LEVANT POLICY RESEARCH

Strategic Cartography for Volatile Terrain

LPR Conceptual Framework

Glossary v1.0

35 published concepts · 5 categories · Updated 25 April 2026

This glossary documents the conceptual framework deployed by Levant Policy Research across its analytical production on Operation Epic Fury (US-Israel coalition against Iran, onset 28 February 2026), Lebanon, Syria, the Kurdish question, and the broader MENA strategic environment.

Each entry is structured according to the LPR analytical discipline: **formulation** (the concept stated), **first canonical formulation** (date and channel of original publication), **empirical anchors** (documented observations supporting the formulation), **falsification conditions** (what would invalidate the concept), **subsequent confirmations** (where applicable), and **related concepts** within the framework.

The structure reflects LPR's editorial red line: *never reason from doubtful premises without naming them explicitly*. Each uncertain premise is declared as such; falsification conditions are non-negotiable.

Version: 1.0
Published entries: 35
Categories: Cardinal · Structural · Operational · Systemic · Phase 2
Last update: 25 April 2026

Contents

Cardinal Concepts — 6 entries

Foundational frameworks load-bearing across LPR analysis. Each underpins multiple downstream concepts.

01 · Quadrilemma Hormuz
02 · Doctrinal Divergence Us / Israel
03 · Borrowed Shield
04 · Asymmetric Victory Conditions
05 · Friction Economy / The Rent Machine
06 · Institutional Amnesia

Structural Concepts — 7 entries

Frameworks describing the architecture of Operation Epic Fury and its post-onset configurations.

07 · No Endgame / Force Without Theory Of Change
08 · European Temptation
09 · Arithmetic Of Defeat
10 · Structure Of The Non-Deal
11 · Pakistan As Cessation Architect
12 · Tag Mehir Doctrine
13 · Geography Of Qualification

Operational Concepts — 7 entries

Tools, indicators, and tactical-level frameworks used in LPR tracking and assessment products.

14 · Indicators Of Coercive Degradation (Ind-O1, Ind-I1, S1-S4)
15 · Energy Cartography
16 · Ground Option Matrix — Five Scenarios
17 · War Economy Tracker / Convergence Of Rent
18 · Ahvaz Variable / Bifurcation Thesis
19 · Kurdish Wager
20 · Irgc Financial Architecture — Four Layers

Systemic Concepts — 7 entries

Frameworks describing recurring patterns that operate across actors, theatres, and time horizons.

21 · Two Wars. One Operation.
22 · Scorched Earth As Default Exit
23 · The Art Of Not Fighting / Mediation Redistribution
24 · Authoritarian Pluralism
25 · The (In)Competence Gap / Five-Layer Cascade
26 · Three Journalists. One Day.
27 · The Aoun Calculation

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026

Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Phase 2 Concepts — 8 entries

Concepts developed since mid-April 2026 in the Phase 2 LinkedIn series — structural typologies of US/EU/MENA alignment.

28 · Capricious Giant
29 · Vassalic Loyalty
30 · Three-Level Distinction (Structure / Language / Revelation)
31 · Verbalization Threshold
32 · Nato As Strategic Reserve
33 · Roman Vassals Analog
34 · Vassalage That Funds Itself
35 · Closing Vs Exploration Distinction (Islamabad Round Ii)

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

CARDINAL CONCEPTS

Foundational frameworks load-bearing across LPR analysis. Each underpins multiple downstream concepts.

01 Quadrilemma Hormuz *CARDINAL*

Formulation

The Strait of Hormuz functions, in the post-onset configuration of Operation Epic Fury, as a structural rent mechanism articulated around four interconnected dilemmas simultaneously binding the United States, Iran, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and Europe — none of which can resolve its dilemma without aggravating the others'. The chokepoint is therefore not closed, nor open, but selectively monetised: access becomes the resource. The four constituent dilemmas are: (1) Iran wants to signal capacity to disrupt without actually closing the strait, since closure would forfeit the rent extraction it derives from selective passage; (2) The United States want the route preserved without bearing the full cost of military securitisation, while extracting strategic concessions from those who depend on it; (3) The GCC want US protection without operational rupture with Tehran, since their hydrocarbon revenue depends on the route remaining viable; (4) Europe absorbs the energy price shock without seat at the strategic table, paying for an architecture it did not design. The framework's analytical force lies in showing that the strait's dysfunction is not a failure of the system — it is the system. Disruption produces rent. Rent disincentivises resolution.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Friction Economy (the broader system within which Hormuz functions as one of several rent-extracting chokepoints) · Borrowed Shield (the GCC dilemma within the Quadrilemma) · Doctrinal Divergence US/Israel (which complicates the US dilemma resolution) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (Iran's strategic logic that supports its dilemma posture) · Strategy of Attrition vs Decisive Shock (the temporal logic operating beneath the rent extraction)

02 Doctrinal Divergence Us / Israel *CARDINAL*

Formulation

The United States and Israel pursued, from the onset of Operation Epic Fury, two structurally incompatible theories of victory with respect to Iran's nuclear capability. The US theory aimed at delay of the programme — degradation, postponement, negotiation leverage. The Israeli theory aimed at permanent elimination — destruction of capability such that recovery would require political conditions Israel could continue to deny. These two theories are not adjacent positions on a continuum; they are operationally divergent. Delay implies preserving negotiating partners and a programme that can be re-activated, monitored, and bargained with. Elimination implies denying the existence of those partners, and treating any reconstitution as triggering renewed strikes — i.e. a permanent campaign rather than a discrete operation. The framework's analytical force lies in tracing how this divergence — present from before the onset — produced cumulative operational fractures

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

(target selection disputes, escalation thresholds, exit framing) and internal US institutional resignations as actors aligned with the delay track were marginalised by the elimination track.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Quadrilemma Hormuz (the US dilemma within Quadrilemma is complicated by the divergence) · Institutional Amnesia (the divergence is enabled by the elimination of negotiating memory) · No Endgame / Force Without Theory of Change (the divergence's downstream consequence) · The (In)Competence Gap (the institutional cascade that produced the divergence) · Arithmetic of Defeat (the convergent failure of both tracks on their own stated objectives)

---

03 Borrowed Shield *CARDINAL*

Formulation

The Gulf Cooperation Council states (Saudi Arabia, UAE, Qatar, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman) operate under a structural security arrangement they do not own. Their hydrocarbon revenue, regime continuity, and territorial integrity depend on US military presence, naval protection of sea lanes, and extended deterrence — none of which they control doctrinally, operationally, or politically. The shield is borrowed, not built. The framework's analytical force lies in distinguishing financial wealth (which the GCC possesses abundantly) from strategic autonomy (which the borrowed shield arrangement structurally precludes). Wealth purchases consumption, infrastructure, and external influence — but not the capacity to exit the security dependency. Any GCC attempt to diverge from US strategic preference (rapprochement with Iran, neutrality on Israel-Palestine, multipolar hedging) is constrained by the withdrawal cost: losing the shield means absorbing risks the GCC is structurally unequipped to manage alone. The framework extends, by structural homology, to Europe — which under the post-Hegseth verbalization (24 April 2026) finds itself addressed in similar terms: "getting a boat", "we are not counting on Europe". The European shield is, in this reading, equally borrowed — but only verbalised as such recently.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Quadrilemma Hormuz (the GCC dilemma within Quadrilemma is the Borrowed Shield in operation) · Dependency Architecture (the broader system of payment without strategic voice) · European Temptation (the European response to recognising its own borrowed shield status) · Capricious Giant (the unreliability of the shield-provider as accelerator of emancipation)

---

04 Asymmetric Victory Conditions *CARDINAL*

Formulation

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

In the Iran–US/Israel coalition confrontation, the conditions of victory are structurally asymmetric between the parties. The coalition requires achievement of stated objectives: elimination or durable degradation of Iranian nuclear capability, regime change or behavioural change, restoration of unimpeded Hormuz transit, and political stabilisation of the post-conflict regional order. Iran does not require victory in the same sense. Iran requires the coalition not to win — i.e. the persistence of the regime, the survival of nuclear capability sufficient to deter, the maintenance of selective Hormuz leverage, and the absorption of military costs without political collapse. The framework's analytical force lies in showing that the two parties are not playing the same game. The coalition operates under the temporality of stated objectives and political accountability; Iran operates under the temporality of survival and erosion. In a war of attrition, asymmetric conditions favour the party with the lower bar — provided that party can absorb the cost of holding. The framework reverses standard Western strategic analysis, which tends to assess Iran's position by coalition criteria (territorial control, kinetic effect, regime stability indicators). Under asymmetric victory conditions, Iran's "losing" by those criteria can be operationally consistent with "winning" by its own.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Strategy of Attrition vs Decisive Shock (the temporal logic operating under asymmetric conditions) · No Endgame / Force Without Theory of Change (the coalition's structural problem given asymmetric conditions) · Institutional Resilience Under Decapitation Strikes (the operational dimension of Iran's holding capacity) · Structure of the Non-Deal (the diplomatic manifestation of asymmetric conditions)

---

05 Friction Economy / The Rent Machine *CARDINAL*

Formulation

The post-onset MENA geopolitical configuration operates as a friction economy in which structural disruptions — chokepoints, blockades, sanctions enforcement, energy market dislocations — function as rent extraction mechanisms rather than transitory crises to be resolved. Friction itself becomes the productive resource: actors accumulate value through the persistence of disorder, not through its resolution. The framework distinguishes two analytical layers, posed with explicit epistemic differentiation: (1) Convergence of rent — the empirical observation that disruption produces wealth concentration in identifiable actors. This layer is irrefutable from the documented facts. (2) Deliberate design — the hypothesis that the disorder is engineered, not merely exploited. This layer is declared as hypothesis with explicit falsification conditions. This methodological distinction is constitutive of the framework. LPR maintains that the Friction Economy can be analytically deployed at level 1 alone, without commitment to level 2 — and that the conflation of the two is precisely what compromises analytical rigour. The framework extends to The Rent Machine: the application of friction-economy logic to the European energy crisis specifically. The TTF (Title Transfer Facility) is described as "the market working exactly as designed" — three capture layers (state, producers/suppliers, financial intermediaries), two crises (post-Ukraine 2022 and post-Iran 2026), one mechanism. The Useful Enemy (the geographic scapegoat — Russia, Iran) preserves the architecture by absorbing political blame.

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Quadrilemma Hormuz (Hormuz as one chokepoint in the broader friction architecture) · Energy Cartography (the cartographic decomposition of the friction economy) · War Economy Tracker (the quantified ledger of the friction economy) · Borrowed Shield (the structural dependency that sustains GCC participation in the friction economy)

---

06 Institutional Amnesia *CARDINAL*

Formulation

US foreign policy on Iran exhibits a structural incapacity to close its own files. From 1953 (Mossadegh coup) through 2026 (Operation Epic Fury), Washington serially produces and discards negotiating frameworks without integrating their lessons. Each new iteration confronts the previous as if it were unprecedented. This pattern is institutional amnesia — not the absence of memory, but the systemic elimination of memory-bearers from decision-making positions. The framework's analytical force lies in identifying the mechanism of the amnesia, which is not random: (1) Personnel purge: 80+ State Department Iran-experienced diplomats purged (post-2018, accelerated post-2025). (2) Expertise displacement: nuclear specialists removed from Geneva; Iran-track officials marginalised (cf. Kent removal). (3) Institutional fragmentation: the JCPOA framework abandoned (2018) without preservation of negotiating architecture. (4) Narrative reset: each new administration reframes Iran as a "new" problem rather than a continuing file. The cumulative effect is that Washington forgets structurally, while Iran has learned structurally — but the strikes targeted the bearers of that diplomatic learning on the Iranian side too, eliminating Larijani as documented in AN-0318. The framework therefore reveals a double amnesia: the US erases its own memory through purge; the coalition strikes erase Iran's bearers of negotiated memory. The downstream consequence is the structural impossibility of reaching an agreement: amnesiac negotiators cannot close files because they do not know which files exist. The 2026 round repeats 2015 errors that themselves repeated 2003 errors that themselves repeated 1979 errors.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

The (In)Competence Gap (the staffing dimension of amnesia) · Doctrinal Divergence US/Israel (enabled by amnesia of past coordination doctrine) · Pakistan as Cessation Architect (the mediation mechanism that compensates for amnesia by externalising memory) · Structure of the Non-Deal (the diplomatic manifestation of amnesiac negotiating)

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS

Frameworks describing the architecture of Operation Epic Fury and its post-onset configurations.

07 No Endgame / Force Without Theory Of Change *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

Operation Epic Fury applies maximum military coercion against Iran without a documented theory of what comes after. The coalition possesses tactical objectives (degrade nuclear capability, eliminate IRGC leadership, destabilise regime) but lacks an articulated theory of change linking those tactical effects to a desired political end-state. The framework's analytical force lies in distinguishing tactical effect from strategic conclusion: kinetic success against fixed targets does not, on its own, produce regime collapse, behavioural moderation, or stable post-conflict order. Without a theory of change, force becomes self-justifying — strikes continue because strikes are what the coalition does — and the absence of endgame becomes the operating condition rather than a problem to be solved. This is LPR's central analytical thesis at J+9, articulated before the empirical confirmations of regime resilience accumulated, and before the coalition itself acknowledged the gap.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Doctrinal Divergence US/Israel (the divergence prevents the formulation of a unified theory of change) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the structural reason coalition theories of change fail) · Arithmetic of Defeat (the terminal manifestation of No Endgame) · Scorched Earth (the default substitute for theory of change when none is available)

08 European Temptation *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

The Iran war opens a window for European strategic reorientation — but the window is narrow and structurally closes. The framework identifies coordinated European signals (France's UNSC veto, CMA CGM transit decisions, Hormuz toll posture) as a candidate emancipation moment, and analyses what conditions would convert temptation into structural shift. The analytical force lies in distinguishing rhetorical emancipation (declaratory positions taken in moments of friction) from structural emancipation (durable institutional and material change). The framework also articulates what survives beyond the regime — Hormuz as law, resilience as founding myth, nuclear logic installed, the generation formed by bombs — i.e. the conditions that persist regardless of immediate political outcomes.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Borrowed Shield (the structural condition the European Temptation seeks to exit) · Capricious Giant (the accelerator of emancipation through unreliability of the dominant ally) · Verbalization Threshold (the moment language change dissolves the fiction sustaining dependency) · NATO as Strategic Reserve (the operational reading of the architecture European Temptation seeks to escape)

---

09 Arithmetic Of Defeat *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

The coalition loses whether it stays or leaves. The Arithmetic of Defeat articulates the terminal dilemma: continued operations require striking civilian infrastructure (and absorbing war crimes exposure) or abandoning the five remaining political deadlines (and confirming Iran's hold on Hormuz). Each path produces strategic defeat by the coalition's own stated criteria. The framework's analytical force lies in showing that this is not a contingent failure but an arithmetic one — the numbers do not balance, and no operational adjustment can make them balance. Israel without American cover, an honourable exit that does not repair the six structural dimensions of damage, and the lesson repeated (Vietnam, WWI, WWII, Iran): force without political theory produces strategic defeat regardless of tactical performance.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

No Endgame / Force Without Theory of Change (the upstream condition producing the arithmetic) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the structural reason the arithmetic is asymmetric) · Scorched Earth (the operational substitute when arithmetic of defeat is recognised internally) · Doctrinal Divergence US/Israel (the source of the divergent failure paths)

---

10 Structure Of The Non-Deal *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

Iran refuses the second Islamabad round 72 hours before the 22 April ceasefire expiry. The refusal is not a tactic — it is the revealed preference of a party whose position is strengthened by the absence of agreement. The framework articulates three regime-survival thresholds that cannot be conceded without regime collapse, and shows that Iranian decision-making has been narrowed by the coalition's own targeting strategy. Between Tehran's floor and the ceiling anchored in Washington's domestic constraints and Jerusalem's coalition politics lies a structural vacancy no skilful diplomacy can bridge. The analytical force lies in showing that the absence of deal is not a failure of process — it is the structural equilibrium of the parties' incompatible minimum positions.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the upstream logic producing the structural non-deal) · Pakistan as Cessation Architect (the mediation that produces ambiguity rather than substance) · Institutional Amnesia (the US-side condition compounding the impossibility of closure) · Arithmetic of Defeat (the coalition-side condition compounding the impossibility of closure)

---

11 Pakistan As Cessation Architect *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

The US-Iran ceasefire was not architected by Washington — it was architected by Islamabad. The framework identifies three structural elements: (1) ambiguity as product (each party retains its own interpretation, no substantive agreement is documented); (2) Hormuz toll institutionalised (the strait remains functional as structural rent rather than being surrendered); (3) the Munir channel (Pakistani military-to-military mediation, distinct from civilian diplomacy). The framework's analytical force lies in showing that the cessation function has been outsourced from Washington to Islamabad — a structural displacement that confirms the broader thesis of US loss of MENA mediator role. LPR documented the Pakistani channel approximately 25 days before Bloomberg's confirmation in late March 2026.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Loss of US Mediator Role in MENA (the broader displacement of which Pakistani mediation is symptom) · Structure of the Non-Deal (the structural vacancy Pakistani mediation cannot bridge substantively) · Institutional Amnesia (the US-side condition that necessitates external memory hosts) · The Art of Not Fighting (the analytical frame within which Pakistani mediation is read)

---

12 Tag Mehir Doctrine *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

The 8 April 2026 Israeli strike on Beirut is read as the state-scale actualisation of Tag Mehir, a doctrine of coercion through targeted reprisal formalised in the Israeli settler movement from 2008 onward. The framework establishes structural homology between infra-state settler practice and state-scale operations across five dimensions: trigger, target, message, temporality, institutional location of the carriers. The analytical force lies in showing that the 8 April operation does not represent an aberration from doctrine — it represents the doctrine itself, scaled. The framework includes a transposition test (Korea 1953 armistice) as conceptual robustness check, and closes on the Iranian diplomatic sequence of 8-16 April, which converted the operation into a political trap for its authors.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Geography of Qualification (companion brief mapping international response) · Two Standards of Public Mourning (the asymmetric mourning grammar that accompanies Tag Mehir) · Targeting of Journalistic Function (operational extension of Tag Mehir to the press) · Manufacture of the Isolated Case (the post-event narrative management of Tag Mehir operations)

---

13 Geography Of Qualification *STRUCTURAL*

Formulation

A mapping of international response to the Israeli strikes of 8 April 2026 on Lebanon, structured in three zones: (1) states that qualified the act in legal terms (specific reference to IHL violations, Article 51(4) Additional Protocol I, etc.); (2) states that denounced without qualifying (general moral condemnation absent legal categorisation, including Macron's 'indiscriminate' formulation analysed as Article 51(4) terminology one inferential step short of the grave breach); (3) states that did not speak. The ICC/Ukraine comparator situates the qualification asymmetry against a recent precedent. The framework's analytical force lies in showing that the silence and the calibration of language are themselves diagnostic of the international system's response architecture — and that the absence of qualification is not neutrality but a positioning.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Tag Mehir Doctrine (companion brief on the operational substance being qualified or not) · Verbalization Threshold (the moment language change reveals positioning previously masked) · European Temptation (the European response asymmetry as condition for emancipation) · Two Standards of Public Mourning (the parallel asymmetry in mourning grammar)

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS

Tools, indicators, and tactical-level frameworks used in LPR tracking and assessment products.

14 Indicators Of Coercive Degradation (Ind-O1, Ind-I1, S1-S4)

OPERATIONAL

Formulation

A structured monitoring framework for assessing regime degradation under sustained coercive pressure. Twelve degradation indicators (IND-O1 through IND-O12 for observed signals, IND-I1 for internal regime cohesion threshold), twelve pivot events (PE-01 through PE-12) marking decision points, and five theories of change (TC-1 through TC-5) articulating possible regime trajectories. The S1-S4 scenario architecture captures the dominant trajectory at any given timestamp: S1 Constrained Survival, S2 Negotiated Exit, S3 Regime Transformation, S4 Regime Collapse. The framework's analytical force lies in providing a systematic, replicable, falsifiable monitoring instrument — distinct from impressionistic assessment of regime stability — that LPR has applied consistently from J+9 onward. As of J+57, S1 Constrained Survival remains dominant (~55%), and IND-I1 has not been activated.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Institutional Resilience Under Decapitation Strikes (the empirical phenomenon the framework monitors) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the strategic context shaping indicator interpretation) · Strategy of Attrition vs Decisive Shock (the temporal logic operating on indicator trajectories) · Ground Option Matrix (companion operational instrument for ground-scenario decomposition)

15 Energy Cartography *OPERATIONAL*

Formulation

A cartographic decomposition of the energy economy of Operation Epic Fury, identifying who gains energetically from the conflict and who pays. Four rent-capturing entities (Israel via Leviathan FID January 2026, US via LNG export expansion, Norway via European supply substitution, Algeria via European supply substitution); three bill-payers (Europe via energy price absorption, GCC via supply chain disruption, Qatar as net loser at $60-100B). The framework documents specific structural events: South Pars degraded, Ras Laffan offline 3-5 years, Lebanese Bloc 9 frozen, Hormuz selectively closed. The analytical force lies in showing that energy is not the war's collateral but its central economic substance — and that the geography of who gains and who pays maps onto strategic alignment patterns more accurately than declared political positions.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Friction Economy / The Rent Machine (the broader analytical framework Energy Cartography operationalises) · Quadrilemma Hormuz (the chokepoint cartographied in the energy frame) · War Economy Tracker (the quantified ledger complementing the cartography) · Borrowed Shield (the structural condition shaping the bill-payer positions)

---

16 Ground Option Matrix — Five Scenarios *OPERATIONAL*

Formulation

An interactive analytical tool decomposing five structurally distinct ground options against Iran into operational components: (A) Hormuz coastline control, (B) Abu Musa & Tunbs islands, (C) Kharg Island, (D) Khuzestan revenue denial, (E) Jask projection denial. Each option is parameterised across objective, time horizon, human cost, Iranian retaliation profile, and integration with broader strategic objectives. The Iraqi Variable (Option D) introduces three simultaneous fronts. The framework includes a mix scenario (B→E→Kharg) for cumulative escalation paths. The analytical force lies in disaggregating what is often discussed as 'ground operations against Iran' into structurally distinct options with non-equivalent operational, political, and strategic implications. Bilingual EN/FR switch for European decision-maker accessibility.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Ahvaz Variable / Bifurcation Thesis (companion AN on the Khuzestan revenue denial option) · Indicators of Coercive Degradation (the monitoring framework within which ground options are evaluated) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the strategic frame conditioning ground option viability) · No Endgame / Force Without Theory of Change (the upstream condition under which ground options are considered without political doctrine)

---

17 War Economy Tracker / Convergence Of Rent *OPERATIONAL*

Formulation

A quantified ledger of Operation Epic Fury's economic dimensions across nine actors and fourteen lines, organised in three categories: costs incurred, gains captured, forgone revenue. The framework operationalises the AN-0901 thesis that force without theory of change produces structural defeat by tracking the cost/benefit tipping point at which the operation becomes economically irrational for its primary financiers. Top four winners identified (Russia +$40B/yr at zero cost since J+1; US +$80-270B in LNG and deferred defence spending; Norway and Algeria via European supply substitution); top loser identified (Qatar at -$60-100B as collateral victim from J+18). Tipping point projection: J+42-56, when 'war becomes losing bet'. The analytical force lies in transforming impressionistic assessment of war costs into structured comparable data with declared methodology and uncertainty.

Empirical anchors

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Energy Cartography (the cartographic frame for the quantified ledger) · Friction Economy / The Rent Machine (the analytical framework operationalised by the tracker) · Borrowed Shield (the structural dependency shaping GCC position in the ledger) · Strategy of Attrition vs Decisive Shock (the temporal logic against which tipping point projections are calibrated)

---

18 Ahvaz Variable / Bifurcation Thesis *OPERATIONAL*

Formulation

Structural analysis of the Ahwaz/Khuzestan ethnic-Arab mobilisation vector as a strategic variable in Operation Epic Fury. Timeline J-60→J+10: CCAO formation (December 2022), Ahwaz Falcons raid on IRGC (J+4), Freedom Brigades declaration (J+10), London Declaration, tribal coalitions (Bani Kaab, Bani Tarf, Al-Hawiza). The bifurcation thesis identifies two structurally distinct trajectories: strategic diversion (Ahwaz mobilisation as coalition-coordinated pressure on Khuzestan oil infrastructure to force Iranian negotiation) versus genuine insurrection (autonomous Ahwaz political project with its own demands and timelines). The key variable is heavy weapons delivery before J+40: if heavy weapons arrive, the bifurcation tilts toward genuine insurrection; if they do not, the mobilisation remains diversionary leverage. The framework includes the peripheral stretch analysis: five simultaneous fronts and what the system can sustain.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Ground Option Matrix (Option D Khuzestan revenue denial) · Iranian Opposition Affinity Matrix (the broader catalogue within which Ahwaz vector is positioned) · Indicators of Coercive Degradation (the monitoring frame for Ahwaz-vector signals) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the strategic context conditioning bifurcation outcomes)

---

19 Kurdish Wager *OPERATIONAL*

Formulation

Eighty years of betrayal and the architecture of a different outcome. The framework documents six betrayals of Kurdish political projects across eighty years (Mahabad 1946, post-WWII partitions, post-Gulf War 1991, Syrian civil war, post-ISIS, contemporary) and identifies a structural constant: Kurdish political projects have served as instruments for non-Kurdish strategic objectives, with no durable Kurdish political gain. The framework's analytical force lies in showing that for the first time since Mahabad 1946, Iranian Kurds sit at the intersection of competing interests from multiple actors (US, Israel, Turkey, Baghdad) — none coordinating, each needing something only the Kurds can provide. The framework maps constraints, leverage points, structural traps, and minimum viable position before the window closes. The Kurdish Wager is what would be required for the seventh moment to differ from the previous six.

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Iranian Opposition Affinity Matrix (the broader catalogue within which Kurdish parties are positioned) · Ground Option Matrix (the Kurdish vector as element in ground option configurations) · Ahvaz Variable / Bifurcation Thesis (parallel ethnic mobilisation framework with structural similarities) · Loss of US Mediator Role in MENA (the structural condition that has produced the four-actor configuration)

---

20 Irgc Financial Architecture — Four Layers *OPERATIONAL*

Formulation

Structural decomposition of the IRGC's financial architecture into four revenue circuits with feedback loops to coercive operations. The framework identifies a financial-coercive circuit: revenue generation supports operational capacity; operational capacity protects revenue generation; targeting any one layer produces displaced effects on the others. The four-layer structure (revenue circuits) is mapped against Israeli targeting rationale by financial layer, producing a theory of financial change with three bifurcations: (1) layer-by-layer degradation versus simultaneous targeting, (2) revenue substitution capacity assessment, (3) regime-IRGC financial integration as constraint on isolated targeting. The framework includes documented gaps in the open-source picture and PE-12 dual vector analysis (South Pars labour as financial vulnerability).

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Indicators of Coercive Degradation (the monitoring framework for IRGC degradation signals) · Iranian Regime Module (the broader institutional architecture of which IRGC finance is one element) · Friction Economy / The Rent Machine (the structural rent extraction logic IRGC participates in) · Energy Cartography (the energy revenue dimension of IRGC financial architecture)

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

SYSTEMIC CONCEPTS

Frameworks describing recurring patterns that operate across actors, theatres, and time horizons.

---

21 Two Wars. One Operation. *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

Operation Epic Fury and the Lebanon front are not two parallel campaigns but one integrated operational design. The framework establishes structural integration across coalition sequencing, resource allocation, and strategic coherence — showing that what appears as separate theatres (Iran nuclear, Hezbollah disarmament) is in fact a unified operational architecture with shared command intent, sequenced kinetic effects, and integrated political objectives. The analytical force lies in disrupting the conventional separation of Iran and Lebanon files in Western analytical practice, and in showing that this separation itself serves the operational design (allowing parallel execution under separate diplomatic covers).

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Tag Mehir Doctrine (the operational doctrine integrating both theatres) · Geography of Qualification (international response patterns mapping the integration) · The Aoun Calculation (Lebanese internal political response to the integrated operation) · Borrowed Shield (the GCC dimension of the integration)

---

22 Scorched Earth As Default Exit *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

When a coalition lacks a theory of political victory, destruction defaults as exit strategy. The framework identifies the credibility trap (a coalition that has staked credibility on stated objectives cannot exit without those objectives being achieved or the failure being laundered through destruction), the terminal dilemma (continued operations require either striking civilian infrastructure or abandoning deadlines), and the historical lesson: scorched earth has never produced the political result its architects sought. Vietnam, Korea, Iraq, Afghanistan — destruction as exit produces neither victory nor durable order. The framework cites ICRC, 100+ US legal experts, Komala, and documented Trump statements to anchor the contemporary application. The analytical force lies in showing that scorched earth is not a deviation from rational coalition behaviour — it is the predictable default when the coalition's theory of change is absent.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

No Endgame / Force Without Theory of Change (the upstream condition producing scorched earth as default) · Arithmetic of Defeat (the structural symmetry of failure paths) · The (In)Competence Gap (the institutional condition enabling scorched earth substitution for political doctrine) · Doctrinal Divergence US/Israel (the source of incoherent objectives that make political victory unobtainable)

---

23 The Art Of Not Fighting / Mediation Redistribution *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

Sun Tzu's Revenge: at J+41, Washington negotiates in Islamabad while Beijing moves on Taiwan. The framework reads the post-onset moment as a structural redistribution of Middle East mediation capacity — away from Washington (Pakistan now mediates the US-Iran ceasefire), away from Europe (whose role since 2011 has been forfeited), toward actors capable of holding ambiguity (Pakistan as cessation architect, Qatar as channel). The analytical force lies in shifting the question from 'who is winning the war' to 'who is filling the diplomatic space the war creates' — and in showing that the answer is not who Western analysts expect. The Iran war, in this reading, is not just a conflict but a redistribution event for the regional and global mediation architecture. The question nobody is asking is what fills the space.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Pakistan as Cessation Architect (the operational manifestation of mediation redistribution) · Loss of US Mediator Role in MENA (the structural condition producing redistribution) · European Temptation (the European response to its own diplomatic forfeiture) · Capricious Giant (the unreliability of the displaced mediator accelerating redistribution)

---

24 Authoritarian Pluralism *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

The Rafi-Niya synagogue destroyed on day 6 of Passover. Iran as home to the largest Jewish community in the Middle East outside Israel. The framework articulates selective tolerance as political instrument: the Iranian regime maintains specific minority communities (Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian) as instruments of state legitimation precisely because their tolerated existence demonstrates regime legitimacy on Western criteria the regime nominally rejects. The analytical force lies in showing that authoritarian pluralism is not contradiction but configuration — the same regime structure produces both the repression and the tolerated minorities, and these are functionally interconnected. The 6-Passover strike erases this configuration: what the war erases in erasing complexity is precisely the political instrument that allowed the regime to claim a category of legitimacy.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Institutional Resilience Under Decapitation Strikes (the regime structure within which authoritarian pluralism operates) · Targeting of Journalistic Function (parallel selective targeting framework) · Doctrinal Anti-Christianity (parallel framework for state-actualised targeting of tolerated communities) · What the War Erases (the broader analytical reading of operation effects on regional complexity)

---

25 The (In)Competence Gap / Five-Layer Cascade *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

Washington went to war it could have avoided — but did it want to? The framework articulates a five-layer cascade documenting how the institutional capacity to avoid war was structurally dismantled before the war began: (1) JCPOA abandoned 2018; (2) 80+ Iran-experienced diplomats purged; (3) no nuclear experts in Geneva at decision points; (4) internal expert Kent removed from Iran briefings; (5) Iran placed its uranium on the table two days before the war began. The analytical force lies in distinguishing failure of competence (the institutional cascade prevented good-faith judgment) from failure of will (the cascade was constructed precisely to prevent good-faith judgment). The framework leaves the binary open: the cascade is documented; the question of whether it represents incompetence or design is posed but not resolved. This methodological restraint is constitutive of the framework.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Institutional Amnesia (the structural framework of which the cascade is one expression) · Doctrinal Divergence US/Israel (the operational consequence of the cascade) · No Endgame / Force Without Theory of Change (the strategic consequence of the cascade) · Manufacture of the Isolated Case (the post-event narrative management of cascade outcomes)

---

26 Three Journalists. One Day. *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

CPJ documents at least three journalists killed in a single day across Gaza and Lebanon, including one in a marked press vehicle. The legal framework is unambiguous (Geneva Conventions, Additional Protocols, customary IHL on the protection of journalists). The accountability mechanism is absent. The framework articulates a documented pattern since 7 October 2023 that has not stopped — over 260 journalists killed (CPJ documentation) without proportionate accountability response. The analytical force lies in distinguishing legal clarity (the framework is unambiguous) from practical impunity (the framework produces no consequences). The framework anchors the broader thesis on the targeting of journalistic function as systemic operation, articulated more comprehensively in the integrated framework.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Related concepts

Targeting of Journalistic Function (the integrated framework with Khalil and Legitimization Cell) · Tag Mehir Doctrine (the broader operational doctrine within which journalist targeting fits) · Manufacture of the Isolated Case (the narrative management framework for journalist casualties) · Legitimization Cell as Institution (the AMAN unit institutionalising the pre-targeting operation)

---

27 The Aoun Calculation *SYSTEMIC*

Formulation

48 hours into the 17 April Lebanon ceasefire. Aoun attempts to reclaim on behalf of the state the grammar of liberation Hezbollah has used for four decades. The wager depends on Israeli withdrawal — a deliverable Gemayel's 14 April OLJ interview suggests Israel has never genuinely intended to produce. French UNIFIL peacekeeper killed 48 hours after signature; Moussaoui publicly compares Aoun to Sadat. On the evidence of the first 48 hours, the other end of the tightrope does not yet exist. The framework's analytical force lies in showing that the Lebanese sovereign transition is not a settled outcome but an active wager whose conditions of success include actors (Israel, Hezbollah, the Lebanese political class itself) with non-aligned interests in its success.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Tag Mehir Doctrine (the operational frame within which 8 April and Lebanon dynamics integrate) · Geography of Qualification (the international response shaping Aoun's decision space) · The Lebanese Government Asserts Control (LB-260310-01) (the upstream sovereign transition framework) · Two Wars. One Operation. (the dual-theatre logic conditioning the calculation)

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

PHASE 2 CONCEPTS

Concepts developed since mid-April 2026 in the Phase 2 LinkedIn series — structural typologies of US/EU/MENA alignment.

---

28 Capricious Giant *PHASE 2*

Formulation

The United States, in the post-Operation Epic Fury configuration, function as a capricious giant whose allies see less and less value in continued strategic dependence. The framework reads the operation's deepening contradictions — failed objectives, doctrinal divergence with Israel, demand for ally loyalty without demonstrated reciprocity — not as strategic necessity but as an attempt to tighten the reins around allies who are already drifting. The analytical force lies in distinguishing strategic logic from compensatory behaviour: a hegemon whose strategic position is eroding produces increasingly demanding loyalty rituals precisely because the structural conditions sustaining loyalty are dissolving. The capricious giant is therefore not an aberrant US — it is the US in the moment of its waning unipolar reach, behaving consistently with the structural condition.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Verbalization Threshold (the moment language change reveals the structural condition) · Vassalic Loyalty (the lexical form the capricious giant's demand takes) · European Temptation (the ally response to the capricious giant) · Borrowed Shield (the structural dependency from which allies seek to exit)

---

29 Vassalic Loyalty *PHASE 2*

Formulation

The vocabulary employed by Hegseth at the Pentagon on 24 April 2026 — "loyal", "one-way street", demands of capability and loyalty — is structurally that of suzerain-to-vassal relations rather than partner-to-partner. The framework articulates the distinction: in partnership, parties share, warn, organise together, define objectives jointly, and share benefits. In suzerainty, parties demand loyalty for adventures the subordinate did not co-design. The analytical force lies in showing that this lexical shift from partnership to vassalic loyalty does not represent a change in underlying structure (which has been substantially constant since 1949) but a change in verbalisation of that structure. The shift is itself diagnostic: previous administrations practiced coercion in the language of partnership, this one practices it in the language of vassalic loyalty.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Capricious Giant (the broader behavioural pattern of which vassalic loyalty is one expression) · Verbalization Threshold (the analytical mechanism explaining why the lexicon change matters) · Three-Level Distinction (the methodological frame: structure / language / revelation) · Roman Vassals Analog (the historical comparator articulating the long-term trajectory)

---

30 Three-Level Distinction (Structure / Language / Revelation)

PHASE 2

Formulation

Any architecture of coercion between dominant power and allies operates on three distinct levels that must be analytically separated: (1) the structure of subordination (typically stable across long periods — example: NATO architecture of US command since 1949); (2) the language enveloping the structure (variable across administrations — partnership / leadership / transaction); (3) the revelation that occurs when language changes (the moment language shifts makes visible the structure that was always present). The framework's analytical force lies in providing a methodological tool to distinguish what is genuinely new in apparent diplomatic ruptures (typically the language) from what is structurally continuous (typically the architecture). It also explains why language changes can have disproportionate effects: they do not change the structure, but they dissolve the fiction that allowed the structure to operate without overt resistance.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Verbalization Threshold (the operational mechanism by which language change produces revelation) · Vassalic Loyalty (the specific language change documented at the Pentagon) · Capricious Giant (the broader behavioural pattern within which the language change occurs) · Suez 1956 as Clarification (the historical comparator for revelation through language change)

---

31 Verbalization Threshold *PHASE 2*

Formulation

A structure of coercion sustained over time depends on a fiction enveloping it (in the NATO case: the partnership fiction). When the dominant party crosses the threshold of verbalising the structure as it actually is — without the fiction — the fiction dissolves. The structure does not change, but its operability changes radically: subordinates can no longer participate in the fiction-as-cooperation, because the dominant party has explicitly named the relationship as something other than cooperation. The threshold is therefore not a quantitative point but a qualitative shift in what is publicly sayable. Once verbalised, the structure cannot easily be re-enveloped. The analytical force lies in showing that verbalization is itself a structural event with consequences independent of the structural facts being verbalised. "What is new is the verbalization. And when the word changes, the fiction dissolves."

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Three-Level Distinction (the methodological frame within which Verbalization Threshold operates) · Vassalic Loyalty (the specific lexical content of the threshold crossing) · Capricious Giant (the broader behavioural pattern producing threshold crossings) · Suez 1956 as Clarification (the historical comparator for threshold dynamics)

---

32 Nato As Strategic Reserve *PHASE 2*

Formulation

NATO is no longer an alliance. It has become a strategic reserve available at American discretion — funded, maintained, and kept ready by the Europeans themselves. The framework articulates this as functional description, not critique: under Trumpian pressure, the Alliance has been transformed structurally into a reserve force that can be drawn upon by the dominant power without the consultative architecture an alliance implies. The Politico "naughty and nice" list of allies ranked by compliance with the Iran war (an operation never formally submitted to NATO collective procedures, no Article 5, no formal consultation, no codified trigger) is the involuntary confession of the transformation. The non-activation of formal mechanisms is calculation, not oversight: invoking them would have produced documented refusal that Trump cannot afford; staying in procedural ambiguity preserves the narrative "they didn't support us" without allies being able to respond "we were never solicited according to the rules we all signed".

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Capricious Giant (the broader US behavioural pattern producing the reserve transformation) · Vassalic Loyalty (the lexical register accompanying reserve operationalisation) · Roman Vassals Analog (the historical comparator for reserve-funded-by-subordinates dynamics) · European Temptation (the structural condition being read through the reserve frame)

---

33 Roman Vassals Analog *PHASE 2*

Formulation

The vassals at the margins of the Roman Empire funded their own protection through tribute to Rome. Then they funded their own legions — still nominally under Rome, but de facto increasingly autonomous. At some point, the centre was neither necessary nor credible. The framework applies this trajectory to contemporary European rearmament: Poland building the largest conventional army in Europe, Germany rearming massively, capabilities accumulating that "once built, do not belong to Washington". By forcing European rearmament to maximise his available reserve, Trump is accelerating the condition of his own future irrelevance. The analytical force lies in showing that vassalage which funds itself contains structurally the seeds of its own exit. The framework explicitly notes the historical timeframe asymmetry: "Rome learned that. Over several centuries. We shall see how long it takes this time."

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

NATO as Strategic Reserve (the operational reading of which the Roman analog provides historical depth) · Vassalage That Funds Itself (the central structural mechanism articulated) · Capricious Giant (the contemporary US behaviour accelerating the trajectory) · European Temptation (the European response trajectory the analog illuminates)

---

34 Vassalage That Funds Itself *PHASE 2*

Formulation

The structural mechanism by which dominant powers, through compelling subordinates to fund their own protection at increasing levels, accelerate the conditions of subordinate autonomy. Capabilities funded by subordinates (military equipment, defence industries, command capacity, intelligence apparatus) accumulate in subordinate hands. Once built, those capabilities do not belong to the dominant power. The dominant power retains nominal authority but progressively loses material control. The mechanism is not an unintended consequence — it is structural: any vassalage requiring tribute payment in capability rather than coin produces, by accumulation, the autonomy that ends the vassalage. The analytical force lies in showing that the contemporary European rearmament dynamic, often read as evidence of ongoing US control (Trump getting Europeans to spend more), is in fact evidence of the opposite: it is the mechanism by which the structure of US strategic primacy in Europe is being unwound, financed by the Europeans themselves.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Roman Vassals Analog (the historical illustration of the mechanism) · NATO as Strategic Reserve (the operational architecture within which the mechanism operates) · European Temptation (the European response shaped by the mechanism's effects) · Capricious Giant (the dominant-power behaviour accelerating the mechanism)

---

35 Closing Vs Exploration Distinction (Islamabad Round Ii) *PHASE 2*

Formulation

A diplomatic round can be analytically read as either closing (final-stage negotiation toward signature on substantive terms already agreed) or exploration (early-stage assessment of possible terms without commitment). The distinction is not declarative but indicated by structural markers: delegation profile (closers vs. process negotiators), prior public statements (briefed-on-content vs. briefed-on-intentions), advance positioning of mediating parties, and pre-round behaviour of the parties. Applied to Islamabad Round II (April 2026): the framework identifies multiple closing markers — Witkoff and Kushner ("not process negotiators — they show up when you're closing"), Trump's public expectation of "an offer meeting US demands" ("you don't say that unless you've been briefed on content"),

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Araghchi seeking military rather than diplomatic cover via Munir meeting ("the signal of a negotiator who needs to go home and sell something to his security establishment"), Iran's "face-saving" Defence Ministry framing ("standard domestic cover narrative of a party about to sign without appearing to capitulate"). The expected outcome is a narrow-scope agreement: operational pause, monitoring mechanism, temporary nuclear freeze — deliberately ambiguous enough for each side to sell its own version domestically.

Empirical anchors

Falsification conditions

Subsequent confirmations

Related concepts

Pakistan as Cessation Architect (the broader framework within which Round II operates) · Structure of the Non-Deal (companion analysis on the structural impossibility of substantive deal — narrow-scope ambiguity expected as workaround) · Institutional Amnesia (the US-side condition affecting closing-stage memory) · Asymmetric Victory Conditions (the strategic frame conditioning what each party can accept at closing)

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026
Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation

Editorial Discipline

LPR's editorial red line is non-negotiable across every document, every category, every entry: never reason from doubtful premises without naming them explicitly. Each uncertain premise must be declared as such in the analysis. Falsification conditions are non-negotiable across the entire framework.

The credibility of LPR rests not on certainty of conclusions but on epistemic transparency. A concept is a structural reading of a documented pattern — not a verdict, not a prediction, and never a moral statement masquerading as analysis. When the empirical record is contested, the framework names the contestation. When the timeline is incomplete, the framework names the gap. When the inference exceeds the evidence, the framework declares the hypothesis as such, with its falsification conditions stated.

This glossary, v1.0, formalises 35 concepts that have crossed the threshold of canonical formulation. Each entry has been published in working LPR materials, has accumulated empirical anchors, and is articulated with falsification conditions. Future versions will add concepts as they cross this threshold.

Levant Policy Research

Strategic Cartography for Volatile Terrain

Brussels, est. February 2026

www.levantpolicyresearch.com

© 2026 Levant Policy Research — Independent analytical initiative · Brussels, est. February 2026

Non-commercial distribution authorised with citation