Working Paper

F-Series Information:
The WP-F series explores AI governance and strategic risk through comparative and historical diagnostics, examining how inherited strategic and regulatory logics break down when transferred into AI-mediated contexts.

Recommended Citation:
Wu, Shaoyuan. (2026). *Who Loses Control First? Threshold Competition in the 2026 U.S.–Israel–Iran Conflict* (EPINOVA Working Paper No. EPINOVA–WP–F–2026–08). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19118195.

Disclaimer:
This working paper presents diagnostic and exploratory analysis intended to examine inherited strategic and governance logics under AI-mediated conditions. It does not constitute policy recommendations, predictive assessments, or official positions of any institution.

GLOBAL AI GOVERNANCE RESEARCH CENTER

EPINOVA

Who Loses Control First?

Threshold Competition in the 2026 U.S.–Israel–Iran Conflict

Author: Shaoyuan Wu

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0660-8232

Affiliation: Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC

Date: March 19, 2026

Abstract

This paper analyzes the 2026 U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict as a form of threshold competition rather than a contest for decisive military victory. It introduces the concept of the loss-of-control threshold (LoCT) to explain how actors lose the ability to regulate escalation under cumulative systemic pressure. The analysis identifies three distinct pathways: U.S. fiscal–strategic overextension, Israeli escalation lock-in, and Iran's legitimacy–retaliation loop. The paper argues that the key variable in contemporary conflict is not battlefield superiority, but the ability to delay crossing actor-specific thresholds of uncontrollability.

Keywords: loss-of-control threshold (LoCT); threshold competition; systemic warfare; escalation dynamics; cost-imposition strategy; network warfare; U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict; cross-domain pressure; strategic resilience

1. Introduction

The central question in the 2026 U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict is not which actor will win, but which actor will lose control first.

This reflects a broader shift in modern warfare. Conflict is no longer primarily about territorial gains or battlefield destruction. It is increasingly defined by the ability to sustain operations, manage escalation, and absorb pressure across interconnected systems (Wu, 2026d).

The current conflict already spans multiple domains, including energy infrastructure, maritime logistics, nuclear-adjacent facilities, leadership targeting, alliance networks, and information ecosystems. Under these conditions, strength alone is not decisive; system-level failure is.

2. From Victory to Thresholds

Traditional escalation theory conceptualizes conflict as a sequence of moves along an escalation ladder (Kahn, 1965; Schelling, 1966). However, this framework assumes relatively linear dynamics and discrete decision points, making it increasingly inadequate in networked environments where pressure accumulates across interdependent systems and escalation emerges nonlinearly.

A more appropriate analytical lens is the concept of the **loss-of-control threshold (LoCT)**. It refers to the point at which cumulative pressures across military, political, economic, and informational systems exceed an actor's capacity to regulate escalation dynamics. It is not defined by a single battlefield defeat, but by a **system-level tipping point**.

This concept aligns with the logic of the **Systemic Pressure Index (SPI)**, in which pressure accumulates nonlinearly through the interaction of node criticality, cascading effects, temporal persistence, and information amplification (Wu, 2026d). In this sense, modern conflict is best understood as **threshold competition under systemic pressure**.

3. The United States: Overextension as a Path to Loss of Control

For the United States, the primary risk of loss of control does not lie on the battlefield itself, but in the structural risk between **global commitments and finite resources**.

As argued in *Industrial War and Network War*, globally deployed powers derive strength from their extensive operational architectures such as forward bases, logistics networks, air-defense systems, alliance integration, and cross-regional force distribution, but this same architecture constitutes a source of vulnerability under sustained pressure (Wu, 2026b).

Four dynamics are driving this risk.

First, **fiscal pressure is accelerating**. Reports indicate that the United States has requested more than $200 billion in additional war funding, suggesting a shift from short-term affordability to long-term sustainability concerns (Reuters, 2026a).

Second, **cross-regional strategic strain is intensifying**, reinforcing the logic that localized pressure propagates across global deployment networks (Brands, 2022; Wu, 2026b). This mechanism is consistent with evidence that regional conflicts can reshape deterrence dynamics in other theaters by consuming scarce U.S. assets and compressing alliance decision space.

Third, **domestic political constraints are tightening.** Ongoing debates over war authorization and intelligence justification in U.S. domestic politics suggest that political legitimacy may erode before military capability is exhausted (The Guardian, 2026).

Fourth, **cost-imposition asymmetry favors the attacker**, as adversaries do not need to defeat U.S. forces directly but only to increase the marginal cost of sustaining its global system over time (Wu, 2026b).

The likely outcome is not collapse, but constrained strategic choices: either **strategic contraction** or **high-risk escalation to avoid prolonged attrition**. Both represent different pathways to loss of control.

4. Israel: Escalation Lock-In

Israel faces a different problem: **it may become trapped by its own escalation strategy**.

High-intensity operations, such as leadership targeting, strikes near nuclear facilities, and attacks on critical infrastructure, raise the baseline of escalation. Each subsequent action must maintain or exceed the intensity of previous actions to preserve deterrence. De-escalation becomes increasingly costly.

This creates a self-reinforcing dynamic:

- escalation generates deterrence,
- deterrence requires continued escalation, and
- continued escalation reduces room for maneuver.

From a systemic warfare perspective, this dynamic reflects the interaction between **operational disruption and information amplification** (Wu, 2026d). It demonstrates how a limited number of highly engaged communication nodes can amplify conflict narratives and rapidly transform tactical events into political pressure. At the same time, information dynamics accelerate this process. Rapid narrative formation and amplification compress decision timelines and increase political pressure.

As a result, Israel's loss-of-control threshold is driven by:

- multi-front resource dispersion,
- rising retaliation thresholds, and
- increasing international legitimacy costs and regional spillover risks

Its central dilemma is clear: **de-escalation weakens deterrence, but continued escalation reduces control**.

5. Iran: The Legitimacy–Retaliation Loop

Iran's pathway to loss of control is shaped by a **legitimacy–retaliation loop**, in which it cannot afford not to respond to external attacks without undermining its domestic and regional credibility (Tabatabai, 2020).

Leadership targeting, energy infrastructure attacks, and strikes near nuclear facilities create a structural dilemma. Failure to retaliate weakens domestic and regional credibility. Retaliation, however, increases exposure to further escalation.

This dynamic is consistent with Iran's broader strategy of **distributed cost imposition**, including missile and drone operations, proxy activity, and node targeting (Tabatabai, 2020; Wu, 2026b).

Yet Iran also faces its own thresholds:

First, a **political legitimacy threshold**: sustained inaction is not viable after high-profile losses.

Second, **an economic and energy threshold** emerges as continued damage to infrastructure increases systemic pressure and generates wider spillover effects across energy markets and logistics systems.

Third, a **nuclear risk threshold**: escalation near nuclear facilities introduces high-consequence tail risks.

Iran therefore risks entering a **self-reinforcing escalation cycle**, in which maintaining deterrence requires continued retaliation, while each act of retaliation increases the probability of more severe counterstrikes.

6. Three Pathways to Losing Control

The three actors are not symmetric, but they converge on the same structural problem. The following table summarizes the actor-specific pathways to loss of control and their underlying drivers.

Table 1. Comparative drivers and escalation dynamics across the United States, Israel, and Iran.

Actor	Primary Driver	Outcome Logic
United States	Fiscal–strategic overextension	Sustaining global commitments becomes increasingly difficult.
Israel	Escalation lock-in	Escalation reduces flexibility and increases risk.
Iran	Legitimacy–retaliation loop	Response pressure accelerates escalation cycles.

Each represents a distinct pathway to loss of control. The United States faces structural overextension; Israel faces behavioral escalation entrapment; Iran faces a political retaliation cycle.

The critical point is that these pathways are different, but they all lead to the same outcome: crossing actor-specific thresholds of uncontrollability.

Conclusion

The 2026 U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict is best understood not as a contest for decisive military victory, but as a competition among three distinct pathways to loss of control: U.S. fiscal–strategic overextension, Israeli escalation lock-in, and Iran’s legitimacy–retaliation loop.

What ultimately determines outcomes is not battlefield success alone, but each actor’s capacity to absorb and manage cumulative systemic pressure without crossing its loss-of-control threshold.

More broadly, in contemporary systemic warfare, strategic success is defined less by the ability to defeat an opponent than by the ability to sustain control under escalating pressure. The actor that loses control first is the one that loses.

References

Associated Press. (2026, March 17). *Iran, Iraq, U.S., Israel tensions escalate amid regional conflict*. https://apnews.com/article/iran-iraq-us-israel-trump-march-17-2026-35d15d7cbcfa65fd7d180c28d38e7f31

Biddle, S. (2004). *Military power: Explaining victory and defeat in modern battle*. Princeton University Press.

Brands, H. (2022). *The twilight struggle: What the Cold War teaches us about great-power rivalry today*. Yale University Press.

Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton University Press.

Kahn, H. (1965). *On escalation: Metaphors and scenarios*. Praeger.

Reuters. (2026a, March 18). *Pentagon seeks more than $200 billion budget request for Iran war*. https://www.reuters.com/world/us/pentagon-seeks-more-than-200-billion-budget-request-iran-war-washington-post-2026-03-18/

Reuters. (2026b, March 18). *U.S. weighs military reinforcements as Iran war enters possible new phase*. https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/us-weighs-military-reinforcements-iran-war-enters-possible-new-phase-2026-03-18/

Reuters. (2026d, March 18). *Israel kills Iranian security chief Ali Larijani in airstrike*. https://www.reuters.com/graphics/IRAN-CRISIS/MAPS/znpnmelervl/

Reuters. (2026c, March 17). *Trump criticises allies over Hormuz request amid Iran-Israel tensions*. https://www.reuters.com/world/china/trump-criticises-allies-over-rejection-hormuz-request-iran-israel-trade-2026-03-17/

Schelling, T. C. (1966). *Arms and influence*. Yale University Press.

Tabatabai, A. M. (2020). *No confrontation: Iran's national security strategy*. Oxford University Press.

The Guardian. (2026, March 18). *Trump, Iran war, and domestic political tensions in the U.S.* https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/live/2026/mar/18/donald-trump-iran-war-markwayne-mullin-security-immigration-intelligence-federal-reserve-interest-rates-latest-news-updates

Wu, S. (2026a). *Industrial War and Network War: Operational logics in the Russia–Ukraine War and the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict* (EPINOVA Working Paper No. EPINOVA–WP–F–2026–06). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18972327

Wu, S. (2026b). *Systemic Warfare in the Networked Age: Operational systems, information competition, and cumulative pressure* (EPINOVA Working Paper No. EPINOVA–WP–F–2026–07). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19078936

Wu, S. (2026c). *Terminal platform nodes and narrative competition in the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict* (Policy Brief No. EPINOVA–2026–PB–13). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19027188

Wu, S. (2026d). *Post-nodal warfare: Will distributed AI command replace human leadership in high-intensity conflict?* (Policy Brief No. EPINOVA–2026–PB–14). Global AI Governance and Policy Research Center, EPINOVA LLC. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19104090