

UDC 327.5
DOI: 10.46493/2663-2675.34(4).2024.80

Tatiana Meleshchenko*

PhD in History, Associate Professor

Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University

01601, 9 Pirogova Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1562-2932>

G7 and G20 Clubs' participation in international conflict resolution: Ambitions and realia

Abstract. This study analysed the involvement of the G7 and G20 clubs in the settlement of international conflicts in 2020-2024 to identify discrepancies between the declared intentions and practical achievements of these forums. The study was found significant differences in the approaches and effectiveness of the G7 and G20 in peacekeeping. The G7, due to its more homogeneous composition and strong economic leverage, has demonstrated greater effectiveness in the short term, especially in responding to acute crises such as Russia's aggression against Ukraine. On the other hand, the G20, with its wider representation, has shown the potential to have a more systemic impact on global security in the long term by focusing on economic development as a means of conflict prevention. The analysis of approaches and tools revealed that the G7 relies more on economic sanctions and political pressure, while the G20 focuses on economic cooperation and development. Both clubs face challenges in reaching consensus and achieving ambitious goals, especially in the context of complex geopolitical conflicts. The study revealed a considerable gap between rhetoric and practice, especially in the areas of conflict resolution, counter-terrorism, and climate security. Declarative statements are often not backed up by effective actions, partly due to the lack of enforcement mechanisms and the need to reconcile diverse national interests. The results point to the need to rethink the role and working methods of the G7 and G20 in the context of current global challenges. The study proposed a more flexible and adaptive approach to peacekeeping that would account for both short-term crises and long-term stability factors. The significance of strengthening coordination between the G7 and G20, as well as with other international organisations, to achieve a synergistic effect in conflict resolution was emphasised. Understanding the potential and limitations of these international forums in the field of peacekeeping allows developing more effective strategies of state cooperation to overcome crises

Keywords: global governance; peacekeeping; international security; economic sanctions; diplomacy; geopolitics; multi-lateral cooperation

Introduction

In modern globalised world, international conflicts pose a serious threat to stability and security. The growing interdependence of states and regions underscores the need for effective mechanisms to resolve disputes in the international arena. In this context, the activities of influential international clubs, such as the G7 and G20, which bring together the world's leading economies and have considerable potential to influence global processes, are of particular importance. The problematic of this study lies in the discrepancy between the declared ambitions of the G7 and G20 clubs to resolve international conflicts and their actual achievements in this area. Despite the considerable resources and political influence of the member states, the effectiveness of these organisations in peacekeeping is still a matter of debate. There is a need for an in-depth

analysis of the factors that influence the effectiveness of the G7 and G20's efforts in conflict resolution and an assessment of their real contribution to international stability. The study of the G7 and G20 clubs' involvement in international conflict resolution is of particular relevance considering the growing geopolitical tensions and new challenges to global security. The study of the role of international clubs in resolving global conflicts gains particular relevance in the context of growing geopolitical tensions. Specifically, the activities of the G7 and G20 as influential global policy forums attract considerable attention from the academic community.

In the context of analysing multilateral approaches to addressing global challenges, M. Beisheim *et al.* (2022) examined the role of the G7 in supporting cooperative and

Received: 29.04.2024, Revised: 03.08.2024, Accepted: 26.08.2024

Suggested Citation:

Meleshchenko, T. (2024). G7 and G20 Clubs' participation in international conflict resolution: Ambitions and realia. *Foreign Affairs*, 34(4), 80-92. doi: 10.46493/2663-2675.34(4).2024.80.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

inclusive strategies. The researchers emphasise the need to preserve and strengthen the multilateral approach even in the face of aggression, which is especially relevant in view of current international conflicts. This aspect is complemented by A. Andriane-Moylan & J. Wouters (2023), who study the impact of populist trends on the functioning of the G20 and G7. Researchers emphasise that the informal nature of cooperation within these forums can both facilitate and hinder effective conflict resolution in turbulent times.

Expanding the understanding of the multidimensional role of international clubs, D. Lesage (2022) explores the multiple functions of the G20 in the context of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The researcher focuses on the potential of this forum to coordinate efforts to achieve global goals, which indirectly affects conflict prevention. This perspective is complemented by M. Albert & M. Koch (2024), who conduct a comparative analysis of power in the G7 and G20. Their study covers the mechanisms by which these clubs gain significance in world politics, which is key to understanding their role in conflict resolution. An essential aspect in investigating the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 is the issue of synergy between these forums. In this context, J. Prasad *et al.* (2023) offered valuable insights into building effective cooperation between the G7 and G20 in a multipolar world. The researchers emphasise the need to coordinate the strategies of these clubs to achieve maximum impact on global processes, including conflict resolution.

S. Bery (2022) analysed the historical perspective of the G20 and its transformation into an influential international forum. The researcher traces the evolution of the G20 over a decade, which offers a better understanding of the potential of this club in resolving modern international crises. This study is organically complemented by the findings of C. Lechervy (2020), who examined the phenomenon of club and group diplomacy in the broader context of global diplomacy. The researcher emphasised the unique role of informal forums, such as the G7 and G20, in shaping the international agenda and resolving conflicts. Special attention should be paid to the study by I. Johnstone (2022), which focused on the role of the G7 in the context of global governance and the implementation of the Green New Deal. Although not directly related to conflict resolution, this study demonstrates the potential of the G7 to coordinate global initiatives, which can be applied to peacekeeping.

An analysis of the available literature suggests that researchers are interested in the activities of the G7 and G20 in various aspects of global governance. However, despite a wide range of studies, a comparative analysis of the effectiveness of these clubs in the field of international conflict resolution stays underdeveloped. Most researchers focus on certain aspects of the G7 or G20, without paying sufficient attention to their comparative effectiveness in peacekeeping processes. Specifically, the issues of concrete mechanisms of influence of the G7 and G20 on the course of international conflicts, assessment of the actual results of their peacekeeping initiatives, and analysis of factors limiting the effectiveness of these forums in conflict resolution still lack sufficient coverage. Furthermore, the issue of interaction between the G7 and G20 and other

international organisations and institutions in peacekeeping processes needs to be investigated in greater depth.

The purpose of this study was to identify discrepancies between the declared intentions and practical results of the leading international forums in the field of global conflict resolution. To fulfil this purpose, the following objectives were set: to analyse peacekeeping initiatives and specific measures of the G7 and G20 aimed at resolving international conflicts; to compare the approaches and tools of the G7 and G20 in the field of peacekeeping; to investigate the correlation between the stated ambitions of the clubs and their actual achievements in conflict resolution.

Materials and Methods

The study of the participation of the G7 and G20 clubs in the settlement of international conflicts was based on a comprehensive analysis of a wide range of sources and the use of a series of complementary methods of scientific cognition. The source base was based on official documents of the G7 and G20, including summit communiqués, leaders' declarations, and joint statements. The key documents for 2020-2024 were analysed, including the Communiqué of the 2021 G7 Carbis Bay Summit (Carbis Bay..., 2021) and the 2023 G20 Rome Leaders' Declaration (G20 Rome Leaders', 2023). These materials helped to determine the official positions and declared goals of both forums in resolving international conflicts.

An important source of information was the UN documents, specifically the resolutions of the Security Council and the UN General Assembly. Resolutions on key international conflicts and crises, such as the conflict in Ukraine, the situation in Syria and Libya, were considered. Specifically, the following were analysed: United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 242 (1967); United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1718 (2006); United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2254 (2015); United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2510 (2020); United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1373 (2001); United Nations General Assembly Resolution No. 73/27 (2018); United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2417 (2018) on the link between armed conflict and food security. The analysis of these documents helped to compare the positions of the G7 and G20 with official UN decisions and evaluate their compliance with international law.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 peacekeeping efforts, the study employed statistics and analytical reports of international organisations. Specifically, the data from the Global Terrorism Index (Global terrorism index, 2024) and the reports of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF, 2023) were analysed. These materials provided quantitative indicators for assessing the performance of the G7 and G20 in the fight against terrorism and its financing. The study also used legal documents, namely the United Nations Charter (1945). The analysis of this document helped to evaluate the compliance of the G7 and G20 actions with international legal norms.

To ensure the objectivity of the study, a wide range of academic publications on the activities of the G7 and G20 was analysed. This helped to consider different approaches and assessments of the effectiveness of these forums in resolving international conflicts. The study compared the approaches and tools of the G7 and G20 in the field

of peacekeeping. Specifically, the differences in the use of economic sanctions, political pressure, and economic cooperation as instruments of influence were analysed. This helped to identify the specific features of strategies of each forum and assess their effectiveness in different contexts.

A comparative analysis of the declared goals and real achievements of the G7 and G20 in conflict resolution was performed. For this, the study compared official statements and communiqués with the actual results of the forums' activities in key crisis situations, such as the conflict in Ukraine, the situation in Syria and Libya. To assess the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 in the long term, the dynamics of their impact on global security and stability for 2020–2024 were analysed. This helped to identify trends and patterns in the activities of both forums.

The study also analysed the interaction of the G7 and G20 with other international organisations, including the UN. This helped to assess the role of these forums in the broader system of global governance and their impact on international decision-making. The study analyses the impact of internal factors, such as divergent interests of member states, on the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 in conflict resolution. For this, the study considered concrete cases where internal contradictions prevented the achievement of consensus and implementation of joint initiatives.

The study also included an analysis of the impact of external factors, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change, on the G7 and G20 peacekeeping activities. This helped to assess the ability of the forums to adapt to new global challenges and coordinate international efforts in crisis situations. To ensure a comprehensive approach, the study analysed not only the political but also the economic aspects of the G7 and G20. Specifically, initiatives on economic development as a means of conflict prevention, such as the G20 Compact with Africa (2022), were considered. The use of these methods and materials enabled a comprehensive analysis of the G7 and G20's involvement in international conflict resolution, identifying the gaps between their ambitions and actual achievements, and assessing the effectiveness of these forums in ensuring global stability and security.

Results

Peacekeeping initiatives and activities of the G7 and G20. The Group of Seven (G7), as an influential international forum, demonstrates an active position in resolving global conflicts. An analysis of the G7's activities in 2020–2023 revealed a series of key peacekeeping initiatives that reflect the group's commitment to playing a leading role in ensuring international security and stability. The Ukrainian crisis has become one of the central issues for the G7 in the context of peacekeeping efforts. Since the beginning of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, the G7 has consistently condemned the aggressive actions of the Russian Federation, which violate fundamental principles of international law, specifically Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter (1945), which prohibits the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

The G7 played a key role in coordinating the international response to Russian aggression. At the G7 summit in June 2022, it was decided to increase economic pressure

on Russia and increase military aid to Ukraine (Beisheim *et al.*, 2022; Joint G7 Input..., 2022). This decision was backed up by concrete actions, including the introduction of sanctions against the Russian energy sector. Such actions are fully in line with Article XXI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (1947) (GATT), which allows for the imposition of trade restrictions in case of a threat to international peace and security. Russia's aggression against Ukraine, including the destruction of cities, killings, and kidnappings, as well as threats to use nuclear weapons, poses a direct threat not only to Ukraine but to the overall international security, including the national security of the G7 countries. Thus, the G7 sanctions are a legitimate and justified response to actions that threaten global stability.

Financial support for Ukraine has become an essential aspect of the G7's peacekeeping efforts. At the G7 summit in Puglia on 13–15 June 2024, it was decided to launch a mechanism to help Ukraine, which stipulates the provision of USD 50 billion by the end of 2024 (Jędrysiak *et al.*, 2024). This initiative, known as the Extraordinary Revenue Acceleration Loans for Ukraine (ERA), demonstrates the G7's willingness to use innovative financial instruments to support countries affected by aggression. The Middle East peace process stays one of the G7's priority peacekeeping activities. The group regularly expresses its support for a peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, calling for the resumption of direct negotiations between the parties and the two-state solution (Andrione-Moylan & Wouters, 2023). This position of the G7 is based on United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), which calls for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied during the recent conflict and recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of each state in the area. North Korea's nuclear programme has been the focal point of the G7's attention. The group coordinates efforts to denuclearise the Korean Peninsula, consistently condemning the DPRK's missile tests and calling for the resumption of dialogue (Wolff, 2023). These actions of the G7 are based on the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1718 (2006), which requires the DPRK to cease all nuclear and ballistic missile tests. The Syrian conflict also stays in the focus of the G7's attention. The group supports a political settlement of the Syrian crisis under the auspices of the United Nations, stressing the need for an end to hostilities and free elections in Syria (Albert & Koch, 2024). This position is in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2254 (2015), which calls for a ceasefire and a political settlement of the conflict.

The Libyan crisis also continues to be a subject of the G7's concern. The group advocates for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Libya and supports UN efforts in this regard, calling on all parties to the conflict to engage in dialogue and national reconciliation (Prasad *et al.*, 2023). This position is in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2510 (2020), which reaffirms the commitment to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and national unity of Libya. These initiatives demonstrate that the G7 is actively using its political and economic influence to resolve international conflicts. However, the effectiveness of these efforts is often limited by the lack of mechanisms for direct influence on the

conflicting parties and the need to coordinate with other international organisations, including the UN.

The Group of Twenty (G20), with a wider representation of countries, is also actively involved in resolving international conflicts, although its approach is somewhat different from the G7. An analysis of the G20's activities in 2020-2024 has identified a series of key peacekeeping initiatives that reflect the group's commitment to promoting global stability and security. The fight against terrorism has been a priority for the G20. The group has developed a comprehensive strategy for countering terrorism and extremism, including measures to disrupt the financing of terrorist organisations and intelligence sharing (Dobson, 2024). These actions of the G20 are based on the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1373 (2001), which calls on states to prevent the financing of terrorist acts and to refrain from providing any support to terrorist groups. Cybersecurity has become an important aspect of the G20's peacekeeping activities. The group works to reduce the risks of cyber conflicts between states by developing principles for responsible state behaviour in cyberspace (Shackelford, 2020). This initiative is in line with United Nations General Assembly Resolution No. 73/27 (2018), which calls on states to promote the use of information and communications technologies for peaceful purposes.

The resolution of regional conflicts stays a major area of G20 activity. The group promotes dialogue between conflicting parties in different regions of the world, specifically, supports the peace process in Afghanistan and stabilisation of the situation in Yemen. These efforts are in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2513 (2020) on Afghanistan and United Nations Security

Council Resolution No. 2534 (2020) on Yemen, which call for a peaceful resolution of the conflicts in these countries. Preventing conflicts through economic development is another important aspect of the G20's peacekeeping activities. The Group implements initiatives aimed at overcoming poverty and inequality as factors that trigger conflicts. Specifically, the G20 supports sustainable development programmes in Africa (Rumble *et al.*, 2021). These efforts are in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goals, namely Goal 16 (2023), which aims to promote peaceful and inclusive societies. Humanitarian aid is a vital component of the G20's peacekeeping efforts. The group coordinates humanitarian aid in conflict and post-conflict areas, working to improve access to humanitarian aid and protect civilians (Andrione-Moylan & Wouters, 2023). These actions are in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2417 (2018), which highlights the link between armed conflict and food insecurity.

A look at the G20's peacekeeping initiatives shows that the group is focusing on a wider range of issues related to global security and stability. However, as in the case of the G7, the effectiveness of these initiatives is often limited by the difficulty of reaching consensus among the participating countries and the need to coordinate with other international organisations. For a more visual representation of the key differences and similarities in the G7 and G20 approaches to peacekeeping, the comparative Table 1 is offered below. It systematises the key aspects of the peacekeeping initiatives of both groups, including focus, leverage, consensus-building, global representation, effectiveness in different time perspectives, support for UN peacekeeping operations, attention to economic development and climate security.

Table 1. Comparative characteristics of G7 and G20 peacekeeping initiatives

Aspect	G7	G20
Focus of attention	Specific political conflicts (Ukrainian crisis, Syrian conflict, situation in Libya)	Global security challenges (terrorism, cyber security, economic instability)
Mechanisms of influence	Economic sanctions, political pressure	Economic cooperation, development assistance
Reaching consensus	Faster, more consistent decisions	Slower, more general solutions
Global representation	Limited (developed democracies)	Broad (different political systems and levels of development)
Efficiency in the short term	High	Average
Potential for long-term impact	Average	High
Support for UN peacekeeping operations	Active	Limited
Focus on economic development	Average	High
Attention to the climate aspects of security	High	High
Gender equality and youth engagement	Significant attention	Significant attention
Preventive diplomacy	Active	Active

Source: created by the author of this study

Notably, the effectiveness of the peacekeeping efforts of both groups is often limited by the lack of enforcement mechanisms for their decisions. Unlike the UN Security Council, which can make binding decisions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter (1945), the G7 and G20 decisions are advisory in nature. This means that their effectiveness largely depends on the political will of the

participating countries and their ability to influence other international actors.

In summary, the G7 and G20 play significant but different roles in global peacekeeping efforts. The G7, due to its more homogeneous composition and strong economic leverage, is often more effective in the short term and in responding to acute crises. The G20, on the other hand, can

have a more systemic impact on global security in the long term, thanks to its broader representation and focus on economic development as a means of conflict prevention.

Comparative analysis of the G7 and G20 approaches and tools in the field of peacekeeping. The Group of Seven, as an influential international forum that brings together the world's leading democracies, uses a wide range of approaches and tools in the field of peacekeeping. An analysis of the G7's activities in 2020-2024 reveals a series of key strategies and mechanisms used by the group to resolve international conflicts and ensure global stability. Economic sanctions are still one of the G7's most powerful tools in peacekeeping (Drezner, 2024). The application of sanctions is based on Article 41 of the UN Charter, which makes provision for the use of measures not involving the use of armed force to maintain international peace and security (United Nations Charter, 1945). For instance, in response to Russia's aggression against Ukraine, the G7 imposed wide-ranging sanctions on the Russian energy sector, financial institutions, and individuals (Abely, 2023).

Diplomatic pressure is another valuable tool of the G7 in peacekeeping efforts. The group actively uses its political influence to put pressure on parties to conflicts through public statements, diplomatic isolation, or exclusion from international forums. Diplomatic pressure is another valuable tool of the G7 in peacekeeping efforts. For example, in the context of the conflict in Sudan, the G7 in its statement of 18 April 2023 strongly condemned the violence and called for an immediate cessation of hostilities (G7 Joint Statement..., 2023). The group also stressed the need to protect civilians and ensure unimpeded access for humanitarian aid, in line with the principles of international humanitarian law and United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 2573 (2021) on the protection of civilians in armed conflict. This example demonstrates how the G7 uses its diplomatic influence to promote peaceful conflict resolution and protect the rights of civilians. The G7 also actively supports UN peacekeeping missions by providing funding and logistical support. Although the group does not conduct its own peacekeeping operations, it plays a significant role in ensuring the effectiveness of UN missions. For instance, in the document (Joint G7 Input..., 2022), the Group calls for regular reviews of peacekeeping strategies and strengthening their effectiveness.

Mediation is another valuable tool of the G7 in peacekeeping. The group often mediates in negotiations between conflicting parties, using its authority to reach compromises. This is in line with Article 33 of the UN Charter, which calls upon the parties to any dispute to seek a solution by negotiation, survey, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional bodies or agreements, or other peaceful means of their own choosing (United Nations Charter, 1945).

Concrete examples of the G7's mediation efforts on various conflicts included a range of activities. France and Germany, as members of the G7, played a key role in creating and supporting the Normandy format for resolving the conflict in the east of Ukraine. Launched in 2014, this format brought together representatives from Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany to find a peaceful solution to the conflict (Marangé & Stewart, 2021). In 2019, during the French presidency of the G7, the group actively

supported the peace process in Libya, including by organising an international conference on Libya in Palermo and supporting the UN plan for a national conference (Pack, 2022).

The Group of Twenty (G20), which brings together both developed and developing countries, has a slightly distinct set of approaches and tools to resolve conflicts and ensure global stability. An analysis of the G20's activities in 2020-2024 reveals a series of specific strategies and mechanisms employed by the group in its peacekeeping activities. Economic cooperation is one of the key instruments of the G20 in peacekeeping. The Group focuses on developing economic cooperation as a means of preventing conflict and ensuring stability. The G20 promotes initiatives to overcome poverty and inequality (Fighting inequalities, poverty..., 2024), which is in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goals, specifically Goal 1 (ending poverty) and Goal 10 (reducing inequality) (The 17 Goals..., n.d.). For example, the G20's initiative to support industrialisation in Africa aims to create jobs and economic growth, which can help reduce the risk of conflict. The fight against terrorism is another prominent area of the G20's global security efforts. The group has developed a comprehensive strategy for countering terrorism and extremism, including measures to stop the financing of terrorist organisations and intelligence sharing (Kirton & Larionova, 2022).

The G20 pays considerable attention to global governance as an essential tool for preventing conflicts in the international arena. This group, which brings together the world's leading economies, recognises that effective global governance can play a key role in maintaining stability and peace (Bradford, 2022). The G20 recognises the need to modernise and adapt existing international financial structures to the current realities of the global economy. This includes reviewing the governance mechanisms of organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. The purpose of these reforms is to ensure a more equitable representation of developing countries and to make these institutions more effective in addressing global economic challenges. Such changes could help reduce economic inequalities between countries, which are often a source of international tension.

The G20 supports efforts to strengthen the position of the United Nations as a key player in maintaining international peace and security. This could include supporting reforms in the UN structure, specifically the Security Council, to make it more effective and representative. Strengthening the role of the UN can contribute to a more effective resolution of international conflicts and crises through multilateral diplomacy. These G20 initiatives are directly in line with the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 16.6. This goal is aimed at creating effective, accountable, and transparent institutions at all levels – from local to global (The 17 GOALS..., n.d.). The improvement of the global governance system promoted by the G20 is fully consistent with this objective.

The work on reforming international financial institutions and strengthening the role of the UN is aimed at creating a more effective system of global governance. This system should be able to better respond to current challenges, be more accountable to the international community, and operate with greater transparency. Thus, the G20

seeks to create an international system that not only effectively prevents conflicts but also contributes to a more just and stable world order. This is the G20's long-term vision for global governance, which aims to create the conditions for sustainable peace and development around the world.

A comparative analysis of the G7 and G20 approaches and tools in peacekeeping reveals both commonalities and significant differences that affect the effectiveness of their efforts to resolve conflicts and ensure global stability. The focus and scope of activities is one of the key differences between the G7 and the G20. The G7, as a more homogeneous group of developed democracies, usually focuses on concrete political conflicts and crises, such as the situation in Ukraine or Syria. This enables the G7 to develop more targeted and concrete intervention strategies. The G20, on the other hand, with its more diverse membership, tends to focus on broader global challenges such as economic instability, climate change, or terrorism. This leads to a more comprehensive, but often less focused, approach to peacekeeping.

The mechanisms of influence also differ substantially between the two groups. The G7 relies more on economic sanctions and political pressure as instruments of influence. This can be effective in the short term, but it can also lead to an escalation of tensions. The G20, on the other hand, focuses more on economic cooperation and development as a means of conflict prevention. This approach may be less effective in the short term, but potentially has a greater impact on long-term stability.

Speed of response and consensus building is another important aspect of the comparison. The G7, with fewer members and more homogeneous political systems, tends to reach consensus faster and can respond more quickly to crises. The G20, with its more diverse membership,

often finds it difficult to develop a unified position, which can lead to delays in responding to conflicts. Legitimacy and global representation is an area where the G20 has an advantage. The broader representation of the G20, which includes both developed and developing countries, gives its decisions greater global legitimacy. This is especially significant when addressing global issues such as climate change or economic inequality. The G7, while wielding considerable economic and political influence, is often criticised for its lack of representation. Performance over different time horizons also differs between the two groups. The G7 has often been more effective in the short term, especially in responding to acute crises. For instance, the G7's rapid and coordinated response to Russia's aggression against Ukraine in 2022 demonstrated the group's ability to promptly mobilise considerable resources and political will. The G20, on the other hand, can have a more systemic impact on global security in the long term due to its focus on economic development and global governance. Supporting UN peacekeeping operations is an area where the G7 is more active. The G7 regularly calls for more effective UN peacekeeping missions and provides significant financial and logistical support. The G20, while recognising the importance of UN peacekeeping operations, is less actively involved in their direct support. The G20's focus on economic development as a means of conflict prevention is a strong point. The Group pays considerable attention to economic growth, financial stability, and tackling inequality as key factors in ensuring peace. The G7 also recognises the significance of economic development, but often focuses more on the political aspects of conflicts. A comparative assessment of the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 approaches to peacekeeping is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparative assessment of the effectiveness of G7 and G20 approaches to peacekeeping

Criterion	G7	G20
Focus of activity	Concrete political conflicts	Global security challenges
Key mechanisms of influence	Economic sanctions, political pressure	Economic cooperation, development
Speed of response to crises	High	Average
Reaching consensus	Faster	Slower
Legitimacy at the global level	Average	High
Efficiency in the short term	High	Average
Potential for long-term impact	Average	High
Support for UN peacekeeping operations	Active	Limited
Focus on economic development	Average	High
Approach to climate change	Active	Active, with a focus on a just transition
Gender equality and youth engagement	Concrete initiatives	General declarations
Preventive diplomacy	Active	Active, but less responsive
Interaction with the UN	Tight	Moderate

Source: created by the author of this study

Both groups pay considerable attention to climate change and its impact on international security. This is in line with the growing recognition of climate change as a factor that can trigger or exacerbate conflicts. However, the groups' approaches to addressing this issue may differ,

with the G20 often focusing more on just transition and support for developing countries. Table 2 demonstrates the key differences and similarities in the G7 and G20 approaches to peacekeeping, highlighting their unique roles and potential to contribute to global stability and security.

Correlation between the clubs' stated ambitions and their real achievements. The G7 and G20, as influential international forums, regularly declare ambitious goals for conflict resolution and global stability. An analysis of the official statements and communiqués of these groups for 2020-2024 reveals a series of key areas of focus. The G7, as a more homogeneous group of developed democracies, often focuses on specific political conflicts and crises. In its communiqué following the Carbis Bay Summit in 2021, the G7 declared its commitment to "open societies, shared values, and a rules-based international order" (Carbis Bay..., 2021). The group also reaffirmed its commitment to "defend democracy and freedoms around the world" and "oppose authoritarianism in all its forms".

The G7, as an influential international forum, has identified a range of key peacekeeping goals that reflect the most pressing global challenges to security and stability. Central to these goals is the settlement of the conflict in Ukraine and countering Russian aggression, which has become a critical issue for European and global security. In parallel, the G7 pays considerable attention to stabilising the situation in the Middle East, particularly in Syria and Yemen, recognising that the ongoing conflicts in the region have far-reaching implications for global security, including migration crises and the spread of terrorism. In this context, support for the peace process in Afghanistan is considered an essential element of stabilising the wider Central and South Asian region. Facilitating the denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula stays a key priority to prevent the escalation of nuclear threats in the Asia-Pacific region. Finally, the fight against international terrorism and extremism cuts across all these objectives, as these phenomena are often fuelled and exacerbated by existing conflicts. Thus, these interrelated goals form a comprehensive approach to global security by the G7, which aims to address both concrete regional conflicts and broader transnational threats.

The G20, with its more diverse membership, tends to formulate its goals in broader terms, focusing on global security challenges. In the G20 Rome Leaders' Declaration of 2023, the group reaffirmed its commitment to "multilateralism and international cooperation" as key tools for addressing global challenges (G20 Rome Leaders'..., 2023). The key declared goals of the G20 in the field of peacekeeping include strengthening the global economic governance system to prevent conflicts; combating terrorism and its financing; promoting sustainable development as a means of preventing conflicts; addressing climate change and its impact on security; strengthening cybersecurity and preventing cyber conflicts. An analysis of the G20's activities reveals a substantial dichotomy between the declared principles and the actual behaviour of some of its members. Despite the group's official commitment to the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter (1945), namely Articles 2(3) and 2(4), which relate to the peaceful settlement of disputes and refraining from the threat or use of force, some G20 member states demonstrate a clear violation of these norms. For instance, Russia's aggression against Ukraine, which began in 2014 and escalated in 2022 (Dib, 2022), is a direct violation of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter. Nevertheless,

the reaction of other G20 members to these actions is still ambiguous and often limited to rhetorical statements.

Similarly, China's actions in the South China Sea, which include the militarisation of disputed territories, raise concerns about adherence to the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes (Aziz & Basir, 2021). This situation reflects a broader problem in international relations, where geopolitical interests often prevail over the principles of international law. International relations researchers, such as J.J. Mearsheimer & S. Rosato (2023), argue that such behaviour is a manifestation of a realist approach to international politics, where states seek to maximise their power and influence. However, this situation poses considerable challenges to the legitimacy and effectiveness of the G20 as a global forum. The inability of the G20 to respond effectively to violations of international law by its members undermines the group's credibility and ability to address global issues.

Thus, there is a considerable gap between rhetoric and practice within the G20 in terms of compliance with the principles of international law. This phenomenon requires further critical analysis and rethinking of accountability mechanisms within international forums. Assessing the real achievements of the G7 and G20 in conflict resolution is an arduous task, as their impact is often indirect and long-term. Nevertheless, an analysis of concrete situations and initiatives for 2020-2024 reveals certain trends and results. The G7 has demonstrated significant effectiveness in rallying international support for Ukraine in the wake of Russia's aggression. The group coordinated the introduction of wide-ranging sanctions against Russia and the provision of military and economic aid to Ukraine. These actions are in line with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter (1945), which recognises the inherent right to individual or collective self-defence. However, despite these efforts, the conflict in Ukraine continues, highlighting the limitations of the G7's influence on complex geopolitical situations. This also raises the question of the effectiveness of sanctions as a foreign policy tool and their compliance with international law.

In the fight against terrorism, the G7 and G20 have made some progress. Specifically, the G20 initiative to combat the financing of terrorism has led to increased international cooperation in this area. According to the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF), progress was made in 2022 in identifying and blocking financial flows linked to terrorist activities (FATF, 2023). The G20 has also had some success in promoting economic development as a means of conflict prevention. The G20 Compact with Africa initiative, launched in 2017, continues to promote private investment and economic growth in African countries (G20 Compact with..., 2022).

However, the effectiveness of these economic initiatives in preventing conflicts stays debatable. Some critics point out that economic growth alone does not guarantee political stability and may even exacerbate inequality, which is a potential source of conflict (Cervi, 2023). In the area of climate security, both groups have made some progress. The G7 and G20 reaffirmed their commitment to the Paris Agreement and pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, real actions often fall behind ambitious statements. According to the Climate Action

Tracker, none of the G20 countries has a climate policy that fully meets the goals of the Paris Agreement as of 2023 (Visualised: How all..., 2023).

An analysis of the declared goals and actual achievements of the G7 and G20 reveals a series of substantial discrepancies between ambitions and results. The G7 often declares ambitious goals for resolving specific conflicts, but the actual results are often limited. For example, despite the G7's consistent support for the peace process in Syria, the conflict has been ongoing for more than a decade. This underscores the limitations of the G7's influence in complex geopolitical situations, especially when the interests of other major powers, such as Russia or China, contradict the G7's position. The G20 pays considerable attention to economic development as a means of preventing conflict, but the relationship between economic growth and political stability stays complex and ambiguous. Economic growth can both reduce and exacerbate conflict risks depending on the context (Fällgren, 2024). This points to the need for a more nuanced approach to the use of economic instruments in peacekeeping.

Both groups declare ambitious goals in the fight against terrorism, but the effectiveness of their efforts is still mixed. Although progress has been made in combating terrorist financing, the global threat of terrorism stays high. According to the Global Terrorism Index (2024), in 2024, there was an increase in terrorist activity in some regions of the world. The G7 and G20 regularly reaffirm their commitment to tackling climate change, but real action often falls short of ambitious statements. This poses risks to global security, as climate change can exacerbate

existing conflicts and create new sources of tension. The G20 often declares the need to reform international financial institutions and global governance, but progress in this area is still slow. This is partly due to the difference in interests between developed and developing countries within the G20. The G7 regularly emphasises its commitment to democracy and human rights, but the effectiveness of these efforts is often limited by geopolitical realities. Critics point to selective application of these principles and potential violations of the sovereignty of other states (Zürn, 2024).

The discrepancy between the ambitions and results of the G7 and G20 in peacekeeping is the result of a set of interrelated factors. The informal status of these forums is fundamental, limiting their legal powers and making their effectiveness dependent on the political will of member states. This structural feature is exacerbated by the geopolitical complexity of modern conflicts, which are often multilateral and intertwined with global economic and security challenges. Internal divisions between member countries, particularly evident in the more diverse G20, make it even more difficult to reach consensus and achieve ambitious goals. The limited effectiveness of available instruments of influence, such as sanctions and economic incentives, in resolving complex political conflicts further reduces the practical impact of these forums. The long-term nature of many of the G7 and G20 goals, especially in the areas of economic development and climate security, complicates the evaluation of their effectiveness in the short term, creating the appearance of a gap between ambition and results (Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of the declared goals and real achievements of the G7 and G20 in peacekeeping (2020-2024)

Aspect	Declared goals	Real achievements	Discrepancies
Conflict resolution in Ukraine	G7: Ending Russian aggression, restoring Ukraine's territorial integrity	Considerable financial and military aid for Ukraine, sanctions against Russia, but the conflict continues	Limited effectiveness of sanctions, ongoing conflict
Fighting terrorism	G7 and G20: Strengthening international cooperation, combating the financing of terrorism	Coordination in the fight against terrorist financing improved, but terrorist threat is still high	Limited effectiveness in preventing terrorist acts
Economic development as a means of conflict prevention	G20: Promoting economic growth in vulnerable regions	The Compact with Africa initiative has boosted investment, but the link between economic growth and stability is still complex	The ambiguous impact of economic growth on conflict prevention
Climate security	G7 and G20: Implementing the Paris Agreement, reducing emissions	Reaffirmation of commitments, but not enough concrete actions to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement	Considerable gap between ambition and real action
Global governance reform	G20: Reforming international financial institutions	Slow progress in reforming the IMF and World Bank	Considerable gap between ambition and real change
Defending democracy and human rights	G7: Promoting democratic values and protecting human rights	Public statements and some sanctions against violators, but limited impact on authoritarian regimes	Considerable gap between rhetoric and real impact
Cybersecurity	G20: Strengthening international cooperation on cybersecurity	Adoption of joint declarations but limited progress in creating global cybersecurity norms	Gap between ambition and concrete results

Source: created by the author of this study.

Thus, interrelated factors form a complex system of constraints that determine the real capabilities of the G7 and G20 in global governance and peacekeeping, leading to noticeable discrepancies between the declared goals and

the results achieved. These proposals, admittedly, require further discussion and analysis, but they could be a starting point for improving the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 in peacekeeping. Table 3 above compares the declared

goals and real achievements of the G7 and G20 in peacekeeping for 2020-2024. This table clearly demonstrates the discrepancy between the ambitious peacekeeping goals of the G7 and G20 and their actual achievements. It highlights the complexity of global challenges and the limited influence of international forums in the modern world.

Discussion

The findings of a study of the G7 and G20's activities in international conflict resolution in 2020-2024 revealed substantial discrepancies between the ambitious declarations of these forums and their real achievements. These differences can be traced to several key aspects: the effectiveness of economic sanctions and political pressure, the role of economic development in conflict prevention, and the ability to influence global security challenges. The effectiveness of conventional mechanisms of international cooperation, including economic sanctions, has proven to be limited, especially in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. This observation correlates with the conclusions of M. Feist (2023), who argued that conventional approaches are becoming less effective in the modern multipolar world. M. Feist (2023) suggests an alternative in the form of plurilateral initiatives that could provide more flexibility in addressing complex international issues. This proposal deserves attention, as it can overcome the identified limitations of the G7. However, M. Feist's (2023) focus on climate policy limits the direct transferability of his findings to all aspects of peacekeeping. Furthermore, the plurilateral approach, despite its potential flexibility, may face problems of legitimacy and coordination, especially in situations requiring a rapid and coordinated response to acute international crises.

The transformation of the format of international diplomacy as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic has substantially affected the effectiveness of the G7 and G20. T. Naylor (2020) addressed the "dilution" of summit diplomacy through the virtualisation of meetings. This observation resonates with the identified challenges in implementing the G7 and G20 peacekeeping initiatives. The loss of the informal aspects of diplomacy, which often play a key role in reaching compromises, partly explains the discrepancy between ambitious declarations and limited practical results.

At the same time, the study also revealed certain positive aspects of virtualisation that were not considered by T. Naylor (2020). Specifically, the possibility of more frequent virtual consultations has allowed the G7 and G20 to respond more quickly to some international crises, especially in the context of coordinating economic responses to the pandemic. Notably, the problems with the G7 and G20 are not limited to the format of the meetings. Even after the possibility of face-to-face meetings was restored, the effectiveness of these forums in resolving international conflicts was still limited. This points to deeper structural problems in the functioning of these international institutions.

The role of informal institutions in global governance and peacekeeping, according to A.F. Cooper *et al.* (2022), provides a significant perspective for understanding the activities of the G7 and G20. Their conclusions regarding the significance of informal mechanisms and

organisational processes correlate with the observations on the methods of influence of the G7 and G20 on international conflicts. Admittedly, these forums often rely on informal agreements and personal contacts between leaders to achieve their goals. A.F. Cooper *et al.* (2022) argue that informal institutions can be more adaptive and effective in addressing complex global issues. This is partly confirmed by the ability of the G7 and G20 to respond quickly to international crises and coordinate actions in a changing geopolitical landscape. However, the study also revealed substantial limitations of this informal approach, especially in the context of complex geopolitical conflicts, such as the situation in Ukraine.

The lack of formal enforcement mechanisms and binding decisions often limits the practical impact of the G7 and G20 on conflict resolution. This contrasts with the more optimistic assessment of the potential of informal institutions presented by A.F. Cooper *et al.* (2022). Furthermore, the lack of clear decision-making procedures and accountability mechanisms may lead to a decrease in the legitimacy of these forums in the eyes of the international community, especially non-member states.

Economic development as a tool for conflict prevention plays a considerable role in the G20's activities. The study by A.G. Shivamurthy (2023) on the G20's response to the Sri Lankan debt crisis provides an important case study for analysis. The findings of A.G. Shivamurthy (2023) on the limited effectiveness of the G20 in addressing this crisis resonate with the observations on the gap between the group's ambitions and real achievements. The researcher points out the difficulties in coordinating actions between G20 members and the difficulties in implementing concrete aid measures. These observations are supported by broader findings on the G20's economic development and conflict prevention activities. At the same time, the findings provide a broader context, considering economic development as a tool for conflict prevention on a global scale.

While economic development can be a significant factor in stability, its effectiveness as a conflict prevention tool depends on many other factors, including political and social conditions in concrete countries and regions. This underscores the need for a comprehensive approach to peacekeeping that accommodates not only economic but also political, social, and cultural aspects. The study also revealed some positive aspects of the G20's economic development activities that are not fully covered in the study by A.G. Shivamurthy (2023). Specifically, the G20's initiatives to promote investment and economic growth in developing countries can have a long-term positive impact on stability and conflict prevention, even if their effectiveness in addressing acute crises is limited.

Analysing the role of the UN in global governance, S. Werthes (2022) emphasises the difficulty of adapting established international institutions to a rapidly changing global context. These findings resonate with the difficulties this study identified in the G7 and G20. However, this study reveals certain advantages of informal forums such as the G7 and G20 that are not fully reflected in the analysis of S. Werthes (2022). Specifically, the findings suggest that these platforms are more flexible than formal international organisations, allowing them to adapt more quickly

to changing geopolitical realities. An essential aspect that requires further investigation is the interaction between formal international organisations and informal forums in global governance. The findings also suggest the potential for complementarity of different formats of international cooperation in addressing global challenges.

The central theme of the study by J. Kolsdorf & U. Müller (2020) was the rethinking of the foundations of international cooperation. The researchers emphasise the need to adapt existing cooperation mechanisms to new global realities. This perspective correlates with the need for the G7 and G20 to find new formats of interaction to improve their effectiveness, as identified in the present study. However, in contrast to the theoretical concepts of researchers, the findings of the present study offer more concrete data on the practical challenges faced by international forums in the transformation. Specifically, it was found that the inertia of established practices and differences in the interests of member states often hinder the introduction of innovative approaches in the activities of the G7 and G20. At the same time, this study confirms the researchers' thesis about the significance of a cross-sectoral approach to solving global problems. The results point to the growing role of non-state actors, such as business and civil society, in shaping the G7 and G20 agendas, which opens new opportunities for a more comprehensive approach to international cooperation.

The consideration of scenarios for the development of global energy governance proposed by S.Y. Shin (2020) offers a valuable perspective for assessing the G20's potential to address global energy challenges. The scientist argues that the G20 is uniquely positioned to coordinate global energy policy due to its composition, which includes both major energy producers and consumers. This study partially confirms this thesis, revealing the growing role of energy issues on the G20 agenda. However, contrary to optimistic forecasts, the findings suggest considerable difficulties in reaching consensus among G20 members on key aspects of energy policy, especially in the context of the transition to a low-carbon economy. Specifically, it was found that differences in economic interests and levels of technological development among G20 member states often lead to compromise solutions that do not meet ambitious climate policy goals. This underscores the need to develop more effective mechanisms for aligning national interests with global sustainable development goals within the G20.

A. Kloke-Lesch (2021) covered new perspectives for strengthening the role of international cooperation in achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The researcher emphasised the need to rethink the functions of international cooperation in the context of global challenges of the 21st century. The findings of this study resonate with the researcher's conclusions on the potential of international forums such as the G7 and G20 to mobilise resources and coordinate efforts to achieve ambitious sustainable development goals. However, contrary to the researcher's optimistic assessments, the present study revealed a significant gap between the declarative commitments of these forums and their practical implementation. Specifically, the results point to the insufficient integration of the Sustainable Development Goals into concrete political

and economic decisions of the G7 and G20. This highlights the need to develop more effective mechanisms for implementing global goals at the national and regional levels.

The concept of a "climate club" proposed by N. Stern & H.P. Lankes (2022) represents an innovative approach to international cooperation in the field of climate policy. The researchers argue that the creation of such a club could overcome the limitations of existing global climate agreements and accelerate progress in the fight against climate change. The present study revealed a growing interest in such initiatives among the G7 and G20 countries, which is consistent with the cited findings. However, in contrast to the researchers' optimistic forecasts, the findings of the present study suggest the presence considerable political and economic challenges in implementing the climate club concept. Specifically, it was found that differences in the levels of economic development and dependence on fossil fuels among the G20 countries create substantial obstacles to the development of a common position on ambitious climate goals. This highlights the need to develop flexible participation and incentive mechanisms that accommodate the diversity of national contexts.

T. Naylor (2024) covered significant aspects of the symbolic component of international summits. The researcher argues that the processes of production and demonstration of status play a key role in shaping the dynamics of international relations. The findings confirm the researcher's observations on the significance of informal and symbolic aspects of diplomacy within the G7 and G20. It was found that status considerations often influence decision-making and coalition building within these forums.

However, in contrast to the focus of T. Naylor (2024) on symbolic aspects, this study provided a more critical assessment of the practical results of these processes in the context of international conflict resolution. The findings suggest that excessive attention to status issues can distract from addressing concrete global challenges and reduce the effectiveness of international cooperation. This underscores the need to find a balance between symbolic and practical aspects of international diplomacy to increase the effectiveness of the G7 and G20 in addressing global challenges.

Conclusions

A study of the G7 and G20 clubs' involvement in international conflict resolution has revealed substantial discrepancies between the declared intentions of these forums and their practical achievements. An analysis of peace-keeping initiatives and concrete activities of the G7 and G20 showed that both clubs are actively involved in conflict resolution, but their approaches and effectiveness differ substantially. The G7, due to its more homogeneous composition and strong economic leverage, is more effective in the short term, especially when responding to acute crises. This was manifested, specifically, in the rapid and coordinated response to Russia's aggression against Ukraine. On the other hand, the G20, with its wider representation, can have a more systemic impact on global security in the long term by focusing on economic development as a means of conflict prevention. A comparative analysis of approaches and tools of the G7 and the G20 revealed that the G7 relies more on economic sanctions

and political pressure, while the G20 focuses on economic cooperation and development. This difference in approach reflects both the composition of participants and the specific features of the mandates of these forums. However, both clubs face challenges in reaching consensus and achieving ambitious goals, especially in the context of complex geopolitical conflicts.

The study of the correlation between the clubs' stated ambitions and their real achievements revealed a considerable gap between rhetoric and practice. This is particularly evident in the areas of conflict resolution, counter-terrorism, and climate security. Declarative statements are often not backed up by effective actions, partly due to the lack of enforcement mechanisms and the need to reconcile diverse national interests. The findings of the study point to the need to rethink the role and working methods of the G7 and G20 in the context of current global challenges. A more flexible and adaptive approach to peacekeeping is required, which would account for both short-term crises

and long-term stability factors. It is vital to strengthen the coordination between the G7 and G20, as well as with other international organisations, to achieve a synergistic effect in conflict resolution.

The limitation of this study is the focus on the period of 2020-2024, which prevents a full assessment of long-term trends in the activities of the G7 and G20. Promising areas for further research include analysing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the effectiveness of international forums, investigating the role of non-state actors in peacekeeping processes within the G7 and G20, and exploring the potential of new formats of international cooperation in conflict resolution.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Abely, C. (2023). *The Russia sanctions: The economic response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Albert, M., & Koch, M. (2024). *Comparing power in the G7 and the G20: Making yourself "matter" in world politics*. *European Review of International Studies*, 11(1), 67-94.
- [3] Andriane-Moylan, A., & Wouters, J. (2023). Populists at the G20 and G7: Informal cooperation in turbulent times. In M. Egan, K. Raube, J. Wouters & J. Chaisse (Eds.), *Contestation and polarization in global governance* (pp. 124-142). London: Edward Elgar Publishing. doi: 10.4337/9781800887268.00013.
- [4] Aziz, S.N.A., & Basir, S.M. (2022). South China Sea. *The Journal of Territorial and Maritime Studies*, 9(2), 65-82. doi: 10.2307/TMS.9.265.
- [5] Beisheim, M., Berger, A., Brozus, L., Klope-Lesch, A., Scheler, R., & Weinlich, S. (2022). The G7 and multilateralism in times of aggression: Maintaining and strengthening cooperative and inclusive approaches for the global common good. *Policy Brief, T7 task force international cooperation for the global common good*. Retrieved from https://www.idos-research.de/uploads/media/Cooperation_The_G7_and_Multilateralism_Beisheim_et_al_final20220321_002.pdf.
- [6] Bery, S. (2022). G20 turns ten: What's past is prologue. *Bruegel*. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/resrep28507.pdf>.
- [7] Bradford, C.I. (2022). *Governance transition from G7 to G20 and to Asia and the Global South: Coping with US-China relations in a changing global summitry context*. In *Strengthening global governance by strengthening the G20. Global summitry special issue e-Journal* (pp. 15-19).
- [8] Carbis Bay G7 summit communiqué. (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/06/13/carbis-bay-g7-summit-communique/>.
- [9] Cervi, A. (2023). Inequalities and conflict: A literature review. In S.S. Jodhka & B. Rehbein (Eds.), *Global handbook of inequality*. Cham: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-97417-6_124-1.
- [10] Cooper, A.F., Parlar Dal, E., & Cannon, B. (2022). The cascading dynamics of informal institutions: Organizational processes and governance implications. *International Politics*. doi: 10.1057/s41311-022-00399-4.
- [11] Dib, M. (2022). *Military aggression against Ukraine: Russia's rhetoric and the international legal framework*. *EU Policy Review*, 2, 98-109.
- [12] Dobson, H. (2024). Security and terrorism. In *Unpacking the G20* (pp. 103-125). London: Edward Elgar Publishing. doi: 10.4337/9781786433558.00011.
- [13] Drezner, D.W. (2024). Global economic sanctions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 27, 9-24. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-041322-032240.
- [14] Fällgren, J. (2024). *Investing for peace or for war?* (Bachelor's thesis, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Finland).
- [15] FATF. (2023). *FATF annual report 2022-2023*. Retrieved from <https://www.fatf-gafi.org/content/dam/fatf-gafi/publications/FATF-Annual-Report-2022-2023.pdf.coredownload.pdf>.
- [16] Feist, M. (2023). New alliances: Plurilateral initiatives as a mode of cooperation in international climate politics. *SWP Research Paper*, 6. doi: 10.18449/2023RP06.
- [17] Fighting inequalities, poverty, and hunger. (2024). Retrieved from <https://www.t20brasil.org/en/tf/1/tf01-fighting-inequalities-poverty-and-hunger>.
- [18] G20 Compact with Africa. (2022, January). Retrieved from <https://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/Content/EN/Standardartikel/Topics/world/G7-G20/2017-03-30-g20-compact-with-africa.html>.
- [19] G20 Rome Leaders' Declaration. (2023, October). Retrieved from https://www.governo.it/sites/governo.it/files/G20ROMELEADERSDECLARATION_0.pdf.

- [20] G7 Joint Statement Strongly Condemns the Fighting in Sudan. (2023, April). Retrieved from <https://www.voanews.com/a/g7-joint-statement-strongly-condemns-the-fighting-in-sudan/7055033.html>.
- [21] General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. (1947, October). Retrieved from https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_264#Text.
- [22] Global terrorism index. (2024). Retrieved from <https://www.economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/GTI-2024-web-290224.pdf>.
- [23] Goal 16: Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies. (2023). Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/peace-justice/>.
- [24] Jędrzyśiak, M., Matuszak, S., & Wiśniewska, I. (2024). *The G7 summit: \$50 billion has been promised to Ukraine*. Retrieved from <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2024-06-18/g7-summit-50-billion-has-been-promised-to-ukraine>.
- [25] Johnstone, I. (2022). Global governance and the global Green New Deal: The G7's role. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), article number 33. doi: 10.1057/s41599-022-01046-2.
- [26] Joint G7 Input Paper to the UN's New Agenda for Peace. (2022, October). Retrieved from <https://dppa.un.org/sites/default/files/g7.pdf>.
- [27] Kirton, J., & Larionova, M. (2022). Contagious convergent cumulative cooperation: The dynamic development of the G20, BRICS and SCO. *International Politics*. doi: 10.1057/s41311-022-00407-7.
- [28] Kloke-Lesch, A. (2021). The untapped functions of international cooperation in the age of sustainable development. In *The Palgrave handbook of development cooperation for achieving the 2030 agenda: Contested collaboration* (pp. 127-163). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/s41311-022-00407-7.
- [29] Kolsdorf, J., & Müller, U. (2020). *Transforming international cooperation. Thoughts and perspectives on moving beyond aid*. Baden-Baden: Nomos. doi: 10.5771/9783748908388.
- [30] Lechervy, C. (2020). Club and group diplomacy. In T. Balzacq, F. Charillon & F. Ramel (Eds.), *Global diplomacy. The Sciences Po Series in international relations and political economy* (pp. 63-77). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-28786-3_5.
- [31] Lesage, D. (2022). The multiple roles of the G20 with regard to the UN sustainable development goals. In D. Lesage & J. Wouters (Eds.), *The G20, development and the UN agenda 2030* (pp. 135-158). London: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315608822.
- [32] Marangé, C., & Stewart, S. (2021). *French and German approaches to Russia*. London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs Chatham House.
- [33] Mearsheimer, J.J., & Rosato, S. (2023). *How states think: The rationality of foreign policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [34] Naylor, T. (2020). All that's lost: The hollowing of summit diplomacy in a socially distanced world. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 15(4), 583-598. doi: 10.1163/1871191X-BJA10041.
- [35] Naylor, T. (2024). The production and performance of status: Behind the scenes of an international summit. *Cooperation and Conflict*. doi: 10.1177/00108367241261482.
- [36] No change to warming as fossil fuel endgame brings focus onto false solutions. (2023). Retrieved from https://climateactiontracker.org/documents/1187/CAT_2023-12-05_GlobalUpdate_COP28.pdf.
- [37] Pack, J. (2022). *Libya and the global enduring disorder*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [38] Prasad, J., Khasru, S. M., Jaskólska, A., & Tourangbam, M. (2023). *Building G7-G20 synergy for a multipolar world*. New Delhi: Observer Research Foundation.
- [39] Resolution of General Assembly of the United Nations No. 73/27. (2018, December). Retrieved from <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n18/418/04/pdf/n1841804.pdf?token=mSWswzBfBgh6X4mVAZ&fe=true>.
- [40] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 1373. (2001, September). Retrieved from https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism/files/oct_pe_handbook.pdf.
- [41] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 1718. (2006, October). Retrieved from <https://press.un.org/en/2006/sc8853.doc.htm>.
- [42] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 2254. (2015, December). Retrieved from <https://press.un.org/en/2015/sc12171.doc.htm>.
- [43] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 2417. (2018, May). Retrieved from <https://www.globalr2p.org/resources/resolution-2417-protection-of-civilians-s-res-2417/>.
- [44] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 242. (1967, November). Retrieved from <https://peacemaker.un.org/middle-east-resolution242>.
- [45] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 2510. (2020, February). Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3850557?v=pdf>.
- [46] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 2513. (2020, March). Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3863118?ln=ru>.
- [47] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 2534. (2020, July). Retrieved from <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n20/182/59/pdf/n2018259.pdf?token=RCLZCCg1nZl0a1cMFz&fe=true>.
- [48] Resolution of Security Council of the United Nations No. 2573. (2021, April). Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3924402?v=pdf>.
- [49] Rumble, O., Sidiropoulos, E., Fakir, S., & Benkenstein, A. (2021). *A new South African climate diplomacy: G7, G20 and beyond*. *South African Institute of International Affairs*, article number 334.

- [50] Shackelford, S.J. (2020). [Inside the drive for cyber peace: Unpacking implications for practitioners and policymakers](#). *UC Davis Business Law Journal*, 21(2), article number 285-329.
- [51] Shin, S.Y. (2020). The evolution of global energy governance: Scenario analysis with a focus on the G20. *Strategic Planning for Energy and the Environment*, 39(1-4), 199-218. doi: 10.13052/spee1048-4236.391410.
- [52] Shivamurthy, A.G. (2023). *The G20's response to debt distress: The case of Sri Lanka*. Retrieved from https://t20ind.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/TF7_726_SriLankaCrisis.pdf.
- [53] Stern, N., & Lankes, H. P. (2022). *Collaborating and delivering on climate action through a climate club*. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.
- [54] The 17 GOALS, Sustainable Development. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>.
- [55] United Nations Charter. (1945, June). Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>.
- [56] Visualised: How all of G20 is missing climate goals – but some nations are closer than others. (2023). Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/dec/07/visualised-how-all-of-g20-is-missing-climate-goals-but-some-nations-are-closer-than-others>.
- [57] Werthes, S. (2022). *The United Nations: In between international and global governance*. In *Handbook on global governance and regionalism* (pp. 118-136). London: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [58] Wolff, R.D. (2023). *Economic growth in G7 versus BRICS: A reality check*. Retrieved from <https://asiatimes.com/2023/09/economic-growth-in-g7-versus-brics-a-reality-check/>.
- [59] Zürn, M. (2024). Public sphere and global governance. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 50(1), 255-277. doi: 10.1177/01914537231203547.