GL©BAL UP-TO-DATE

A CGS Publication

The world around us is changing rapidly. Wars, new turn in global politics, human rights issues are occurring every day, posing new challenges and concerns. Global Up-to-Date is an initiative by Centre for Governance Studies (CGS) which will work as a hub for explaining the contemporary global issues.

The regular briefs will focus and explain the issues related to International Politics, Economy, Security, Human Rights, and Development. There will be a monthly printed version newsletter containing briefs of all the contemporary global important issues. The online version contains regular updates of the pressing issues along with the PDF version of the newsletter.

Contributors



Depanjai RoyChief of Staff
Centre for Governance Studies



Really ChakmaResearch Intern
Centre for Governance Studies



Shamsul Arif FahimResearch Intern
Centre for Governance Studies

Assistant Editor, Global Up-To-Date

Roman Uddin

Research Associate and Youth Outreach Program Coordinator Centre for Governance Studies (CGS)



US Election and Trump's rhetoric of dismantling "Deep State"

Shamsul Arif Fahim



The 2024 United States presidential election took place on November 5, with former President Donald Trump defeating Vice President Kamala Harris. Trump won 312 electoral votes, exceeding the 270 needed, while Harris secured 226. In the popular vote, Trump garnered roughly 77.2 million votes (49.9%), compared to Harris's 74.7 million votes (48.3%). Beyond the election results, the debate around the concept of the "Deep State" became a significant part of the political discourse, particularly during Trump's campaign. He frequently used the term to describe what he claimed was an entrenched bureaucratic system working against elected officials and undermining democratic processes. This narrative has fueled polarization and skepticism toward government institutions, even as evidence supporting the existence of such a system remains scarce.

A 2024 Gallup poll revealed that 42% of Americans believe in the existence of a hidden power structure influencing political outcomes. For Trump, the deep state narrative ties into his broader argument that career officials and federal agencies obstruct the will of the voters. During his presidency, he often accused government institutions of sabotaging his policies on immigration, foreign relations, and economic reform. The investigation into alleged Russian interference in the 2016 election, which Trump repeatedly dismissed as a "witch hunt," became a focal point for his claims, reinforcing the idea of a shadowy network working to undermine outsiders challenging the status quo. Incidents like whistleblower complaints and high-profile clashes with the FBI and Department of Justice only added fuel to this rhetoric.

Despite these claims, the notion of the federal workforce as a unified entity opposing the executive branch does not hold up to scrutiny. The U.S. civil service, consisting of approximately 2.1 million employees, is tasked with implementing laws passed by Congress and the President. These professionals work within legal frameworks designed to ensure impartial governance, regardless of political shifts. Trump's critique of the deep state, however, extends beyond federal institutions. He has linked it to globalization, arguing that international agreements, military interventions, and trade deals have undermined American sovereignty. For example, his decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement was framed as a stand against an elite-driven agenda that prioritized global concerns over domestic interests. This aligns with his "America First" philosophy, which emphasizes national economic growth and reduced reliance on multilateral institutions.

Critics oppose that the deep state narrative serves to delegitimize opposition and consolidate power within the executive branch. By framing dissent as the work of a hidden cabal, this rhetoric can be used to justify bypassing established democratic processes. This approach threatens public trust in government and erodes transparency and accountability, cornerstones of a functioning democracy. Moreover, efforts to reform or expose the deep state often involve appointing loyalists to key positions, raising concerns about the politicization of nonpartisan institutions. For instance, Trump's appointments to the judiciary and intelligence community were frequently criticized for prioritizing ideological alignment over expertise, potentially setting a dangerous precedent for future administrations.

Ultimately, the concept of a deep state, while politically convenient for some, lacks concrete evidence and poses risks to democratic principles. Attempts to dismantle or politicize the civil service undermine impartiality and continuity, which are critical for effective governance. As the U.S. approaches future elections, it is imperative to critically assess such rhetoric and consider its implications for the preservation of democratic norms and the functionality of governmental institutions.

COP-29: A Commitment Towards New Collective Quantified Goal Decision?

Really Chakma



The twenty-ninth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP29) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), held from November 11 to 22, 2024, in Baku, Azerbaijan, represented a pivotal moment in global climate diplomacy. Since its inception, COP has served as the central platform for nations to negotiate and implement strategies to combat climate change. Emerging from the landmark agreements of the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement, COP29 carried the weight of expectations to address the pressing challenges of climate financing, carbon markets, adaptation strategies, and global emissions reductions. Positioned within a historical trajectory of evolving climate goals, COP29 sought to build upon commitments established in prior conferences, such as the tripling of renewable energy targets set at COP28 in Dubai and the creation of the Loss and Damage Fund at COP27 in Egypt.

The objectives of COP29 were deeply rooted in the urgency of the climate crisis and the inadequacy of current measures to meet the Paris Agreement's goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C. Dubbed the "Finance COP," the conference's primary focus was to finalize a New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG) on climate finance, intended to replace the \$100 billion annual target set in 2009. This target, criticized for its failure to adequately reflect current needs and its inconsistent delivery by wealthier nations, was set to expire in 2025. COP29 aimed to establish a financial framework aligned with the escalating costs of transitioning to sustainable energy systems, adapting to climate impacts, and addressing loss and damage in the Global South.

The discussions at COP29 were characterized by a dynamic interplay of ambition, contention, and compromise. The participating nations agreed to a new financial target of mobilizing \$300 billion annually by 2035, marking a substantial increase from the previous commitment. While this figure fell short of the trillions demanded by many developing nations, it was hailed as a progressive step toward equitable climate financing. The framework emphasized leveraging private capital and restructuring international financial institutions to better address climate risks. The contentious debate over whether fast-growing economies like China and Gulf states should contribute to the NCQG. But as usual they claimed to be classed as "developing" in the UN climate system.

Carbon market mechanisms, particularly under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement, remained a contentious topic at COP29. The conference achieved a breakthrough by finalizing the rules for carbon credit trading, establishing a standardized mechanism under the Paris Agreement Crediting Mechanism (PACM). The resolution sought to ensure transparency and environmental integrity in the use of offsets, addressing concerns that carbon credits might undermine genuine emissions reductions. Nonetheless, disagreements lingered regarding the inclusion of carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies, which many viewed as speculative and prone to diverting resources from direct mitigation efforts.

Despite these achievements, COP29 faced criticism for its perceived shortcomings and the controversial choice of Azerbaijan as the host nation. Azerbaijani president described fossil fuels as a "gift from God" at the World Leaders Climate Action Summit and its limited progress on climate policy drew scrutiny. He also criticised "western fake news" about his country's emissions and chose not to announce its new UN climate plan, as widely anticipated. The exclusion of gender equity issues from the presidency's priority list also elicited criticism, particularly in light of ongoing negotiations to revise the UNFCCC's Gender Action Plan. Prominent world leaders wrote in an "open letter" criticizing the summit as "no longer fit for purpose" and emphasized the need for stronger leadership aligned with climate action goals let alone holding the presidency. Comparisons were drawn to the COP16 biodiversity summit which was concluded without a finance deal due to the absence of a large number of developing-country delegates who were forced to catch flights home, leaving parties without the "quorum" needed to reach consensus. On the other hand, the new presidency of Donald Trump raises the possibilities of rolling back climate action by the USA. Developing countries with G77 and China rejected the "substantive framework" requesting a new one. They pointed out providing money rather than investment or loans with tons of conditions in the name of investment.

Key takeaways from the conference sessions reflected both advancements and persistent challenges in global climate action. The tripling of climate finance commitments was a key achievement, though uncertainties around equitable delivery and allocation remain. Finalizing carbon market rules marked progress, but concerns about implementation linger. The focus on adaptation and resilience highlighted the needs of vulnerable communities, yet a gap between promised and mobilized resources continued to erode trust among developing nations. Looking ahead, the 2025 updates to Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) will test global ambition towards a Carbon-Free World. Looking ahead, COP29's outcomes set the stage for critical discussions at COP30 in Belém, Brazil to resolve the long-standing lack of definition of what "climate finance" includes, which the LDCs said left "the door open for manipulation and inaction". Yet the question remains, will ever climate justice become a reality with just climate finance holding the flag of unity in the world?

Pro-Russian Victory in Georgia: EU Dreams in Jeopardy

Depanjai Roy



"The ballot is stronger than the bullet"
- Abraham Lincoln

Is it?

The year of 2024 made the world see and experience the power of this quote. Many countries have held elections. Some are walking towards democracy, some overlook the manipulation of the super powers, some are continuously protesting against rigged elections. One such country is Georgia. The parliamentary election of Georgia was held on October 26, 2024. The Georgian Dream party won the election. However the Georgian news media and the people said this election was rigged and the protest started on the street after the results had been announced. What is the reason behind their dissatisfaction?

If we go back in history, Georgia got its independence after the break of the Soviet Union after 1991. However, the road was never smooth for this young country. After the independence ethnic conflicts in Abkhazia and South Oseetia. The people of Abkhazia wanted an independent state as their culture is different from Georgians. On the other hand, the people of South Ossetia wanted to reunite with North Ossetia, which is situated in Russia. The scenario changed after Vladimir Putin came to power in 2000, in Russia. Long story short, because when the European Union welcomed Ukraine and Georgia to join, it was a red light for Russia, resulting in the war of Russia and Georgia in the Abkhazia and South Osseti. Though it ended after 12 days on a ceasefire by France, even though Russia did not care about the ceasefire and took control over two territories of Georgia.

In 2023, it was shown on a survey that 79 percent of Georgians wanted to join the EU and 67 percent of them wanted to join NATO. Although anto-westen propaganda started by the Georgian Dream Party who came to power in 2012. After that day by day the pro-Russian influence is seen in the government. It is important to mention that Bidzina Ivanishvili is the founder and informal leader of Georgian Dream and an oligarch who made his fortune in Russia in the 1990s and 2000s. After 2012 Georgian Dream Party came to power and slowly engaged Russian influence in the Georgian Society.

On October 26, 2024, elections took place in Georgia and the Georgian Dream Party won the election. This is a clear indication that joining the EU won't be easy for Georgia. Georgian Dream doesn't support Russia directly though their stance is anti-Western and wants to be in a friendly relationship with Russia as it still occupies 20 percent of Georgian territory from 2008. After winning the election the Prime Minister Irakli Kobakhidze said that the government will not be involved in talks to join the EU till 2028. In the effects the opposition and Georgians have staged nightly protests in the capital Tbilisi and other cities since November. Here no less to mention that, the EU granted Georgia candidate status in December 2023 on condition that it meets the bloc's recommendations but put its accession on hold and cut financial support earlier this year after the passage of a "foreign influence" law widely seen as a blow to democratic freedoms. This is a clear indication that the current government has a pro Russian policy. Through analysis we can come to this conclusion that, whoever wants to join the western ally or EU, Russia will get into the matter and will shake everything up to gain the upper hand. The same we have seen with Ukraine. When Ukraine wanted to join the European Union, Russia attacked the country to "take back what's theirs", according to Russia. The red county put up their logic by saying Ukraine has always been their integral part, and now they are rooting for the annexation. The majority of the Georgian people think of Russia as a threat and consider themselves European and deny any involvement of Russia in the inclusion of the EU. Experts also assume Georgia will face the same fate as Ukraine if the international organizations do not take any measures to prevent that.

On the other hand, Russia is playing its game to secure itself from any western involvement. If any bordering countries of Russia joins the European Union or NATO, that will be a huge security threat to Russia. By creating instability in their bordering countries Russia wants to create a "security zone" significant by military, political, and economic influence on these countries. Literally Russia wants to make Ukraine and Georgia "the next Belarus", where it lost its independence and now its strategic assets (railways, communications, oil and gas pipelines) are in the hands of Russia including all the policies as well. Previously Georgia has shown their capability and strength without any support of Russia in the region. They established an energy connection between Azerbaijan and Turkey by running a successful energy project in 2003. Georgians peacefully protested rigged elections, ousting the declared winners, Citizens' Union.Georgia declared independence on April 9, 1991, before the Soviet Union's collapse. But this time it seems difficult for the country to hold the democracy and tackle the Russian influence in Georgia, as it is declared that the election in 2024 was rigged (by the election observers). Newspapers and international media are also spreading this news. However it does not seem that the Russia backed Georgian Dream Party will consider any of the protests or mobs by the Georgians. Needless to say, democracy hardly prevails for the Georgians.

