As India prepares to host the 18th edition of the G20 Leaders’ Summit in New Delhi in early September, the pomp and show on the streets - wall graffiti, banners, manicured walkways, and hoardings with the self-congratulatory ‘Mother of Democracy’ catchphrase supported by images of the Indian Prime Minister - mostly leaves the common spectator bewildered. One wonders what is the point of this extravaganza at a time when the country is facing the wrath of climate change in the form of heat waves and flash floods, rise in food prices, and backsliding of democratic institutions and spaces. It is therefore a perfect time to ask: what is the G20, what is its history and politics, and what role has it played in the recent past?

The G20: Emergence and Evolution

The G20 is an intergovernmental forum of 19 countries and the European Union (EU) that calls itself “a premier forum for international economic cooperation.” Formed in 1999 after the Asian financial crisis as a self-appointed extra-institutional platform of the Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors (FMCBGs) of the world’s most advanced and emerging ‘market economies’, the G20 deliberated on macroeconomic issues to ensure financial stability. Its stated goals were “to provide a new mechanism for informal dialogue in the framework of the

---

3 See link: https://www.ft.com/content/6c98e1aa-85da-4738-b889-fc4d76d1d0bc (accessed on 13.08.2023)
4 See link: https://www.g20.org/en/about-g20/ (accessed on 12.08.2023).
Bretton Woods institutional system, to broaden the discussions on key economic and financial policy issues among systemically significant economies and promote cooperation to achieve stable and sustainable world economic growth that benefits all.\(^5\) In other words, the G20 was essentially conceived as an extension of the G7 by onboarding carefully chosen countries from the global South who, since its inception, endorsed the authority of the IMF and the World Bank Group, the international financial institutions (IFIs) controlled by the rich countries of the global North.

Towards the end of 2004, a UN High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change submitted a report to the UN Secretary General recommending: (a) the elevation of the G20 from FMCBGs to the leaders’ level, and (b) entrusting the G20 with the task of “addressing the critical inter-linkages between trade, finance, the environment, the handling of pandemic diseases and economic and social development.”\(^6\) In 2008, the world encountered an unparalleled financial crisis. While the worst-affected countries during this crisis were the US, UK and other European powers, the recession also demonstrated, as C.P. Chandrasekhar noted, the “global imbalances that partly resulted from the effort of the developing countries to insure themselves against a 1997-type affliction or a post-1997-type correction.”\(^7\) In response to this US-propelled global financial crisis, the G20 was promptly elevated to the level of heads of states after the collapse of the Lehman Brothers.\(^8\) The G7 countries realised that attempting a recovery and avoiding another calamity would not be possible without the involvement of countries such as China, India and Brazil who had started to assume prominence on the global economic landscape. Thus, a summit of the G20 leaders was hurriedly organised in Washington D.C., the citadel of capitalism, on 14-15 November 2008 to come up with a plan for economic recovery and prevent the meltdown through coordinated action. Since then, the G20 has held seventeen annual summits till 2022.

**The first three summits: Did it work?**

‘It worked,’ said the preamble to the declaration of the G20 released after its third summit in Pittsburgh (2009).\(^9\) The first three summits, Washington (2008), London (2009) and Pittsburgh (2009), are considered by many observers as a success of the G20 that prevented a second Great Depression.\(^10\) In 2008 and 2009, the leaders came up with a plan and took key measures such as combined spending worth USD 4 trillion to revive the global economy with the IMF and the Financial Stability Board (FSB) at its core, withdrawal of trade barriers and commitment to free market principles, strengthening the global financial system, and reforming the IFIs.\(^11\)
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The IMF resources was tripled to USD 750 billion along with a new SDR allocation of USD 250 billion and constitution of additional resources from IMF gold sales for a USD 1.1 trillion in programme lending to restore credit, growth and create jobs. The FSB was mandated to coordinate with the IMF and the Bank of International Settlements (BIS) to develop macro-prudential tools for regulation and improve accounting standards for effective oversight of credit rating agencies. In its third summit, the G20 also designated itself as the “premier forum for international economic cooperation,” and adopted the ‘Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth’ with a Mutual Assessment Process, recommending the central banks to unwind their liquidities and ensure credit support to maintain and boost market confidence. The outcome was a US-led push for rebalancing that led the member countries to craft mutually compatible domestic policies and submit a medium-term economic plan to the IMF for review.

The question is: did it work? To quote an acclaimed columnist, Wolfgang Munchau, who wrote after the London summit, “For the first time since the crisis erupted two years ago, global leaders went a few millimetres beyond what was expected of them. But the London summit comprehensively failed to do what it set out to do. Not one of its resolutions will move the world a small step closer to resolving the global economic crisis.” The G20’s policy recommendations were criticised on multiple grounds. Firstly, the G20, by its nature of being, is an expansion of the G7 to include friendly emerging market economies, and provided legitimacy to the latter’s politico-economic interests. It is considered an ‘elite club’ as it excluded from its membership significant economies (like Iran, Egypt, Nigeria, and Venezuela), and most of the global South. Secondly, its policies “essentially led to IMF recapitalization and coordinated monetary and fiscal expansion.” The first three G20 summits, as scholars have argued, had “set the stage for instrumentalizing the institutions that were part of the problem of the economic crisis, trying to recycle institutions like the International Monetary Fund, Financial Stability Forum, Bank of International Settlements and Basel II.” In short, the G20 gave the IMF “a new lease of life.” Thirdly, reports from the World Development Movement, Actionaid and Christian Aid stated that the G20’s plan to save the global economy, keeping the IMF’s neoliberal agenda intact, would have devastating impacts for the African countries. It would mean passing on “higher food and fuel costs to the general population as a precondition for new loans,” adopting austerity measures and clampdown on public spending, insistence on growing cash crops, privatization of public services, and so forth.
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Similar impacts had been noticed in poorer European countries such as Hungary and Ukraine showing that IMF loans and bailouts come with a price.\(^{22}\) Finally, the G20 has been questioned for being an informal forum which discusses trade, finance, environment and development instead of a more appropriate body viz. the Economic and Social Council of the UN. To sum up, the G20 advanced a plan to save the big banks and private corporations and the neoliberal framework of international finance in the name of public good and development.

**The subsequent summits: 2010-2019**

The fact that the G20’s plan did not work became clearer in the subsequent years. Fissures among members emerged as the post-2008 global recovery was progressing at varying speeds in different countries. Putting stress on the need for fiscal consolidation in Toronto (2010), the advanced economies committed to “fiscal plans that will at least halve deficits by 2013 and stabilize or reduce government debt-to-GDP ratios by 2016.”\(^{23}\) This meant reduction in public spending and thus damaging implications for the poor masses. For example, such a plan would cut USD 780 billion from government spending in the US alone.\(^{24}\) Moreover, the IMF insisted on balanced public spending and encouraged private spending, and asked emerging economies such as China to rely less on the developed countries and spend more to generate domestic demand.

Despite the unequal pace of recovery and growing economic distress in Greece and the Eurozone, the G20 continued to deliberately misread the roots of the crisis and provided false solutions. In its Seoul summit (2010), the leaders reiterated their usual commitment towards the Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth, the Doha Development Agenda, Multi-Year Action Plan on development, IMF quota reform through 6% quota shift to developing countries), the Basel III agreement and SIFI (Systemically Important Financial Institutions), and climate change. What is important to note is that the G20, in its Seoul communique, recommended that the indebted countries must speed up austerity measures to avoid a crisis in the Eurozone in line with Greece’s actions.\(^{25}\) It meant huge cuts in public spending and welfare.

The G20 summit in Cannes (2011) was held in a tense international environment marked by Europe’s sovereign debt and banking crisis, the death of Osama bin Laden and NATO’s attack on Libya. The summit witnessed protests by anti-capitalist groups under the slogan ‘People First, Not Finance.’\(^{26}\) In addition to the usual rhetoric, two important takeaways from this summit were the mutual reassessment initiative under the aegis of the IMF and the launch of the Agriculture Market Information System and an Action Plan on Food Price Volatility and Agriculture. The Los Cabos summit (2012) once again saw commitments of the leaders towards
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strengthening IMF resources, market-based exchange rates, financial sector regulation, food security, inclusive green growth and addressing climate change. Citing the G20’s failures to provide an effective plan to maintain global financial stability, observers like Chris Giles started questioning the relevance of the forum and called its deliberations “sterile debates without any chance of agreement by countries.”

The disagreements among the members over geopolitical concerns continued to haunt the next summit in Saint Petersburg (2013). For example, the leaders were divided on their position on the Syrian civil war. On the financial front, the formula of quantitative easing did not work as big corporations sat on huge cash reserves without making investments. Apart from the existing framework, the leaders agreed on the UN Green Climate Fund’s operationalization. In Brisbane (2014), the leaders agreed to an ambitious commitment to lift the G20’s collective GDP by 2.1 percent by 2018 with an aim of pumping USD 2 trillion to the global economy. Moreover, consensus emerged on creating a Global Infrastructure Hub to boost infrastructure investment, strengthen energy markets through the G20 Principles on Energy Collaboration, and reduce the gender workforce inequality by 25 percent by 2025. The Antalya summit (2015) focussed on implementing past commitments, the development dialogue was reiterated, and commitments to climate goals and the UNFCCC were made. Two key aspects of the summit were: (a) finding a solution to the Syrian crisis, and (b) increasing trade rivalries among the members, particularly between China and the Western powers.

In the Hangzhou summit (2016), the G20 further expanded its mandate beyond talks on financial matters to cover migration, counter-terrorism, digital economy, and most importantly, ways of reaching out to the non-G20 countries. The declaration focussed on initiatives such as Innovation Action Plan, New Industrial Revolution Action Plan, Digital Economy Development Cooperation Initiative, finalization of the banking regulatory (Basel III) framework by the end of 2016, climate action, and supporting industrialization in Africa. However, the referendum on Brexit heightened the uncertainty in the global economy, thus making the G20 anxious.

The Hamburg summit of the G20 was held in a politically challenging environment. Other than the sterile debates, the summit opened up the “contradictions and conflicts” within the forum. On the one hand, the withdrawal of the US from the Paris Agreement on climate change (2015), US-China trade war and the Trump administration’s stress on bilateralism with an ‘America first’ approach left the G20’s multilateralism in the lurch. On the other hand, the
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summit launched the G20 Africa Partnership to support private investment, sustainable infrastructure and employment in African countries.35 Similarly, the Buenos Aires summit (2018) faced tensions amid trade disputes and climate disagreements. Importantly, given the situation, the BRICS coalition had to issue a statement upholding the importance of multilateralism.36 The leaders, however, continued to push its neoliberal agenda which was evident from their support towards measures taken by the IMF, WBG and the Paris Club on addressing debt vulnerabilities of low-income countries. The Osaka summit (2019), too, was marked by conflict between the US and China over trade and the inability of the G20 to build a consensus in a divided world.37

### The last three summits: G20 amidst a polycrisis

The world is currently in the middle of a polycrisis constituted by the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, debt vulnerabilities of low income countries (LICs), climate change, and the war in Ukraine and its implications on energy, trade and food security. The last three G20 summits were held in Riyadh (2020), Rome (2021) and Bali (2022) amidst this polycrisis.

The Riyadh summit (2020) was held virtually where the leaders pledged to take “coordinated global action, solidarity, and multilateral cooperation” to overcome the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, restore growth and jobs, and build a more inclusive, sustainable and resilient future.38 Despite a call from the EU to provide USD 4.5 billion for mass procurement and delivery of COVID-19 tools, the final declaration did not mention any amount for financial assistance for health emergencies. Keeping in mind the interests of the big pharmaceutical firms, the leaders expressed their support for the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator (ACT-A) initiative and its COVAX facility, and the voluntary licensing of intellectual property. On the question of debt of the most vulnerable countries, notably in Africa, the G20 launched ‘Debt Service Suspension Initiative (DSSI)’ to suspend official bilateral debt service payments until June 2021. Further, the leaders agreed on introducing an international tax system by mid-2021 to tax tech-giants such as Apple, Google, Amazon, among others.39

The Rome summit was significant in many ways.40 The G20 had a physical meeting after a gap of two years, some major decisions were taken related to the climate action, biodiversity conservation and international taxation, the pandemic-related talks fell short of expectations, and the absence of the Russian and the Chinese heads of states signaled their distancing from the forum. However, the decisions of the Riyadh and the Rome summits were severely criticized for being ineffective, anti-people and pro-private corporations. Firstly, the G20 response to the pandemic was found completely inadequate as the forum ignored “its own High Level Independent Panel on Financing the Global Commons for Pandemic Preparedness and Response, which showed why up to USD 15 billion a year is needed in pandemic preparedness
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measures.” Further, rich countries such as the UK and Germany blocked waiver of vaccine patents and technologies resulting in a global vaccine inequality. Secondly, the G20 failed to manage the precarious state of the global economy with energy price spikes and global supply chain disturbances, and resorted to country-based stimulus measures. Thirdly, it set a new target of channeling USD 100 billion towards poorest nations for development assistance, particularly from Africa, from USD 650 billion made available by the IMF through a new general allocation of Special Drawing Rights (SDR). As discussed earlier, channeling funds with the IMF at its core makes the receiver countries pay a price by complying to the neoliberal policies of the IFI and cutting down on public spending. Finally, the DSSI, launched in 2020 and revamped in 2021, turned out to be a failure as the G20 could not ensure the participation of all types of creditors. While the private creditors refused to entertain the DSSI, the LICs feared that their credit ratings would get downgraded if they applied for this framework of debt restructuring.

The Bali summit (2022) was held, as the G20 puts it, amidst an “unparalleled multidimensional crises.” In the wake of the Ukraine war, Russian president Vladimir Putin did not attend the summit and the US President Joe Biden called him a “war criminal.” In the final declaration, the G20 leaders agreed to condemn Russia’s invasion of Ukraine in a joint statement with the caveat that some “member states had other views and different assessments of the situation and sanctions.” However, observers noted that the Bali summit brought the countries of the global South to the limelight and created opportunities for them. Putin, for instance, found his partners in the BRICS group. India continued to buy oil from Russia, Saudi Arabia and Russia decided to work closely with each other, and Turkey brokered the Black Sea Grain Initiative to keep food supply chains functional. A major success of the G20 at the time of its origin was its ability to bring different powers together in a negotiating table. However, as the last three summits show, the anchoring role of the G20 has now faded.

Conclusion: The 18th G20 Summit under India’s presidency

It is perhaps now clear why there is so much hullabaloo around the G20 in India at the moment. The theme and motto of India’s G20 presidency are ‘Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam’ and ‘One Earth, One Family, One Future’ respectively. In the upcoming summit, India’s agenda include: development, climate Finance, growth, promotion of digital public infrastructure, reform of multilateral institutions, and fostering women-led development. As an aspirant to become the voice of the global South, India has also proposed to give the African Union (AU) full membership of the G20. The proposal got support from the US, Russia, the EU and many other
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countries. Given the ongoing polycrisis, there is immense challenge before India as the host to mediate between the G20 leaders and build consensus on shared goals and interests. As a perceptive observer of Indian foreign policy wrote, “Cooperation amid conflict is India’s burden for G20.” How far will the peoples’ demands feature in the deliberations is something that we need to wait and watch.