based on the national interests of each member.

With the G20 process in meeting the needs of members and reaching the needs of non-members, Jokela said that this has contributed to sustainable development both in the informal and formal regions. On the other hand, this has increased the interest of developing countries to try to duplicate the role of the United Nations by maintaining the United Nations system as a source of legitimacy in the global governance structure. The G20 countries also expressed their commitment to maintaining their commitment from the protectionist tendencies of world trade by reforming global finance and structures in global economic governance. In other words, this development has allowed the G20 process to be based on the norms of multilateralism and greater global responsibility.

Second, Nascimento's research entitled "Twenty Years of Climate Policy: G20 Coverage and Gaps" analyzes the G20 climate policy from 2000 to 2019 (Nascimento, 2022). In his writing, Nascimento adds that the existence of policy adoption has made about half of the policy options offered cannot be adopted comprehensively. In addition, the poor implementation of policies, such as eliminating coal and oil, reducing industrial

process emissions, and using renewable energy to remove fossil fuel subsidies and support the elimination of carbon dioxide, still require substantial improvement. Departing from filling this climate policy, policy options are needed to advance a clean global transition from greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, Nascimento, in his research, provides valuable insights into the G20's ability to coordinate action on a complex and pressing global issue, which focuses on how the complexity of G20 membership and the power dynamics within the organization affect crisis management.

By implementing cross-sectoral policies, Nascimento argued that this could be used to examine power dynamics within the G20, particularly between the G7 and BRICS countries, and how they have influenced climate policy. Furthermore, if sectoral climate policies are combined with a comprehensive pricing instrument, it will significantly reduce long-term barriers to mitigation. As it is known that each country has a different climate policy, it highlighted gaps in G20 coverage of climate policy, particularly concerning adaptation and climate finance. In other words, emphasizing power dynamics is directly relevant to provide valuable insights into the role of the G20 in climate policy and the factors that influence its ability to coordinate action on global issues.

Third, in research entitled "The Role of China and India in the G20 and BRICS: Commonalities or Competitive Behavior?", Cooper and Farooq examine the relationship between China and India, which shows the degree of difference in the G20 and BRICS

(Cooper A. F., 2016). The Indian leadership has a specific orientation towards development issues in response to China, whereas the Chinese approach focuses on the United States and the rest of the West. Both China and India show their potential to represent the interests of all developing countries. Both are expected to become powerful agents of change in multilateral forums to benefit the Global South. Furthermore, Cooper and Farooq said that in the G20 and BRICS, China and India tried to reshape their international political contours by promoting “change” so that differences in national interests between China and India in the BRICS to the G20 had influenced the G20 agenda.

By adopting a precautionary approach and institutional reforms by China and India, Cooper and Farooq convey that India is trying to find its position to catch up with China. Within the BRICS, India adjusted its national policy to actively participate in New Development Bank (NDB) projects, such as the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB). On the other hand, China continues to show its hegemony among developing countries through its involvement in other international forums, such as the China-Africa Cooperation Forum. Then, China also conveyed its position to the G7 forum, which impacted the US to maintain its capacity in currency and balance. In other words, while India has been able to adapt to any changes in the BRICS towards a security orientation, China has undertaken various non-traditional agenda initiatives beyond national financial security.

Fourth, in another writing entitled “China, India and the Pattern of G20/BRICS Engagement: Differentiated Ambivalence between ‘Rising’ Power and Solidarity with the Global South”, Cooper highlighted that China and India, as the two prominent members of the BRICS grouping, exhibit a pattern of ambivalent engagement with the G20 (Cooper A. F., 2021). It is, then, shaped by their desire to assert their rising power status on the one hand and their commitment to solidarity with the Global South on the other. He argued that China and India had used their participation in the G20 to enhance their global status. However, they have also sought to maintain a distance from the G20 to signal their solidarity with developing countries outside the G20. This ambivalence has led to a complex engagement pattern characterized by selective cooperation and resistance to specific G20 initiatives. For that reason, through his writing, Cooper has provided insights into the role of BRICS countries in the G20, which affected the power-based of each of the G7 and BRICS and the crisis management in the G20.

As explained from several studies above, four studies contribute to the sustainability of this research, especially in explaining the reality of the existence of BRICS and G7 as essential players in the G20. Understanding their role within the organization is vital for evaluating the effectiveness of the G20 as a forum for international cooperation and addressing global challenges. The research that has been submitted is sufficient to contribute to the research that will be carried out in the complexity of the G20 interests

and the national interests of each member. Therefore, it is hoped that this research can provide an analysis related to the complexity of the G20 membership, which includes two country-level groups with different interests.

Discussion

G20 Membership Complexity and Differences of Interest

Since established as a forum that addresses international economic issues in 1999, the G20 has been responsible for countries' needs in providing cooperation and a platform for economic policy-making. To facilitate this urgency, the G20 forum seeks to involve countries in membership of the world's largest advanced and emerging economies. The membership is expected to include countries that represent more than 60% of the world's population, 85% of global GDP, and 75% of global trade.

At the beginning of the G20, the forum seemed quite ambitious, as the spirit of addressing global economic problems was maintained as a continuation of the G7. When the previously formed G7 was deemed unsuccessful in solving economic problems, the G20 came into force with other countries such as Russia, Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Argentina, and South Africa (in the first phase), and then added Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Indonesia (in the next phase) (Joke-la J., 2011). The presence of these various countries adds multilateral value, especially in the policy formulation process.

Although the formation of the G20 is considered a forum that can fulfill the interests of all actors in producing new solutions

to economic problems, oligarchic tendencies in global governance can be seen in its membership. Cooper and Pouliot (2015) argue that the G20 has arbitrary membership rules because it is self-determined and dominated by the power of former countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and France (Cooper & Pouliot, How much is global governance changing? The G20 as international practice, 2015). This raises new concerns that the G20 cannot strengthen its position as a platform that can accommodate various interests but collides with the limitations formed at the beginning of its presence, also known as "multilateralism of differences" (Cooper A. F., 2015).

The G20 has a complex membership structure as a form of a cooperative group. This is based on the group of developed and developing countries and the group of Western countries, usually called the G7 and the BRICS group, which consists of various countries. The two groups, especially the G7 and BRICS, have different policies in responding to various global issues, even attacking and criticizing each other a little because they both have sufficient power to achieve their respective interests and existence in global politics. The G20 also has informal members with a prominent role, such as the involvement of regional organizations such as ASEAN, the African Union, and others. In addition, there is the involvement of other international organizations such as the International Monetary Forum (IMF), the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and

Development (OECD) (Hajnal, 2022).

The involvement of various international organizations is a form of strength and weakness of the G20 in achieving its goals. The conflicting actors that are involved in the G20, each of which has a different group. Ukraine is under the support of G7 countries led by the United States and the European Union, while Russia is a member of the BRICS. The Ukraine-Russia conflict has become a battle for the interests of the United States and its Western allies with Russia and its allies. This can be seen in several UN sessions discussing the Ukraine-Russia conflict, namely, from the emergence of a humanitarian crisis to a food crisis that threatens the world; both have different responses (United Nations, 2022).

As part of the BRICS member countries, Russia and other BRICS member countries have contributed significantly to influence countries in the region. This can be seen in terms of a reasonably large population (40%), land coverage (30%), global nominal GDP (25%), and world trade (18%) (Smith-Boyle, 2022). Another critical point of interest is the ability of the BRICS countries to spread their influence and interests as recently as 2022, which can even be compared to other powers such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Russia possesses more warheads than NATO countries, which is 6,257 (Doyle, 2022), which poses a more severe threat. Moreover, if it is added with two other nuclear powers, such as China and India, the warheads that BRICS can produce can be estimated to be as many as 6,763 (Doyle, 2022). With this data, BRICS

certainly has the advantage of being able to voice its interests in various forums.

On the other hand, the G7 member countries consisting of Western countries, continue to voice their support for Ukraine. Issues related to human rights and the position of Ukraine, a victim of the war and attacks carried out by Russia, continue to be echoed in strengthening its position against Ukraine. Some assistance was also provided to help Ukraine bounce back after being attacked by Russia. The assistance is distributed through food, moral support, a safe place for displaced persons and refugees, financial and economical, and sanctions that will be given to Russia (G7 Germany, 2022).

For the G7, the issue of the Russo-Ukrainian war is a top priority so that it can be resolved immediately. The G7 meeting in Germany on 26-28 June 2022 proves this issue is still crucial and is feared to have a much more significant impact, especially for the world economy. Western powers that are members of the G7 strengthen their position in opposing the aggression carried out by Russia (International Crisis Group, 2022). The G7 sees that the severe threat posed by the war will significantly affect global commodity prices and other economic crises. The G7's concern about the crisis has expanded to become a crisis of multilateralism that will impact the global economy in the future (International Crisis Group, 2022). To that end, some of the proposals made during this period also focused on aspects of the crisis in other parts of the world, such as most African and Middle Eastern countries (International Crisis Group, 2022).

The Russia-Ukraine conflict is a challenge for the G20. The economic threats resulting from the war have forced the G20 countries to develop practical solutions to restore the global economy. The role of the BRICS countries is essential to underline, especially for India and China. The two countries have proven significant economic improvements for the prospects for future BRICS cooperation. The formation of cooperation carried out by the countries of the Global South is a new hope in breaking the domination and hegemony created by Western countries. Important actors, such as India and China, are expected to be able to contribute to a world order that is based on rules, is stable, and can also respect the diversity of political systems and development (Cooper & Farooq, *The Role of China and India in the G20 and BRICS: Commonalities or Competitive Behaviour*, 2016). Both countries' position provides more expectations for the BRICS countries to bring the Global South's interests to multilateral forums such as the G20.

India risks pushing the boundaries of the coexistence of exceptionalism (as emerging powers) and universalism by choosing a strategy for the G20 and the BRICS that prevents the suspended equipoise between dualistic self-identities from being redefined (as part of the Global South). In other words, ambivalence becomes uncertain when India is perceived as lacking the capability, not just the commitment, to take on this enhanced role as a status-seeking rising power. Comparatively speaking, China's style of ambivalence allows for an impressive ratcheting up

of state agency in managing coexistence by keeping sensitive to the need to balance, if not reconcile, its dualistic self-identities and its self-interest. By applying superior material resources, China remained connected to other countries in the Global South via the BRICS while increasing the advantages of inclusion as a privileged insider via the G20 (Cooper, A.F., 2021). In comparison to India, which continues to struggle to reconcile in practice the strained coexistence between its two minds of national status-seeking and collective solidarity, China's combination of flexibility and instrumentality, with greater attention to locating equilibrium between its dual identities, allows China to perform within a broader range of possibilities (Cooper, A.F., 2021).

Differences in G7 and BRICS Responses to the Food Crisis due to the Ukraine-Russia Conflict and the G20 Challenge

The different interests of the two groups pose a significant burden to the G20 in overcoming the problem of a declining world economy. The G7 is a group of countries that support Ukraine, while the BRISC is a group that supports Russia. These two groups have different perspectives on the Ukraine-Russia conflict and the resulting impact of the conflict, namely the food crisis. G7 calls for unity against Russia (Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office & The Rt Hon Elizabeth Truss MP, 2022). As a result of this difference in response, the food crisis is getting longer, so various regions are facing the threat of a massive food crisis. The United Nations voiced concern about the ad-

verse effects for many countries on the impact of the Russian invasion on global food availability because Ukraine and Russia are not only producing countries for wheat and sunflower seed oil, but Ukraine has ports and international trade routes. So that the conflict also hampered the exports and imports of other countries. UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres said that the conflict between Ukraine and Russia created the perfect storm for developing countries. The conflict resulted in soaring food and energy prices. Thus making it difficult for all countries to mobilize financial resources (United Nations, 2022).

This situation makes the G20 a massive challenge to the problem of declining world economic growth. At the beginning of 2020, the world experienced an economic recession due to Covid-19 which until now has not been resolved. Trade flows were hampered during the pandemic due to policies breaking the chain of Covid-19. This problem took time for the G20 to resolve, with only two summits being held in Saudi Arabia and Italy. Therefore it must be reformulated with inclusive policies at the Bali Indonesia Summit in October 2022. However, in February 2022, the conflict occurred in the European region with an enormous scale of influence on the world economy. This has dramatically burdened the G20 to double recover the world economy.

Several countries are facing the threat of a food crisis, which has hampered world food supplies because each country has decided to withhold its domestic food exports. One of the countries that responded was

India. India is a member of the G20 in response to the wheat crisis in May 2022. The increase in world wheat prices has driven the world's demand for wheat to be giant. India, as a wheat-producing country, issued a policy not to export wheat on the grounds of guaranteeing its basic domestic needs. Banning wheat exports adds to the reduced supply of world wheat, and many countries do not agree with India's efforts to issue this policy. However, India found unexpected support for the change in export policy. China, previously facing challenges from the WTO in export restraint, turned out to support India and underlined that India has contributed as a global supplier of wheat. Support for the export ban policy is carried out by China as a form of diplomacy so that China accepts the use of applications being developed in China. China's behavior as a member country of the G20 shows that support for India is not to solve the global grain security problem but that there is China's interest in India (Chakraborty, 2022). On the other hand, the responses of the G20 countries at the UN session to resolve the Ukraine-Russia conflict were very diverse. As a G20 country, China has not provided a response that could make it easier for the G20 to achieve the goal of boosting the world economy, but domestic interests are prioritized.

India and China are BRICS member states and, at several UN conferences, abstained from UN efforts to encourage Russia to stop its attacks on Ukraine. Unlike the case with the G7 countries that support international sanctions against Russia. At the June 23, 2022, BRICS Summit, which took place

in China, President Xi Jinping, in his speech, criticized the Western boycott of Russia. Xi Jinping considered it a form of abuse of international sanctions (Aljazeera, 2022). This proves that China is in alliance with Russia and supports Russia in the Ukraine and Russia wars. When the economic situation was damaged due to international sanctions imposed by Western countries, President Putin stated that the BRICS countries had helped the Russian economy. This is a stark reminder that Russia, China, and the other four BRICS countries also support the war. During the meeting, President Xi Jinping also emphasized that Western countries are using global economic policies as a weapon to punish enemy countries, including Russia. Putin emphasized that Russia is ready to fight for years for the territory of Ukraine and is supported by the BRICS countries (Aljazeera, 2022).

Meanwhile, on the other hand, the June 2022 G7 Summit expressed full support for Ukraine and encouraged Russia not to attack Ukraine. Based on the G7 Annual Report states that the G7 is committed to helping Ukraine uphold its sovereignty and territorial integrity by trying to meet Ukraine's needs, both military and economic needs (Elmau, 2022). In addition, the G7 emphasized that Russia must be responsible for the increasing threat to global food security because it has blocked trade routes and Black Sea ports and damaged Ukrainian agricultural products. The G7 will actively exert international economic and political pressure on Russia (Elmau, G7 Statement on Support for Ukraine, 2022). Thus the conflict

between Ukraine and Russia was considered by the G7 countries as a whole to be Russia's fault. Therefore, differences of opinion regarding the Ukraine-Russia conflict sparked differences regarding how to end it, making it very difficult to resolve the crisis if it cannot be resolved. The two countries in conflict have different power and political support. This conflict triggered a world food crisis, making it difficult for the G20 to boost the global economy. Therefore the differences between the two camps have caused a multilateral crisis within the G20. Thus it will be difficult for the G20 to take appropriate steps to end the world food crisis.

Discussion of the food crisis in Indonesia's G20 continues to be linked to security issues, so at the G20 Bali Summit in November 2022, representatives of the Russian government refused to discuss security as the leading cause of the food crisis. The G20 Indonesia Summit experienced tension due to discussions on the Russia and Ukraine conflict, which became the center of attention, with most members strongly condemning the military action. Responding to this, the Russian foreign minister said that the G20 Summit was not the place to discuss security issues, but what must be prioritized were world economic problems (Aljazeera, 2022). Further discussions on security and conflict issues triggered a major food crisis. It is known that Ukraine and Russia are the countries that produce about one-third of the world's wheat and two-thirds of sunflower seed oil. Several countries experienced difficulties meeting their domestic needs due to the conflict, which resulted in inflation in

several countries. One of the regions most vulnerable to these conflicts is the African region. Africa is an area that is prone to conflict, so hunger is very much lurking in the fate of African countries (Filseth, 2022).

This discussion regarding the food crisis gave rise to clear pros and cons between the BRICS and the G7 because, on several occasions, the G7 and BRICS meetings did not seek a solution to the conflict but criticized each other for who was wrong and who was right. At the June 23, 2022, BRICS Summit, which took place in China, President Xi Jinping, in his speech, criticized the Western boycott of Russia. Xi Jinping considered it a form of abuse of international sanctions (Aljazeera, 2022). Meanwhile, on the other hand, the G7 Summit, which was held in June 2022, expressed full support for Ukraine and encouraged Russia not to attack Ukraine. For the G7, the one most responsible for the problem of food crisis or food security problem is Russia due to the conflict caused by that country (Elmau, 2022). Based on the G7 Annual Report states that the G7 is committed to helping Ukraine uphold its sovereignty and territorial integrity by trying to meet Ukraine's needs, both military needs (Elmau, 2022). The need for military power supply against Ukraine is still a priority for the G7 countries instead of emphasizing how to resolve the conflict so that a food crisis does not occur in order to save the world from a food crisis due to the conflict.

The food crisis in various regions due to the Ukraine-Russia conflict has become a fact for the world community. At the beginning of the conflict, European countries

faced the threat of not fulfilling their domestic energy needs, threatening several German companies to close as it is known that Russia supplies 40 percent of Germany's gas needs. German Economy Minister Robert Habeck warned that his country is experiencing a gas crisis because Russia's exports to Germany are meager. Robert Habeck said that if the gas crisis continues, it will cause the German industry to experience significant paralysis. The Ukraine-Russia conflict also had an impact on Middle Eastern countries where the imposition of economic sanctions against Russia by the West made it difficult for the Arab Gulf countries to import food grains from Russia because it was difficult to transfer funds to Russian companies and ensure merchant ships (Hiltermann, Esfaniary, Fabiani, & Vaez, 2022). Apart from Africa and the Middle East, South Asian countries are also experiencing an economic recession. One is India; to meet its domestic needs, the Indian government issued a policy banning wheat exports on May 13, 2022. The increase in wheat prices started from US\$ 325 to US\$ 450 after Russia decided to attack Ukraine (Chakraborty, 2022). If the policy to increase India's wheat exports occurs, it can compensate for the supply shortage from Ukraine during April 2022. However, seeing that the world is increasingly vulnerable to a food crisis, the Indian government issued a policy to ban wheat exports. Another reason for India's wheat export ban policy is to maintain South Asia's regional food needs (Chakraborty, 2022). Despite this, the South Asian countries' need for wheat did not gain access to wheat exports.

Southeast Asian countries also face a food crisis. Based on data from the World Bank in June 2022, it was stated that inflation in developed countries had increased to 6.95% this year, and the inflation rate in developing countries had increased to 9.37%. The Ukraine-Russia conflict threatens developing countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and several European countries with different dependency models. The crises occurring in several areas above are not a paramount concern. Instead, claim the truth and attack each other because of the political interests of each G7 and BRICS countries. This conflict of interests makes it difficult for the Indonesian G20 to make effective policies because there are different interests and focus on other problems of the G20 members, which become an obstacle to making effective policies. This difference in interests makes it difficult for the G20 norm-setting to formulate policies against the world food crisis.

Despite the political sentiments arising from the Ukraine-Russia conflict, BRICS, and G7 at the G20 Bali Summit, Indonesia did not show political sentiment; for example, not many BRICS and G7 members attended the G20 Summit. However, what happened was the opposite; all member countries attended the Bali G20 Summit even though Russia did not attend the Summit. Even countries that contradict each other and openly differ in opinion, namely China as a member of the BRICS and the United States as a member of the G7, did not show a contradictory reaction in the discussion of the food crisis at the G20 Summit in Bali.

Nevertheless, the G7 is still pressing Russia and helping Ukraine until now. Both BRICS and G7 member countries support world economic recovery and push for a solution to the food crisis but cannot resolve sentiment and conflicting political interests towards the Ukraine-Russia conflict as one of the causes of the food crisis, so these different political interests trigger a food crisis that is difficult to resolve.

Conclusion

The complexity of membership in the G20 has advantages and disadvantages; on the one hand, the complexity of membership will trigger the success of G20 policies in formulating economic problems and the causes of hindering world economic growth. Discuss how to deal with the problem of food crisis and other problems that trigger a downturn in the world economy. However, in the frame of the Ukraine-Russia conflict, some G20 countries have different perspectives because these countries have different interests and have enough power to survive their respective existences. The G20 has not been able to resolve the problem of conflict of interest, primarily related to the interests of Western countries represented by the United States towards Russia with their respective interest groups. In the G20, the existence of the G7 and BRICS, especially in response to the Ukraine-Russia conflict, shows that the complexity of membership is also a weakness for the G20 because countries still ensure the political interests of each country. Even so, in a regime, there must be black and white where the regime's complexity is an

advantage; on the other hand, it can also be a weakness. The complexity of membership triggers the multilateral crisis of the G20, especially in dealing with the Ukraine-Russia conflict. The countries involved in the conflict are no longer two sovereign countries but a cooperation group where each country in conflict has an interest that triggers the difficulty of reaching a consensus in the G20. The position of the G20 in the Ukraine-Russia conflict is a major challenge that is considered to lead to the ineffectiveness of the G20 consensus. The G20 Bali Indonesia in 2022 will experience difficulties in achieving its goal of encouraging efforts to recover the world economy after experiencing a recession due to Covid-19.

The weakness in this article, namely assessing the complexity of membership as a weakness of the G20, is seen in only one issue: the world food crisis due to the Ukraine-Russia conflict.

References

Books

- Cooper, A. F. (2015). *The G20 and Rising Powers: An Innovative but Awkward Form of Multilateralism. Rising Powers and Multilateral Institutions*, pp. 280–294.
- Slaughter, S. (2019). *Introduction: Theorizing the G20, in Slaughter S (ed) The G20 and International*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Soederberg, S. (2006). *Global Governance in Question; Empire, Class and New Common Sense in Managing North-South Relations*. London:

Pluto Press, p.30.

Journal Article (retrieved online, with DOI)

- Berger, A., Cooper, A. F., & Grimm, S. (2019). A decade of G20 summitry: Assessing global club governance's benefits, limitations, and future in turbulent times. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 26(4), 493–504, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2019.1705889>
- Cooper, A. F., & Farooq, A. B. (2016). The Role of China and India in the G20 and BRICS: Commonalities or Competitive Behaviour. *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*, pp. 74–76. <https://doi.1177/186810261604500303>
- Cooper, A. F. (2020). The G20 is dead as a crisis or steering committee: Long live the G20 as a hybrid focal point. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 26(4), 505–520, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2019.1699855>.
- Cooper, A. F. (2021). China, India and the pattern of G20/BRICS engagement: differentiated ambivalence between 'rising' power status and solidarity with the Global South. *Third World Quarterly*, 42:9, 1945-1962, DOI: 0.1080/01436597.2020.1829464.
- Garret, G. (2010). G2 in G20: China, the United States and the World after the Global Financial Cri-

- sis. *Global policy*, 1(1), 29–39, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-5899.2009.00014.x>.
- Hajnal, P. (2022). Whither the G7 na G20? *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 28(2), pp.127--143, <https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.2022.2027797>.
- He, A. (2019). Interaction between the G20 agenda and members' national-level policy: A theoretical model for increasing G20 effectiveness. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 26(4), pp.601-620, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2019.1694064>.
- McBride, B., Hawkes, S., & Buse, K. (2019). Soft Power and global health: the sustainable development goals (SDGs) era health agenda of the G7, G20, and BRICS. *BMC Public Health*, 19(815), 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7114-5>.
- Nascimento, L. e. (2022). Twenty Years of Climate Policy: G20 Coverage and Gaps. *Climate Policy Vol. 22, No. 2*, 158-174, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2021.1993776>.
- Journal Article (retrieved online, without DOI or page numbers)**
- Cooper, A. F., & Pouliot, V. (2015). How much is global governance changing? The G20 as international practice. *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 50, No. 3, Special issue: *Diplomacy in Theory and in Practice*, 334-350. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45084293>
- Jokela, J. (2011). The history of the G-20. In *THE G-20: A PATHWAY TO EFFECTIVE MULTILATERALISM?* (pp. 11–30). European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS). Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265076825_The_G-20_A_Pathway_to_Effective_Multilateralism
- Audiovisual media (videos, music recordings, podcasts, etc.)**
- Aljazeera. (2022, June 24). *BRICS summit: Chinese and Russian presidents criticize West*. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B-w1Dp-IWYAs>
- Aljazeera. (2022, June 24). *How much influence does BRICS wield on the world stage?* Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vP8Rmi9Tnd4&t=593s>
- Electronic source**
- Chakraborty, D. (2022, June 16). *A closer look at India's wheat export ban*. Retrieved from <https://www.easiaforum.org/2022/06/16/a-closer-look-at-indias-wheat-export-ban/#more-961447>
- Doyle, L. (2022, July 8). *What would happen in a NATO vs. BRICS war?* Retrieved

- from <https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1637597/What-would-happen-NATO-vs-BRICS-war-evg>
- Elmau. (2022, June 27). *G7 Leaders' Statement on the Missile Attack on a Shopping Mall in Kremen-chuck*. Retrieved from <https://www.g7germany.de/resource/blob/974430/2057756/8845d-6c55bf2be751b8651bfed-b395a6/2022-06-27-g7-erklaerung-raketenangriff-en-data.pdf?download=1>
- Elmau. (2022, June 27). *G7 Statement on Support for Ukraine*. Retrieved from <https://www.g7germany.de/resource/blob/974430/2057196/4628490e-da0863e429c30136ec180feb/2022-06-27-g7-erklaerung-ukraine-en-data.pdf?download=1>
- Filseth, T. (2022, May 26). *A 'Collateral Victim': Africa Feels the Pain of the Russo-Ukrainian War*. Retrieved from <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/%E2%80%98collateral-victim%E2%80%99-africa-feels-pain-%C2%A0-russo-ukrainian-war-202671>
- Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office & The Rt Hon Elizabeth Truss MP. (2022, May 14). *Global food security consequences of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine: G7 foreign ministers' commitments, May 2022*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/commitments-on-the-global-food-security-consequences-of-russias-war-of-aggression-against-ukraine-g7-foreign-ministers-may-2022>
- G7 Germany. (2022). *G7 Statement on Support for Ukraine*. Elmau: Europa Consilium. Retrieved from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2022/06/27/g7-statement-on-support-for-ukraine/>
- Hiltermann, J., Esfaniary, D., Fabiani, R., & Vaez, A. (2022, April 14). *The Impact of Russia's Invasion of Ukraine in the Middle East and North Africa*. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/impact-russias-invasion-ukraine-middle-east-and-north-africa>
- International Crisis Group. (2022). *7 Priorities for the G7: Managing the Global Fallout of Russia's War on Ukraine*. New York: International Crisis Group. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/global/sb007-7-priorities-g7-managing-global-fallout-russias-war-ukraine>
- Smith-Boyle, V. (2022, July 9). *How the Growing Appeal of BRICS Challenges American Influence Abroad*. Retrieved from <https://www.americansecurityproject.org/how-the-growing-appeal-of-brics-challenges-american-influence-abroad/>

UnitedNations. (2022, May 24). *Africa provides a 'home for hope,' despite new challenges: Guterres*. Retrieved from <https://news.un.org/en/story/2022/05/1118972>