

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

by Thierry Meyssan
30.10.2024

In Kazan, the order of the world changed

The BRICS summit in Kazan marked the end of the domination of the G7 over the world. The Anglo-Saxon rules that organize international relations will be gradually replaced by the commitments made by everyone who will now have to be respected. This revolution brings us back to the attempts of Russia and France, in 1899, to found international law, undermined by the Atlantic conference and the duopoly United States/United Kingdom.

VOLTAIRE NETWORK / PARIS (FRANCE) / 29 OCTOBER 2024

The XVI enlarged BRICS summit was held in Kazan (Russia), from October 22 to 24, 2024 [1]. In addition to the nine heads of state and government already members of this organization, eleven others attended it, and around twenty additional states have applied for membership.

This event is the culmination of the strategy initiated in 2009 by the Brazilian president, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, the president of the Russian government, Vladimir Putin, the Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, and the Chinese president, Hu Jintao. These four men had imagined international relations, based on the Charter of the United Nations, allowing each country to develop. It was not a question for them to stand up against the Western Imperialism of the G8 (of which Russia was a member until the Western coup of the Maidan), but of exploring another way, without the Anglo-Saxons.

Vladimir Putin played a central role in the creation of this organ of economic cooperation like Tsar Nicolas II had played in the invention of international law, in 1899 [2]. It was he

who organized the first summit in Iekaterinburg, even if it was President Dmitri Medvedev who represented Russia there.

In an interview on the occasion of the Kazan summit, Vladimir Putin, citing the words of the Indian Prime Minister, Narandra Modi, reaffirmed that " BRICS is not an anti-Western, but is a non-Western organization".

In their final declaration, the heads of state and government tackled four separate subjects [3]:

- Multilateralism;
- Cooperation for stability and security;
- Economic and financial cooperation;
- Interpersonal exchanges.



MULTILATERALISM

After observing that, regardless of Western power centers, new centers are emerging, they reaffirm their attachment to the Charter of the United Nations in the drafting of which all participated, except the United Arab Emirates who were not yet independent. Then they plead for a reform of the UN and its agencies so that its institutions adapt to the world today and integrate new powers. If they do not give any date for a reform of the Security Council and the IMF, they fix the horizon of 2025 to obtain that of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and that of the Board of Directors of the International Bank for the reconstruction and development (BIRD).

They describe the "unilateral coercive measures", that is to say the "sanctions" taken outside the Security Council, as "illegal", whether political or economic. They support the work of the intergovernmental group of experts on climate evolution (IPCC), but do not pronounce on

the conclusions that Westerners draw from it. They say they are deeply concerned about attempts aimed at linking security to the program relating to climate change. Further in the text (§ 83), they condemn the use of the climate pretext to impose unilateral, punitive and discriminatory protection measures. In addition, they support cooperation in the fight against greenhouse gases, in accordance with article 6 of the Paris Accords (§ 85). Let us recall that the Russian Academy of Sciences rejects the Western anthropocentric interpretation of climate change.

They undertake to promote and protect human rights, including the right to development, and fundamental freedoms within the framework of the principles of equality and mutual respect. Identically, they undertake to intensify the fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and the intolerance which are associated with it, as well as discrimination based on religion, faith or conviction, and all their contemporary forms in the world, including alarming trends in the increase of hate speech.

COOPERATION FOR STABILITY AND SECURITY

They agree on a common position in the face of current conflicts not without referring to Resolution 2686 (2023) of the Security Council (which denounces expressions of intolerance and hatred) and to Resolution 46/182 (1991) of the United Nations General Assembly (on emergency humanitarian aid). Likewise, they recall the need to respect legitimate and reasonable concerns in terms of security of all countries.

There follows a long list of positions.

- Gaza (§ 30) They underline that it is urgent to establish an immediate, global and permanent cease-fire in the Gaza Strip, to immediately and unconditionally release all the hostages and detainees of both parties which are illegally detained in captivity and to provide Sustainable and large -scale humanitarian aid, and end all aggression actions. However, they support the two -state solution (initially the colonial plan of Lord Peel) which seems to them the only possible peaceful solution.

- Lebanon (§ 31-32) They condemn "the premeditated terrorist act" consisting in exploding beepers and walkie-talkies on September 17, 2024. They identically condemn attacks on UN staff, threats to their security and ask the Hebrew State to immediately stop these activities in Lebanon. They declare for strict compliance with resolution 1701 (2006), it being understood that it applies identically to Israel which must therefore withdraw behind the "blue line" (demarcation line).

- Yemen (§ 33) They decide for freedom of navigation, but, instead of condemning Ansar Allah as do Westerners, they intend to tackle the causes of the conflict, and support dialogue and the peace process under the auspices of the UN.

- Syria (§ 34) They insist that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria must be strictly respected. They condemn the illegal foreign military presence which leads to an increase in the risks of a large -scale conflict in the region. They emphasize that illegal "unilateral sanctions" seriously exacerbate the sufferings of the Syrian people. They also decide (§ 43) against the Israeli occupation of the Syrian Golan.

- Iran (§ 35 and 37) They condemn the attack on the diplomatic premises of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Damascus. They recall that the JCPOA agreement has been validated by the Security Council and the United States cannot withdraw as they did.

- Ukraine (§ 36) They emphasize that all states should act in accordance with the goals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations in their entirety (which gives reason to the Russian interpretation of the conflict). They note with satisfaction the relevant proposals of mediation and good offices (from China, South Africa and India), aiming to peacefully settle the conflict by dialogue and diplomacy.

- Sudan (§ 40) They condemn the attack, by the troops of President Abdel Fattah Al-Burhan, against the residence of the chief of the mission of the United Arab Emirates Emirates, September 29, 2024; An attack comparable to that of Iranian diplomatic premises in Syria by Israel. They call for an immediate, permanent and unconditional ceasefire.

- Afghanistan (§ 42) They defend the principle of an independent, united and peaceful state, free from terrorism, war and drugs. They underline the need to provide urgent and uninterrupted humanitarian aid to the Afghan people and to protect the fundamental rights of all Afghans, including women, girls and different ethnic groups, which implies the cancellation of effective prohibitions for secondary and superior studies.

- Disarmament (§ 43-46) They declare for the acceleration of the application of resolutions on the creation of an area exempt from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East (that is to say for the denuclearization of Israel), in accordance with the Iranian proposal. They also decide in favour of the prevention of an arms race in space, despite the opposition of the United States.

- Terrorism (§ 47-49) They reject any attempt to politicize issues against terrorism and the use of terrorist groups to achieve political ends and emphasize that only BRICS is an effective organization in the matter, a direct allusion to the secret operations of the United

States and United Kingdom. They plead for the rapid adoption of the General Convention on International Terrorism within the framework of the United Nations.

- Transnational crime (§ 50-53) Under the leadership of Russia, BRICS tackles the questions of drugs, transnational crime and corruption by strengthening a repressive coordinated response.



ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL COOPERATION

BRICS first study the need to have a compensation chamber to exchange liquidity between them (without having to go through the Swift system created by the NATO Stay-Behind network) and a reinsurance system for Secure goods transport (without having to go through Anglo-Saxon companies or those indirectly controlled by them).

They do not approach trade from the angle of free trade or customs duties, but under that of security, resilience, stability and efficiency of supply chains. They have been setting up a program for a year to harmonize and coordinate their use of computer science (Partnir) in economics and trade. Regarding the fight against diseases, BRICS, while welcoming the work of the World Health Organization (WHO), develops its own alert and aid system. Regarding intellectual property, BRICS, being aware that the rights of authors and other patents are today the main source of income of the Anglo-Saxons (and not their real or financial production), BRICs intends to put this system right by targeting the fight against counterfeits and no longer by valuing their income. They intend to multiply cooperation in research, development and innovation programs in biomedical sectors, renewable energies, space and astronomical sciences, ocean and polar sciences.

INTERPERSONAL EXCHANGES

BRICS mainly intends to fight against the Anglo-Saxon ideology of the war of civilizations [4] by relying on two UN agencies, UNICEF and the Alliance of civilizations. BRICS countries wish to multiply interpersonal exchanges between them in the fields of the media, culture, education, sports, arts, young people, civil society, public diplomacy and university exchanges.

BRICS is standing up against a return to the past: the concept of the war of civilizations, which had been a key part of President George Bush Jr.'s speech, seemed to have been definitively forgotten. It is coming back into fashion with the candidacy of Kamala Harris supported by the neo-conservatives. It is nothing more or less than a supposedly learned form of the old violent discourse of the 1930s-1945s: to survive, Westerners have no choice but to eliminate others.

Heads of state and governments present at the Kazan summit, members and guests. This photo suffices to measure Russia's "isolation" since the G7 imposed its sanctions.

NOTES ON THIS SUMMIT

This summit was held as the world witnesses a direct Israeli ethnic cleaning, first in Gaza, then in south of Lebanon. Simultaneously, the Russian special military operation aimed at applying resolution 2202 of the Security Council in Ukraine (the Minsk agreements) runs for the benefit of Moscow. The Ukrainian army will not survive the winter and Western "unilateral coercive measures" have all failed. Sorry, from a "war of civilizations" perspective, the Arabs in Gaza and the Russians in Ukraine threaten the West and must be eliminated.

Participation in BRICS therefore appears as a revolt against the Anglo-Saxon World Order. We can only be disappointed by the retreat of the Brazilian President, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, who did not dare to come to Kazan and was represented by his Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mauro Vieira. Brazil is nevertheless a founding member of BRICS. However, it is true that Brazil is involved since it holds the presidency of the New Development Bank. This is chaired by the former President Dilma Youssef who was overthrown in an operation remote-controlled by the United States and Israel.

The same point must be made about the last-minute refusal of Saudi Arabia's Prince Mohammed bin Salman to take sides with either camp and travel to Kazan, even though his

preferred ally, the United Arab Emirates, is now a member of BRICS and their president, Sheikh Mohammed bin Zayed Al Nahyan, was present.

Russia had chosen to host this Kazan summit in the capital of Tatarstan, because this dynamic city illustrates both the integration of Muslims into the Russian Federation and Moscow's ability to delegate its powers.

Economically, the summit has advanced in the dedollarization of international trade. A BRICS digital monetary token, paths to a common tax authority, a court for arbitration of economic disputes between member countries, or the idea of a grain stock exchange are examined. Also the possibility of establishing an independent regulation and cross-border deposit infrastructure, "BRICS Clear" is discussed. Finally, BRICS advances in the development of a payment card system called "BRICS PAY", presented at the Kazan summit. Its operation seems relatively classic: the "BRICS PAY" card should make it possible to set payments in national currency via the use of a QR-CODE by debit from an Electronic wallet powered via an eponymous application, by attaching a Visa, Mastercard or MIR bank card. The problem is to maintain complete sovereignty while participating in a collective currency.

The summit has above all shown, at the political level, in the presence of Antonio Guterres, the Secretary-General of the UN, that BRICS rejects the changing Western rules, imposed by the G7 at the head of the customer, and prefer respect for the given word, that is to say international law. The countries of the "global south" (as opposed to the "collective West") have an acute conscience of the commitments and treaties signed by the Anglo-Saxons and shamelessly violated by them. Westerners consider that in the name of democracy, an elected head of state or government may not feel obliged by the signature of those who preceded him, while other states, whether they are illiberal or dictatorial in their eyes, have an obligation to do so. For example, Donald Trump abandoned the JCPOA (Iranian nuclear deal) that his predecessor, Barack Obama, had negotiated at length. Or Joe Biden did not consider himself committed to two documents signed by his friend Barack Obama, nor to the Istanbul agreement (1999 [5]), nor to resolution 2202 (2015) on the Minsk agreements. He therefore claims that Russia invaded Ukraine and violated the United Nations Charter, while many subsequent texts show that Russia is the only one to have followed all of its principles to the letter.

The IMF has just reviewed its calculation methods and placed Russian GDP in purchasing power parity in fourth position behind China, the United States and India. it therefore suddenly increased by 23 % and left the 48 ° place where it had been languishing. However, beyond economic realities (BRICS represents 37 % of world GDP and 45 % of humanity,

while the G7 only represents 29 % of GDP and 10 % of the world's population), this summit opened the eyes of many sightless persons. The world has changed. It is no longer dominated by Washington and London.

[Thierry Meyssan](#)

Translation

[Roger Lagassé](#)

[1] [Kazan Summit Official Website](#).

[2] “[What international order?](#)”, by Thierry Meyssan, Translation Roger Lagassé, *Voltaire Network*, 7 November 2023.

[3] “[XVI BRICS Summit : Kazan Declaration](#)”, *Voltaire Network*, 24 October 2024.

[4] “[The "Clash of Civilizations"](#)”, by Thierry Meyssan, *Voltaire Network*, 4 June 2004.

[5] «[Istanbul Document](#)», OSCE, 1999.