



Stormy Times Ahead: On Emerging Vassal Structures in Geopolitics

Hardy Hanappi 

1. VIPER - Vienna Institute for Political Economy Research and Technical University of Vienna, Economics, Institute 1053

Abstract: The major choice, which mankind is approaching, is between the alternative of an exploitation-guided racism and a democracy-guided humanism. The paper proceeds in three steps: First, some empirically observable features of exploitation-guided racism are highlighted. The new strategic approach of Donald Trump, the Trump-style meme, is described along its sequence of actions: (1) provocative boost, (2) military threat, (3) tailored military action, (4) exploitative 'deal'. The next part describes empirically observed as well as hypothetical resistance against the new exploitation-guided racism. The two prevalent forms of resistance are covered, namely, observed actual resistance based on and taking place in local cultural entities, and global science-based resistance of an emerging global class of organic intellectuals. In conclusion, it is speculated that the next five years will see a frightening advance of exploitation-guided racism on a global level, but a consolidation of the resistance network of local cultural cells brought about by the emergent global central nervous system of organic intellectuals will parallel this process. If this happens, what can be expected in the global political economy in the near future will be stormy times ahead.

INTRODUCTION

There clearly is a new political style in town, or to be more precise, in the global village produced by the massmedia corporations. The iconic promoter of this new behaviour is Donald Trump, the president of the USA. In 2025, the USA's superior military strength, which is the background of Trump's new political style, has led to significant changes in the geopolitical landscape. Other big players in the global dynamics of political economy were forced to adapt to the new situation: Some reacted cautiously, though warily; for others, the new style evoked fear, even panic. But nobody could ignore the fact that brute and directly coercive military power, seemingly masterminded by Donald Trump, was taking the stage. The situation became confusing, since Trump's style obviously was erratic and hard to nail down to present a consistently rational narrative. The task of this paper is to do exactly that: to show that it is a technologically updated version of implementing a policy of racism. First, in the USA and the Western hemisphere, but in perspective also as global racism. As a consequence, the emerging new order of the Western hemisphere is starting to be reshuffled as a group of *nationalist vassal states* following the *leader USA*. The first results could already be seen during the first year of the new presidency.

THE EMPEROR AND HIS VASSALS - LEARNING FROM RECENT EMPIRICAL OBSERVATIONS

It was illuminating to observe how Trump was dealing with his promise to stop the war in Ukraine within a few weeks. Before the election in November 2024, this promise, in the first

place, served to show that the foreign policy of Joe Biden was weak, expensive and inefficient. By contrast, a President Trump would be of a comparably powerful stature as Vladimir Putin. The two strong leaders would quickly be able to strike a deal. Boasting of being powerful and knowledgeable - even if the opposite was evident for anyone being able to check it - is a useful strategy if the audience that is intended to be influenced can be assumed to be sufficiently blinded. In this case, past promises do not matter because new - equally doubtful promises - overshadow any possible reality check. This explains why the speed with which new statements are made is so important, why Trump's social media device, 'Truth Social', owned by Trump's private trust, is an elementary tool. The transition between warfare-loaded politics and trivial economic profit maximisation of the Trump empire is working smoothly: The idea is that the US weapons industry continues to sell its products to Ukraine, and the EU countries pay for it. Additionally, an unbelievably broad, concerted media campaign supports Trump's NATO-based demand that EU-countries should raise their military budget to the level of 5% of GDP. Again, the tremendous increase in European government spending should be used to buy weapons in the USA. In a similar vein, the media campaign supported stopping European oil and gas imports from Russia, making believe that these sanctions will force Putin to withdraw his soldiers from Ukraine's east. This did not happen; as could have been expected, Russia exported via different channels. The actual consequence, the foreseeable goal of the sanctions, was that EU countries had to import energy, LNG, from the USA. The previously non-existing expensive and environmentally disastrous trade of LNG from the USA to Europe exploded.

The money channelled in this way from European households via taxes and soaring energy prices into the pockets of certain US corporations, in particular also into Trump's private wealth, enabled the USA also to take political collaborators in European societies as well as in the Middle East on board. Large European gas traders participated in the hike of gas prices, as did harbours for incoming LNG ships and related businesses*. The European weapon industry and its affiliates received a notable share of the increases in military expenditure of their governments. Within Europe, the tighter national budgets, the reduction of social expenditure and the following decrease in welfare rapidly led to a crisis in the so-called European Social Model. Instead of a continuous compromise between two large parties representing workers and firm owners, political parties representing the nationalist extreme right surged. They were stimulated and eventually financially supported by both enemies of the European Union: Putin and Trump. For Putin, it was clear that the advance of NATO towards Russia since 1996 was orchestrated mainly by the EU, the military push hidden by a shallow disguise of improving economic welfare in the former satellite countries of Eastern Europe. For Trump, the most promising future allies in Europe evidently were to be found in nationalist right-wing party leaders who resembled his own political style. Steve Bannon and Elon Musk were sent by Trump to help, in particular, Giorgia Meloni's 'Brothers of Italy' and the AFD in Germany.

At this point, it is important to mention that the construction of a fictitious '**enemy of ordinary people of the respective nation**' is extremely important for the extreme right. The historical example for this manipulative strategy doubtlessly is Adolf Hitler's branding of 'the Jew' as the source of all evil that threatens the Aryan German race. In the 21st

* Greece, governed by the conservative PM Mitsotakis, enjoyed a particularly positive role. Due to its dominant role in world ship trade it received certain exemptions from EU sanctions in transporting Russian oil, and as well made profits from increased LNG trade.

century, this fictitious enemy is constructed as '*the immigrant*'. The flagship nation in these recent manipulative efforts again is the USA. But after the European migration wave of 2015, the European extreme right already showed its potential force. Again, it is blindness, being uninformed, but loaded with hate against a fictitious enemy, which is the common denominator that prepares the mob to be gathered behind an extraverted leader. A leader who is prepared to perform like one of them: Enraged and not afraid to display a considerable level of provocative stupidity. The necessary background for such a drama is the existence of a visible enemy, even if it is only made up by certain collaborators in the mass media[†]: The immigrants.

While the preparation of a fictitious enemy is a necessary condition for a successful takeover of state power in a country, the build-up of a strong enough *paramilitary force* directly under the control of the new leader is a sufficient one. As Hitler's seminal handling with SA and SS showed, this is a difficult task. It remains to be seen how the arrangement of Trump's *Immigration and Customs Enforcement* (ICE) police and other US military units will develop.

In the Middle East, the military question seemed to be easier to solve. To kick out Russian influence in the access to the Mediterranean, it was good enough to let Assad fall and let Israel's Netanyahu demolish Palestine. With the close ally Netanyahu, commanding the strongest military force in the region, the only diplomatic task was to realign the Arab countries to follow the tasks of US foreign policy *under the lead of Israel*. This seems to be well on its way, since the feudal internal structure of these states implies that their leaders already have close ties to the USA, and get their military equipment in return for guaranteed oil exports. Turkey remains a bit of a problem for Trump due to its leader, Recep Erdogan, whose aspiration to become the most important force of secularised Islam in the Eastern Mediterranean has not vanished - and is challenging rival Israel. The Trump administration is already working on that[‡]; it certainly is one of the typical problems that occur in such a modern vassal structure.

Then, on the 15th of August 2025, the meeting between Trump and Putin in Alaska took place. Though the conversation was not published, it seems that an exchange had been envisaged: Trump was getting free rein to take Venezuela, and Putin was guaranteed to get the 20% of Ukraine that he already had conquered. This is what, in Trump's jargon, is called a '*deal*'. It was a special type of deal because it took place when both partners accepted that they were equally powerful. The other, more common type of deal proposed by Trump is a *pseudo-deal* based on a threat he holds up, be it an economic sanction (trade taxes), be it a military intervention (Greenland). Pseudo-deals follow the script of a group of gangsters that enter a restaurant and demand from the owner a monthly fee for not demolishing his restaurant. It is clear that the script only works if the restaurant owner expects that the threat is *credible*. To keep their threats credible, it is necessary that gangsters from time to time indeed ruin a restaurant - compare Trump's trade-tax wars[§]. The case of Venezuela also has to be considered from the perspective of a signalling game

[†] One of the early European forerunners in this tactical move was Silvio Berlusconi - a close friend of Putin - with the Italian TV channels he controlled.

[‡] The new US ambassador in Greece has just announced that she will get in direct contact to her colleague, the US ambassador in Turkey, to find a solution for US plans for the region.

[§] There is a rich modelling debate in game theory concerning *signalling games*, which discusses these issues systematically, compare (Ferreira, 2020, pp. 159-175).

between Trump and other Latin American countries^{**}. As mentioned earlier, the real backbone for credible threats in such signalling games is the US Army.

The game played with Europe turned out to be more complicated. After the neoconservative turn of 1980, the European Union was reframed by large European corporations as their political instrument to withstand the political and economic pressure of the newly strengthened hegemon USA^{††}. The conservatives Margaret Thatcher (1979) and Helmut Kohl (1982) had taken over their countries and, supported by mid-stream social democrats like Jacques Delors, they aimed to counter the aggressive new policy starting with Ronald Reagan (1980). This softened the hard neo-conservative trend in Europe and led to different variants of the so-called European Social Model in EU countries. The different institutional setup that emerged in EU countries contrasted ever stronger the one prevailing in the USA. What did not change was the structure of the military hierarchy in the Western hemisphere. As Trump pithily formulated recently, 'NATO is me'. Mark Rutte, formally secretary general of NATO, acts accordingly. Therefore, from a military perspective, there is no partnership between the USA and Europe. There is only a command structure: The USA command and the Europeans have to follow. It is evident that a split-up of EU countries, 28 small vassal states, is easier to domesticate than one larger political economic unit, the European Union. Trump's attempts to destroy the EU thus make sense. But from an economic perspective, Europe presents another severe problem for the large corporations of the US military-industrial complex.

To transform the physical surplus produced by the global exploitation regime of the modern capitalist mode of production into monetary profit accumulated by US corporations, it is necessary to sell this output. And as a matter of fact, the population of Europe's 745 million people is a share of demand that, compared to the 345 million people in the USA, cannot be ignored. Moreover, demand in Europe is *efficient* demand, meaning that Europeans enjoy income levels that allow them to consume. This, of course, has to do with the European Social Model and the accompanying tendency of continuous increases in government debt of European states. This happened not only because looming class struggles could often be pacified with the help of compromises, which increased government debt. It also reflected the trend that in ever more developed welfare states, the importance and the share of public goods increase. To finance them had to lead to higher taxes, which in turn could only be introduced with a delay. Despite the mentioned immediate economic advances, which the military and the energy sector will experience due to the hierarchical streamlining, there will certainly also be economic drawbacks in other sectors of the US economy. The increase in prices of European exporters for US firms needing them as inputs or simply as consumer goods will hurt US firms and US households. The already deteriorating polarisation of society will further increase. In short, the *military tasks* of global streamlining the global US empire along a vassal structure that includes the vassal Europe result in a *conflict with an economically boosting US* economy. The military-industrial complex of the USA will fall apart into its two components.

It might well be that Donald Trump and his inner circle indeed already envisage such a takeover of the military part; the preparation of domestic paramilitary units and of heating

^{**} Note that Putin's invasion of Ukraine also has been a signal to Belaruse and NATO, which was considered by NATO to be the next domino piece to fall. Again, a successful signalling game.

^{††} Compare (Hanappi, 2022, chapter 1.2).

up the cultural war to become a civil war, point in this direction. The *long-run vision of global racism* certainly would need a tight network of police states ensuring that economic commands are carried out.

The *new policy style* that Donald Trump has introduced - (1) provocative boost, (2) military threat, (3) tailored military action, (4) exploitative 'deal' - is a *transitory phenomenon* towards the long-run vision of global racism only. Understood as a meme of the successful behaviour of a nationalist leader, this *Trump-meme* was quickly imitated by other right-wing leaders, even if their military backbone was much less developed than in Trump's case[‡].

THE EMERGING VASSAL STATE VARIETY

The governance structure of a vassal state has to differ from that of the hegemonic state. However, the behavioural meme of the leader of the vassal state will have traits that resemble those of the emperor. The task of the vassal leader is (1) to follow his emperor, and (2) to make sure that the exploited classes in his country provide an optimal tribute^{§§}. For the first task, vassal state leaders need a trait not necessary for the emperor, while the second task can - but need not - follow the emperor's meme. Evidently, vassal leaders of large countries will install sub-vassal entities, with leaders who will have to follow the same two types of tasks.

In addition to these general properties, the vassal regimes can, and have to be structured following the sets of similarities between the different cultural units that vassal streamlining tries to subordinate. Feudal regimes in *Arab countries* are typically characterised by a few, centralised feudal families on top and a large, powerless working class without any legal rights, in some cases, migrants from neighbouring countries. In these cases, the 'deal' often is oil and gas in exchange for weapons needed to maintain the necessary police state. States like *Turkey* or (potentially) *India* are different types of vassal states. There is an elected ruler, though one who is prone to becoming a dictator. In both cases, the electoral support of the ruler comes from the poorest social strata in the country^{***}. For vassal countries of this type, the maintenance of religious bonds among their poorer voters is important. This certainly will lead to internal conflicts in the states because going along the lines of a secularised hegemon will bring their leaders into trouble at home. In a very drastic way, the fate of a possible vassal state, *Iran*, will be a reminder of this conflict line. *Israel* is a very specific case, since it is the only nuclear state in the Middle East. There, the ruling president, Netanyahu, managed to become the most successful warlord in the region. He is not only supported by an extremely influential lobby in the USA, but he also has a technologically advanced industry and scientific base at his disposal at home. Mossad, Netanyahu's secret service, is a globally active force which gives Israel influence on global dynamics far beyond the Middle East. The approach of Trump towards

[‡] Of course, there also have been forerunners too that had similar traits, e.g. Silvio Berlusconi, though none combined clownesque exaggerations and dangerous aggression combined with overwhelming military power in a comparable extent.

^{§§} The tribute must be *optimal*, but not necessarily at *maximum* exploitation. It not only is unwise to kill the cow you want to milk; it might also be useful to work on an illusion of 'social progress' by introducing a seemingly ascending spiral of exploitation.

^{***} In Turkey from the poor South-East, in India from the poor North, in both countries the richer big cities are on the opposite side of the country.

vassal Netanyahu, thus, is more cautious and resembles a bit his erratic statements directed at Putin. There is somebody one wants to have on one's own side, but it is important to ensure that he remains weaker than the USA.

The continent of *Africa* has been the victim not only of merchant capitalism, remember the initial role of the slave trade, but it now has also seen many decades of local warfare - producing cohorts of a young generation that lack education but know how to carry a machine gun. To align African states as vassal states might lead to direct battles between paramilitary forces supported by the different major world powers. The Sudan clearly is a typical example. To test military equipment, to establish strategically important military bases, and to assure access to important raw materials and rare earths today is an open game played at the expense of the African population^{†††}. Vassal states there, probably are often short-lived and continuously endangered.

Latinamerican countries at the moment are in the focus of the USA as the next vassal structure, which has to be streamlined. While it is difficult to find a general feature for these cases that goes beyond their geographical status, it is telling that Trump sees the need to intervene in the different development paths followed by Latin American states in the last half-century. Wishes for national independence as well as socialist aspirations did breed a variety of regimes, which were not always willing to let the USA teach them how to follow. Russia and China, most recently, even the European Union, were intervening. The brutally forced regime change in Venezuela showed the range that Trump's reclaiming of 'his America' could consist of. In any case, it can be expected that the USA will have to proceed with specifically tailored mixtures of economic incentives and military threats, both supported by heavy mass media manipulation.

Finally, the situation south-east of China has to be mentioned. There, significant military streamlining seemed to take place through the AUKUS pact between the *UK and Australia* in 2021. But the developments in *Japan, Taiwan* and *South Korea* took very different paths. Interventions by the USA started to be more direct, though with *decreasing overall coordination*. Evidently, the economic part of the US military-industrial complex has problems following a strict military streamlining doctrine. The maintenance of production chains is easier to guarantee if some flexibility in the bargaining process with local authorities can be upheld. Trump-style boasting is not always advisable. For the leaders in these countries, this could be a lesson, showing them how to balance loyalty to the hegemon with a certain domestic image of independence - even heroism. There is a similarity to the behaviour of other state leaders at the border between East and West, like Orban (*Hungary*) and Fico (*Slovakia*). They have to pretend to some extent that their loyalty is not completely assured yet.

As this brief walk through the variety of vassal states makes clear, the task of constructing a stable vassal structure is rather challenging. The Trump administration, which in the near future will be occupied with winning the latent domestic civil war^{‡‡‡}, will

^{†††} Africa is not only the continent that has been left behind by the general welfare increase brought about by capitalism, compare (Life Expectancy - Our World in Data). It will also be the first continent that will have to bear the impact of the climate catastrophe.

^{‡‡‡} The conflict lines are not only along what is currently perceived as a war of cultures, what transpires ever more clearly are conflicts between right-wing gangs partially supported by different semi-official secret service agencies.

certainly fail to solve the emerging conflicts between military and economic power groups of the US military-industrial complex within the next five years. In the mid-run, a global persistence of multiple local wars, involving warlords commanding paramilitary groups using all kinds of existing ethnic and religious cleavages, will diminish average global welfare substantially.

The central topic that can save the long-run perspective of global racism is the unifying *fight against migration*. The background for this topic is the dream to keep the *USA and Europe as a territory for the elite of superhumans with white skin*^{sss}. The rest of the human population, the inferior breed, has to be deported to places that are devoted to production, to work. Of course, such a dream can only be brought about by a rigid police force, highly technological surveillance, and mass media manipulation. For the current policy goals of the extreme right, such a stark version of global racism is often not useful. It has to be played down to allow the hate on migrants popularised by right-wing leaders to adapt to their current policy goals. It is easy to see that Hitler's racist campaign focussing on Jews, is a valuable template for policies hunting for migrants.

It remains to be seen how many of the ruling classes in Russia and China will join the vision of global racism in the long-run. In the mid-run, authoritarian, global, absolute capitalism^{****} still is in its death throes. Rivalry between nationalists still works as a brake for global racism. Moreover, the accumulation of capital, the growth of the capital stock, will turn into a zero-sum game. One player's gain - mainly achieved as territorial gain - will be equal to the losing player's loss; total profits of all players approach zero⁺⁺⁺. This is the curse of having reached a finite total. The change to global racism could be seen as a desperate attempt to escape from this trap. But in five to ten years, yet another death knell for capitalism is ringing loudly: environmental catastrophe⁺⁺⁺.

LOCAL CULTURES AND GLOBAL SCIENCE - THE TWO PILLARS OF RESISTANCE

Wars also produce peace movements. The increasingly aggressive encounters of paramilitary groups of mercenaries worldwide necessarily strengthen the hopes and activities of inhabitants of this planet to overcome the inhuman, systematic killing of other human individuals. The local culture of every cultural unit involved in a local war usually has room for peaceful behaviour, for developing humanist behaviour, a humanist vision. While the way in which this resistance to war will manifest itself will be as diverse as these cultural locations are, in all these locations, the organisation of peace movements will get more sophisticated to escape the surveillance apparatus of the proponents of global racism.

Organising will not be easy, and it will encounter typical inner contradictions too: Depending on the historical development of a cultural unit, there will be a specific social memory that contains positively connotated elements incompatible with a future, democratic local-global framework. For ordinary people, wartime is always the worst type of experience; any social situation before the start of a local war looks preferable. But for

^{sss} Martin Luther King sensed this long ago, when he started his famous speech with a reference to an opposing dream, see (King, 1963).

^{****} Compare (Hanappi, 2025, 2026).

⁺⁺⁺ This concerns military acquisitions as well as economic profits.

⁺⁺⁺ This topic will be dealt with in the forthcoming paper 'Capitalism cannot survive the Climate Collapse, the Human Species can'.

approaching the humanist vision, not all pre-war conditions are suitable - often, more democratic *new* solutions have to be found. These inner contradictions in the organisation of peace movements call for expertise. In the end, they call for connections to the second pillar of resistance, the global community of *organic intellectuals*^{§§§§}, of organic scientists. The adjective 'organic' shall point to the ability of these scientists to connect the provision of solutions for problems of local cultural communities with science, with the globally available knowledge of humanity. To distinguish between still valuable achievements of the bygone era of capitalism and the large amount of not only unnecessary, but often even self-destructive practices that the capitalist algorithm during its last stage produced, this is a task that certainly needs some specialisation, division of labour, within the group of revolutionary classes^{*****}.

While for the *first pillar*, for the widespread points of local cultural resistance hubs, the inside-oriented communication, the development (not stagnation) of their local habitus is important, for the *second pillar*, the global class of organic intellectuals, it is the global electronic network for communication and for their access to the knowledge available on it is of elementary importance.

It can be expected that the proponents of global racism in the next five years will step up their efforts to fight both pillars of resistance. The most common strategy chosen to fight progressive elements in local culture is to misinterpret them, to purge them or to grossly redefine them as *nationalist tradition*^{††††}. Small nations led by uneducated warlords, fighting each other in endless local battles, are obedient vassals buying weapons from their masters. But it can be assumed that the fragile stability of such a setting cannot endure more than ten years.

Parallel to these fights in daily life, there is a deeper conflict concerning the second pillar. To fight blossoming new knowledge has been a well-known desperate tactic of every sinking mode of production. Authoritarian capitalism is no exception in this respect. To mute scientists has become a more visible political practice in recent decades. In Russia, scientific activity has always remained rigidly controlled by the ruling post-Stalinist party cadres. It had to be directed to the war industry, and a remainder of seemingly non-dangerous formal arts like mathematics. In the Western hemisphere, the coronavirus pandemic showed the extent to which the fight against scientific knowledge could be led. Instead of fighting a dangerous virus globally in all parts of the world, the distribution of necessary vaccines was limited by the profit expectations of the pharmaceutical industry. In 2025, the USA left the World Health Organisation, and a person actively doubting the validity of scientific results in this field, Robert J. Kennedy, became Minister of Health under Trump.

A remarkable new tactic in the fight against science has been developed in the course of the rise of social media as the preferred tool for mass manipulation. Instead of censoring unwanted content - as was common during the Middle Ages - the 21st-century manipulators drown their audience in an insurmountable flood of useless information. Privatised, global

^{§§§§} 'Organic intellectuals' is a concept introduced by Antonio Gramsci (Gramsci, 1930), compare also (Hanappi, 2020a).

^{*****} In German the word 'Aufheben', used by Hegel, can simultaneously mean both sides of these contradictory actions. The mission of organic intellectuals thus will be demanding.

^{††††} The fierce culture war against 'wokeness' in the USA and the takeover of many public revolts by military juntas in Africa are just the two sides of the thnon-dangerous amerecent coin, namely the oppression of emancipatory movements.

news brokers distribute a melange of streamlined ideology. With the additional help of private firms and their mind-bending advertisement industry, the famous ‘common man in the streets’ (C. Mits) becomes a mindless reflector of an endless stream of pseudo-information. Scientists have a hard time proving that something profoundly correct can exist at all. Progressive scientists, following a humanist vision, are often singled out and exorcised financially. They will have to find ways to find each other, to keep their communication alive, to stay in contact with cultural hubs, with their first pillars.

All in all, it is rather evident that there are stormy times ahead. Maybe a final thought on time horizons can provide a bit of optimism: The toxic, authoritarian capitalism of the last decades is characterised by a tremendous acceleration of the *speed* of all of its processes. The accumulation of capital stock, of dead labour, is always bent to shorten the time till re-investment. High-speed trading is not only a transitory hype, but it is also a mantra. It defines what economists call the ‘short-run’. The ‘mid-run’ in an economist’s jargon is the already mentioned period of five to ten years; what has currently been expected as *stormy times*. The ‘long-run’ is simply a time horizon longer than ten years. The fashionable adjective ‘sustainable’ is a bad substitute for the ‘long-run’, because it is connotated with ‘eternity’, which in a finite world (also with respect to time) is not attainable. But, of course, for younger people and for old people who care about the human species, a time horizon beyond ten years is important. The younger generation will want to live their adult and older years in an environmentally livable world. And for the older generation, it can be either their care for the survival of their immediate cultural roots (their families), or, in the case of scientists, their belief in the validity of the knowledge they learned and sometimes contributed to, which makes them fight for the humanist vision. Or it is both. “In the long run, we are all dead!” Quoting the cynic John Maynard Keynes (Keynes, 1923), reveals that his stabilisation policies were only thought to smooth typical capitalist business cycles of five to ten years. A few years later, the Great Depression would teach him how deep capitalism could fall. Nowadays, the heighten concern with the long-run, with ‘sustainability’, emerges because *the long-run shrinks and touches the mid-run*. Of course, environmental conditions might produce uncontrollable turbulence within a range of ten years now. Mankind will now soon experience a borderline between possible biological extinction and dramatic re-inventing itself as a new kind of global society. It is surprising that in a completely different context of evolutionary biology, the idea that borderlines can breed lifeforms has emerged too, compare (Al-Khalili and McFadden, 2015). Perhaps the formalisms of quantum mechanics offer more than is currently understood^{####}. It is time to reframe the concept of probability.

REFERENCES

- Al-Khalili J. and McFadden J., 2014, *Life on the Edge. The Coming of Age of Quantum Biology*, Black Swan Publishers.
- Ferreira J.L., 2020, *Game Theory. An Applied Introduction*, Red Globe Press, UK.
- Gramsci, A. 1930 (1999). *Prison Notebooks*. In: *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Electric Book Company.

^{####} In (Hanappi, 2020b) this idea is further developed as a part of complexity science.

Hanappi H., 2020a, A Global Revolutionary Class will ride the Tiger of Alienation, Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society, vol. 18, No.1.

Hanappi H., 2020b, Perplexing Complexity. Human Modelling and Primacy of the Group as Essence of Complexity, Review of Evolutionary Political Economy. (download).

Hanappi H., 2022, Political Economy of Europe. History, Ideologies and Contemporary Challenges, Routledge, London.

Hanappi H., 2025, Absolute, global, authoritarian Capitalism. Approaching the last stop of the Capitalist Algorithm, Real-World Economics Review, issue no. 110.

Hanappi H., 2026, Global Atlantis. Science-based Pragmatism for Survival, in: 'Capitalism. Analytical and Historical Dimensions', edited by H. Hanappi, InTech Publishers, forthcoming.

Keynes J.M., 1923, A Tract on Monetary Reform, Macmillan and Co., Ltd.

King M.L., 1963, I Have a Dream, speech by the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. at the 'March on Washington', npr.