ATLAS PROTOCOL / STRATEGIC INTELLIGENCE

GEO 06 / 01
Global Power Architecture

How is global power redistributed without a single measure capturing the whole system?

22 OCTOBER 2026 | EDITION 1.0 | ANALYTICAL DRAFT FOR REVIEW

Executive strategic assessment

Global power is multidimensional. Economic scale, monetary position, manufacturing depth, military readiness, technological capacity, demographic trends and institutional legitimacy can reinforce or contradict one another.

Atlas position: this dossier is an independent analytic framework, not an operational mandate or a statement issued by the United Nations or any government.

Analytical architecture

A multidimensional power map

Evaluate productive capacity, strategic industry, financial networks, military reach, technological ecosystems, institutions and demographic resilience separately. Avoid a composite rank unless weights and uncertainty are published.

Asymmetry over hierarchy

A state may dominate one capability but depend on another actor for critical inputs, security guarantees, markets or logistics. Influence emerges through bargaining position, not only absolute strength.

Multipolarity and fragmentation

Test whether distributed power creates bargaining flexibility or overlapping coercive spheres. The WEF survey reports that 68% expect a multipolar or fragmented order over the next decade; this is a survey expectation rather than a forecast.

Power conversion

Distinguish latent assets from usable influence: implementation capacity, alliance credibility, industrial throughput, domestic consent and credible diplomatic alternatives.

Institutional leverage

Consider agenda-setting, standard-setting, dispute settlement and access to institutions alongside economic or military power.

Observed reality / strategic interpretation / forward outlook

Observed reality

Use documented primary sources and dated data; an official statement establishes that a claim was made, not that the claim is true.

Strategic interpretation

State assumptions, alternative explanations and actor incentives; distinguish competing narratives and corroborated observations.

Forward outlook

Use conditional pathways and clear signposts, not deterministic forecasts or unsupported numerical probabilities.

Geopolitical Actor Matrix — common standard

DIMENSION	ASSESSMENT RULE
Strategic objectives	Identify declared priorities and inferred red lines separately.
Capabilities	Compare economic, military, financial, technological and institutional leverage.
Dependencies	Map imports, security guarantees, trade routes, compute, energy and critical inputs.
Alliances	Distinguish treaty obligations, partnerships, issue coalitions and tactical alignment.
Constraints	Test domestic politics, fiscal exposure, legitimacy, law and time horizons.
Escalation behaviour	Record signals, deployments, thresholds and crisis communications.
Cooperation potential	Identify verifiable shared interests and reciprocal concessions.
Strategic outlook	Present assumptions, alternatives, indicators and confidence.

Escalation and opportunity pathways

- Financial coercion becomes more effective than military threats in a specific dispute.
- Technology access conditions a partner’s foreign-policy choice.
- A middle-power coalition changes a negotiation without matching major-power capabilities.

Monitoring indicators

- Cross-domain leverage changes
- Strategic trade restrictions
- Institutional voting alignments

- Reserve and financing concentration
- Alliance commitments and implementation

Scenario framework — conditional, not predictive

Concentrated competition

Regional spheres and bloc discipline strengthen; policy autonomy narrows.

Managed pluralism

Rival powers compete while preserving limited rules, crisis lines and trading space.

Networked fragmentation

Multiple overlapping coalitions and sector-specific dependencies replace clear blocs.

Decision questions

- What has changed since the previous assessment, with what verified evidence?
- Which actor has gained or lost bargaining alternatives, and why?
- Which dependency, alliance or institutional constraint is most decisive?
- What evidence would contradict the leading interpretation?
- Which de-escalatory or cooperative pathway remains available?

Connections within Atlas Intelligence Core

STR 05 provides analysis of strategic systems (financial, maritime, defence, AI and space); GEO 06 evaluates actors, interests and relational power; OBS 07 tracks signals and evidence. PLN 01, SPE 02, CIV 03 and HUM 04 add physical, species, institutional and human-decision perspectives.

Selected references and source discipline

WEF Global Risks Report 2026 — https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2026

SIPRI Trends in World Military Expenditure 2025 (April 2026) — https://www.sipri.org/publications/2026/sipri-fact-sheets/trends-world-military-expenditure-2025

IMF World Economic Outlook October 2026 — https://www.imf.org/en/publications/weo/issues/2026/10/13/world-economic-outlook-october-2026

United Nations Charter — https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text

Method note: cited figures require matching vintage, definitions and verification before web publication. WEF 2026 risk survey (18% cite geoeconomic confrontation as highest potential crisis trigger; 68% anticipate a multipolar/fragmented order) is perception data. SIPRI reports military spending of US$2,887 billion in 2025. IMF October 2026 WEO forecasts 3.1% global growth in 2026 and 3.4% in 2027; these are projections, not confirmed outcomes.

Editorial control: Draft v1.0 — scholarly and institutional fact-check, owner review and publication approval required; no claimed live monitoring, applied scores or state endorsements.