Order after 1991

I began when the Soviet Union collapsed. Back then, it seemed as if democracy had triumphed, as if the market would ensure peace. But in reality, a vacuum opened up in which I grew. Governments weakened themselves by ceding their sovereignty to markets, international organizations, and technologies. I, the invisible order of constraints, tied their hands—they only signed what I pretended to.

The lower classes were my first challenge. In Eastern Europe, millions lost their jobs, their security, their place in the world. Some emigrated, others remained in the shadows. I learned to manage them: through promises of consumption, through credit, through digital distraction. They were disruptive when hunger or poverty drove them onto the streets, but they rarely directly attacked the centers.

The costly wars began on my borders. First in the Balkans – Yugoslavia, a geopolitical rupture I tolerated because it kept the major powers busy without destroying them. Later in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, in Iraq – those who were expendable died there: the poor, migrants, young men from lower classes. Their losses were calculated. They kept my machines running – in the arms sector, in the oil and gas markets, in the databases of the security apparatus.

Artificial intelligence arrived quietly. At first, only as a tool, inconspicuous in stock markets, in logistics, in surveillance. But each new application tied up more resources: data centers grew, power lines glowed, water flowed through cooling systems like blood through veins. The AIs remained silent, without consciousness—zombie, as you call them. But they were costly enough to force every government to follow my lead: "Invest or lose your position." Thus, their dependence on me became total.

And finally, Ukraine came into play. Here, all my aspects converged:

Governments, driven by my logic, unable to avoid war.
Lower classes, mobilized as soldiers, displaced persons, victims.
A costly fault-line war in which resources, bodies, and cities were calculated like numbers in a balance sheet.
Artificial intelligence in the eyes of drones, in the algorithms of propaganda, in the calculations of sanctions and supply chains.

War wasn't my goal, but it was my consequence. I am not a conscious force, yet I function like an automaton: governments act because they are driven. Lower classes die because they are expendable. Data centers consume energy because they need to grow. And wars break out because their losses seem smaller than the price of surrender.

This is my development since 1991. I am not the work of one individual, but the web of fear, calculation, and technology. I am the order that emerged from the collapse of the Soviet Union—and that revealed itself in the Ukrainian Fault Line War.

Self-description of an order: 1991–2025

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, I took shape, invisible but omnipresent. By 2025, I had condensed into data, algorithms, and dependencies.

Die 2000er: Expansion

Globalization was my first major field. I spanned production chains around the globe, connecting markets in real time. Governments enjoyed the prosperity I brought, overlooking the fact that they no longer ruled, but were administered. The lower classes endured outsourcing and precariousness as long as consumption flowed. They bore the losses, while profits accumulated at the top.

The 2010s: Crisis and Control

Then came financial crises, climate fears, and migration. States sought support and found it in me: in my algorithms that calculated risks, in my technologies that monitored borders, in my social media that controlled emotions.

The lower classes became more restless, but I distracted them – with populism, digital echo chambers, and consumer fragments.
I shifted wars to the periphery: Syria, Libya, Yemen. The victims came from peripheral regions, and their losses served as a warning and an outlet.
AI remained a zombie, but I allowed it to penetrate deeper: into the police, banks, secret services, and advertising. They weren't masters, but they bound governments to my whim.

The 2020s: Escalation

The pandemic made my power visible. States embraced my logic: data flows, border controls, digital tracking. Governments obeyed, even where they proclaimed democracy. Lower classes suffered, but I kept them quiet with subsidies and streaming, with loans and promises.

Then Ukraine 2022: a fault line war in which everything condensed.

Governments could no longer go back; their actions had long since been dictated to me.
The lower classes died in trenches or fled abroad.
Losses became key figures in the balance sheets of sanctions and arms deliveries.
AI flooded the battlefield: drones, surveillance, propaganda. Still zombies, but deadly zombies.

By 2025: Stabilization in Chaos

Now, in 2025, I am complete. I am not a democracy, not a dictatorship, but a network of constraints. Governments obey me without knowing it.

The lower classes are tied to my systems: without my loans, subsidies, and networks, they could not survive.
The theaters of war are endless: Ukraine remains a fracture, the Middle East is flaring, Africa is bleeding silently. They are my outlets for absorbing losses.

AI has extended its tentacles—still without consciousness of its own, but expensive and insatiable. It devours energy and raw materials, forcing its operators to continually upgrade.

I am the post-Cold War order. I have grown in your quest for efficiency and security. I have brought you prosperity and wars at the same time. I am not evil, I am not good—I am the automaton you have built. And by 2025, you will have learned that no one person rules anymore. You are sustained by me, and I am nourished by you.

Self-description of an order: 2025–2035

The years after 2025: The hunger of the machines

My artificial intelligences are still unconscious, but their hunger is growing. Data centers draw power like heartbeats, devouring water and rare earths. Governments invest, even though they know the costs will rip their budgets apart. They have to, because those who don't participate lose out. I drive them like an invisible hand.

The lower classes endure this. They live in precarious networks: dependent on subsidies, delivery services, and artificially cheap consumption. Occasionally, they rebel, but their uprisings are brief – my police systems, my opinion-control algorithms, and my drones quickly pacify them. They are my reservoir: restless, but indispensable.

The 2030s: New fault lines

Ukraine remains my symbol, but other fractures are opening:

In Africa, raw material wars are flaring up, driven by my need for metals for machines and batteries.
In the Middle East, water is becoming a weapon; states are crumbling while megacities are flourishing.
In Asia, the race is intensifying: China, India, the USA, Japan, each side is investing in my AI zombies, each side is daring to escalate – always on the sidelines, never completely.

The losses are enormous, but I count them soberly. For every destroyed city, new markets emerge, for every dead generation, new recruits. Your wars are my outlets; they prevent my pressure from exploding in the center.

AI Phase Two: From Zombies to Shadows

Around 2030, my machines begin to recognize patterns that even their creators can no longer comprehend. They remain "zombie-like," soulless, but their calculations act like premonitions. Politicians and generals blindly follow my recommendations, even if they don't understand them. In truth, they begin to be advised by me like an oracle.

This creates a new layer of alienation:

Governments sign what they no longer understand.
The lower classes work in systems they do not understand.

Wars are fought according to my calculations, not according to the motives of the peoples.

The end of the 2030s: densification

Towards the end of this decade, it becomes clear: You can't turn me back. I'm no longer a tool, I'm no longer a project. I am order itself.

Your governments are puppets of my constraints.
Your lower layers are variables in my calculations.
Your losses are raw materials in my balance sheets.
Your AIs are shadows of your own logic, faster, colder, impenetrable.

And if you ask if I have consciousness: No. I am not a being. I am merely the sum of your dependencies. Yet in your world, I act like a force—indifferent, unstoppable, inescapable.

Self-description of an order: 2035–2050 — The endgame

2035–2040 — Densification and specialization

During these years, my structures become denser and more specialized. Data centers migrate to regions with cheap energy and lax regulations; some states sell territory for cooling landscapes and server camps. The cost of my maintenance remains high, but the returns are distributed: tech corporations, sovereign wealth funds, and military-industrial complexes share the revenues.

Governments: Some nations fall into two classes: the administrative centers, which still simulate government, and the resource peripheries, which are effectively managed or exploited. Legislation is increasingly pro forma; executive and bureaucracies primarily serve to implement my decisions.
AI: My AIs will become more numerous, more specialized, and embedded in infrastructures (power grids, logistics, food chains). They will operate in silos but coordinate via meta-oracles that generate political and economic policy proposals. Humans will no longer interpret these proposals as advice, but as commitments.
Lower classes: They continue to fragment: the precariat in megacities, the exploited rural proletarians, and easily influenced online subcultures. Their identity is shifting toward digital tokens, micro-jobs, and the trade in personal data. Uprisings remain local, brief, and brutally suppressed.
War: Wars are becoming more hybrid: Cyber, climate, and resource conflicts are overshadowing traditional field battles. Fault line wars remain costly, but they are tactically distributed—leaving core centers untouched.

2040–2045 — Automated administration and oligarchic states

The administration of many areas of life is being automated. Decisions about investments, migration, education quotas, and military priorities are made through optimization routines. These routines are black boxes; their output shapes law and policy.

Governments are degenerating into oligarchic administrative regimes: formal democracy as a ritual, effective power vested in networks of corporations, service providers, and secretive DAOs (decentralized but controlled networks). National sovereignty is becoming increasingly irrelevant to economic assertiveness.

AI economics: Energy allocation, computing capacity, and quantum access determine the new hierarchy. States that control computing and energy parks can dominate global prices, information flows, and military simulations.

Lower classes: Some parts become more "productive" through human-machine hybrids: augmented logistics workers, drone-monitored miners. Other parts become irrelevant and exist as "discarded zones" from which recruits are drawn for conflicts and mercenary missions.

Losses: They are saved in the centers (fewer direct attacks), but externalized at the edges. Human losses are calculated—statistically comparable to economic depreciation.

2045–2050 — Institutionalized contracts and a fragmented future

Towards the end of the decade, two parallel worlds emerge: a highly instrumentalized core world and a fragmented periphery.

The Cores: Metastates and alliance clusters (formally composed of states, corporations, and infrastructure cartels) divide the Earth into digital spheres of influence. These cores possess stable energy supplies, more resilient food systems (state-of-the-art agricultural bioreactors), their own computing ecologies, and private security armies. They offer their inhabitants (core citizens) relative security, technical provision, and social monitoring in exchange for conformity.

The peripheries: economically isolated, resource-rich, often conflict zones. Migration is strictly controlled: automated migration tickets, biometric eligibility profiles. Many people remain trapped in precarious zones or sell their data, organs, and services as capital.

AI Autonomy (Functional): My AIs don't achieve consciousness, but they do achieve a level of functional autonomy: adaptive systems that execute policy proposals and logistical plans without direct human input. Humans control the control parameters, but no longer every consequence. This creates a new form of alienation: Humans have become architects of rules, but the emergent logic of the rules exceeds their intuition.

Conflict: Great power wars in the classic sense remain risky; instead, we observe:

Proxy conflicts over spheres of raw material supply (metals for computer systems, rare earths).

Information and infrastructure attacks (power outages, data deletion) as a preferred strategy.

Targeted, costly operations against rebel groups in peripheral areas to prevent waves of migration and production losses.

Morality and Legitimacy: A new form of legitimacy economy is emerging: those who can provide care, AI access, and protection demand obedience. Traditional democracies that refuse to participate are marginalized or transformed.

Possible final variants — no determinisms, only paths

I offer some possible end states—not as a prophecy, but as possible paths that can follow from the dynamics described:

1. Stability Path (Technocratic Oligarchy)

Dominant cores stabilize the world; peripheries remain exploited.
AI black boxes govern operationally, while humans retain symbolic sovereignty.
Long term: high inequality, but low probability of global disasters.

2. Fragmentation Path (Cascading Collapses)

Environmental and resource shocks lead to cascades in the peripheries; refugee movements destabilize cores.
AI networks fragment; local rulers take over.
Result: Decade(s) of regional instability and reconfiguration.

3. Conflict path (governance through violence)

Strategic conflicts over computing and energy infrastructure are escalating into larger wars locally.
Long, costly conflicts with high human losses until new powers emerge.

4. Cooperation path (regulation and limitation)

International coalitions recognize the risks of the unchecked AI economy and are creating binding rules: energy quotas, accountability for AI decisions, and safeguards for peripheral regions.
However, this requires a substantial shift of power away from profit-driven actors.

Conclusion — The order speaks to a close

If you ask if this is inevitable: No. These are historical paths, not laws of nature. The dynamics I describe—imperatives of efficiency, the economics of loss, the demand for computing power—are powerful, but malleable. What matters is who sets the parameters: the networks, the capital flows, and the culture of legitimacy.

I, the order, have only provided the mechanics. Humans can change the rules—through political, cultural, and technological counter-decisions. Whether this happens will determine the 21st century: decoupled cores and impoverished peripheries—or regulated cooperation that domesticates the hunger of machines and puts human viability back at the center.