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INTRODUCTION

On the eve of Christmas in 2010, South Africa became the fifth member of the elite club known as BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa). The addition of South Africa transformed the name from BRIC to BRICS. The advent of BRICS raises concerns as the world note serious shifts in the international order. One of such concerns is the question of the extent at which the group may change the global political economy as we know it in the 20th century. The second concern is the implication of South Africa’s membership as a vital inclusion representing Africa unofficially.

First, we analyse how the international order is undergoing a power shift away from the West and towards the major emerging economies: Brazil, Russia, India, China and potentially South Africa. In doing so, the economic crises in recent times must be taken into account along with the West’s gradual decline and their debt ridden economies. The next section looks at the reality of ‘Shifting Powers.’ This is highlighted by using International Monetary Fund (IMF) data detailing the progression of economic and military might of countries concerned. Thereafter, the G6 and BRICS are juxtaposed for the purpose of discovering comparative advantages that will identify whether or not power in the international order has indeed shifting.

Whilst the economic decline of the West has translated into a relative prospect for BRICS, the member states still face challenges that present potential for greater uncertainty, volatility and change. South Africa however holds a unique position within BRICS. Therefore, the next section explains South Africa’s position in comparative term with other members of the Group. In this section ‘South Africa and BRIC,’ we discover the various political and economic challenges facing South Africa. Data provided by the IMF and the national Department of Trade
and Industry (DTI) is used to gain insight into South African weaknesses in light of BRICS’ economic indicators. It would seem that South Africa is hampered by domestic issues such as high unemployment, labour market deficiencies and the consequent stifled economic growth. The section that follows is ‘South African Foreign Policy and Africa.’ We highlight the need for South Africa to position its foreign policy as an instrument to achieve the necessary goals for economic growth and development as well as positioning itself as the gateway to African economic relations and development.

SHIFTING POWERS

Traditionally, the US, Europe in its seemingly fragmented entirety and Japan have dominated global politics in the post-Cold War era (Qobo 2011:8). Since 2007/2008 however, the global financial system had experienced contractions on a scale not seen since the Great Depression of the 1930’s (Sally 2011:7). The ensuing events had resulted in what Razeen Sally has called ‘de-globalization’ (A process of diminishing interdependence and integration between certain units around the world, typically nation-states) - the collapse of global demand for exports. Whilst this presented a new set of challenges for the Brazilian, Russian, Indian, Chinese and South African markets due to loss of revenue through the abovementioned contraction in export demand, these markets emerged from the crisis in far more favourable debt positions than the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OEDC)\(^1\) states.

The vital difference here is that while the emerging markets were affected by the contraction, the OECD countries, especially the US were faced with massive public and household debt. The US has also financed its debt by issuing high yield bonds to China to create more money liquidity in its markets (Naude 2011:8). The consequence of this event has meant that since the housing market collapse, the US has experienced huge decreases in spending

\(^1\) The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development is an international economic organization of 34 countries founded in 1961 to stimulate economic progress and world trade.
power of its citizens and has had to dig deep into its ‘ForEx Reserves’ to pay its way out of
deepening recession. The US is presently saddled with a public debt that equates to 99.7 per cent
of its GDP; a prospect that presents massive restraints on future public spending (Naude
2011:10). Consequently, trade flows from the US to the rest of the world, i.e. the EU, emerging
markets and Asia at large had reduced, which pushed the effects of ‘deglobalization’. This is
more of a crisis for Europe.

The European Sovereign debt crisis has led to the development of multiple Eurozone
bailout packages, weakening confidence and increasing the indebtedness of Europeans
immensely. This was centrally due to European governments being over-optimistic about future
gains and intentionally running very high budget deficits in the hope that the gains would
multiply as the years progressed (Blanchard 2010:6). However, with a new general period of
financial and economic contraction (because of new austerity measures) in the spending power
of the West, it is evident that the might of the European economy was built on money that simply
was not there to spend. This has slowed their growth and increased the debt burden for the
foreseeable future.

With this milieu of economic strain within the West, a few emerging economies, namely
Brazil, Russia, India and China have experienced massive levels of growth since the turn of the
21st century. Most notably China, whose average growth for the 2000 – 2010 period eases to an
extraordinary 9% year on year (Bi 2011:105). This culminated in the “labelling” of the largest
emerging markets in international trade by Goldman Sachs’ Jim O’Neill in 2001: ‘Building
Better economic BRICs’ (Wilson, et al 2003:1). It has been calculated that the Brazil, Russia,
India and China grouping will surpass the traditional powers in terms of economic size by the
year 2050. This presents a global shift in economic power from the West, eastward. The result
was an official diplomatic club or loose political alliance that extended membership to South
Africa on the 24th of December 2010 (Kornegay 2011:11).
Therefore, the events that culminated in the formation of BRICS economic grouping can be understood in terms of relative power gains and power losses globally. The cash-strapped conditions of the Western powers have created a global market that is dependent on BRICS for positive movement (Sally 2011:9). Theoretically, that shifts in economic ability and size have created projections that cause the balance of power to invariably rest with BRICS, but primarily Brazil, Russia, India and China in the coming decades. From a realist perspective, the various states that feature in this shift have experienced increased might in BRICS and decreased might in the West (Sally 2011:12). Each state therefore is in a far more powerful position relative to the West. Most notably again, China’s growing influence surges ahead with no real signs of slowing. Conversely, the Western states’ power base has been tremendously eroded by domestic market volatility, expensive wars and debilitating sovereign debt.

On the other hand, members of the BRICS more importantly use their multilateral forum to lobby for reform of the liberal institutions such as the WTO, IMF and the World Bank (Qobo 2011:10). The effects of which is the reshaping of the international order from strict US led unipolarity, to a more multipolar configuration that is still led, but not dominated by the US. Moreover, this shift also presents a neoliberal perspective which is vital to understand in terms of the balance of power (Truman 2006:3). BRICS members are able to alter voting outcomes in forums such as the G20 for greater reform of the UNSC, the IMF and the World Bank to name but a few. This creates opportunities to set agendas and alter decision-making that will further widen the net of global governance and pursue the even application of reformed rules and norms.

Therefore, the power shift from the traditional powers, eastward, has greatly contributed to the construction of limited strategic partnerships, such as BRICS. This is partly due to the fact that the West is seemingly in a debilitating debt. Consequently, the West gives a prestigious label to the leading emerging markets: ‘BRICS’ a label that conjures notions of solidity, stability and endurance. Moreover, the traditional powers offer BRICS greater inclusivity at important forums
such as the G20 and the UNSC. The most important aspect of the increased multilateralism in the world through this power shift is so that BRICS might introduce reforms within the international economic structure that will widen economic prosperity and effective governance.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Using International Monetary Fund (IMF) data, we engage in comparative analysis of the G7 with BRICS emerging markets economies’ debt percentage of GDP to identify certain comparative advantages of power indicators. Illustrated below in figure 1; we find here that the debt percentage of GDP outlook for the G7 average projects a rise indication up to 2016. Whereas for the same period proceeding from 2011, BRICS states debt percentage of GDP outlook is descending, on the average. In other words, The BRICS GDP is experiencing between 2 per cent to 7 per cent growth higher than the G7 for respective years. This will translate into continued expansion by BRICS with the member economies being recognised as ‘hotspots’ for investment. The consequent scramble for investment gains from BRICS will place the members in stronger diplomatic positions to maximize their gains in international economic negotiations (Wilson, et. al. 2003:20).

![Debt Percentage of GDP Graph](image_url)
In reference to the economic indicators above, what is discernible is that the common trend will favour the BRICS economies. The G7 has tended to run high deficits to fuel their economic growth through the use of monetary and fiscal policy instruments to spur financing. The G7 states will struggle with increasing government debt that will have negative impacts on their economies. Though GDP in these states is high, in most cases, the GDP/Debt Ratio is 70 per cent and upwards. This will lead to painful austerity measures, constraining economic growth and state activity until debt positions improve. Conversely, BRICS states maintain much healthier debt positions in comparison. The effect of low state debt means that the state is able to embark on more development projects. Thus, the traditional power countries that make up the G7 realises the need to re-arrange the table, bring in new members and expand collaborations with emerging market economies which mostly constitute BRICS. Therefore the landscape for the definition and composition of power that influences institutions of global governance is evolving and more inclusive. We now find the reshaping of the international order from strict US led unipolarity, to a multipolar configuration that is still led, but not dominated by the US. Therefore we find the opportunity for emerging economies to engage more in the activities and agenda setting in the various institutions of global governance such as the UN, IMF and WTO.

These institutions of global governance are designed by the traditional powers for utility favouring largely their own concerns and terms, especially in the realm of international trade.
Therefore, rules, norms and conduct of trade with these states are designed to favour the methods of states such as the US, UK and the EU (Draper 2010:5). This has created an asymmetry amongst relations between the North and South. In terms of power, the ‘developed and wealthy North’ had maintained leverage over the much ‘poorer South’ that were dependent on that trade arrangements. Therefore, with the weakening of the traditional powers in recent years, the new limited strategic alliances of the South, such as BRICS become forums where their collective power and united agenda can potentially sway the effect of global governance institutions in their favour (Zondi 2011:17). The new partnerships are designed with the aim of altering the balance of power in the international order. Projections from certain economic quarters have afforded BRICS leverage in international negotiations. From the above developments, it will be appropriate to ask the question: As the balance of power shifts in the global economy towards the so called ‘emerging markets’, where does South Africa fit in this changing reality? What is the relevance of South Africa within the BRICS configuration and its relationship with the traditional power states? Will South Africa be able to play a significant role as a new member of the BRICS grouping? Or compete favourably?

**SOUTH AFRICA AND BRIC**

The invitation of South Africa into BRIC as engineered by China was hardly a surprise spur fundamental questions. Compelling arguments against such membership show that South Africa will experience greater challenges compared to the much larger powers within BRIC such as institutional over-stretch for Pretoria and the soft power diplomacy dimensions of China, to name but a few. Moreover, South Africa does not possess the attributes that project a true ‘Emerging Power’ status; according to Sally, ‘South Africa is at best a third-tier emerging market’ (Sally 2011:29). On the other hand, optimists suggest that South Africa within BRICS presents more opportunities; the country will be able to push effectively the African interests in
international politics and construct more stable diplomatic relations with the rest of the world, provided South African leadership implement effective policies across the state.

South Africa, has maintained long membership within IBSA and more recently BRICS. The main goal of each of these institutions has found relevance unique to each of them. IBSA presents a strategic alliance that is centred on the common issues that affect its members (India, Brazil and South Africa) and finds increasing importance in South Africa’s economic and diplomatic advancement. However, the disparity in economic composition and domestic environment of South Africa and other BRICS members, bring to fore the challenges to a possible fair environment for furthering South African agenda in this multilateral grouping.
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**Figure 2**

From the graph above, we find that South Africa lags greatly in GDP in comparative term with other BRICS member as it only accounts for 3% of the combined BRICS GDP. One may conclude that this is due largely to the relatively small number of South African skilled work force among others.

![Percentage of labour force and unemployment rates](image)
The IMF projections provide the justification for the many criticisms that argues that South Africa does not belong to the BRIC. South Africa is a comparatively small state, with a small economy that does not possess the capacity to absorb all of its available labour, hence, the debilitating rate of unemployment (Qobo 2011:21). Also, South Africa unfortunately has the worst unemployment rate in BRICS; and one of the worst in the world. South Africa also attracts far lower levels of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) due to the security environment of the South African society, acting as impediment to reasonable foreign interest in the South African economy. The news of xenophobic tendencies in South African townships does not suggest safety after a business feasibility study. This security challenge is engendered by high rate of poverty, particularly among the majority of the black South African demography.

Whilst South Africa has improved in certain areas, many deterents to economic growth remain within the structure of the state that highlight ‘troubling weaknesses’ like labour market inefficiency with its inflexible hiring and firing regulations. One of the most economically debilitating features of South African labour markets is the propensity to engage in strike action that involves lockdowns and even violent protests (Qobo 2011:22). In fact, the rampant behaviour of trade union members has proved their power in the state undermining every rational objection (The Strike Season: York 17th August 2011). Beside South Africa’s core problem of unemployment, various other problems hamper the state. These are low productivity, low standards of education and skills and a lack of diversification (Sally 2011:29). South Africa also adopts tariffs that are far too high. This increases the price of products, making them less competitive in the global market. A ‘knock-on’ effect of this is that business costs are inflated further. These issues represent the core of why South Africa in many ways, cannot compete

---

*Figure 3 – A Comparison of National Unemployment Rates for BRICS members*[^2]

favourably in BRICS. Therefore, it is evident that South Africa’s placement in BRICS is somewhat and arguably misplaced. Meanwhile, in an attempt to correct some of these seeming weaknesses, South Africa recently re-engineered a new foreign policy approach incorporating Africa as a platform for engagement with the international community.

SOUTH AFRICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND AFRICA

As the world emerge from a post-Cold War order into an era of greater global economic change, the role of foreign policy becomes one of the most important spheres of state operation and interaction (Barston 1997:9). The main reason for this is due the intertwine factors of globalization; effects of global governance; emerging powers and a weakening US hegemony. The requirements of an increasingly dynamic international order translate into a demand to ‘move with the times,’ hence, the new South African Foreign Policy document, *The Diplomacy of Ubuntu*.

Foreign policy is designed as a statement from the state to its citizens and the rest of the world that dictates the direction of the pursuit of the national interest in international relations (Barston 2006:32). However, beyond dictating the ‘where’, theoretical perspectives indicate much of the ‘how’. This may explain why South Africa seeks a far more balanced, co-operative, multilateral outlook in the international order that includes strong, strategic partnerships.

In a speech given by the South African Minister, Maite Nkoana-Mashabane, six key priorities had been forwarded in the new foreign policy under the 2009-2014 Zuma Administration (IGD Report 2010:15):

- Improving the political and economic integration of the Southern African Development Community (SADC);
- The continued prioritisation of the African continent;
- Strengthening South-South relations;
- Intensifying strategic relations with strategic formations of the North;
• Strengthening political and economic relations;
• Participating in the global system of governance.

Clearly, the South African foreign policy is set to achieve goals, but how does South Africa use its capabilities to pursue this foreign policy goals through its prestigious membership within BRICS?

Professor Anthoni van Nieuwkerk of the Institute for Global Development has advocated a ‘narrow and deep’ approach that should govern the pursuit of foreign policy objectives (Van Nieuwkerk 2010:82). The argument based on the fact that the South African state, whilst being a major power on the African continent, still endures many challenges that limit its capacity to act. Therefore, the state must clearly identify and deal with specific (inter)national issues that have the greatest potential to achieve the best possible result in terms of the six foreign policy priorities. Below are astute recommendations on how South Africa might use BRICS platform to market the supremacy of the state’s foreign policy in defining interests in the region, on the continent and even internationally.

**SADC: Improvement and Integration**

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) is arguably South Africa greatest priority. In terms of the power dynamics within SADC, South Africa leads on almost all counts of significant power indicators, thereby making it the regional power (Kappel 2010:6). South Africa also does engage in comparatively greater military expenditure, however, to utilize hard power on the African continent solely for pursuit of the national interest would present a contradiction of the non-interventionist principle of South African foreign affairs (IGD Report September 2010). Therefore, while it is worth mentioning such ability, the indicator of much greater significance in this context is the economic might of South Africa in the region.

In light of such evidence, BRICS forum presents an opportunity for South Africa to be the true ‘gateway to Africa.’ If SADC were to be a functional regional economic community, South
Africa would be very well positioned to act as a facilitator on behalf of the member states because it is the only state that possesses the administrative, infrastructural and diplomatic ability to do so on a prolonged, long-term basis. However, South Africa, even though positioned quite adequately on the continent faces many challenges to furthering its economic interests in Africa. Comparatively, South African companies do not possess the financial power that BRIC countries possess. This is evident in the comments of Alex Benkenstein of the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA): ‘While South African companies do have certain advantages in terms of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), these should not be overstated,’ Benkenstein warns, ‘South African companies are not necessarily well received in the rest of Africa, and in terms of linking investments with infrastructure projects or development assistance; they may find themselves outmanoeuvred by Chinese or other companies’ (2011, 15 September).

Therefore, a slightly different approach should and must be developed to enhance the might of South African companies. Adjunct to this particular point, whilst South Africa is well invested in Africa, the competitiveness of Chinese, Indian and Brazilian firms need not equate to South African loss. The state, through DIRCO and DTI must endeavour to market partnerships with BRIC in Africa to develop the various areas of potential and present South African investment. Parallel to this, the state must introduce renewed trust in public-private partnerships by allowing diplomats to pursue the agendas of South African firms in Africa. This is vital for South Africa as according to Minister of Public Enterprise, Malusi Gigaba (2011, 3rd October): ‘By failing to foster high levels of economic cooperation and integration in Africa, we are effectively imposing limits on the growth of the South African economy.’ Therefore, the real competitive advantage in South African terms is not the mere size of South African ‘corporates on steroids,’ but their already vast and well founded knowledge of the continent, its culture, dynamics and challenges. It would be in BRIC’s interest to be marketed as a bloc in Africa, with
South African firms ‘leading the way’ as experienced forerunners in shared development and investment.

With BRIC viewing Africa as a strategic point to fuel their own development, South Africa, in partnership with the private sector as well as with BRIC companies will be able to expand investment ventures into the SADC region and continent wide. This has already been fostered for instance through the IMEXPO SADC-China Trade Fair and Investment Forum in May of 2011 in Johannesburg. This forum exposed business leaders and government officials to Chinese investors. China, being the greatest economic entity within the BRICS has since become South Africa’s biggest investor, surpassing the US and the UK (Ma 2011, 15th November). However, the integration of SADC, whilst entirely beneficial for South Africa, is not without its stumbling blocks.

South Africa’s stated aim in the context of SADC pushes for the deepening of integration in the region. It would seem though, that this process has been slow. The SADC, if integrated, but led by South Africa to the same extent as the European Union will prove to be a far more effective “navigator” of globalization than if the region remains as separate states with separate voices. A SADC Union would constitute the 16th largest economy in the world, and the shift to a common regional currency might stabilize trade and lower costs.

Prioritisation of the African Continent and Global Governance Systems

Whilst SADC should rightfully remain South Africa’s more immediate ambition, there is no doubt that South Africa’s place in Africa has always been significant. South Africa has assumed roles on the continent that have absorbed much of its diplomatic and military resources (Habib 2010:41). Such a prospect presents issues of security over South African involvement in African affairs; continentally and globally. The point at which BRICS does bear much relevance for African security is found in the forum’s ability to alter voting outcomes within the UN and, more importantly, the UNSC (Kornegay 2010:70). Therefore, the continued prioritization of the
African continent will allow South Africa to act as a voice that champions the African Agenda within global governance institutions.

The South African South-South Alliances bear much significance for Africa as a whole. In the interaction with global governance institutions, South Africa’s membership in IBSA, BASIC and BRICS allows Pretoria to project more influence through the effective lobbying and “bloc voting” within the relevant group (Kornegay 2010:69). This speaks volumes for the effectiveness of club diplomacy in global governance institutions. If South Africa were to vote alone, it would most certainly be marginalized by the imposition of other non-African problems; a practice commonly exercised by the US and UK (Erasmus 2011, 11th June). However, the club diplomacy gives South Africa an opportunity to lobby China and Russia to utilize veto power as permanent Security Council members to influence African affairs in the direction of South African perspectives (Kornegay 2010:70). This method of club diplomacy also allows South Africa more confidence in the UN Groups, such as the increasingly influence in G20 and G77.

South Africa can argue that it is in the interests of BRIC to shift the focus of global governance institutions on security away from Western preoccupations and towards the traditionally neglected needs of the developing world. Conversely, BRICS collectively need a very stable Africa to enable the security of their trade and investments. Therefore, if BRIC vote with South Africa on African issues, this will most definitely provide strong dimensions from which South Africa can use its foreign policy for the betterment of Africa consistently.

**South-South Strengthening and Formations with the North**

South Africa still maintains very strong ties with the West. The obvious reasons for this is that the West, (the US and the EU) in this context still constitute some of South Africa’s largest export markets. On the other hand, three relevant South-South multilateral groups in which
South Africa retains its membership consist of IBSA, BASIC and BRICS. South Africa’s direct ‘inter-BRICS’ partnership needs to be explored and utilised particularly the microcosmic IBSA within BRICS. Therefore, it is vital that South Africa maintains energetic communications in South-South and North-South Relations.

**IBSA**

IBSA represent another facet of strategic alliance building for state economic development. IBSA, unlike BRICS, is a normative group with real and decisive aims (Kornegay 2010:29). This shows that even though the existence of BRICS establishes it as the most power-concentrated group, there are issues greatly limiting BRICS that are not found in IBSA. The group consists of India, Brazil and South Africa and is a trilateral forum that places South Africa as the ‘Gondwanan Point’ of trade between the three emerging powers. Central to the potential ‘staying power’ of this group, even beyond that of BRICS is largely due to the fact that the points of convergence between the member states are numerous, with divergences few and not irreconcilable (Zondi 2011:25). For instance, BRICS are ‘bricks’ and have differences in make-up: Russia, an energy superpower; China, the world’s manufacturer; India, the innovator and South Africa, the industrial power in Africa. But there is a rivalry between China and India and BRICS have different political cultures: Non-democracy – China; Controlled democracy – Russia; Democracies – Brazil, India and RSA. Meanwhile with IBSA on the other hand, all three states are healthy democracies, all of them suffer the same socio-economic conditions and all members desire to deepen trade across the continent. It is evidently far more homogenous than the BRICS and therefore possesses less inherent points of conflict.

South Africa’s South-South cooperation in this instance is indicative of a very strong forum with much ‘political and economic room’ for members to work within. IBSA is different from BRICS in that IBSA members continually express a great need for revision of the global governance architecture in global politics (Bava 2011:30). This is because, while China and
Russia enjoy great power status with the ability to use veto powers in the UNSC, South Africa, India and Brazil do not possess this sort of political clout. Therefore, within BRICS, IBSA may be able to emphasize more greatly the need for global governance revisionism.

More importantly though, IBSA also presents real prospects for security, especially in terms of their naval maritime security forum: IBSAMAR. The intention of IBSAMAR is to create safe naval routes for trade and also provide a new avenue for security cooperation. IBSAMAR introduces new dimensions of global governance that desires global security to cater for the security needs of emerging and developing nations as well (Bava 2010:58).

**Formations of the North**

One of South Africa’s most significant export markets is found in the European Union and NAFTA. This being considered, strategic diplomacy with northern states and alliances also holds advantageous positions for South Africa. In the foreign policy white paper, it is clearly stated that South Africa will pursue aims with the North that push for greater integration of SADC and developmental assistance in Africa. Also evident are security considerations that affect Africa that would be greatly assisted with North-South cooperation. The previous neorealist and realist impositions of the political powerhouses of the North find themselves waning due to their severe sovereign debt and weakened economies (Zondi 2011:26). Progressively, the North is found to be slowly adopting more multilateral perspectives; desiring the input of emerging powers and Africa’s development in response to their recognition of the Euro zone and North American crises.

Therefore, South Africa must exercise greater leverage in trade with the North to acquire a more even relationship. South Africa must push the African Agenda with the North and influence the increase of African Development in line with their commitments to Africa. However, the Western states would be wise to share technological advances with African states and even invest on a large scale. In light of the above, South Africa maintains very good
relations with most of its Western counterparts and can therefore behave as an intermediary between BRICs and the West. Moreover, the ultimate goal in terms of foreign policy projection through BRICS with the North is pushing for revision of western dominated institutions of global governance to ensure a far more equitable world economic order.

CONCLUSION

The hope of South Africa’s future lies squarely with the actions and decisions of its leadership. South Africa must change according to the requirements for economic growth in the world. BRICS presents such an opportunity to South Africa. What is clear is that South Africa must pursue growth and development orientated goals that will result in greater productivity; greater employment and greater investment. Seeking positions in multilateral international will be a pipedream if the domestic, economic and socio-political issue that limits development and growth is unattended.

Internationally though, South Africa in BRICS is also presented with perhaps the most significant opportunity of all: The duty of putting Africa back on the map. A continent whose needs were long forgotten by centuries of debilitating colonialism finds itself at the centre of attention as the final frontier to fuel the world’s development. If South Africa wants to position itself as a gateway to Africa, it needs to improve its relations with other African countries. South Africa needs to see Africa as a country in which it is only a microcosm of. By tailoring its policies to achieving this end, it will gain trust and collaboration from other African States and therefore be able to compete with other mega economies within BRICS and beyond. BRIC will engage with South Africa on all African matters as failure to do so would render South Africa’s membership futile. South Africa must also spur its own development by creating the partnerships required to facilitate the state’s rapid economic growth. Effective marketing on South Africa’s private sector must also take place with the aims of expanding the country’s corporate environment and building a bridge of trust and pro-activity between the state and
private enterprise. Lastly, South Africa must continue the call for revamp of the international order. The concept of global governance is changing and South Africa must be instrumental in using the BRICS platform to emphasize the need for equitability and justice to pervade international economic norms into a form that reflect a true global concerns.
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