April 2025

GLOBAL 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 news letter.

Contributors



Really Chakma
Research Assistant



Depanjali Roy
Chief of Staff

Assistant Editor



Roman Uddin
Research Associate



Roman Uddin
Research Associate



The Global Economic Repercussions of President Trump's Tariffs: Fragmentation in Global Trade

Really Chakma



U.S. President Donald Trump announced a comprehensive executive order in April 2025 that imposed a baseline tariff of 10 percent on all imports into the United States. The tariffs on 57 targeted countries, including a 104 percent duty on Chinese imports, ranged from 11 to 50 percent. This protectionist action caused global economic consequences in the areas of financial markets, trade flows, inflation, and macroeconomic stability. It also represented a substantial break from post-war trade liberalization norms. A rising amount of research indicates that the long-term costs, both domestically and internationally, may exceed the projected benefits, even if the Trump administration defends these tariffs on the basis of trade imbalances, national security, and industrial rebirth.

Depending on the dynamic economic feedback taken into account, President Trump's tariffs are expected to bring in between $3.2 trillion and $5.2 trillion in revenue over the course of ten years. The impact on net revenue is extremely sensitive to foreign retaliation, according to research from the Peterson Institute for foreign Economics (PIIE). A 15% tariff may generate $3.2 trillion in net income in the absence of response. However, if trading partners retaliate with reciprocal tariffs, this amount would decrease to $1.5 trillion. In actuality, it is anticipated that higher tariffed costs will result in decreased real wages, decreased investment, and decreased consumption. Industries that depend

significantly on trade are disproportionately affected by these consequences, including mining, manufacturing, and agriculture.

The news of the tariff elicited a strong reaction from the world's financial markets. Countries all throughout the world reacted to President Trump's 2025 tariffs with a combination of caution, policy changes, and retribution. Al Jazeera claims that within three days of the executive order, around $10 trillion in global equities value, nearly 10% of the world's GDP was destroyed. The greatest two-day drop in the history of the U.S. stock market heightened investor concerns about an imminent global trade war. Tariffs on shipments from China, the main target of the tariff escalation, increased to 104%. In response, China redirected its exports to other markets and imposed high counter-tariffs on American goods. The European Union prepared countermeasures but suspended them for ninety days to allow for negotiations. The EU was initially targeted with a 20% tariff, which was eventually lowered to 10% after a brief halt. Trade realignment and diplomatic tension resulted from the imposition of new steel and aluminum tariffs on other major economies, including Canada and Mexico. Globally, there was significant market volatility, and central banks adjusted interest rates to mitigate the effects of the economic shock, particularly in the EU and emerging countries.

Both direct economic exposure and more general regional worries about trade stability have influenced South Asia's like the other major economies. India was subject to higher taxes on important exports like equipment, textiles, and medicines even though it was not one of the most heavily targeted nations. It responded by reviewing its trade policies with the United States and establishing closer bilateral relations with ASEAN and the EU, two alternative markets. Due to its heavy reliance on U.S. garment exports, Bangladesh was immediately concerned about cost competitiveness and market access, which led to local requests for diversification and governmental support. Viewing the levies as an additional burden on its export industry, Pakistan, which was already dealing with macroeconomic issues, concentrated on controlling currency volatility and enlisting China's trade assistance.

In its April 2025 Global Financial Stability Report, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) lowered the global GDP projection from 3.3% to 2.8%, pointing to "significant" headwinds brought on by Trump's tariffs. IMF representatives highlighted two shocks: direct trade restrictions and the ambiguity they created in the world economy. Global borrowing costs are rising as a result of this uncertainty, which is also driving capital out of emerging nations. Additionally, the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) lowered its 2025 global GDP growth prediction to 1.9%, the lowest level since the COVID-19 pandemic. The EIU ascribes this revision to supply chain disruptions, decreasing investment, and diminishing trade flows. It predicts a 0.1% real GDP decrease in the U.S. recession, down from previous projections of 1.4% growth. The tariffs imposed in 2025 are among the most significant changes to U.S. trade policy in recent memory. Although Trump supporters contend that tariffs can protect domestic sectors, manage trade imbalances, and lessen reliance on foreign manufacturing, the empirical data shows significant economic consequences. Domestically, firms and individuals must contend with decreased investment, depressed earnings, and rising prices. Fears of a full-scale trade war and aspirations for a "zero-for-zero" tariff agreement influencing the countries towards cautious reprisal strategies.

The threat of a protracted global slowdown has been raised by trade partners' actions on a worldwide scale. Trump and the US administration have kept the tariffs on hold for 90 days, but it is almost unpredictable what the future holds for the world economy scenario. Undoubtedly the overall scenario reflects a shift toward fragmentation in global trade, where the ripple effects of protectionist policies extend well beyond national borders, reshaping international economic relations in complex and often adverse ways.

Pahalgam Attack and the Fragile Illusion of Peace in Kashmir

Depanjali Roy



“Gar firdaus bar-rue zaminast, hamiasto, haminasto”

Famous Indian poet Amir Khusrau wrote this line in a poem which translates "If there is a paradise on earth, it is here, it is here, it is here." These lines he wrote to describe Kashmir, which is the northernmost region in India. Though the beauty of Kashmir is described and portrayed by many, its destructive side is also not unknown. From 1947, the history of Kashmir is very complex and has many layers. It is the people of Kashmir who bear the brunt of these troubling changes the region is forced to endure. Terrorist attacks, casualties among civilians,and mutual accusations between India and Pakistan have been recurrent phenomena..

However, the attack on April 22, 2025, was a shock to the world, as the motives of the terrorists appeared to be different from previous incidents. The Indian government has accused Pakistan of being behind the attack.According to Indian authorities, the attackers specifically targeted tourists, allegedly selecting victims based on religion. There were terrorist attacks in Kashmir previously but the number of victims has risen. As per Indian media reports, 26 civilians were killed, reportedly all male,

and several were allegedly asked to state their religion or recite the kalma before being shot.This information, while widely reported in Indian outlets, may differ in presentation or emphasis in other regions and sources.The selection of the location for the attack was a strategic plan of the terrorists. Specifically, the attack took place in Baisaran meadow, in Pahalgam, located about 50km from the main city of Srinagar. The only way to reach this location was to walk or take a ride on a pony. The attackers know about this situation as the help can't be reached soon to the victims.This terrorist attack is provoked outrage by the public, as the security force and the army deployed near Pahalgam has major information on terrorist movements, still they have not taken any measures to stop the attack.

However,Indian authority claimed that Pakistan was behind this attack, as two of the four alleged attackers in the attack were from Pakistan and other two are from Indian-administered Kashmir. It is further alleged by Indian intelligence that the latter two have crossed the border and taken terrorist training in Pakistan, later came back with other two companions to execute it. The government of Pakistan has strongly denied any involvement, with the Pakistani Defense Minister stating that the incident could be a false flag operation, allegedly intended to discredit Pakistan internationally. Meanwhile, it is reported by several Indian media outlets that the terrorist group The Resistance Front (TRF), believed to be a shadow outfit of Lashkar-e-Taiba, claimed responsibility for the attack. However, interpretations and credibility of such claims vary across regions and political narratives.

Following the attack, bilateral relations deteriorated rapidly. Both countries engaged in retaliatory diplomatic measures, including the expulsion of diplomats, suspension of visas, and closure of border crossings. Additionally, it was reported by Indian media that the government considered suspending the Indus Waters Treaty (IWT) of 1960, which regulates water sharing between the two nations. Given that nearly 80% of Pakistan's agriculture and a substantial portion of its hydropower rely on Indus basin waters, Islamabad responded by warning that such action would be interpreted as an "act of war".

After all the reactions from both the sides, it is clear the terrorist area does not support non-kashmiries to settle in Kashmir, have the quota in jobs and the right to buy land after the revoke of Article 370. This is another way of showing anger towards the Indian government on the Kashmir issue. On the other hand, local Kashmiri people have shown anger by joining protests and candle marches in the streets. Because the local people know whatever happens Kashmir and Kashmiri people will suffer only. Already 90 percent of the reservations by tourists are cancelled from every hotel. Already there is a high possibility that the 38-day pilgrimage Amarnath Yatra, which is a Hindu pilgrim palace for devotees, can be cancelled as a result of this heinous incident in Pahalgam. In 2023, 4.45 lakh pilgrims visited Amarnathat and at least 8 percent of the Union Territory's GDP generated from Kashmir tourism. In this regard, it is disappointing for the local people, as they earn their bread and butter from it. Even the students from Kashmir, studying in different places of India, are facing harassment, bullying and threats from other students. After getting complaints from different sources, J&K Students Association requested the Home Minister Amit Shah not to treat Kashmiri students unfairly or differently.

It is widely believed that the intent of the attackers was to provoke communal tensions across the region. In response, India reportedly launched "Operation Sindoor" on May 7, 2025, targeting alleged

terrorist infrastructures in Pakistan-administered Kashmir and other regions across the border. According to both Indian and Pakistani reports, retaliatory strikes were carried out, with both sides claiming civilian casualties. The situation prompted international concern due to the involvement of two nuclear-armed states, underscoring the urgent need for diplomatic restraint and constructive engagement.

It is important to note that information regarding this incident has been disseminated differently across various countries and media platforms. Consequently, details may vary depending on the source, reflecting differing political perspectives and editorial priorities.

Contest Between State Power and Civic Mobilization in Contemporary Turkey

Roman Uddin



Since ascending to national prominence in the early 2000s, Recep Tayyip Erdogan has shaped Turkish politics with a combination of populist conservatism, economic pragmatism, and assertive foreign policy. Under the Justice and Development Party (AKP), Erdogan reoriented Turkey away from its rigidly secular Kemalist legacy, reintroducing Islamic discourse into public life, expanding infrastructure, and positioning himself as a modern defender of Muslim identity. His supporters have often likened him to a potential revivalist of Islamic leadership reminiscent of the Ottoman era, seeing in him a visionary who could fill the vacuum of leadership in the Muslim world after decades of fragmentation. Domestically, Erdogan consolidated power through successive electoral victories, transforming Turkey's parliamentary democracy into an executive presidency in 2017, and cultivating an image of a leader safeguarding national sovereignty and Islamic heritage. Internationally, he sought to elevate Turkey's status as a central voice in the Muslim world, at times clashing with Saudi Arabia, notably

after the Jamal Khashoggi affair, and pushing a narrative that challenged the Gulf-dominated leadership of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC).

However, by April 2025, Erdogan's long grip on power is facing its most formidable and unpredictable challenge. The arrest of Istanbul's Mayor EkremImamoglu on March 19, on charges widely perceived as politically motivated, has ignited a wave of protests unlike any seen since the 2013 Gezi Park movement. What differentiates the 2025 protests is their cross-demographic nature and national reach. Students, teachers, opposition party members, and even former Erdogan supporters have rallied under a shared concern over democratic erosion. The protests are not merely reactive; they are proactive assertions of civil agency against an entrenched power structure. Unlike earlier protests, these are not restricted to secular or urban elite groups. The discontent includes conservative and religious communities disillusioned by economic instability, increased censorship, and perceptions of cronyism within the AKP regime. The rhetoric has shifted from opposition to specific policies toward a more existential critique of Erdogan's leadership itself, suggesting a broader crisis of legitimacy.

Erdogan has survived previous challenges to his authority, most notably the 2016 coup attempt. That episode, in which a faction of the military tried to topple the government, ended in failure but served to justify a far-reaching crackdown. Tens of thousands were arrested, purged, or blacklisted in the aftermath. The coup, framed as a betrayal of the nation, rallied both Erdogan's base and undecided citizens to his side. Similarly, the 2013 Gezi Park protests, while symbolically potent, failed to achieve structural change and were eventually suppressed through state force and media control. However, the 2025 movement is substantively different: it has a clearer political catalyst in Imamoglu's arrest, broader social participation, and a more focused articulation of democratic demands. Moreover, the opposition, particularly the Republican People's Party (CHP), has for the first time coalesced around a viable leadership alternative in Imamoglu, further destabilizing Erdogan's dominant narrative of being without credible rivals.

The implications of this domestic crisis extend far beyond Turkey's borders. April 2025 also saw renewed tensions between Pakistan and India, following a deadly attack in Kashmir. Erdogan's vocal support for Pakistan, including statements lauding Islamabad's "restraint" and reaffirming Turkey's strategic partnership, triggered diplomatic backlash from India. His position, framed as solidarity with a fellow Muslim-majority country, intensified calls within India to boycott Turkish goods and services, harming bilateral economic ties. Simultaneously, these developments unfolded against a backdrop of global instability. In the United States, Donald Trump's administration, returning to power in January, has largely remained inward-focused, prioritizing domestic security and economic nationalism. Trump's historically warm ties with Saudi Arabia continue, contrasting sharply with Erdogan's strained relationship with Riyadh. This geopolitical divergence has splintered the coherence of Muslim leadership in international forums like the OIC, as Erdogan positions Turkey as an alternative to Gulf-dominated politics, fueling further polarizations within the Islamic world.

Erdogan's recent actions and the ensuing public response reflect a critical juncture in Turkey's evolving democratic landscape and its regional role. As the protests continue to gain momentum, they underscore a dynamic political environment marked by civic engagement and a maturing public

discourse. Should this unrest translate into greater electoral competitiveness, it may open avenues for institutional renewal and pluralism within Turkey's democratic framework. Conversely, if the government opts for a more assertive approach to restore order and stability, it would reflect Ankara's prioritization of national unity and continuity during a turbulent period. While such measures could raise concerns about political openness, they may also be viewed by some as necessary responses to complex internal and external pressures. Economically, challenges persist, reflected in currency fluctuations and cautious investor sentiment, but these are not uncommon in transitional phases of political recalibration. In navigating this period, Turkey's resilience and strategic significance remain pivotal to both regional diplomacy and broader global dynamics.

Turkey stands at a pivotal moment. Erdogan's legacy as a transformative but divisive leader is now being challenged in ways unprecedented during his two-decade rule. The current protests, unlike past movements, present a comprehensive indictment of the system he has built, one that combines ideological rigidity with economic centralization and personalized governance. Whether this challenge will produce democratic reform or deeper authoritarian entrenchment remains uncertain. What is clear is that the outcome will reshape not only Turkish politics but potentially the broader configuration of power and identity across the Muslim world.