Helsinki Geoeconomics Society

Communiqué No. 1 (2026)

Call for Expert Evidence: Helsinki Manual on Corporate Geoeconomics — 2026 Drafting Cycle

Helsinki, 6 January 2026

The Helsinki Geoeconomics Society hereby opens the **Call for Expert Evidence (CFE)** for the 2026 drafting cycle of the **New Helsinki Process**, as set out in *Communiqué No. 2 (2025)*.

The CFE is the competitive submission mechanism through which senior experts may contribute substantive evidentiary material to the analytical and drafting work underpinning the ***Helsinki Manual on Corporate Geoeconomics*** (the "***Helsinki Manual***").

Evidence submitted through the CFE enters directly into the deliberative work of the Task Force, the Helsinki Society's standing drafting body appointed to steer the authorship of the *Helsinki Manual*. Such evidence informs the *Manual*'s analytical development, methodological refinement, and structured synthesis.

I. What this Call involves in practice

The CFE solicits written evidence for use in the Task Force's drafting work on the *Helsinki Manual*. Submissions may include published or unpublished manuscripts, analytical notes, case studies, or other forms of documented expert material.

Evidence accepted through the CFE may be presented to the Task Force in written form and, where relevant, through oral presentation and questioning. Contributors whose evidence is taken forward may be invited to engage further in the drafting process, including through participation in committee discussions or presentation at the Helsinki Society's open drafting hearings or convenings.

All such invitations follow from the assessment of the evidence submitted and are issued at the discretion of the Helsinki Society.

Helsinki Geoeconomics Society

II. Purpose of the Call

The CFE is designed to gather practice-grounded, verifiable, and analytically usable evidence relevant to contemporary geoeconomic decision-making.

Submissions must illuminate how geoeconomic instruments are designed, deployed, constrained, or contested in real-world settings. The emphasis is on evidence, not advocacy.

III. Institutional Context

The Helsinki Geoeconomics Society is an independent, member-led peer group of experts at the intersection of business, law, technology, and geopolitics. It is devoted to advancing the understanding of geoeconomics through investigation, publishing, and institutional development.

The CFE serves the Society's flagship New Helsinki Process, a multiyear effort to develop a coherent analytical framework for corporate geoeconomics by examining how states design, implement, and enforce economic security regulation, and how firms and investors adapt to evolving—and often competing—requirements across jurisdictions and global markets.

The New Helsinki Process is the Society's framework for developing the *Helsinki Manual* through coordinated evidence-gathering, committee deliberation, and iterative drafting.

At the core of the New Helsinki Process is the Task Force, the Society's standing drafting body composed of appointed senior experts and Society Fellows responsible for steering the authorship of the *Helsinki Manual* through committee deliberations and plenary drafting sessions.

Evidence submitted through the CFE enters directly into the deliberative work of the Task Force and may, where warranted, form the basis for further consultation or designation as an Expert Witness for the relevant drafting cycle.

IV. Scope and Domains

The *Helsinki Manual* addresses geoeconomic practice across five domains:

1. Strategic Trade and Market Access
2. Foreign Investment and Ownership Control
3. Finance, Monetary Power, and Sanctions
4. Industrial Strategy, Technology, and Production Networks
5. Data, Digital Infrastructure, and Algorithmic Governance

Submissions may engage one or more domains or contribute cross-cutting evidence relevant to the *Helsinki Manual*'s development.

In practical terms, the Task Force is examining how contemporary geoeconomic practices are reshaping ownership, control, value extraction, and strategic dependence across firms,

markets, and jurisdictions. Submissions should engage these dynamics through concrete, practice-based evidence—including documented cases, operational experiences, regulatory encounters, or analytically grounded observations—rather than normative argument or advocacy.

V. Review and Status of Contributors

All submissions are assessed through a **merit-based, double-blind review process** for their relevance, analytical rigour, and contribution to the *Helsinki Manual*'s drafting cycles.

Contributors whose evidence is accepted may be designated **Expert Witnesses** for the 2026 cycle of the New Helsinki Process.

Expert Witnesses:

- participate in committee deliberations; and
- may be invited to present their evidence at the plenary drafting sessions convened in **Helsinki (August 2026)** and **Singapore (December 2026)**.

Expert Witness status:

- follows from the merit of the evidence submitted and the contributor's willingness to support the iterative drafting cycle;
- applies to the 2026 cycle;
- may be renewed upon further contribution in subsequent iterations; and
- is distinct from membership in the Task Force, which is constituted separately by the Society.

Submission of evidence does not imply appointment, membership, or access to Helsinki Geoeconomics Week.

VI. Submission Instructions

Evidence should be submitted by email as a PDF to:

secretariat@geoeconomics.fi

Please include:

- the domain(s) addressed; and
- the author's professional affiliation and contact details.

A short biographical note (maximum 150 words) may be included. A curriculum vitae is optional.

Helsinki Geoeconomics Society

VII. Timeline

- **Call opens:** Tuesday, 6 January 2026
- **Submission deadline:** Friday, 6 March 2026

The CFE marks the formal opening of the 2026 drafting cycle of the New Helsinki Process.

End of Communiqué

Annexes:

Annex A: Thematic Orientation and Evidentiary Guidance

Annex B: Master Inquiry for the 2026 Drafting Cycle

Annex C: Forms of Evidence and Illustrative Themes

Helsinki Geoeconomics Society

Annex A: Thematic Orientation and Evidentiary Guidance

(Non-binding; for orientation only)

Indicative Focus Areas by Domain

Strategic Trade and Market Access
Export controls, licensing regimes, chokepoint dependencies, trade conditionality, enforcement practices.

Foreign Investment and Ownership Control
Screening mechanisms, ownership thresholds, governance rights, state influence channels, de facto control structures.

Finance, Monetary Power, and Sanctions
Payment systems, collateral chains, compliance architectures, financial messaging infrastructures, extraterritorial enforcement.

Industrial Strategy, Technology, and Production Networks
Subsidy design, supply-chain restructuring, technology transfer constraints, localization requirements, and capacity concentration.

Data, Digital Infrastructure, and Algorithmic Governance
Cloud dependencies, data localization regimes, platform control, algorithmic compliance tools, infrastructural leverage.

Helsinki Geoeconomics Society

Annex B: Master Inquiry for the 2026 Drafting Cycle

(Analytical framing; submissions may support, refine, or challenge)

Metasystemic Crisis and the "New West": From Capital Destruction to Digital Vassalage

This inquiry examines whether the post-WWII geoeconomic order—stabilised less by formal rules than by a political-economic bargain centred on surplus absorption, monetary reach, and security externalities—is entering a phase of metasystemic strain.

A **metasystemic crisis** differs from a systemic crisis in that it calls into question not merely the functioning of the economic system, but the premises that define what the system is, how it coordinates behaviour, and how stability is produced and enforced.

The **"New West"** refers to an evolving geoeconomic order in which Western power is exercised less through universal rules and institutions than through control over financial, legal, and digital infrastructures that structure access, compliance, and enforceability.

In this context, **capital destruction** refers to the United States' historically unique capacity to absorb global export surpluses through sovereign borrowing directed toward non-productive expenditure, most notably military spending. By issuing universally accepted safe assets to finance activities that did not generate tradable output, the United States converted surplus capital into security provision and systemic stability. This mechanism—central to the post-war order—was not replicable by other states lacking comparable monetary reach, fiscal credibility, and enforcement capacity.

Digital vassalage describes an alternative model of order formation in which subordinate actors maintain internal security and public order through privileged access to digital infrastructures that enable monitoring, attribution, compliance, and defence against destabilising informational, narrative, and cyber disruptions.

The Task Force is assessing how emerging forms of digital infrastructure, compliance systems, and enforceability are reshaping political security, capital allocation, and global economic coordination.

Submissions that test, refine, or contest these working hypotheses are explicitly encouraged.

Helsinki Geoeconomics Society

Annex C: Forms of Evidence and Illustrative Themes

(Non-exhaustive)

Forms of Evidence

- analytical case studies;
- regulatory, market, or institutional analyses;
- methodological or standards-mapping proposals;
- documented operational or contractual evidence;
- empirical or practice-based analytical notes.

Illustrative Themes

- Capital absorption and global surplus recycling
- Monetary reach and political security
- Digital infrastructure as enforceability
- Postlegality and lawfare
- Non-scalar wealth architectures
- Crisis as epistemic transition
- Platform power and geopolitical alignment