SAMPLE

Building the Drone Warfare of Tomorrow

The Sky Full of Small Decisions

Aiman JoeHanz

Free sample: Introduction & Chapter 1

putrabooks.github.io

Buy the full book:

Carousell carousell.sg/p/building-the-drone-warfare-of-tomorrow-ebook-pdf-1471336046

Ko-fi

Payhip

Contents

Introduction

Chapter 1: The Definition and Its Impostors

Chapter 2: The Airframe and the Energy Budget

Chapter 3: The Payload and the Mission

Chapter 4: The Tether

Chapter 5: The Swarm

Chapter 6: The Kill Chain Flown from Above

Chapter 7: The Counter-Drone Problem

Chapter 8: The Human in the Loop

Chapter 9: The Record

Chapter 10: The Decade Ahead

Introduction

Drone warfare is what happens when the pilot leaves the aircraft and the pilot's judgment does not. A crewed fighter costs a fortune because it must carry a person, protect the person, and bring the person home; an unmanned one is free to be cheap, expendable, and shaped entirely around the job, because the one component the machine cannot afford to lose has been moved somewhere safe. What remains aboard the vehicle is a loop: sense, decide, act. What has been moved down a radio link, or into software, or into a targeting folder prepared the night before, is the part of the loop that matters. The history of this field is the history of that migration. Each generation moves another piece of the pilot out of the airframe and into a place where it cannot be shot down, and each migration changes who bears the risk, who makes the decision, and what the weapon is allowed to cost.

This is the first lesson of the subject, and it inverts most of what a century of airpower thinking assumed. Douhet promised that the bomber would always get through, and the century spent itself proving him half right: the aircraft got through, but the crews paid for the doctrine in blood, and every air force built after 1945 quietly organized itself around the idea that losing an aircraft meant losing a family. The unmanned vehicle breaks that equation. A drone can be lost the way a shell is lost, without a folded flag, and a force that can lose machines without losing people will behave differently at every decision point: it will fly lower, accept more risk, saturate where a crewed force would feint, and buy a hundred cheap airframes where a crewed force would have bought one expensive one. The shield-and-sword argument of the previous volume continues here with the sword suddenly, dramatically cheaper.

The second lesson is that the smallness is the weapon. The large unmanned aircraft, the satellite-relayed, runway-based, camera-carrying kind, inherited the crewed world's economics and behaved like a conventional airplane with the pilot relocated. The revolution arrived from below instead, in vehicles the size of a dinner tray, built from hobby motors and phone cameras and consumer batteries, first as scouts and then, once someone strapped a grenade to one, as the cheapest precision weapon any infantry squad had ever owned. The cheap drone demolished a quiet assumption that had held since the 1940s: that precision is expensive. Precision, it turned out, was a solved problem the moment the phone industry solved it, and the phone industry solved it for reasons that had nothing to do with war. The modern battlefield did not adopt drones so much as it adopted consumer electronics, and the consumer electronics turned out to be weapons-grade.

The third lesson is the one this book dwells on longest, because the decade's arguments will be fought over it. Every drone that matters is a bundle of small decisions: whether the image shows a truck or an ambulance, whether the lost-link behavior is to orbit or to attack, whether the swarm's vote counts two sensors or three, whether a human saw the targeting folder before the machine acted on it. Nobody aboard the vehicle owns these decisions, because nobody is aboard the vehicle. The decisions live in software, in doctrine, in radio protocols, and in the legal space between a machine's sensor and a human's signature, and they are the battlefield's real terrain. A war between two drone powers is, at bottom, a war over who can make good small decisions faster and at lower cost, and that is a stranger contest than any the century prepared us for.

This book follows the series method. It defines the machine from its anatomy outward, works every governing equation in plain arithmetic, prices every claim against the field's own record, and refuses every number that a budget cycle can outlive. No manufacturer is named, no platform is endorsed, no engagement is presented as anything but a composite drawn from public reporting and named as such. What the chapters build is the structure: the definition and the impostors that pretend to it; the airframe and the energy budget that caps everything it can do; the payload that turns a bus into a weapon; the datalink, the single most vulnerable organ, and what happens when it is cut; the swarm and the arithmetic of numbers; the kill chain flown from above; the counter-drone problem, which is the hardest sensing problem in modern defense; the human in the loop and the responsibility the loop must not be allowed to launder; the procurement record the field cannot seem to learn from; and the decade ahead, stated in honest probabilities rather than forecasts.

The reader this book is written for holds any of three jobs. A builder needs the physics and the interfaces: what endurance the battery actually buys, what bandwidth the sensor actually needs, what the jammer does to both. A soldier or analyst needs the doctrine: what the machine is good at, what it is terrible at, and what its literature is reluctant to admit. A policymaker needs the consequences: where the cost curve is pulling, where the law is thin, and which small decisions must be made by a person because no machine will ever be accountable for them. All three jobs reduce, in this field, to the same discipline, which is the discipline of reading a flying computer as what it is: an engineering artifact whose behavior is a set of choices someone made, on the ground, in advance, in software. Read it that way and the sky stops being a

mystery. It becomes a readable, auditable, improvable system, which is what every technology in this series becomes once its bones are showing.

One caution belongs in the front of the book rather than the back. Drone warfare's public conversation is dominated by two opposite errors: the terror narrative, in which the machines are steps toward autonomous atrocity, and the sales narrative, in which each year's model has abolished the previous war's problems. Both narratives share a root: they treat the machine as an actor with intentions. It is not. It is a bundle of engineering trades, flown by people whose names are in a tasking chain, and every horror and every failure it produces will be traceable to a trade someone priced or a decision someone delegated. The chapters that follow are an audit of those trades. The reader who finishes them will be able to look at any drone on any front page and answer the only question that matters about such a machine: what, exactly, was it decided to let it do by itself?

A word on method before the chapters begin, because the series' method is a promise and the reader should know what was refused. No engagement described in this book is presented as history; the battles are composites, assembled from public reporting and named as composites, because the series' standard for honesty is higher than the memoir's and lower than the archive's: every claim is priced, every mechanism is explained, and nothing is dramatized that cannot be defended in a footnote of arithmetic. No vendor is named and no platform is endorsed, because the machines age on a budget cycle's schedule and the structures under them do not age at all: the square-cube law, the link budget, the square law of numbers, and the audit trail are as true of next year's catalog as of this year's wreckage. Where the field is uncertain, the book says so and says why, and where the field's public conversation is wrong, the book disagrees in the first person, because a guide that hedges its own judgments is a catalog wearing a coat.

The reader should also know the book's limits, stated up front rather than buried. This is not a legal text; the laws of armed conflict appear where the engineering meets them, and the reader who needs the jurisprudence should read the jurists. It is not a tactical manual; the formations and employment patterns it describes are structural, meant to be understood, not copied, because doctrine belongs to the services that own the risk. And it is not the whole of the machine's story: the intelligence war, the industrial war, the nuclear shadow, all have their own volumes' worth, and this book touches each only where the drone's anatomy requires it. What it is, completely, is a

working engineer's and commander's guide to the machine's structure, from the definition down, with the arithmetic shown, in the faith that has carried every volume of this series: that a reader who understands why a machine behaves as it does is prepared for the machine that has not been built yet.

The chapters, in the order the structure requires: the definition first, because a machine that cannot be classified cannot be discussed; then the airframe and its energy, because everything the machine does is priced from that account; then the payload, because the mission lives there; then the tether, because the link is the system's most attackable organ; then the swarm, because numbers have their own arithmetic; then the kill chain, flown from above; then the counter-drone problem, the defense's hardest brief; then the human in the loop, where the signatures live; then the record, where the claims are priced; and the decade ahead, in honest probabilities. Ten chapters, one spine, and a reader who finishes with the ability to audit any machine the news places over any battlefield, which is the ability this series was written to give.

The introduction's last word is an orientation for the reader who opens the chapters at random, because a structural book should survive random access. Each chapter is a budget: the definition prices judgment, the airframe prices energy, the payload prices the mission, the tether prices communication, the swarm prices numbers, the chain prices certainty, the counter-drone chapter prices defense, the human chapter prices responsibility, the record prices the claims, and the decade prices the future. Each budget stands alone, each borrows from the others, and the reader who reads any single one will finish with its arithmetic and its failure modes, able to audit the machines in that one domain, which is a complete skill and the reason the chapters are built to be self-contained.

Chapter 1: The Definition and Its Impostors

Every book in this series begins by drawing a fence around its subject, because every engineering field is surrounded by machines that wear its costume. The fence for this one is a single sentence, and the rest of the chapter drives its posts. A drone is a vehicle whose sensing, deciding, and acting are arranged in a loop that closes somewhere other than aboard the vehicle itself. Three clauses matter: it senses, it decides, and it acts, and the second clause is the one that draws the line, because the decision can live in a ground station, in a radio protocol, in software that flies the whole mission alone, or in a human's thumb on a console thousands of kilometers away. What makes the machine a drone is not the absence of a pilot but the portability of the pilot's judgment. The airframe is furniture.

The definition's first impostor is the missile. A cruise missile flies itself, senses nothing that matters, and holds no model of the world; its guidance is a decision made once at launch and burned into its memory, and its loop never closes against what it finds. The distinction matters beyond taste, for it divides two industries with different economics, and the line between them is the line the arms-control arguments of the decade will be fought over. A loitering munition that orbits a grid square, looks at what is inside it, and picks a target from what it sees has crossed from the missile camp into the drone camp, however much its brochure insists on calling it a munition. The tell is always the same: does the machine make a decision after arrival that could have come out differently? If it does, the warhead is riding a drone.

The second impostor is the toy. The consumer quadcopter is a genuine unmanned aircraft, and its manufacturers were the field's accidental arms suppliers, but the toy earns its name honestly in one respect: it makes no decisions its operator has not already made, its safety logic excepted. A camera drone that follows a skater is closing a loop, but the loop closes around a preprogrammed task with no stakes. The battlefield did not have to upgrade the machines much to make them weapons; it had to upgrade the tasking. That is the uncomfortable finding of the last decade: the distance from hobbyist to combatant was measured in firmware and doctrine, not in engineering. The toy is the drone's body with the war's software still uninstalled, which is why export controls on airframes fail so regularly. The airframe was never the controlled item. The decision logic is.

The third impostor is the crewed aircraft with the crew reduced. A two-seat fighter flying with a drone as a wingman, a helicopter flown remotely for

resupply runs, a bomber converted to pilotless trials: these are crewed designs wearing the new costume, and their economics remain crewed economics, because the airframe still costs what a human-rated machine costs. They matter, and they will be common, but the reader should be suspicious of any claim that they represent the revolution. The revolution is always on the cheap side of the ledger. An unmanned fleet built at crewed prices behaves like a crewed fleet with fewer funerals, which is a moral gain and a strategic null; an unmanned fleet built at radio prices behaves like something the opponent has never had to fight.

The word autonomy needs separate treatment, for it is the most abused term in the field. Autonomy is not one property but a stack of them, and a machine can be high on one level and rock-bottom on the next. A useful ladder has four rungs. At the bottom is remote control: a human commands each act, the machine executes, and all judgment lives with the operator. Above it sits automation: the machine executes standing behaviors, holds altitude, follows waypoints, returns home on a lost link, but chooses nothing that was not enumerated in advance. Above that sits delegated decision: the machine selects among behaviors against a goal, picking its own route around a jammer or its own spot in a formation, within boundaries a human wrote. At the top, which no fielded system honestly occupies in combat, sits unsupervised mission autonomy: the machine receives an objective and interprets the world to pursue it. Most public argument about killer robots is an argument about the top rung, while almost all real engineering happens between the second and third, and almost all real risk lives at the boundary between them, where a delegated decision and an enumerated one look identical from outside.

The definition also has to say what the machine is for, because a drone is not a mission but a chassis for missions. The military taxonomy that groups them by weight, altitude, and endurance is honest about size and mute about purpose, and purpose is what the builder cares about. This book will sort them instead by the job the loop performs: the scout, whose loop ends in a report; the strike machine, whose loop ends in an effect delivered; the relay, whose loop keeps someone else's loop alive; and the decoy or absorber, whose loop exists to be destroyed on favorable terms. The same airframe can serve all four jobs on the same afternoon, which is the point: the job is software, the software is decisions, and the decisions are the subject.

Why does the definition chapter matter to a builder, rather than to a lawyer?

Because every clause of the fence corresponds to a design decision with a price. If the deciding clause lives aboard the vehicle, the vehicle needs a computer that survives thermal and vibration abuse, and its software becomes a weapons system subject to every certification burden that implies; if it lives on the ground, the vehicle needs a datalink, and the datalink becomes the system's single point of failure, priced in jammers rather than in dollars. There is no third option. The pilot's judgment has to live somewhere, and the somewhere determines the machine's shape, cost, and failure modes more surely than any other choice in the program. Whole procurement disasters trace to a team that made this decision by default, letting an airframe contractor decide where the software would sit because the specification was silent.

The record offers the definition one final test: machines whose names lied. Both the early target drones, which were unmanned aircraft in every clause and yet were treated as expendable targets rather than vehicles, and the early reconnaissance conversions, which were called drones because the term was already cheap, show that the field's vocabulary has always run behind its engineering. The vocabulary still runs behind it. The decade's arguing about autonomous weapons is, in large part, an argument conducted by people using the word drone to mean four different rungs of the ladder, and the reader who has the ladder can shorten most such arguments by asking one question: which decisions, exactly, were delegated? That question is answerable. It is answerable by reading software, by auditing tasking chains, and by testing machines against ranges, and the fact that it is rarely asked in public debate is a choice, not a limitation.

The Page to Keep

A drone is a vehicle whose sense-decide-act loop closes somewhere other than aboard the vehicle. The missile's loop never closes against the world; the toy's loop closes against a task with no stakes; the crewed conversion closes its loop at crewed prices. Autonomy is a four-rung ladder, remote control, standing automation, delegated decision, and unsupervised mission pursuit, and almost all real systems live on the middle rungs, where the risk concentrates at the boundary between a behavior someone enumerated and a choice someone delegated. The mission the loop performs, scouting, striking, relaying, or absorbing, is software, not airframe. And the clause that decides the machine's entire character is the simplest one: where does the deciding live? Answer that, and the rest of the machine, its computer or its datalink, its

certification or its fragility, its price and its failure modes, follows.

The fence deserves one more post: history, because the migration of judgment out of the cockpit is older than the machines that completed it. Aerial torpedoes of the First World War flew preset courses; target drones of the interwar years accepted radio commands; reconnaissance conversions of the 1960s and 1970s flew camera missions over territory too radioactive or too defended for crews. Each of these moved a fraction of the pilot's work off the vehicle, and each was named for the fraction it lacked: pilotless, unmanned, remotely piloted. The full migration waited on two unrelated industries. Satellite links gave a ground station global reach, and the consumer electronics industry gave computation, sensing, and batteries at prices that made expendability thinkable. The drone is what the airplane becomes when its most expensive component stops riding along, and its history is best read not as invention but as relocation, decade by decade, of one function after another.

The relocation has a grammar, and the builder who learns the grammar can predict the next decade's products without a crystal ball. Functions migrate in a fixed order. First to leave the cockpit are the ones that are exhausting and mechanical: stability, navigation, station-keeping. Then leave the ones that are perceptual but bounded: altitude holds, terrain following, landing sequences. Then the ones that are tactical but precomputable: route choice around known threats, timing of arrival at a coordinated point. What leaves last is judgment under genuine uncertainty: whether the shape under the tree is a launcher or a picnic, whether the pattern of vehicles is a withdrawal or a feint. The grammar says the last migration is different in kind, not just in date, because everything before it could be verified against a checklist, and everything after it cannot. The certification instruments built for the earlier migrations, test ranges, fault injection, requirements traceability, will strain at the last one, and the decade's hardest engineering problem is not making machines that can judge but proving, in a way a court will accept, which judgments were theirs.

A worked example shows why the definition must be auditable rather than rhetorical. Consider a machine released toward a road junction with instructions to loiter and strike the first vehicle meeting a stated profile: four wheels, bed-mounted, traveling south. Every clause of its behavior is enumerated; by the ladder it is a standing automation, two rungs below the nightmare. Yet a school bus and a technical can share a profile if the profile is

written loosely, and the machine will execute the enumeration with perfect discipline. The failure lives in the specification, not in the software, and no level of onboard intelligence would have caught it, because a cleverer machine would still be cleverly wrong if the tasking was wrong. This is why the serious literature in the field spends so little time on machine consciousness and so much on tasking discipline: the machine inherits the quality of the decision that launched it, the way a lawsuit inherits the quality of its contract. The drone is a flying exhibit of its own paperwork.

That worked example also disposes of a seductive error: the belief that keeping a human in the loop solves the specification problem automatically. The human in the loop is only as good as the loop's timing and information. A supervisor who must approve each engagement in a two-second window, staring at a compressed video feed at night, is not a safeguard; the human is a rubber stamp with a pulse, and the system's real decision was made by whoever set the window and chose the sensor. The design question is never whether a human is present but what the human is given and how long the human has. Approving an engagement after the fact is not presence in the loop but presence at the funeral. Any program that reports humans in the loop as a safety property should be asked to demonstrate the loop's latency budget and the information the human actually sees, and a program that cannot produce that budget is reporting theology, not engineering.

The chapter's ladder also clarifies the field's least productive argument: whether drones are cowardly, whether a pilot forty kilometers away is a warrior or an executioner. That argument is old, and it is not really about drones; every generation that could kill at range was accused of cowardice in its own turn, from the crossbow to the artilleryman to the bomber crew. What is genuinely new is not the distance but the auditability. A drone's engagements produce logs, timestamps, and sensor records that a crewed engagement never kept, and the same machine that relocates judgment also records it. The uncomfortable possibility the debate avoids is that the drone is the first weapon whose courage question is decidable from evidence, and that most of the moral weight lies where it always did: in the tasking chain, which the records can now name. A field that can be audited will eventually be audited, and the builder should plan for that audit from the first requirement review, because records written for another purpose rarely satisfy one.

One more impostor completes the fence, and it is the newest: the unattributed drone. Small civilian machines modified for attack, flown by units that never

signed for them, recovered in pieces from assembly areas, present the definitional problem in reverse. Such a vehicle's loop closes with its operator, who may be three streets away or three borders away, and the machine itself, a consumer product with a warhead, carries no doctrine, no certification, and no flag. The field's definitions were written assuming states; the cheap drone's defining scandal is that it works for anyone, and the record of the last several years is a record of that scandal compounding. The definition chapter cannot resolve it, but it can name it: the drone's definition is a statement about where decisions live, and one of the decade's live security problems is that the decisions can live with anyone at all, at hobby prices, with no paper trail until the wreckage is read. The chapters on counter-drone systems and on the human in the loop both inherit the problem from this paragraph, because a machine that anyone can field is a machine that everyone must be able to defeat.

The definition's practical test deserves a section of its own, because the reader will be asked, in briefings and arguments, to classify real machines on the spot, and the test should fit on a card. Four questions, in order, sort any system into its honest category. First, does the machine sense its environment after launch? If not, it is a munition, whatever its wings. Second, do its behaviors exceed an enumerated list, choosing among approaches to a goal? If not, it is an automation, and its surprises are bugs rather than decisions. Third, where do the choices that exceed the enumeration live, with a person, or in software aboard? If with a person, the system is remotely piloted in the meaningful sense, and the person's situation, visibility, latency, and fatigue, is the system's safety case. Fourth, what record exists of the machine's choices, the delegated ones and the human's, timestamps, sensor files, and tasking? If the record is thin, the system's autonomy is unaudited, and unaudited autonomy is not a category error but an institutional one, a machine that can act without ever having to explain. The card's last line is the chapter's thesis in field form: the four answers, not the airframe, are the machine, and any briefing that does not contain them is about the furniture.

The card also prices the classification's consequences, because categories in this field are budgets, laws, and treaties. A munition is export-controlled as a munition and used without a pilot's license; an aircraft is certified as an aircraft and flown by licensed crews under aviation law; an automated system is tested like any safety-critical software; a delegated system, in most jurisdictions, is not yet anything, a regulatory gap the decade is arguing over, and the argument's stakes are visible in the classification's history: vehicles

have been renamed to escape control regimes, munitions renamed to escape treaty definitions, and the renaming has worked because the definitions lagged the software. The reader who holds the card can watch the renaming happen in real time, and the field's public debates, on autonomous weapons, on export rules, on aviation certification for unmanned traffic, are all at bottom arguments about which machines belong in which box, with which obligations attached. The boxes are not pedantry; they are where a machine's accountability is assigned, and the box it ends in is decided, overwhelmingly, by which name its seller found first.

The Page to Keep (prices to carry)

The card's four questions: does it sense after launch, does it exceed its enumeration, where do the exceeding choices live, and what record exists of them? The answers, not the airframe, are the machine. The categories are budgets, laws, and treaties, machines are renamed to escape them, and the box a system ends in is where its accountability is assigned.

One more distinction belongs in the definition chapter because the decade's policy argument depends on it: the difference between a machine that selects and a machine that verifies. A system that selects chooses its target from what it finds; a system that verifies checks what a human chose against what it sees. The distinction matters because the two carry completely different risk profiles and completely different certification burdens, and because the public argument about autonomous weapons argues about the first while most deployed systems, honestly described, are the second. The verifier is the targeting folder's machine half: it holds up the human's choice and the sensor's picture and asks whether they match, and its failure mode, the false negative that aborts a lawful strike or the false positive that confirms a mistaken one, is a quality problem with a quality solution, testable on ranges, bounded in specifications. The selector's failure mode is a doctrine problem wearing software, because a machine that chooses among found things inherits the tasking's assumptions at machine speed, and no range test certifies an assumption. The buyer's question, and the treaty negotiator's, is the same one: does the machine find the answer or check the answer, and the entire honest regulation of this field could be written on that seam.

The Page to Keep (added)

Selecting differs from verifying as doctrine differs from quality: the selector inherits the tasking's assumptions at machine speed, and the verifier is a testable match-checker whose failures are bounded. The whole serious law of

this field could be drafted along that dividing line.

The definition's last boundary is temporal, and stating it prevents the field's most common anachronism. The drone of the record's first decade was a camera with wings; the drone of the record's second was a weapon with wings; the drone of the coming years is a decision with wings, and each version contains the previous ones as a matryoshka, which is why the arguments about killer robots feel eternal: every generation is arguing about the next doll while fielding the current one. The reader who fixes the definition in time, asking what year's enumeration the machine under discussion was executing, will find most of the public debate dissolving into disagreement about which doll is on the table. The book's own position, stated as definition rather than prophecy: the coming machine will still be a bundle of decisions made by people, priced by budgets, and constrained by physics, and the definition that survives every doll is the one this chapter wrote, because it does not describe a technology at all; it describes a location, the place where judgment lives.

The Page to Keep (final)

Each generation's drone contains the previous ones, camera, weapon, decision, and the eternal argument is about which doll is on the table. The definition that survives every doll describes not a technology but a location: the place where judgment lives.

One distinction the field's vocabulary still lacks, and the definition chapter should propose it: the difference between a drone system and a drone fleet. The system is one machine, its link, its crew, its maintenance, a unit of capability that a specification can describe; the fleet is the system multiplied by an institution, and it includes the school, the spares pipeline, the doctrine, the spectrum plan, and the factory relationship, none of which appears in any machine's manual. The confusion between the two accounts for the record's most expensive disappointments: systems that were excellent and fleets that were hollow, acquisitions that bought the first and assumed the second. The definition chapter's closing proposal is therefore a bookkeeping one, offered in the series' plain style: describe a drone power by its fleet, count its schools and its spares and its spectrum managers alongside its airframes, and the description will be true in a way that no system's brochure has ever been, because the fleet is the drone, and the system is merely the part that flies.

The chapter's last note is a warning about the field's most seductive shortcut,

the belief that naming a system autonomous settles the question of what it does. Names in procurement documents are marketing artifacts, and the record's machines have worn names that promised more than their software delivered and names that concealed software nobody had reviewed; the definition chapter's card cuts through all of it, because the card does not ask the name, it asks the behavior, the record, and the owner. The reader who audits by card rather than by label will find the field less mysterious and more ordinary, which is the series' whole aim: an autonomous weapon that cannot produce its four answers is not an enigma but a procurement problem, and procurement problems are solved in daylight, by committees, with the arithmetic this book has shown. The definition is the machine's true serial number, and the reader who asks for it has stopped being an audience and started being an auditor, which is the only relationship with a weapon system that a democracy can afford.

A last caution for the auditor, learned from the record's audit failures: the card's questions are uncomfortable exactly where the institution's interests lie, and the answers will be hardest to obtain precisely when they matter most. The program that answers the four questions readily is usually the program that wrote them down at the beginning; the program that answers with committee language is usually the program that never asked itself, and the difference between the two is visible years before any engagement, in the specification review's minutes, which is where the audit should begin. The reader who has the card should therefore practice it on friendly machines first, until the questions are reflexes, and then ask them of the uncomfortable ones, because the card's whole value is at the edges, where the definitions are argued and the boxes are being drawn.

The definition chapter's practice is a desk exercise: pick any unmanned system in this week's news, or this year's budget, and answer the card's four questions from its public record. What does it sense after launch, what does it do beyond its enumerated behaviors, where do the exceeding choices live, and what provenance trail would a court see? Most systems will answer the first two quickly and the last two not at all, and the gap between the two halves of the card is the exact shape of the audit the institution has not run, which is the finding the exercise exists to produce. The reader who can fill the card from open sources can fill it faster with the documents, and the professional who fills it twice will never again confuse a name with an answer.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Aiman JoeHanz writes the Building of Tomorrow series -- structural, vendor-neutral guides to the technologies reshaping industry, labor, and daily life. Each volume treats one technology the way an engineer treats a machine: definition first, then anatomy, failure modes, principles, build, deployment, and the honest decade ahead.