EXECUTIVE CONTROL ESCALATION

A plain-language guide to the monitoring method and its mathematics

Simplified version 2 | Based on the methodology dated 2 October 2026

Prepared for readers comfortable with everyday business arithmetic. This is a companion explanation of the original 21-page methodology, not a revised model or a new daily assessment.

Two separate questions drive the entire method: Are unusual preparations becoming more evident? And has extraordinary federal authority actually been used?

What the model is for

The monitoring method follows publicly observable federal activities during the election and government transition period. It looks for a possible movement from ordinary government operations toward unusual preparation, extraordinary military intervention, or the displacement of normal civilian control. The stated review period ends 5 January 2027, subject to a change in the date Congress convenes.

The method is designed to provide an early warning while avoiding false alarms. It is not an election prediction, a legal judgment, a determination of anyone's motives, or an estimate of the percentage chance that extraordinary control will occur.

Four levels describe what has actually happened

Level	Plain-English meaning
Level 0 — Ordinary	Government institutions operate through normal legal, administrative, judicial, law-enforcement, and military channels.
Level 1 — Unusual preparation	Concerning preparations or interventions are evident, but normal civilian institutions continue to function.
Level 2 — Extraordinary action	Qualifying extraordinary federal military authority is actually exercised, not merely discussed or planned.
Level 3 — Civilian control displaced	Ordinary civilian authority is materially overridden, suspended, or replaced in the area or function being monitored.

These are descriptions of observed conditions. A level is not a moral judgment, and a higher level does not automatically mean nationwide action. The scope of any action must be stated.

The central safeguard: preparation is not action

Imagine a factory monitoring equipment failure. Increasing temperature, vibration, and pressure may warn of a developing problem. But those warnings are not the same as a confirmed machine failure. This method follows that distinction: one track monitors signs of preparation; another checks whether a defined extraordinary action has happened.

A large number of concerning indicators can strengthen the preparation warning. They cannot, by themselves, establish Level 2. Conversely, an unmistakable qualifying action can establish Level 2 even without a long advance warning.

What counts as evidence?

The model sorts information into six familiar categories, so a collection of headlines is not mistaken for a collection of distinct events.

Category	What analysts look for
Legal authority	Orders, proclamations, legal positions, or cases involving unusual powers.
Agency organization	Unusual assignments, task forces, staffing, coordination, or instructions.
Operational activity	Moving forces or equipment, mission orders, staging, or work actually performed.
Federal and state relations	Federal demands on states, refusals, or changes to who controls a government function.
Official explanations	Statements advancing a reason for exceptional action, such as an emergency or obstruction.
Counterevidence and limits	Court orders, resistance, explicit restraints, canceled plans, or expected actions that have not appeared.

One event counts once

Suppose an agency issues an unusual directive. Five newspapers publish articles about it. That is one underlying directive, not five separate preparations. Independent reporting can improve confidence that the directive exists, but repeated coverage does not multiply the event itself. If the directive later becomes a signed order, the original record is updated rather than counted again as unrelated evidence.

How evidence is weighed

For each underlying event, the reviewer considers whether the source is reliable; whether the fact relates specifically to the action being monitored; whether it is independent of other reports; how close it is to real execution; and whether it represents a draft idea or a harder-to-reverse commitment. An official statement is strong evidence that the statement was made, but not necessarily that every claim within it is true.

The mathematics, using business math

The original model asks a simple comparison question: Would this piece of evidence be more expected if unusual preparation were taking place, or if government activity remained ordinary?

A comparison number of 2 says the evidence is assumed to be twice as expected under unusual preparation. A comparison number of 1 gives neither explanation an advantage. A comparison number of 0.5 favors ordinary conditions or restraint because the evidence is only half as expected under unusual preparation. These are assumed values used to demonstrate the method, not measurements established by research.

For independent pieces of evidence, the comparison numbers can be multiplied. For easier tracking across many events and days, the original model converts them into addable scoring values. That conversion preserves the same comparison information; it does not turn the results into probabilities.

A fictional calculation: follow every step

This example reproduces the five assumed inputs in the original document. It is fictional and does not describe current events.

Fictional observation	Comparison number
An unusual agency coordination directive	2.0
A formal legal memorandum discussing extraordinary authority	2.5
A specific official explanation for possible exceptional action	1.8
Expected troop preparation has not been seen	0.60
A court blocks a relevant federal action	0.70

Step 1: Multiply the five numbers. 2.0 × 2.5 × 1.8 × 0.60 × 0.70 = 3.78. Under the model's illustrative assumptions, this collection is 3.78 times as compatible with the preparation explanation as with the ordinary-operations explanation. This is not a 78 percent increase in real-world risk or a 78 percent probability.

Step 2: Convert to the model's additive scale. The original report expresses this same combined evidence as approximately 1.329 scoring units. A reader does not need to perform that conversion: the key is that the scoring scale is used for combining and charting evidence.

Step 3: Ask whether independent categories are converging. The original prototype adds 0.70 scoring units when at least three moderately strong positive categories genuinely converge within about 10–20 days. Assuming the three positive categories qualify, the score becomes 1.329 + 0.70 = 2.029. The bonus is equivalent to roughly doubling the overall comparison number: 3.78 × 2.01 ≈ 7.61.

Step 4: Compare with the original prototype warning line. The preparation threshold is 3.0 scoring units. Our example remains below it at 2.029. The threshold is an engineering choice, not an established boundary between safe and unsafe or a percentage likelihood.

Step 5: Check actual action separately. No qualifying action or loss of civilian control is assumed in this example. Therefore the example does not support a Level 2 or Level 3 finding, no matter how concerning its preparation score appears.

Why no percentage forecast? The same evidence can lead to very different odds depending on how common the event was before the evidence appeared. The model does not yet have a defensible historical starting rate.

Why an assumed starting rate matters

The original demonstrates this with the comparison result of about 7.61. If an event were assumed to have a 1 percent starting chance, the example gives a resulting chance of about 7.1 percent. If the starting chance were 10 percent, the very same evidence gives about 45.8 percent. Neither starting assumption has been established for this problem. Publishing either answer as a real forecast would create false precision.

Old information gradually counts less

Information has different useful lifetimes. A speech can become stale in days; staging of personnel or equipment can change within a week; organizational arrangements and formal orders may matter for weeks or months. The original design uses a simple fading rule: after one assigned “half-life,” an observation carries half of its earlier influence; after two half-lives, it carries one quarter.

For example, if a short-lived observation starts at 8 points and has a four-day half-life, its remaining influence is 4 points after four days and 2 points after eight days, unless a new development renews or changes it. This illustrates fading only; the original model's actual working scores are on a different scale.

Evidence kind	Illustrative relevance period in the original
Legal or structural actions	About 30–90 days
Agency organization	About 14–45 days
Operational staging	About 3–10 days
Official explanations	Several days to roughly two weeks
Absence of an expected action	Short-lived; reconsidered each day

These periods are initial design assumptions, not experimentally determined constants. A court restriction remains relevant while it is in force; active real-world operations must be checked for continuing status instead of automatically fading away.

Why independent developments matter more than several headlines

Three genuinely separate developments in legal authority, agency organization, and operational planning may strengthen the warning more than three reports derived from one executive decision. The convergence adjustment recognizes independent developments within the same period. The original version uses a 0.70 scoring-unit adjustment when at least three moderately strong categories meet the timing and independence conditions. It must not be awarded just because a single event produces statements, press releases, and lawsuits.

Evidence can lower the warning

The review also records what makes escalation less supported: a court blocks a particular mechanism, state officials retain an authority, a planned action is canceled, or a clear operational restriction is imposed. The warning can fall as such evidence develops, and it can fall when old evidence loses relevance.

Missing evidence is useful only when the missing action would normally have been visible by now. Not seeing troops in a place where no troop movement was expected proves little. Not seeing an expected mobilization after a credible announced timetable may matter more. A restriction on one legal pathway does not guarantee that every other pathway is unavailable.

What opens the actual-action check?

The method asks whether reliable evidence establishes at least one of three things: (1) a qualifying extraordinary authority has actually been invoked or a binding order issued; (2) federal forces or capabilities are actually conducting the relevant extraordinary mission; or (3) ordinary civilian command has been materially transferred, displaced, or suspended.

A real qualifying extraordinary military action supports Level 2. A demonstrated material displacement of ordinary civilian authority supports Level 3. The reviewer must verify the nature, geography, legal command relationship, and actual function of an action rather than inferring them from uniforms, rhetoric, or an unusually high preparation score.

How the daily review is carried out

First: gather original government records, court documents, and independently supported reporting. Second: identify the underlying factual event and remove duplicate coverage. Third: assign it to the most relevant evidence category. Fourth: evaluate its reliability, significance, and age. Fifth: update the preparation score and test any justified convergence adjustment. Sixth: separately check for verified extraordinary action or displacement of civilian government. Finally: record the result, principal supporting and limiting evidence, dates, and a day-by-day history.

The reader should interpret each daily result in this order: observed level; whether the actual-action test has been met; preparation trend; supporting and limiting facts. A small daily fluctuation is less informative than a sustained, independently supported change.

Historical checks are not statistical proof

The original methodology describes limited exercises using Little Rock in 1957, Detroit in 1967, Los Angeles in 1992, Washington in 2020, Ferguson in 2014, and the period preceding 6 January 2021. These were used to see whether the rules behaved sensibly: identifying warning signals before documented intervention in some cases while avoiding inappropriate declarations in others. The reported advance warning intervals were roughly four days for Little Rock and twelve hours in the Detroit/Los Angeles examples.

These examples are informal design checks, not a statistically representative test. They cannot establish how often the model will raise false alarms, miss events, or forecast accurately. Using later-known facts during a historical reconstruction would also make performance appear better than it was.

What still needs to be validated

The original identifies several gaps: too few closely comparable historical cases; evidence that comes from the same underlying decisions; undisclosed or delayed government activities; choices about evidence weights and fading; and the risk that definitions shift over time. To improve credibility, the project would need fixed definitions, a dated collection of positive and negative historical examples, independent reviewers applying the same rules, comparison of different parameter choices, and tests using only information known as of each review date. Only then could it consider responsibly publishing an estimated percentage with an uncertainty range.

Legal context, without treating the model as a court

Federal law generally limits domestic military enforcement of civilian law while providing specific exceptions and powers under defined circumstances. The original cites the Posse Comitatus Act and the Insurrection Act. This model records legal decisions, authorizations, and operational steps as evidence; it does not decide whether a particular action is constitutional or lawful. A proposal to use authority is different from an actual order, and an order is different from completed field action.

How to read this companion alongside the original

This guide explains the methodological baseline documented on 2 October 2026. Its numbers, warning line, and convergence rule come from that document. Later daily operational reports may use a different index presentation or revised coding rules; those later changes are not silently substituted here. Comparisons across methodology versions require a clearly marked change in definition or measurement.

Bottom line: The method tracks preparations early, checks actions separately, avoids counting the same event twice, gives contrary evidence its proper place, and clearly distinguishes an evidence score from a probability.

Source: EEC_Methodology_and_Mathematical_Approach_Version_2.pdf, Paul Hoyt Nelson, methodology baseline dated 2 October 2026. This companion is a plain-language paraphrase and includes no new external factual verification.