



## Buzz, Boom, Repeat: FPV Drones and the New Rules of Modern Warfare

### Description

FPV drones were never supposed to be war machines. Originally, they were the toys of adrenaline junkies and weekend hobbyists, whizzing through obstacle courses to the sound of cheering nerds with VR goggles. But thanks to the war in Ukraine, these buzzing little troublemakers have been promoted to frontline soldiers. They're now diving into trenches, blowing up tanks, and giving military planners worldwide a serious case of drone envy.

The appeal is obvious. For a few hundred quid—or hryvnias—you can take an off-the-shelf drone, strap on some explosives, and turn it into a precision strike weapon. It's like giving a teenager's science project a license to kill. But while Ukraine's ingenuity has turned these FPVs into the AK-47 of the skies—cheap, effective, and everywhere—the defense world's usual suspects have found a way to complicate things.

Enter the \$40,000 FPV drone. Yes, you read that right. While Ukraine is making war on a shoestring budget, defense contractors are out here trying to sell luxury drones for the cost of a new car. These expensive models are packed with so much high-tech wizardry that you'd think they were destined for Mars, not a battlefield where their lifespan is measured in minutes. It begs the question: why are we overengineering things that are supposed to explode?

### Why FPVs Took Over the Battlefield

The genius of Ukraine's FPV revolution is in its simplicity. It's war, but with a maker's workshop vibe. Need to spot a tank? Send up a drone. Need to destroy said tank? Strap on a grenade and send it again. It's like drone DIY, but the stakes are life and death. Their affordability and versatility make them ideal for asymmetric warfare, allowing Ukraine to outmaneuver and outthink a larger enemy.

And they work. FPVs have become an equalizer, wreaking havoc on Russia's traditional tactics and proving that drones don't need to be fancy to be effective. They just need to do their job: fly fast, hit hard, and make the enemy regret waking up that day. But herein lies the rub: the very simplicity that makes these drones so effective also makes them, well, disposable. They're not built to

lastâ??theyâ??re built to blow up. And thatâ??s fineâ?! if youâ??re not spending \$40,000 on them.

## **The Problem with Overengineering**

Now letâ??s talk about the elephantâ??or should I say, the overengineered droneâ??in the room. Why on earth is anyone paying forty grand for a flying bomb? Ukraineâ??s FPVs cost a fraction of that and get the job done. Yet some defense contractors are pitching drones so packed with features they might as well come with leather seats and a moonroof.

Sure, theyâ??ll tell you their drones have advanced targeting systems, encrypted communications, and the kind of build quality that can survive a nuclear apocalypse (well, almost). But when the entire purpose of the drone is to explode, you have to ask: why bother? Are they supposed to explode better? Do we think the enemy will be impressed?

Meanwhile, Ukraineâ??s drones are doing the same job for a fraction of the cost. They donâ??t have military-grade polish or a glossy brochure, but theyâ??re devastatingly effective. And when theyâ??re inevitably destroyed, no oneâ??s crying over the loss of an overpriced flying gadget. The defense industry could learn a thing or two here: sometimes good enough is good enough.

## **Lessons for the Defense Industry**

The war in Ukraine should be a wake-up call for the U.S. and other defense powerhouses. Itâ??s not about being the most expensiveâ??itâ??s about being the most adaptable. Ukraineâ??s approach has shown that ingenuity beats extravagance, and weâ??d do well to follow suit.

First off, we need to stop putting the crown jewels in drones that are designed to last fifteen minutes. Advanced AI, secure communication waveforms, and high-tech targeting systems are all well and good, but they belong in platforms that can justify their inclusion. When you pack that kind of tech into a disposable drone, youâ??re not just wasting moneyâ??youâ??re handing a gift-wrapped tutorial to anyone who picks up the wreckage.

Instead, letâ??s save the clever stuff for the big guns: fixed-wing UAVs that can loiter for hours, rotary-wing drones that thrive in tricky terrain, and modular platforms that can adapt to multiple missions. These are the drones that win wars, not just skirmishes. Theyâ??re the fine dining of the drone world, while FPVs are the fast food.

But that doesnâ??t mean FPVs donâ??t have a place. Theyâ??re brilliant at what they doâ??buzz, boom, repeat. The trick is to keep them simple and cheap, leaving the high-value tech for platforms that can use it to its full potential. Itâ??s the difference between using a match to light a candle and trying to light it with a flamethrower. Both work, but only one makes sense.

## **Conclusion: Thinking Bigger (and Cheaper)**

FPV drones have proven their worth on the battlefield, but theyâ??re not the future of warfare. Theyâ??re tools for the momentâ??disposable assets that win skirmishes but not wars. The real future lies in scalable, adaptable platforms that can justify the integration of advanced technologies.

Ukraine has taught us that simplicity and ingenuity can achieve incredible results. But as the global defense industry moves forward, it must find a balance between accessibility and exclusivity. FPVs are

here to stay, but their place is in the expendable column. For long-term strategy, we need to think bigger. And maybe, just maybe, stop trying to sell \$40,000 firecrackers.

### **Category**

1. Europe

### **Tags**

1. DOD
2. drones
3. FPV
4. loitering munitions
5. russia
6. U.S.
7. Ukraine

### **Date Created**

December 4, 2024

### **Author**

jackson