



THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE BRICS: CHALLENGES AND POWER RELATIONS BETWEEN ANTAGONISM AND INTERDEPENDENCE

Marco António Batista Martins

In this study, the aim is to understand the importance and role of the BRICS as a bloc in international relations, in particular, related to the European Union and the will to counterbalance the United States. On the one hand, we examine the BRICS and its role in international relations, highlighting the existing position regarding the changing world order, untangling its geopolitical factors; on the other hand, international security is analyzed, highlighting NATO and the European Union. Finally, the United States position on the Asia-Pacific is also included, since the BRICS intend to create an alternative international order, but it is dependent on US foreign policy and its projection capacity. The results show that, although the BRICS constitute a bloc and wish for a new world order, they have attained their geocultural limits as well as their capacity for effective power beyond the internal social and political difficulties derived from their heterogeneity, antagonism, and interdependence.

Keywords: BRICS, European union, International relations, Power.

Introduction

In 2011, Jim O'Neill, retired as Chairman of Goldman Sachs Asset Management-Goldman Sachs, the founding father of the acronym BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China) in the distant month and year of 30 November 2001, a few weeks after the attacks in American territory to the twin towers, announced that Brazil, Russia, India, and China have moved into a new category in the economic and international relations. In fact, economies whose population, GDP and growth rate were decisive for being in the fast-growing emerging category, assumed a new status, that of growth markets. It should be noted that Jim O'Neill belonged to one of the largest investment groups in the world, so it is necessary to understand the impact of the advertisement or in other words to assimilate the extent of the importance of changing the same status (O'Neill, 2013).

However, the announcement in the international arena did not fail to cause a shock in the face of the unrest caused, particularly in the words of Jim O'Neil, saying that the concept of growth markets means that initially the 4 BRICs reached not only the power status As well as in the economic sphere, like the rest of the economies operating on the Western side, Europe, and the United States are not double-digit growth rates, and they risk vulnerability to possible local financial crises with global impact .

Paul Kennedy in his *Ascension and Fall of Great Powers* (1987) brings, in the epochal context, to the field of analysis a new perspective alluding to the importance of the relationship between economics and politics. The author points to the causality between economic-financial changes and the maintenance of political power within the framework of the governance of a State. By living in a world of profound disparities, we find that it is a warning for the unpredictability of events in the international arena by

provoking substantial changes in the world's balance. It seeks to portray the image of the world where man struggles to guarantee the most basic right: that of his survival.

If, on the one hand, the growing complexity in our armillary sphere reinforces the link between political-economic structures and the proliferation of decision-making centers, on the other hand, this process tends to provoke an escape of the decision-making capacity in the face of events that flee their sphere of influence and even control. Read here the cases, among others, of the Panama Papers or of the impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff, in which for some the victim of a coup of the opposition and for others symbolizing justice. However, as a reading, only the portrait of corruption appears to the ordinary citizen, which has no frontier or line of demarcation between the promiscuity of private business and the sense of state or patriotic duty of the political elite towards its constituents in the exercise of democracy.

The various crises lived by Humanity, without differentiating genres, since the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989); Of the collapse of the Soviet Union (1991) in which it not only meant the end of an ideology responsible for millions of deaths like Mikhail Gorbachev himself, who as the builder and mentor of Perestroika since 1985 in the name of restructuring and USSR - had been accompanied by his granddaughter in a commercial announcement of Pizza Hut on December 23, 1997, denoting the influence of pizza in the rapprochement of peoples and suggesting that capitalism is better than communism; Of terrorist attacks on US territory on the fateful day of September 11, 2001; Of Saddam Hussein's hanging on December 30, 2006; The death of bin Laden on May 2, 2011; The death of Kadaffi on October 20, 2011, in which up to that time he had been admired by the West; The continuing terrorist attacks by Daesh on government territory; Directly affect the acceleration of the changes of the ideological fields to the society as a whole, clearly going through educational and cultural aspects.

Whether one agrees or not, one fact is that the present world order, in significant steps of gradual change and repositioning of the powers, does not seem to allow a coincident line between internal political legitimacy in the defense of its sovereignty and the international one. However, the point of instability, such as happens in Greece, of Aléxis Tsipras, even though the ruler intends to take this bond of union for granted, is obliged to respect a treaty of which he is an integral part, which has led to civil contestations with police intervention in the famous square Syntagma of Athens. The distance between legitimacies and duties shows the obligation to review the various political models in line with respect for human dignity in the legitimization of the sovereign State and the exercise of power so that incompatibility can be reconciled on a planetary scale in the defense of Life of each country.

This transfer of power, in spite of the beginning of the 50th anniversary of the disastrous ideological campaign, by the President of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, of the fifth generation of leaders, the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), concretized by Mao Zedong, he faces an unprecedented internal struggle to achieve in his political agenda the liberal matrix of a new cultural revolution, the use of the approximation in the name of traditional culture by imperative necessity in the name of the Chinese dream in the revivalism of socialism with Chinese characteristics, in other words, In the pursuit of the legacy of Deng Xiaoping, of one country, two systems, that is, the seat of power located in the Communist Party of China (CPC) and together economic opening to the world, being essential the creation of a Christian spiritual civilization with characteristics By introducing changes to the Christian Church in Chinese territory in order to control the impact it may have on the population.

The BRICS and Its Role in International Relations

In the search for a democratic ideal, two emerging tendencies enter complementarity in the full exercise of citizenship in the legitimization of the State across borders, the evidence of Machiavellian using force to structure normativism and humanist afterward in the promotion of values in the reorganization of State apparatus of power. The existing position and conceptual change reveal that the world is in the process of reaffirming the current paradigm characterized by a liberal international order, that is, states as actors in international relations are now confronted with a reality of undeniable global interdependence. On the one

hand, in the political sector, European elites should understand and assume that the world has changed and that beyond the so-called Europe of the 27, in future to two, contemplating Germany and France, as the United Kingdom has begun the process of exit from the European Union (EU) resulting from a referendum.

In this perspective, the BRICS reality is included as an independent non-formal international organization, aimed at promoting commercial, political and cultural cooperation, integrating for the first time South Africa, whose third summit held on 14 April 2011 in the city of Sanya in the Province of Hainan, China was attended not only by President Dilma Rousseff but also the main leaders. Curiously, the symbology of the meeting place where the ancient name of Sanya is Yazhou means “the end of the sky and the ocean”, and it was also during World War II that the port of Second Fleet of the Imperial Japanese Navy. This year, on the agenda of the five countries in question, the convergent objectives consisted of: (1) the BRICS affirmation in the international arena; (2) the need to reform the monetary system; (3) the commercial dynamization in local currency, distancing the US \$ and the Euro; (4) the creation of the New Development Bank whose aim is to financially support projects related to infrastructure.

Considering Ambassador Zhang Jun (2016), Director General of the Department of International Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, it is possible to reflect BRICS as a new paradigm of intergovernmental cooperation that seeks openness, inclusiveness and above all development at the base or starting point of equality on behalf of a genuine partnership. In addition, efforts to seek peace, development, and cooperation as a representation of a progressive force in international relations. It is intended that each BRICS use effectively achieve pragmatic cooperation in order to maintain a global economy in balance, not neglecting the need to strengthen the concept of democracy in international relations, where each state has sought to ensure their survival In a world of global governance, where social problems of economic and financial instability intersect, in addition to the worsening of the difference between the richest and the poorest that promotes the exclusion of human beings in a situation of weakness and impossibility to guarantee By itself their right to the right to live.

However, it is curious that the BRICS represent contrasting realities, from the social to the political, with marked contrasts, and that as world time progresses, political leaders continue to walk observing not in the short term what would limit the center But rather outlining the defense of the national interest by defining long-term policies that allow the eradication of poverty and the integration of these countries in the international arena with a view to rebalancing the world order and reforming the financial and monetary system. In this contrast, the BRICS, faced with a world order of uncertainties, consider it imperative to transmit the message of hope in the global economy to safeguard international financial stability without sacrificing fragile economies.

In addition, despite the disparity between the BRICS, but in the geopolitical framework and in international relations, the place they occupy and especially the projection that they will hold in the coming years as global leaders economically and politically becomes evident. Precisely from Laidi’s (2011) perspective, these countries function as an integral part of the global geopolitical landscape whose combination results from different cultural and civilizational realities. Considering the BRICS demonstrates the discussion about the change of the international order and the possible decline as a hegemonic power of the United States in the framework of international politics.

According to Jyrki Kähkönen (2013), the hypothesis to be formulated in the face of the possible paradigm shift or even a rebalancing of the present international order does or does not include the possibility for the BRICS to be able on the one hand to convey their perspective of reality and, on the other hand, If this change is to succeed, or if it will only achieve an adaptation in the existing order, despite the aspiration and the will, the absence of means and instruments can lead to failure to affirm in the world arena.

Indeed, in the analysis of Naazneen Barma (2009), it is possible that the BRICS have built a new alternative international order because they have generated a reality of networking relations through the combination of their capacity for power and, above all, of projection for politics as an alternative to the dominant powers. Moreover, in the United Nations, the BRICS are considered as a permanent political

group with two seats in the Security Council, in addition to one of them, Russia, coming from the rivalry of the Cold War, which opposed, on the one hand, the Warsaw Pact and, on the other hand, NATO.

In this respect, it should be stressed that for Christian Brüttsch (2012) one of the major problems regarding BRICS is that their potential antagonistic character is that they want to combine their reality in a kind of collective geopolitical power. Herein lies the sensitive aspect of the BRICS which have sought to transform the current balance of power to weaken the United States, but even though the EU understands and accepts the decisive role of the BRICS, it has not shown a willingness to negotiate with them as if were a “formal” organization represented with one voice. In this sense, the BRICS demand respect for the independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states and nations, in contrast to the domain of the international liberal order. However, it is important to note the interest of the BRICS to operate in accordance with the principles of the inviolability of sovereignty in the neo-Westphalian context.

The vision of this informal group is based on an alternative of the international order where each State, as sovereign entity, can actually exercise its power in concrete actions despite the current reality of interdependence and the weakening of the political role of those who govern in name Financial institutions, particularly those in the banking sector, which have gradually been ruling the whole society, even managing crises with the greatest impact on civil society in the domestic sphere, in a Europe that is increasingly weakened in leadership and incapable of projecting its role in the global spectrum. In addition, among the BRICS, Russia has proved to be the country of greatest optimism, having jointly with developed Brazil its geopolitical purposes, defining the group as an important polycentric system of international relations in a multipolar world.

In this sphere, Russia considers the geopolitical space of the BRICS as an open possibility of developing its international and cultural policy, in addition to the economic and financial aspects involved. However, for the People’s Republic of China, the BRICS symbolize the means to implement foreign policy on behalf of the New Silk Road of President Xi Jinping’s, using a common international policy, which in the short term Different interests among the 5 countries, there is no prospect of clear feasibility. The New Silk Road that was officially announced in 2013, will connect mainland China with its neighbours in Central Asia, Middle East, and Europe to boost the trade in new corridors, one will be overland and the other by sea via the Indian Ocean and Africa to Europe: (1) a new stimulus for its economy; (2) the Silk Road will benefit China’s needs for energy, with new gas pipelines in Central Asia and harbours in South Asia; (3) for strategic and geopolitical purposes, the government of China intend to shape a *cordon sanitaire* of regional stability. (Loesekrug-Pietri, 2015).

It should be noted it is precisely the BRICS that combine in their actions in the world order the combination of three factors (Martins, 2015, p. 32): (1) its formal structure, as sovereign states; (2) act within the regional framework; (3) project their power through their foreign policy to act at a global level.

Security: BRICS and the European Union

Between 8 and 9 July of 2016, one of the most important summits of NATO took place in the context of the present reality of the international crisis, both human and security. The heads of state and government representatives who attended the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Warsaw reported that the essential mission of this Organization remains unchanged, stating that the Alliance should continue to live in an environment of freedom, peace, and security where the smallest values in the name of individual freedom, human rights, contemporary democracy and the rule of law are shared. It is important to note that it is at a crucial juncture in the global geostrategic framework. On the one hand, not only because of the issues involved in the fight against terrorism and, on the other hand, Russia’s position vis-à-vis the EU and the United States, where the feeling of a return to the Cold War seems increasingly evident, But without the latent nuclear threat, fruit of ideological division and not only between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

This summit seeks mainly not to confront Russia, but rather to ensure a dialogue of greater transparency between the protagonists, to highlight NATO allies with the Russian political authorities. It is appropriate, as recently mentioned by France, to show some solidarity to avoid any kind of confrontation which would only lead to increased tensions between NATO and Moscow. Note the position of Vladimir Putin, as President of Russia, although he understands that he must respond to the military reinforcement of NATO near its borders, it is not a reason to be dragged in the name of an arms race. This military reinforcement would be mainly by troops from the United States, United Kingdom and Germany around Poland and the Baltics as a signal and message to Moscow. Faced with this situation, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu said on June 29 that such action by his Western colleagues could undermine European stability and force Russia to take a position on countermeasures.

However, the NATO summit proves to be an opportunity not only for repositioning this organization but also for the security challenges themselves on both the eastern and southern flanks. To the east by the situation generated by the Crimean crisis and Ukraine in 2014, although stagnant, lies the political framework to be solved. To the south, the scourge fomented by the Daesh, with a violent attack on NATO itself, is witnessed by the recent terrorist attacks in Belgium, Canada, France, the United States and the last one at the Istanbul airport in Turkey.

In this circumstance, NATO needs to reposition itself on the ground to react to the two flanks to guarantee the world and intra-European stability. The answer to Russia is not easy, not for geohistorical reasons, but because of the relations between the two main actors, NATO and Russia, are now either divergent or converging since the expansion of this organization to the collapse of the Warsaw Pact. Perhaps the greatest difficulty for NATO is not so much Russia, since it does not represent a direct threat, but rather to contain and to solve once and for all the threat of the Daesh, this one, uncontrollable and uncertain, for its multidimensionality, it is understood That its strategic theater of terrorist operations is the globe in its entirety, encompassing issues of a political, military and economic nature, as well as reaching and deflagrating innocent victims, exhorting, as never before, a sense of fear among civil society.

In this context, NATO is part of the Washington Treaty and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, notably the transatlantic link. The broad strategic lines include absolute protection and collective defense, crisis management, and cooperative security. To this end, it is important to continue in the name of international peace and security with the continued strengthening of cooperation between the United Nations and this Organization, not only in terms of strategic dialogue but also in terms of practical cooperation in world theater. NATO to United Nations peace operations through rapid intervention on the ground of its troops. To that end, we must certainly include Europe, especially EU, despite living in times of political and economic turmoil, such as the political alliances between the various political and partisan colors, the fragile banking sector in Italy and Germany. Lead to an unprecedented new financial crisis. The EU is, in fact, the NATO partner par excellence, with a focus on combating hybrid threats, improving resilience in overcoming obstacles and psychological resistance to adverse pressures, strengthening defense capabilities, cyber-defense and maritime security (Vershbow, 2016).

Indeed, NATO, with the approach of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), can cover another aspect that is precisely the political-military, economic, environmental and human dimensions of the Euro-Atlantic area. The invaluable contribution of the OSCE in the context of the Ukrainian crisis in the pursuit of the international negotiating effort in the name of a peaceful solution to the conflict and the complementarity of trust is the basis for cooperation and dialogue on these sensitive issues International security and the sovereignty of States. Precisely beyond Europe, it is important to include the African continent through increased cooperation with the African Union, from military training to theaters of operations.

However, we are living today in an era threatened by corruption and bad governance that obviously menaces freedom, human rights, democracy and the rule of law. At the same time, these two vectors of contemporary times weaken the democracy and economic development of a state, a nation, a territory under its flag and border. Here, it is clear, not representing novelty or factual news, as it is advocated by the treaties, it is a matter of the utmost urgency to improve the integrity and implementation of concrete

and legally enforceable measures in the fight against corruption, in addition to the capture of future political leaders to the good name of moral integrity, ethics and responsibility for the projection of sovereignty and defense of national interests. Transparency and democratic scrutiny are fundamental in nature of not only global stability but also the Euro-Atlantic and clear international cooperation in defense and security.

The territory of the EU is facing a fragile situation, reading the political and economic discontent on the part of the nationals of the Member States in relation to the (non-) decisions of Brussels, which has gradually led to a situation of fragmentation, in Extremis and unlikely, to a balkanization of the territory. Thus, for Russia, it is important to reduce the spheres of influence of the United States and the British to precisely project its geopolitical vision into the European orbit. Indeed, NATO has been the foundation and guaranteed Euro-Atlantic stability from its inception to the present, and it is therefore imperative that the United Kingdom remains one of NATO's largest military powers operating within the European framework, in addition to Warsaw Summit in 2014, such as halting the reduction of defense spending by 2% of GDP, including 20% for research, development and new equipment by the end of the year. The year of 2024, proceeding in the same way to the creation of the Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (NATO Summit Guide, 2016, p. 78).

This NATO summit will be a key milestone in its greater adaptation in the name of collective defense and international security so that the Cold War will remain a history, refusing to resurrect it. Adaptation consists, similarly, of assuming a position with one voice, although the political unity of the Atlantic Alliance is marked by marked divergences, from combating terrorism to the issue of migratory waves, in addition to Russian military games. The next meeting is scheduled to take place in Brussels in 2017, with one of the biggest challenges on its agenda: NATO's ability to adapt to the need to project stability beyond its borders in the promotion of values, unity and of solidarity in a world in paradigmatic transition.

Accurately after Margaret Thatcher assumed British power as Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990, she had as a mission the reversal of the decline left by her predecessors, Theresa May, also of the Conservative Party, becomes the second woman to present the same assignment in Brexit, but this time, the task is revealed in a sensitive process and particularly in an international context within a EU centered around not only the existential technocracy - where a strategic void is able to conceive another void under the Auspices of financial estimates destroying a whole - as well as the contradictory features of Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble and Chancellor Angela Dorothea Merkel.

The legacy left by his predecessor, David Cameron, means that the newly-empowered Queen Elizabeth II has a Herculean task in hand to get out of the EU, and on the other hand she is anxious to control the political center of power. For this, Theresa May must convey a message whose content reveals the anxieties, revolt, frustrations with those who have demonstrated in the referendum vote the discontent of the current state of the EU and not only because it is to include the consequences emanated of the very process of globalization that has equally generated growing inequalities at the global level. Indeed, one of the main measures of the new government will clearly be to contain domestic damages. However, the construction and definition of new social and financial policies, including defense and security, will include minimizing collateral damage, especially in the intra-European sphere. The repercussions of funding for migration policies within the territories of each Member State are at stake.

With the United Kingdom leaving, the European reality will be subject to a substantial readjustment where we will certainly have a worsening of economic sectors such as poverty. Indeed, the democratic capacity of each of the European sovereign entities to challenge the current status quo will be placed here in the game of chess. Moreover, the position of the voters against Brexit who will act accordingly in demonstrations of discontent with the possibility of undermining the British government's stability in economic and social matters as geopolitical can not be underestimated. Russian President Vladimir Putin's recent visit to Greece where he met with leader Alexis Tsipras, where he sent out occasional messages to Brussels, particularly on sanctions, NATO, refugee's crisis, and reinforced cooperation in strategic sectors of tourism to energy.

Although the BRICS have revealed and demonstrated a common position, similar to the EU, regarding their opposition to a military intervention to solve the Syrian crisis, claiming and defending the principle of national sovereignty (Romanova, 2015). In this case, both the EU and the BRICS choose a position that safeguards a peaceful non-military solution as part of the Geneva peace process. However, the EU does not intend to clearly set aside any military intervention if necessary.

Nevertheless, the meeting of Vladimir Putin on Mount Athos with the leaders of the Orthodox community has a very strong significance in the name of Eurasia. In this perspective, the negotiating skills between the EU and Theresa May are essential to avoid Putin's feeling that after all, he has a certain affinity for Brexit, given that it is a possible geostrategic advantage and a Russian possibility of uniting his people in Name of a cause, of a project coveted since imperial times. Recall the position of the United Kingdom as a Member State on sanctions against Russia. Putin ends up gaining a foothold in this picture when 17.4 million Britons vote on June 23 to exit.

In this crucial aspect, the US position with Donald Trump as President is pending, as it verifies Moscow's intentions to take advantage of and exploit the current disunity in the European territory as a window of opportunity, taking into consideration that certain political parties or in some cases questioning the permanence of their countries in the EU. The EU does not only consist of an area of freedom of movement or of employment but also declares itself as the key guarantor of the regional security and military architecture of global intervention.

Let us note that the current Hungarian Prime Minister, Viktor Orban, of the center-right party Fidesz - Hungarian Civic Union and of a mitteleuropa state called for the abandonment of liberal democracy to an "illiberal State" like Russia, adding that they preserve the full Right to choose who they want to live with and with whom they do not wish to live in the light of national responsibility for the right to defend their borders and sovereignty. Therefore, Theresa May assumes a sensitive portfolio at a time when the decision factor goes beyond the ideological political ideologies British or Brussels under a space of geopolitical maneuver is not limited to the local sphere but global. The great question will be whether Theresa May will prove herself capable of ensuring her political survival as Margaret Thatcher did in healing the "sick man of Europe."

United States - Asia Pacific Region

In order for the BRICS to become a force for global rebalancing, they are in some ways dependent not only on the United States but also on their foreign policy, which will determine whether or not they can strengthen their international projection and development as a non-formal bloc (Schaefer, M., Poffenbarger, J., 2014, pp. 115-116). Such a position on the part of the BRICS seems, however, far from being achieved either in terms of greater integration or the possibility of overcoming the necessary obstacles, with the aim of functioning as a counterbalance to the United States.

The United States, together with the People's Republic of China, prepare the meeting of the 8th Strategic and Economic Dialogue held 5-7th June 2016 in Beijing. It is a meeting in the context of international relations with implications for the world economy in economic and security matters. This meeting, the last one under the leadership of the Obama administration, shows the importance of promoting the rule of law, strengthening regulatory transparency and encouraging economic reforms. The agenda includes key issues, largely because of President Xi Jinping's official visit to the United States between 22 and 28 September 2015, among others, such as global industrial overcapacity, investment liberalization, and macroeconomic rebalancing. Chinese political authorities have been pushing the United States to lift its restrictions on high-tech exports from China, requiring a fair and transparent review in foreign direct investment matters.

It should be noted that the United States is giving top priority to the East Asia region in the name of the strategic and geopolitical rebalancing of the Asia-Pacific region. Therefore, for the fiscal year 2017, a budget of US \$ 1.5 billion is foreseen for this region, including US \$ 873 million for technical assistance and US \$ 646.1 million for diplomatic commitments. This targeted fiscal effort reflects the recognition

that the pursuit of the US national interest is largely the result of defining events and developments in the Asia-Pacific (Kerry, 2016).

Hence the imperative need to proceed in the name of democracy, but in terms of rebalancing commitment and integration against the backdrop of the economic, commercial and financial sector, not forgetting that these countries represent the world's fastest growing economic areas. Though, in the duty of the United States to respond to a greater relaxation of contemporary security challenges, from terrorism to pirate attacks, in the key areas of passage of goods through the sea, such as Southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean coast, Therefore, to secure new agreements with Australia, Japan, South Korea and the Philippines, maintaining the long-standing alliance with Thailand not to be isolated or dependent on China.

We emphasize that the power of the economy and international markets exert more influence on the daily agenda than on governments. States, as sovereign entities with their flag, territory, and fundamental charter, are unable to protect their peoples from the ongoing economic changes that cause unemployment, poverty, inflation, in the event of conflicts and possibly constitute the causes of future wars. However, the power in force under financial value resides unequivocally in business and consumers. On the one hand, if during the economic era the political entities will see their capacity diminished, on the other hand, religious entities will have the same result as an influence, although both continue to coexist in parallel with economic power. Here it is emphasized that it is not only a failure as it has been pointed out to the leaders or leaderships of the elite of the arch of governance or even to events and crises that have occurred, but rather to the effect of globalization and unparalleled world interconnection. Hence, the Obama administration makes a transition between political agents and the action of economic power in world economic relations.

It is recalled that the negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPPA) on the progressive elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers of other; in establishing high environmental standards to contribute to the repression of wildlife traffic; approach to trafficking in human beings; the establishment of high standards for intellectual property; and the promotion of a free and open world wide web. Indeed, the global economic center of gravity has gradually moved towards the Asia-Pacific and, of course, the US national interest does not allow the hegemonic power to be outside or even absent from that region. This policy of engagement of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region, which is not recent, has contributed to the effective support of a new geo-economic and geopolitical architecture in the US-Asia-Pacific relationship, obviously remaining this EU, which has lost its political and economic position in the name of a sort of economic-ideological drift, believing that it can continue without proceeding to a new form of governance that responds to the transition from the current model to a new era of economy.

Final Notes

In fact, this reality, where we all live, has turned into an era of violence, where the voice of Man rises in a cry of despair, highlighting situations of extreme injustice. Mankind has as its aim and mission the cause of recovery, not a time lost in the style of Marcel Proust, but in recovering and finding what it has lost over time to get out of anguish and discouragement by the search for inexistence of employment or by the economic policies provoked by bad governance by the political elite, although democratically elected, but far from the responsibility of the sense of state and the defense of the national interest demanded.

Thus, this era of violence between order and chaos, requires on the part of those who govern the ultimate consciousness of seeking the hope of the human condition in the name of respect for Human Rights. Ultimately, the difficulty for man lies not only in his adaptation to this contemporary age of paradigms in transition but also in the understanding that rights, for example, European citizens, we have to accept that in this armillary sphere we do unequivocally part of a whole, recalling the message given by Karel Capek in the *War with the Newts* in 1936, shortly before the outbreak of World War II, in the allusion to the destructive capacity of Humanity, given that it holds the decision factor at the push of a button to erase life on the face of this planet, in addition to the destruction of the ongoing eco-system.

Considering Schmitter's (1969) typology in order to evaluate the level of integration regarding BRICS, it is interesting to confirm that they have reached their own limits as to the possibility of a greater degree of integration derived from their heterogeneity, distinct geocultural realities, political and geographical disparity. One of the main challenges of the BRICS is to align its policies with the international framework as well as economic policies to reduce inequalities and intervene in the current international dynamic (Beausang, 2012, p. 182).

In fact, in a scenario, the BRICS bloc can become a global force, on the condition that it assert and combine its differences in the exercise of power, otherwise this objective will be difficult to achieve because the differences are superior to similarities in terms of unity and national interest (Keukeleire, Bruyninckx, 2011, pp. 380-403), it is not simply enough to wish to counterbalance the United States as a real power to set the international agenda.

Finally, it is clear that in spite of the heterogeneity and scope of its own limits, the BRICS have assumed a new position within the framework of global governance in the last decade, becoming a platform where it was possible to analyze specific challenges of Negotiating on common causes such as avoiding future financial crises or even trying to solve environmental issues.

References

1. This study conducted at Research Center in Political Science (UID/CPO/00758/2013), University of Minho and supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology and the Portuguese Ministry of Education and Science through national funds.
2. Barma, Naazneen; Chioza, Giacomo; Ratner, Ely; Weber, Steve – “A world without the West? Empirical Patterns and Theoretical Implications.” *Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 2, 2009, pp. 525-544.
3. Beausang, F. – *Globalization and the BRICs: Why the BRICs Will Not Rule the World For Long*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
4. Brüttsch, Christian; Papa, Mihaela – “Deconstructing the BRICs: bargaining coalition, imagined community or geopolitical fad? In *CRP Working Paper*, n. ° 5, October 2012. Cambridge: Center for Rising Powers, Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Cambridge.
5. Käkönen, Jyrki – “BRICS as a new constellation in International Relations?”, IAMCR 2013, Conference Dublin, 25-29 June 2013.
6. Kerry, John – “S&ED Opening Session Remarks”, in U.S Department of State, 6 June 2016, in < <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/06/258091.htm>> [access 10/6/2016].
7. Keukeleire, S., Bruyninckx, H. – “The European Union, the BRICs, and the Emerging New World Order”, in Hill, C., Smith, M, *International Relations and the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 380-403.
8. Laidi, Zaki – “The BRICS against the West?” In *CERI Strategy Papers*, n. ° 11, Hors Série, November 2011.
9. Loesekrug-Pietri, André – “Why Europe can't afford to ignore China's New Silk Road”. In World Economic Forum, November 2015 in < <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/11/europe-china-new-silk-road/> > [access 29/11/2016].
10. Martins, M.A. – “The BRICS in the Global Order: a New Political Agenda”, in Rewizorski, M (ed.) *The European Union and the BRICS: complex relations in the era of global governance*, London: Springer, 2015, pp. 27-37. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19099-0_3
11. NATO Summit Guide, NATO, in <http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2016_07/20160715_1607-Warsaw-Summit-Guide_2016_ENG.pdf> [access 17/10/2015].
12. O'Neill, J. – *The Bric Road to Growth*, London: London Publishing Partnership, 2013.
13. Schaefer, M., Poffenbarger, J. – *The Formation of the BRICS and its Implication for the United States: Emerging Together*, New York: Palgrave Pivot, 2014.

14. Schmitter, P.C. –"Further Notes on Operationalizing Some Variables Related to Regional Integration", *International Organization*, 23(2), 1969, pp. 327–336. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300031623>
15. *Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement*, Office of the United States Trade Representative, < <https://ustr.gov/tpp/#text> > [access, 15/11/2016],
16. Vershbow, Alexander - "NATO and Russia: Why Transparency is Essential". In NATO, in < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_134436.htm > [access 29/11/2016].
17. Zhang Ju – "BRICS adds new dynamism to international relations", Ministry of Foreign Affairs in < http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/t1170274.shtml> [access 4/07/2016].