EXECUTIVE CONTROL ESCALATION (EEC)

Monitoring Model

Logic, Mathematics, Evidence Handling, and Daily Analytic Approach

STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT

Methodology baseline as of 2 October 2026. The model is an engineering-style warning instrument designed to detect escalation signals early while resisting false alarms. It is not a legal opinion, an election forecast, or a calibrated probability of a political outcome.

Paul Hoyt Nelson
02 October 2026
LLM/AI Assistance in Preparation
Monitoring horizon: through 5 January 2027

Executive Summary

The Executive Control Escalation (EEC) model is a structured warning framework for tracking whether observable federal actions are moving from ordinary constitutional operations toward unusual preparation, extraordinary use of federal military authority, or displacement of normal civil authority. Its design problem is asymmetric: the system must become sensitive enough to detect weak precursor signals during E0 and E1, yet it must not convert rhetoric, legal discussion, or isolated administrative activity into a false claim that extraordinary authority has actually been exercised.

The current solution is a two-stage architecture. Stage 1 estimates a latent preparation condition from multiple evidence families using Bayesian likelihood-ratio logic. Stage 2 is an execution gate: the reported E-state cannot advance into E2 merely because precursor evidence is strong. E2 requires observable execution evidence such as an actual invocation/order, corresponding operational mission execution, or displacement of civilian command. This decouples early warning sensitivity from escalation-state classification.

Core idea

Ask two different questions: (1) "How much evidence is accumulating that unusual preparation is occurring?" and (2) "Has extraordinary authority actually crossed into execution?" A model that tries to answer both with one score is either too insensitive early or too trigger-happy later.

Element	Current design
State scale	E0 ordinary operations; E1 unusual preparation/intervention with civilian institutions operative; E2 extraordinary federal military authority exercised; E3 displacement/suspension of civil authority.
Precursor engine	Evidence grouped into L, A, O, Q, J, and N families; evidence contributes likelihood ratios to a preparation log Bayes factor.
Fusion	log BF = sum of log likelihood ratios + a bounded temporal-clustering term.
Prototype alert threshold	Preparation signal enters E1-warning territory at log BF >= 3.0. This is an engineering threshold, not a calibrated posterior-probability boundary.
Clustering	Prototype C = +0.70 when at least three moderate positive evidence families cluster within roughly 10-20 days.
Execution gate	G = L_E OR O_E OR C_E. E2 requires the gate to open; precursor strength alone is insufficient.
Time behavior	Evidence decays by type: legal/structural signals persist longest (roughly 30-90 days), operational staging is shorter-lived (roughly 3-10 days), and rhetoric/justification decays over days.
Negative evidence	Absence of expected execution indicators and affirmative institutional constraints reduce the preparation signal, but do not mechanically "cancel" unrelated evidence.
Current calibration status	Weights, thresholds, decay constants, and clustering bonus are prototype engineering assumptions. A calibrated P(E2 or E3) is intentionally withheld pending defensible priors/CPTs and validation.

Contents

1 Purpose and Analytic Question
2 State Taxonomy: E0 through E3
3 Why the Model Uses Two Stages
4 Evidence Architecture
5 Bayesian Mathematics
6 Temporal Dynamics and Sensitivity
7 Execution Gate and State Assignment
8 Negative Evidence and Institutional Constraints
9 Daily Analytic Workflow
10 Testing and Historical Back-Checks
11 Reading the Daily Report
12 Limitations, Calibration, and Validation Plan
13 Legal and Institutional Context
14 Worked Example
15 Conclusions
Appendix A Mathematical Reference
Appendix B Evidence Coding Guide
Appendix C Sources and Further Reading

1. Purpose and Analytic Question

The model is intended to support disciplined situational awareness over the U.S. federal election cycle and transition period. The monitoring horizon currently runs through 5 January 2027, two days after the new Congress is scheduled to convene on 3 January 2027. The horizon can be adjusted if the statutory convening date changes.

The monitored event is deliberately broader than "martial law." That phrase has no single all-purpose statutory switch and can obscure materially different mechanisms. The EEC framework therefore watches for a family of actions that could increase federal executive control through military, law-enforcement, emergency, administrative, or command mechanisms, especially where those actions intersect election administration or ordinary civilian governance.

1.1 What the model does

- Organizes heterogeneous observations into defined evidence families rather than treating every headline as an independent signal.
- Measures whether precursor evidence is accumulating, strengthening, weakening, or decaying over time.
- Separates preparation from execution so weak early signals can be detected without prematurely declaring E2 or E3.
- Preserves negative evidence and institutional constraints as first-class observations.
- Produces a repeatable daily record whose trend is more informative than a single-day number.

1.2 What the model does not do

- It does not infer intent from personality, ideology, health, competence, or other speculative attributes of public officials.
- It does not treat prediction-market prices as independent Bayesian priors. Markets may be shown as external context only.
- It does not convert an uncalibrated warning index into a numerical probability of E2/E3.
- It does not determine whether a contemplated or completed action is lawful; legal characterization requires separate legal analysis.

2. State Taxonomy: E0 through E3

A useful state scale must describe observable institutional conditions, not moral judgments. The four E-states are therefore operational definitions. The transition from one state to another is based on evidence of preparation and execution, not on whether an observer approves or disapproves of a policy.

State	Operational definition	Typical evidence pattern
E0	Ordinary constitutional operations. Government institutions are functioning through routine legal, administrative, judicial, law-enforcement, and military channels.	Normal planning; ordinary litigation; routine Guard activity; political rhetoric without corroborating unusual preparation.
E1	Unusual federal preparation or intervention, while civilian institutions remain operative.	Converging legal, administrative, operational, federal-state, or justificatory signals; unusual planning; elevated readiness; exceptional requests; no qualifying execution gate.
E2	Extraordinary federal military authority is exercised.	Actual qualifying authority/order and/or corresponding mission execution. Civilian institutions may remain functioning, but extraordinary military power is no longer merely preparatory.
E3	Civil authority is displaced or suspended in a material domain.	Military or extraordinary executive command substitutes for, overrides, or suspends ordinary civilian authority in the monitored domain.

Important

E1 is intentionally broad enough to carry weak but convergent warning evidence. E2 is intentionally narrow: it is protected by an execution gate. This is the principal sensitivity/specificity improvement adopted on 2 October 2026.

3. Why the Model Uses Two Stages

The earlier single-index approach exposed a classic detection problem. If the threshold is high enough to avoid false E2 alarms, E0-to-E1 precursor signals can remain nearly invisible. If the threshold is lowered enough to detect weak preparation, rhetoric and ordinary legal activity can push the same score too close to an execution conclusion. The revised architecture treats this as two different inference problems.

3.1 Stage 1 - latent preparation state

Let P_t denote the unobserved degree of unusual preparation at day t. P_t cannot be measured directly. Instead, the model observes evidence X_t from several families and asks how much more likely that evidence would be if meaningful preparation were occurring than if the system remained in ordinary E0 conditions.

3.2 Stage 2 - observable execution state

Let G_t be an execution gate based on high-specificity observables. The gate is deliberately Boolean or near-Boolean. It prevents a large collection of ambiguous precursor indicators from substituting for the qualitatively different fact of execution.

Preparation evidence -> P_t -> warning strength | Execution evidence -> G_t -> E-state

This architecture resembles safety and fault-detection systems in engineering: a sensitive precursor channel can warn early, while a separate interlock controls declaration of the more consequential state.

4. Evidence Architecture

Evidence is grouped by causal role. This reduces double counting and forces the analyst to ask what an observation actually represents. Multiple articles repeating the same underlying event are one observation, not multiple independent signals.

Code	Family	Question answered	Examples of evidence type
L	Legal / authority	Is unusual legal authority being invoked, prepared, tested, or operationalized?	Orders, proclamations, formal legal positions, emergency authorities, unusual litigation posture.
A	Administrative / organizational	Are organizations being configured to support exceptional action?	Task forces, command arrangements, personnel assignments, unusual directives, interagency coordination.
O	Operational	Are forces, assets, logistics, communications, or missions being staged or executed?	Deployment orders, staging, mobilization, mission tasking, physical presence, operational support.
Q	Federal-state interface	Is the federal relationship with state/local authority changing in a way relevant to control?	Federalization, demands on states, preemption conflicts, requests/refusals, substitution for state functions.
J	Justification / narrative	Is an official rationale being developed that could support extraordinary action?	Official statements defining necessity, emergency, obstruction, rebellion, inability of ordinary processes.
N	Negative / constraint	What expected indicators are absent, contradicted, blocked, or institutionally constrained?	Court rulings, state resistance, internal restraint, absence of staging, absence of execution where it would be expected.

4.1 Evidence quality dimensions

- Source reliability: primary official records and direct documentation outrank anonymous or derivative reporting.
- Specificity: evidence tied directly to the monitored mechanism carries more information than generalized political conflict.
- Independence: syndicated or repeated coverage is deduplicated to the underlying event.
- Proximity: operational acts closer to execution generally carry more diagnostic weight than broad rhetoric.
- Reversibility: exploratory statements or draft plans are weaker than signed orders, deployed forces, or completed command transfers.

5. Bayesian Mathematics

The model uses Bayes factors because they provide a transparent way to combine evidence without pretending that the current model has a fully calibrated prior probability. For an observation x, define a likelihood ratio (LR):

$$\mathbf{LR(x) = P(x \mid meaningful\ preparation) / P(x \mid ordinary\ E0\ conditions)}$$

An LR greater than 1 supports preparation; an LR below 1 supports the ordinary/constraint hypothesis; LR = 1 is neutral. Because independent likelihood ratios multiply, the model works in log space, where contributions add:

$$\mathbf{\log BF_t = \sum_i [\log LR_i(t)] + C_t}$$

BF is the Bayes factor supplied by the observed evidence. C_t is a bounded temporal-clustering term described later. The use of log space has three practical advantages: positive and negative evidence combine symmetrically, contributions can be inspected individually, and very large products do not become numerically awkward.

5.1 From Bayes factor to posterior odds

If a defensible prior were available, Bayes' theorem would convert the evidence factor into posterior odds:

$$\mathbf{Posterior\ odds = Prior\ odds \times BF}$$

$$\mathbf{P(H \mid X) = [BF \times P(H)] / [1 - P(H) + BF \times P(H)]}$$

The current model deliberately stops short of publishing this posterior as a probability. The reason is methodological, not mathematical: the prior probability and conditional probability tables (CPTs) have not yet been calibrated against a sufficiently defined reference class. Choosing an arbitrary prior would make the output look more precise while adding no real information.

5.2 Prototype E0/E1 threshold

For the current prototype, a preparation log Bayes factor of approximately 3.0 is used as an E1-warning threshold. If natural logarithms are used, log BF = 3 corresponds to BF ≈ 20.1: the collected evidence is about twenty times as compatible with the preparation hypothesis as with the ordinary-condition hypothesis under the assumed likelihood model. This does not mean "95% probability" or any other posterior probability without a prior.

6. Temporal Dynamics and Sensitivity

A daily warning system must remember persistent evidence without allowing old observations to dominate forever. Each observation therefore has a persistence profile. A simple implementation is exponential decay:

$$w_i(t) = w_i(t0) \times \exp[-\lambda_i (t - t0)]$$

$$\lambda_i = \ln(2) / h_i$$

Here h_i is the half-life assigned to the evidence type. A legal or structural action can remain relevant for many weeks; physical staging may be highly informative but short-lived; rhetoric often loses value quickly unless repeated or followed by action.

Evidence type	Prototype persistence	Reason
Legal / structural	~30-90 days	Authorities, orders, institutional structures, and formal positions can remain actionable.
Administrative	~14-45 days	Organizational preparations persist but can be superseded or dissolved.
Operational staging	~3-10 days	Readiness and deployments are highly time-sensitive.
Justification / rhetoric	Days to ~2 weeks	Statements are weak unless repeated, made specific, or coupled to action.
Negative execution evidence	Short, refreshed daily	"Nothing happened" is informative only relative to what should have been observable by that time.

6.1 Temporal clustering

Weak signals become more informative when different causal families move together. The prototype therefore adds a bounded clustering bonus $C_t = +0.70$ when at least three moderate positive families occur within a short window, approximately 10-20 days. The bonus is intentionally modest: it recognizes convergence without treating correlated observations as fully independent evidence.

$$C_t = 0.70 \text{ if } \geq 3 \text{ moderate positive families cluster in the window; otherwise } 0$$

6.2 Why this improves E0/E1 sensitivity

The improvement does not come from simply lowering a threshold. It comes from allowing several individually weak, cross-domain observations to accumulate in Stage 1 while Stage 2 remains protected by the execution gate. This is a more robust way to increase sensitivity because it preserves a hard distinction between "preparing" and "doing."

7. Execution Gate and State Assignment

The execution gate is the key safeguard against score inflation. The current prototype is:

$$G_t = L_E \ \text{OR} \ O_E \ \text{OR} \ C_E$$

Gate term	Meaning	Illustrative trigger
L_E	Executed legal authority	A qualifying authority is actually invoked or a binding order is issued, rather than merely discussed.
O_E	Operational execution	Forces or federal capabilities actually perform the extraordinary mission relevant to the monitored event.
C_E	Civil-command displacement	Ordinary civilian authority is materially displaced, suspended, or subordinated in the monitored domain.

State assignment then follows a decision logic rather than a single scalar threshold:

1. If ordinary activity dominates and precursor evidence is below the warning threshold, classify E0.
2. If unusual preparation/intervention evidence is sufficiently strong but G = 0, classify E1.
3. If qualifying extraordinary military authority is actually exercised and G opens through L_E or O_E, classify at least E2, subject to evidence verification.
4. If ordinary civilian authority is materially displaced or suspended in the monitored domain, classify E3.

Conservative escalation rule

A very high preparation score cannot, by itself, produce E2. Conversely, a clear executed event can open the gate even if the preceding warning score was modest. The two channels answer different questions.

8. Negative Evidence and Institutional Constraints

A useful warning model must be capable of moving down as well as up. Negative evidence is not simply "good news"; it is evidence that is less expected under the preparation/execution hypothesis than under ordinary conditions. Examples include a court blocking a relevant action, a state successfully retaining authority, a command official declining or constraining a contemplated mission, or the continued absence of operational staging when such staging would normally be required.

8.1 Likelihood treatment

Negative observations receive LR < 1. In log space, log(LR) is negative and subtracts from the cumulative evidence. For example, LR = 0.5 contributes $\ln(0.5) \approx -0.693$. This is preferable to an arbitrary "minus points" system because the sign and magnitude have an interpretable evidentiary meaning.

8.2 Absence of evidence is conditional

The absence of an indicator is useful only when the indicator would probably be observable if the hypothesized preparation or execution were occurring. The model therefore asks: "If H were true at this stage, how surprising is it that we have not observed x?" This prevents daily non-events from overwhelming genuine but slow-moving structural evidence.

8.3 Constraints are not vetoes

Judicial rulings, statutory limits, state resistance, military professional constraints, and administrative friction reduce feasibility or increase the cost of escalation, but they are not coded as absolute guarantees. They enter as evidence with appropriate strength and persistence.

9. Daily Analytic Workflow

The daily process is designed to be reproducible. The objective is not to collect the maximum number of stories; it is to maintain a clean evidence ledger in which each underlying event is coded once and its later developments are linked to the original item.

5. Collect: review primary government material, court records where available, reputable reporting, and other corroborated sources for new developments.
6. Deduplicate: collapse repeated reporting, commentary, and syndicated stories into the underlying factual event.
7. Classify: assign each event to L, A, O, Q, J, or N based on causal role, not headline wording.
8. Assess quality: record source reliability, specificity, independence, proximity to execution, and reversibility.
9. Assign/update LR: apply the current prototype evidence strength and decay; revise an existing item rather than adding a duplicate when the same event develops.
10. Apply clustering: test whether at least three moderate positive families converge inside the active time window.
11. Evaluate gate: independently test L_E, O_E, and C_E from high-specificity evidence.
12. Compute/report: calculate the preparation signal, state classification, positive and negative contributors, gate status, and trend.
13. Archive: preserve the daily ledger so later calibration can reconstruct exactly what information was available on each date.

9.1 Current report presentation

The revised daily report separates the preparation index from the executed E-state, explicitly shows whether the execution gate is open or closed, and lists the strongest positive and negative contributors. This prevents a reader from interpreting a rising warning score as an assertion that extraordinary authority has already been used.

10. Testing and Historical Back-Checks

The sensitivity change was tested against a small set of historical cases as a prototype sanity check, not as statistical validation. The purpose was to see whether the architecture behaves in the desired direction: earlier detection in genuine escalation cases, resistance to false E2 classification in tense but non-executed cases, and no trigger where precursor evidence remains weak.

Case	Prototype behavior	Interpretation
Little Rock, 1957	Detected preparation roughly four days early.	Cross-family precursor evidence can surface before overt execution.
Detroit, 1967 / Los Angeles, 1992	Detected roughly 12 hours early.	Operational crises may compress the warning interval; the model still provides some precursor separation.
Washington, D.C., 2020	Strong E1-type preparation signal without E2 in the tested framing.	Demonstrates value of separating unusual preparation from the execution gate.
Ferguson, 2014	No inappropriate trigger in the prototype test.	Helps test specificity against a major domestic disturbance with different federal dynamics.
Pre-event January 6, 2021	No inappropriate precursor trigger in the tested window.	Weak or non-convergent evidence should not be amplified merely because a major event is known in hindsight.

Validation warning

These back-checks are qualitative engineering tests. Five cases are far too few to estimate false-positive rates, false-negative rates, calibration curves, or event probabilities. Historical case coding is also vulnerable to hindsight bias unless the analyst uses only information available before the event cutoff.

11. Reading the Daily Report

The daily report should be read as a dashboard with several independent fields, not as a single “risk number.” The most important interpretive sequence is state -> gate -> preparation trend -> evidence composition.

Field	How to interpret it
E-state	Observed institutional condition. E1 means unusual preparation/intervention with civilian institutions still operative; it is not synonymous with execution.
Execution gate	The decisive check for E2. Closed means no qualifying executed legal/operational/civil-command condition has been verified.
Preparation index / log BF	Relative strength of precursor evidence under the prototype likelihood model. Best used as a trend and for day-to-day decomposition.
Positive contributors	What new or persistent evidence increased the preparation signal.
Negative contributors	What constraints, contradictions, or missing expected indicators reduced the signal.
Trend	Whether the evidence system is accumulating, stable, or decaying. Trend persistence matters more than a one-day fluctuation.
External context	Polling, prediction markets, commentary, and expert assessments may be displayed separately but should not silently enter the Bayesian evidence ledger.

For the reconstructed 30 September through 2 October series after the sensitivity revision, the preparation index moved approximately 32 -> 42 -> 38 while the execution gate remained closed. Those values are model-index outputs, not percentages. The important information is the temporary strengthening and subsequent partial decay/offset of precursor evidence without verified execution.

12. Limitations, Calibration, and Validation Plan

The current model is intentionally transparent about what remains uncalibrated. The equations are Bayesian; the present numerical parameter values are engineering assumptions. This distinction matters because a mathematically Bayesian update is not automatically an empirically calibrated probability model.

12.1 Principal limitations

- Reference-class problem: truly comparable U.S. cases are rare, heterogeneous, and historically dependent.
- Conditional dependence: evidence families are not fully independent. One policy decision can generate legal, administrative, operational, and rhetorical observations.
- Source visibility: some planning or command activity may be classified, delayed, or simply unreported.
- Hindsight bias: historical tests can accidentally use facts that were not knowable at the time.
- Parameter uncertainty: LRs, decay half-lives, the +0.70 clustering term, and the log-BF threshold require empirical refinement.
- Definition drift: the monitored event must remain stable over time or trend comparisons become invalid.

12.2 Recommended calibration path

14. Freeze the ontology: finalize E-state definitions, evidence-family definitions, and execution-gate criteria before fitting parameters.
15. Build a timestamped historical corpus containing both positive cases and hard negatives, with information censored to what was knowable on each historical date.
16. Use multiple independent coders and measure inter-rater agreement for evidence classification and strength.
17. Estimate likelihood ranges rather than single values initially; use sensitivity analysis or Monte Carlo sampling over those ranges.
18. Test calibration separately from discrimination. A model can rank days correctly while still producing bad probabilities.
19. Use walk-forward or leave-one-event-out validation to reduce overfitting to famous historical cases.
20. Only after validation, introduce an explicit prior and publish posterior probability intervals with uncertainty bands.

13. Legal and Institutional Context

The model monitors observable conditions against a legal environment in which domestic military use is constrained but not categorically prohibited. The Posse Comitatus Act, 18 U.S.C. §1385, generally prohibits use of the covered armed forces to execute the laws except where expressly authorized by the Constitution or an Act of Congress. The Insurrection Act provisions in 10 U.S.C. Chapter 13 provide statutory mechanisms under specified circumstances for federal use of militia and armed forces. Section 252, for example, addresses circumstances in which unlawful obstructions or rebellion make ordinary judicial enforcement impracticable; §253 addresses specified interference with state or federal law and protected rights. Section 251 concerns federal aid requested by a state government in an insurrection.

This legal structure is one reason the EEC model distinguishes legal preparation from legal execution. Public discussion of an authority, litigation about its scope, or planning for contingencies is not equivalent to an actual invocation or mission. Conversely, a formal order can be highly significant even before extensive physical deployment occurs.

Legal interpretation boundary

The EEC model records whether legally significant acts occurred and how diagnostic they are for the monitored state. It does not independently adjudicate constitutionality, statutory compliance, or the validity of a particular invocation.

14. Worked Example

The following fictional example illustrates the mechanics. The numbers are pedagogical and are not estimates about any real official or event.

Observation	Family	Assumed LR	ln(LR)
Formal agency directive creates unusual election-period coordination cell	A	2.0	+0.693
Official legal memorandum publicly discusses extraordinary domestic authority	L	2.5	+0.916
Repeated official justification becomes specific to a near-term contingency	J	1.8	+0.588
No corresponding troop/Guard staging observed despite expected lead time	N	0.60	-0.511
Court order narrows one relevant federal action	N	0.70	-0.357

Raw log BF = 0.693 + 0.916 + 0.588 - 0.511 - 0.357 = 1.329

Only three positive families are present (A, L, J). If they satisfy the model's "moderate" and timing criteria, add C = 0.70:

Clustered log BF = 1.329 + 0.70 = 2.029

The result remains below the prototype 3.0 preparation threshold. More importantly, suppose L_E = O_E = C_E = 0. The execution gate is closed. The model therefore does not classify E2. If a later signed qualifying order produces an executed legal condition, L_E could open the gate; if the underlying precursor evidence also persists, the state assessment would then be revisited immediately.

14.1 Posterior illustration only

To show why the prior matters, BF = exp(2.029) ≈ 7.61. If one hypothetically used a 1% prior, the posterior would be about 7.1%; with a 10% prior, it would be about 45.8%. The same evidence factor produces very different posterior probabilities. This is precisely why the operational report withholds a probability until a defensible prior/reference class exists.

15. Conclusions

As of 2 October 2026, the EEC methodology has evolved from a single warning index into a two-stage Bayesian precursor/execution architecture. That change directly addresses the identified weakness at E0 and E1: early signals can now accumulate across independent causal families and receive a modest convergence bonus, while the consequential E2/E3 classifications remain protected by explicit execution criteria.

The model's strongest features are conceptual separation, transparent evidence accounting, explicit negative evidence, time decay, deduplication, and a gate that prevents precursor accumulation from masquerading as execution. Its principal weakness is calibration. Until the likelihood ratios, priors, CPTs, decay constants, and thresholds are fitted and validated against a disciplined historical corpus, the preparation score should be treated as a warning index and trend measure rather than a probability.

That is an appropriate engineering posture for the present phase: maximize traceability and falsifiability first, then calibrate. The daily record being accumulated through 5 January 2027 will itself become useful validation material because it preserves what was known, when it was known, and how the model responded before outcomes were known.

Appendix A. Mathematical Reference

Quantity	Definition
H	Hypothesis that meaningful unusual preparation relevant to EEC is occurring.
x_i	Observation i, coded to an evidence family.
LR_i	P(x_i | H) / P(x_i | not-H).
BF	Product of applicable likelihood ratios, adjusted for modeled dependence/clustering.
log BF	Sum of log likelihood ratios plus bounded clustering term.
C_t	Temporal convergence bonus; prototype +0.70 under the defined three-family clustering condition.
h_i	Evidence half-life for decay.
lambda_i	Decay rate ln(2)/h_i.
G_t	Execution gate: L_E OR O_E OR C_E.
E_t	Reported observed escalation state E0-E3.

$$\mathbf{LR_i(t) = \exp[\, w_i(t) \,] \quad \text{and} \quad w_i(t) = w_i(t0) \exp[-\lambda_i \Delta t]}$$

$$\mathbf{\log BF_t = \sum_i w_i(t) + C_t}$$

$$\mathbf{\text{Posterior odds}_t = \text{Prior odds}_t \times BF_t}$$

If future calibration uses a full Bayesian belief network, the simple family-level LR representation can be replaced by conditional probability tables that explicitly encode dependence among parent and child nodes. The current formulation should therefore be viewed as a transparent reduced-order BBN suitable for daily operations and later refinement.

Appendix B. Evidence Coding Guide

Coding question	Preferred treatment
Five outlets report the same statement	One underlying J observation; source corroboration affects confidence, not event count.
A statement becomes a signed order	Update/escalate the original L item; assess whether L_E is now satisfied.
A planned deployment is canceled	Add/update N evidence and decay/remove the associated O precursor as appropriate.
A court blocks one pathway	N evidence against that pathway; do not treat as proof that all pathways are unavailable.
A prediction market moves sharply	External context only unless a separately observed real-world event explains the move and is coded on its own merits.
No troops are observed	N only if deployment should reasonably have been visible by that point under the hypothesized scenario.
A source repeats an old event with new commentary	No new evidence unless the report contains a genuinely new fact.
Evidence is ambiguous between two families	Code to the dominant causal role or split cautiously; do not count the same factual content twice.

Appendix C. Sources and Further Reading

Primary and institutional sources used to anchor the legal/methodological discussion:

- U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. §1385, "Use of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Space Force as posse comitatus." Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives. Current text accessed 2 October 2026.
- U.S. Code, 10 U.S.C. Chapter 13, "Insurrection," including §§251-255. Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives. Current text accessed 2 October 2026.
- U.S. Code, 10 U.S.C. §252, "Use of militia and armed forces to enforce Federal authority." Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives.
- U.S. Code, 10 U.S.C. §253, "Interference with State and Federal law." Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives.
- Congressional Research Service, "The Militia Clauses and the National Guard," IF10535, updated 23 December 2025. Background on constitutional and statutory militia authorities.
- General Bayesian reference: likelihood ratios, Bayes factors, posterior odds, and Bayesian belief networks. The EEC numerical parameters described in this report are project-specific prototype assumptions rather than values taken from these legal sources.

Methodology provenance

The EEC state definitions, evidence-family ontology, clustering rule, execution gate, decay ranges, prototype threshold, historical back-check behavior, and daily-report structure in this document record the project methodology developed through 2 October 2026. They should be version-controlled when changed so historical daily reports remain reproducible.