Філософія, методологія, теорія та історія
основ національної безпеки держави

UDC 355.1:339.9

Tesnikov Oleksandr
Lieutenant Colonel,
Senior Lecturer of the Department of Logistics Management of the Operational Faculty
National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine
Тесніков Олександр Михайлович
підполковник,
старший викладач кафедри управління логістикою оперативного факультету
Національна академія Національної гвардії України
ORCID: 0000-0002-4693-0428

Fursova Viktoriya
Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of the Department of Management and Business Administration
National Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation Institute"
Фурсова Вікторія Анатоліївна
кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри менеджменту та бізнес–адміністрування,
Національний аерокосмічний університет «Харківський авіаційний інститут»
ORCID: 0000-0002-4841-3416

ВІЙСЬКОВА ЛОГІСТИКА ТА ГЛОБАЛЬНА ЕКОНОМІКА: РОЛЬ НАТО І БРИКС У ФОРМУВАННІ НОВОЇ АРХІТЕКТУРИ ПОСТАЧАНЬ

MILITARY LOGISTICS AND THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: THE ROLE OF NATO AND BRICS IN SHAPING A NEW SUPPLY ARCHITECTURE

Summary. *Introduction. In the context of shifting geopolitical alignments and intensifying security challenges, military logistics emerges as a central factor in shaping both defense capabilities and the resilience of global supply chains. NATO and BRICS, as two distinct international platforms, represent contrasting models of security and economic cooperation that directly affect the evolution of logistical systems. While NATO embodies a highly institutionalized alliance with standardized mechanisms, BRICS develops flexible and decentralized supply frameworks aimed at reducing dependency on Western markets.*

Purpose. The purpose of the study is to identify the strategic advantages and limitations in the development of NATO and BRICS logistics systems, as well as to outline directions for improving the global supply architecture in the context of economic and security challenges.

Materials and Methods. The study employs methods of comparative analysis, content analysis of publications by international organizations (SIPRI, NATO, BRICS), and logical generalization of research findings for drawing conclusions.

Results. The findings demonstrate that NATO's approach is built on standardization, interoperability, and large-scale financial commitments, including the 2024 "Logistics Action Plan" that sets operational priorities for short- and mid-term perspectives. This ensures rapid response capacity and integrated infrastructure across member states. In contrast, BRICS relies on regional clusters, localized production, and bilateral or trilateral defense-industrial cooperation projects, such as the North–South Transport Corridor and technology transfer agreements between member states. However, BRICS

faces challenges of political heterogeneity, uneven resource allocation, and limited technological self-sufficiency.

Discussion. NATO's model illustrates the advantages of centralized planning and economies of scale, while BRICS highlights the potential of diversification and autonomous supply networks. Strategic lessons include the importance of digitalization, civil-military cooperation, and the development of alternative logistical corridors to mitigate geopolitical risks.

Conclusion. NATO and BRICS exemplify two contrasting yet complementary approaches to military logistics within the global economy. NATO's centralized integration ensures speed and interoperability, whereas BRICS fosters resilient and diversified supply systems. Together, these models reflect emerging trends toward multipolarity in security and logistics, underscoring the growing importance of adaptability and strategic autonomy in global supply architecture.

Key words: *military logistics, global economy, NATO, BRICS, strategic autonomy, supply chains, transport corridors, defense-industrial cooperation.*

Анотація. *Вступ. У сучасних умовах глобальної конкуренції та посилення геополітичних протистоянь військова логістика стає ключовим елементом міжнародної безпеки й економічної стійкості. Її ефективність визначає не лише обороноздатність держав, але й здатність альянсів формувати стратегічну автономію та підтримувати стабільність у глобальних ланцюгах постачання. Тому аналіз діяльності НАТО та БРІКС у сфері розвитку військової логістики набуває особливої актуальності з оглядом на сучасні виклики.*

Мета. Метою дослідження є визначення стратегічних переваг і обмежень у розвитку логістичних систем НАТО та БРІКС, а також окреслення напрямів удосконалення глобальної архітектури постачань із урахуванням економічних і безпекових викликів.

Матеріали й методи. У роботі застосовано методи порівняльного аналізу, контент-аналіз публікацій міжнародних організацій (SIPRI, NATO, BRICS), логічного узагальнення здобутків дослідження (для формулювання висновків).

Результати. За результатами дослідження було виявлено, що НАТО досягає високої ефективності завдяки стандартизації, уніфікації технічних процедур та стратегічному плануванню. БРІКС, у свою чергу, створює умови для альтернативних ланцюгів постачання шляхом розвитку транспортних коридорів («Північ – Південь»), локалізації виробництва критичних компонентів та спільних оборонно-промислових проєктів (Бразилія–ПАР, Індія–РФ). Водночас інтеграція в межах БРІКС стикається з бар'єрами: політичною неоднорідністю, залежністю від імпорту високотехнологічних компонентів та відсутністю уніфікованих стандартів.

Перспективи. Подальші дослідження доцільно зосередити на аналізі синергії цивільної та військової логістики, впливі цифровізації та штучного інтелекту на стійкість постачань, а також на економічних ефектах регіональних кластерів і стратегічних транспортних коридорів.

Висновки. НАТО та БРІКС демонструють дві різні моделі розвитку військової логістики, що відображають їхні політичні та економічні особливості. Якщо НАТО орієнтоване на уніфікацію й централізацію, то БРІКС прагне до створення паралельних і гнучких ланцюгів постачання. Це підвищує стійкість економік країн Глобального Півдня та формує умови для багатополярної моделі глобальної безпеки.

Ключові слова: *військова логістика, глобальна економіка, НАТО, БРІКС, стратегічна автономія, ланцюги постачання, транспортні коридори, військово-промислова кооперація.*

Formulation of the problem. In recent years, military logistics has acquired the status of a key element of national security while simultaneously becoming an important driver of economic development. The full-scale war in Ukraine has underscored the need for both NATO member states and BRICS countries to undertake a profound restructuring of supply chains, implement transformational measures, and develop new approaches to balancing costs, efficiency, and strategic autonomy.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. Contemporary research emphasizes the growing importance of military logistics as a key element of strategic resilience and economic security in the context of global challenges and multipolar competition. Both national and international publications analyze the role of NATO and BRICS in shaping new models of military logistics and resilient supply chains. For instance, organizations such as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI [1]) and the Allied Command Transformation [1] highlight NATO's focus on standardization, centralized command, and integration of logistics systems, including initiatives such as Military Mobility [8] and Federated Mission Networking, as examples of successful coordination, rapid force deployment, and economies of scale. At the same time, studies by Srivastava R. [10], Cozzens T. [12], Stott M. [18], and the Carnegie Endowment [9] underscore the emphasis within BRICS on production localization, the creation of regional production and logistics clusters, and the reduction of dependence on Western supplies.

Nevertheless, a comprehensive comparative analysis of NATO and BRICS military logistics models in terms of their economic role, integration efficiency, financial sustainability, and prospects for further development remains largely absent.

The purpose of the study is to identify the key characteristics, strategic advantages, and limitations in the development of NATO and BRICS logistics systems under conditions of global challenges and intensifying competition.

Presentation of the main material of the study. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), in 2024 NATO countries' total military expenditures amounted to approximately USD 1,506 billion, accounting for about 55% of global military spending [1]. Furthermore, in December 2024, NATO member states agreed to commit, by 2035, to increase defense and security expenditures to no less than 5% of GDP [2].

The rise in defense expenditures reflects several key trends in NATO's transformation.

First, it represents a direct response to the altered international security environment following the Russian–Ukrainian war and the intensification of strategic competition with China. Second, it aims at strengthening collective defense and ensuring the capacity for large-scale force deployment in the event of conflict on Alliance territory. Third, the increase in defense budgets stimulates the development of the defense-industrial complex, innovation, and infrastructure, although it simultaneously raises the risk of crowding out social expenditures.

Moreover, the strategic decision to raise defense spending by 2035 indicates NATO's long-term preparation for protracted confrontation with Russia as well as for emerging challenges in a multipolar world. Finally, it also performs a political function – signaling the Alliance's unity and readiness to ensure deterrence not only through political declarations but also through tangible resources.

Thus, the increase in NATO's defense expenditures reflects its transformation within the framework of a new security architecture based on the combination of military resilience, technological development, and political consolidation.

NATO's Logistics Policy and Planning. Following the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022, NATO significantly strengthened its deterrence and defense capabilities, which necessitated a revision of its logistics strategy. The primary objective became the assurance of collective defense and the enhancement of the operational effectiveness of forces under the command of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR).

In May 2024, the Allies adopted the *Logistics Action Plan*, which outlines short- and medium-term priorities. The document encompasses *20 action points* focused on defining sustainment requirements, maintaining strategic advantage, and enhancing coordination of decision-making. Logistics planning is carried out along two main dimensions [3]:

1. NATO Defence Planning Process (NDPP) – medium- and long-term planning aimed at capability development, the creation of stockpiles, and resource allocation, based on a "comprehensive approach" that integrates both military and civilian instruments of the member states.

2. Operations Planning Process (OPP) – short-term planning related to specific operations and missions, relying on logistical calculations with the use of national, multinational, or contracted resources.

A key role in defining stockpile requirements belongs to NATO's strategic commands – Allied Command Operations (ACO) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT). They codify standards in the Stockpile Planning Guidance, which is revised every two years. Readiness is verified

through large-scale exercises that test the ability of national and allied logistics systems to rapidly deploy forces.

Following the update of strategic orientations and the adoption of the Logistics Action Plan (2024), which sets the framework for short- and medium-term measures, NATO has moved to the practical implementation of initiatives aimed at enhancing sustainment efficiency. While political documents and doctrines establish overarching principles and requirements for collective defense, concrete modernization programs translate these guidelines into operational practice.

Trends in the Development and Implementation of New Logistic Models in NATO. Current challenges have necessitated not only the revision of strategic documents but also the launch of a number of initiatives aimed at strengthening practical sustainment and logistical capabilities. The main directions of NATO logistics modernization are as follows [4]:

1. Development of the "Enablement Support Services" Program – designed to establish an integrated suite of interoperable services for managing logistics, medical, and military engineering support. It envisages the creation of 31 digital applications to enhance situational awareness, coordination, and sustainment effectiveness across the full spectrum of operations.

2. Implementation of the «Collective Approach to Logistics». This is pursued within the framework of NATO's Logistics Concept and seeks to reduce duplication, promote resource sharing, and optimize processes in accordance with the «DOTMLPFI» model (Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities, Interoperability). This approach is tested through specialized exercises, including «Steadfast Foxtrot 2023».

3. Modernization of Fuel Supply Chains. As part of the NATO 2030 initiative, a new fuel supply model is being developed. Its objectives include

identifying critical dependencies, defining the desired level of capability, and establishing a program for its attainment with due consideration of costs, risks, and life-cycle aspects.

4. Updating Strategic Logistics Guidelines. The development of NATO's Logistics Vision and Objectives, launched after the Wales Summit in 2014, has been significantly shaped by the challenges of the Russia–Ukraine war. New approaches emphasize flexibility in the rapid movement of forces, equipment, and materiel across NATO territory, combining operational efficiency with economic feasibility.

Thus, NATO's logistics modernization focuses on digitalization, collective resource use, strengthening critical supply chains, and adapting strategic concepts to new security conditions. This demonstrates NATO's shift from a classical logistics model to a more integrated and economically oriented approach.

Military Mobility as a Tool for Modernizing Military Logistics in the EU. The European Military Mobility project has become a key element in the modernization of military logistics within the EU, particularly after the outbreak of the Russia – Ukraine war. During NATO's «Defender Europe 2023» exercises, military forces encountered significant challenges in the transit of heavy equipment across several European countries [5]. These difficulties – such as customs delays, narrow bridges, and insufficient railway load-bearing capacity – served as a strong argument in favor of expanding the Military Mobility project. Its significance lies in the combination of infrastructure investments, digitalization, and the simplification of transit procedures, which together enable the rapid redeployment of troops and equipment.

A central focus of the project is the development of dual-use infrastructure through the modernization of roads, bridges, and railways to accommodate heavy military equipment. In 2024, the EU allocated €807 million to support 38 projects in 18 countries, reducing the border-crossing time of military convoys by approximately 20–25% [6].

Another crucial dimension of Military Mobility is administrative digitalization, which introduces a standardized format for permits governing the transit of military equipment. This significantly reduces bureaucratic barriers and brings military logistics closer to the principles of civilian transport through the model of «green corridors». Equally important is the integration with NATO, achieved through the alignment of logistical processes with the «collective approach to logistics». This model has been actively tested in the «Steadfast Defender 2024» exercises, ensuring the creation of interoperable mechanisms for strategic mobility between EU and NATO structures.

A distinctive feature of the project is its «dual effect»: investments in dual-use infrastructure simultaneously enhance military mobility and improve civilian transport flows. This strengthens the economic rationale of Military Mobility and creates synergy between the security and economic interests of EU member states [7; 8].

Thus, Military Mobility in the EU provides the practical foundation for implementing NATO's strategic approaches to collective logistics, digitalization, and strategic mobility. While NATO develops doctrines and standards, the EU ensures their implementation through infrastructure financing and procedural reforms. This demonstrates a trend toward transitioning from fragmented national systems to an integrated logistics model suited to the challenges of modern conflicts.

In this way, NATO – EU synergy in the field of logistics forms a resilient institutional basis for collective defense, where military mobility becomes not only a security component but also a factor of economic efficiency, since dual-use infrastructure serves both civilian and military needs simultaneously.

Military Expenditures and the Economic Role of BRICS. Unlike NATO, which demonstrates dominance in global military expenditures, the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) are pursuing a gradual yet systematic increase in their defense budgets. According to SIPRI, in 2024 the combined military expenditures of BRICS states (excluding South Africa) amounted to approximately USD 570 billion, representing around 21% of global defense spending. China accounted for the largest share (approximately USD 314 billion), followed by Russia (USD 149 billion), India (USD 86.1 billion), and Brazil (USD 20.9 billion) [1].

A key trend for BRICS is the pursuit of reduced dependence on Western defense markets [9]. This is reflected in the establishment of joint ventures for the production and maintenance of military equipment, the development of national defense-industrial complexes, and investments in logistical infrastructure. For instance, India received a license to manufacture RD-33 engines for MiG-29 fighters, which, along with technology transfer from Hindustan Aeronautics Limited (HAL), enabled the localization of engine repair and maintenance, reduced dependence on imports, and enhanced the operational readiness of the national air force [10]. Moreover, India and Russia have implemented projects for the localization of receivers and components for the GLONASS satellite navigation system, thereby creating an alternative to GPS and ensuring strategic autonomy in the management of military and transport systems [11; 12]. Their cooperation also includes the supply of S-400

systems and the localization of Ka-226T light helicopter production, which strengthens defense capabilities and associated supply chains by reducing maintenance times and reliance on external resources [13; 14].

Brazil demonstrates systematic steps in strengthening its domestic defense-industrial complex. Companies such as Thyssenkrupp, Embraer, and Atech have signed a contract for the construction of four «Tamandaré»-class combat ships for the Brazilian Navy, with more than one-third of components manufactured domestically, thus enhancing technological autonomy [15]. In addition, Embraer signed an agreement with Finep for the development of the SABER M200 tactical radar, designed to secure a national air surveillance system without critical dependence on imports [16]. Another important step was cooperation with international partners: in 2023, Embraer and Saab opened a final assembly line for Gripen E fighters in Brazil, which entails large-scale technology transfer and the creation of a national production base for defense and export needs [17]. Parallel to this, China is expanding its presence in infrastructure and transport in Latin America, where Chinese companies control or manage at least 31 ports, creating strategic advantages for the integration of trade and logistics [18]. Such projects have a dual effect: they not only contribute to economic development and commercial transportation but also potentially strengthen military logistics by developing transport corridors, reducing delivery times, and enhancing the resilience of supply chains.

Another important aspect is logistical integration: BRICS countries are developing transport corridors (e.g., the International North–South Transport Corridor, INSTC), which may be used for both commercial and military-logistical purposes. For example, cargo transportation between India and Russia via INSTC reduced transportation costs by more than 56% and

increased cargo turnover by 1.7 times [19]. All this contributes to strengthening strategic autonomy and reducing vulnerability to sanctions.

In recent BRICS summits, the bloc has expanded its institutional formats of cooperation and broadened its network of partnerships, thereby creating a political basis for further bilateral and multilateral defense-industrial projects.

From an economic perspective, BRICS functions as a platform for the development of alternative supply chains. The localization of production of critical components and maintenance facilities reduces the time required for technical servicing and enhances the resilience of armed forces to external shocks. At the same time, the formation of regional production clusters contributes to lowering transportation costs and accelerating logistical processes. Vertical integration (from component production to final assembly and servicing) generates additional economies of scale, while also reducing transaction costs and supply risks. Moreover, joint production creates conditions for exports to the Global South, thereby strengthening the political and economic influence of BRICS on the international stage.

Despite these positive trends, the development of defense-industrial cooperation within BRICS faces several constraints. First, political heterogeneity limits the depth of integration, while concerns regarding the transfer of critical technologies constrain joint projects. Second, BRICS states remain dependent on global supply chains for high-tech components (microelectronics, optics, specialized equipment). Finally, the absence of unified standards complicates logistical interoperability and increases costs related to certification and technical integration [20].

Thus, the economic role of BRICS in the defense sector is manifested not only in the growth of military expenditures but also in the structural

transformation of the defense economy – through the development of domestic production chains, the establishment of joint ventures, and the strengthening of critical logistics. Unlike NATO, which focuses on collective standards and intergovernmental integration, BRICS emphasizes self-sufficiency and regional cooperation in the military-economic domain.

A comparison of the key parameters of the two models is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparative Analysis of NATO and BRICS Models in Military Logistics

Criterion	NATO	BRICS
Military Expenditure (2024)	USD 1,506 billion (55% of global expenditure)	USD 570 billion (21% of global expenditure)
Strategic purpose	Collective defense, integration, and standardization of logistics	Strategic autonomy, reduction of dependence on the West
Key Programs/Initiatives	Enablement Support Services, Military Mobility, NATO-2030 (fuel supply chains), new Logistics Doctrine	Licensed weapons production (India – RD-33, GLONASS), aviation (Embraer), transport corridors ("North–South")
Logistical Approach	Collective: standardization, shared use of resources, multinational exercises (Steadfast Foxtrot 2023)	Regional: development of domestic production and transport chains, focus on national defense industry
Institutional Framework	Clear doctrines, directives, and plans (NDPP, OPP, Logistics Action Plan 2024)	Network-based: intergovernmental agreements, joint ventures, integration through flexible cooperation
Long-term Perspective	Enhancement of the integrated system. Increase defense and security spending to at least 5% of GDP by 2035	Development of defense self-sufficiency and independent logistics corridors, strengthening role in the global arms market, logistical integration within BRICS+

Source: systematized by the authors based on [1–19]

The comparative analysis indicates that NATO holds strategic advantages due to its centralized and standardized logistics, high interoperability among allies, integrated planning, and economies of scale.

These mechanisms enable rapid force deployment, efficient inventory management, and reduced risks during mobilization. However, limitations include high costs associated with maintaining standards and infrastructure, as well as reliance on coordination among member states. Prospects for improvement involve further digitalization of supply chains, the use of artificial intelligence for demand forecasting, and optimization of resource management at the strategic level.

In contrast, BRICS derives strategic advantages from supply autonomy, localization of critical component production, the development of regional manufacturing clusters, and expansion of transport corridors. These measures reduce dependence on Western markets and enhance resilience in the face of external shocks or sanctions. Key limitations relate to political heterogeneity, lack of unified standards, limited financial resources, and dependence on global high-tech supply chains. Directions for enhancement include coordination of bilateral and trilateral agreements, development of joint production and maintenance facilities, standardization of technical requirements, and integration of digital logistics solutions.

Conclusions. Both models demonstrate unique approaches to the development of military logistics: NATO emphasizes centralized and standardized integration, whereas BRICS exhibits a flexible, fragmented cooperation model focused on autonomy and production localization. BRICS is gradually establishing parallel supply chains, enhancing the economic resilience of its members. However, integration within BRICS remains selective and bilateral, dependent on overcoming internal barriers and maintaining access to high-tech resources.

Future research could focus on evaluating the effectiveness of logistics system integration, the impact of digitalization and technology localization on

operational readiness, the economic effects of regional manufacturing clusters and transport corridors, as well as the potential for synergy between civilian and military logistics to strengthen strategic autonomy.

References

1. Liang X., Tian N., Lopes da Silva D., Scarazzato L., Karim Z.A., Ricard J. G. (2025). Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2024. *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.* URL: https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2025-04/2504_fs_milex_2024.pdf

2. Cienski J. (2025). NATO allies agree to 5 percent defense spending goal. *Politiko.* URL: https://www.politico.eu/article/nato-allies-defense-spending-goal-spain-gdp/

3. NATO's role in logistics (2025, January 22). *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_61741.htm

4. Allied Command Transformation Enhances NATO's Logistics and Sustainment Supply Chains (2023, July 27). *Allied Command Transformation.* URL: https://www.act.nato.int/article/act-enhances-natos-logistics-sustainment-supply-chains/

5. Soler P. (2025). Rapid mobility of troops and equipment across the EU still 'problematic', say auditors. *Euronews.* URL: https://www.euronews.com/my-europe/2025/02/05/rapid-mobilisation-of-troops-and-equipment-across-the-eu-still-problematic-say-auditors

6. Military mobility: the EU supports strategic investments on dual-use transport infrastructure with €807 million (2024, January 24). *European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency.* URL: https://cinea.ec.europa.eu/news-events/news/military-mobility-eu-supports-strategic-investments-dual-use-transport-infrastructure-eu807-million-2024-01-24_en

7. Special report: EU military mobility – Full speed not reached due to design weaknesses and obstacles en route (2025, April). *European Court of Auditors.* URL: https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/publications?ref=SR-2025-04

8. Military Mobility (MM) (2025). *PESCO.* URL: https://www.pesco.europa.eu/project/military-mobility/

9. Patrick S., Hogan E. BRICS Expansion and the Future of World Order: Perspectives from Member States, Partners, and Aspirants (2025, March 31). *Carnegie Endowment for International.* URL: https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/03/brics-expansion-and-the-future-of-world-order-perspectives-from-member-states-partners-and-aspirants?lang=en

10. Srivastava R. (2024). Moving Forward on Indigenisation of RD-33 Engine. *Indian Defence Industries.* URL: https://indiandefenceindustries.in/notes/india-hal-rd-33-engine-mig-29

11. India, Russia for joint venture to produce GPS/GLONASS global positioning receivers for civilian and military use (2010). *The Economic Times.* URL: https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/tech/hardware/india-russia-for-joint-venture-to-produce-gps-receivers/articleshow/5665435.cms

12. Cozzens T. (2019). India to host GLONASS ground station for Russia. *GPS World*. URL: https://www.gpsworld.com/india-to-host-glonass-ground-station-for-russia

13. Soldatkin V., Miglani S. (2018). India quietly seals missile deal with Russia despite U.S. warning. *Reuters.* URL: https://www.reuters.com/article/world/india-quietly-seals-missile-deal-with-russia-despite-us-warning-idUSKCN1MF122/

14. Russian Helicopters starts build-up to Ka226 production in India (2016, February 8). URL: https://www.helihub.com/2016/02/08/russian-helicopters-starts-build-up-to-ka226-production-in-india

15. Thyssenkrupp, Embraer and Atech sign a contract to build Brazilian Navy's Tamandaré Class Ships (2020, Marth 5). *Defesanet.* URL:

https://www.defesanet.com.br/navy/thyssenkrupp-embraer-and-atech-sign-a-contract-to-build-brazilian-navy%C2%92s-tamandare-class-ships/#google_vignette

16. Embraer SABER M200 Radar Contracts (2024, December 6). *European Security & Defence.* URL: https://euro-sd.com/2024/12/major-news/41783/ embraer-m200-radar-contracts/

17. Gripen E. (2023). Production Line Inaugurated in Brazil. *Saab.* URL: https://www.saab.com/newsroom/press-releases/2023/gripen-e-production-line-inaugurated-in-brazil

18. Stott M. (2025). China has influence over ports across Latin America, US think-tank reports. *Financial Times.* URL: https://www.ft.com/content/600b8bdb-5b40-4d9e-a4c8-7c9053415aff?

19. India-Russia trade via International North-South Transport Corridor doubles in 2024 (2025, February 20). *TASS.* URL: https://tass.com/economy/1916555?

20. Kortunov A. (2024). What BRICS Cannot and What It Can Deliver 2024 URL: https://russiancouncil.ru/en/analytics-and-comments/analytics/what-brics-cannot-and-what-it-can-deliver/