

Luck vs Skills: Advancing defense architectural infrastructures

(Architecture theory, military, tactics) —

A hypothetical situation follows:

You, a soldier, against a sniper located 500 meters away aiming at you with only 1 bullet. You have 2 decisions:

- 1.) Hide behind a 20' x 20' opaque fabric wall.
- 2.) Hide behind a small high PSI concrete truncated wall with a small 6" x 6" aperture.

Which one would you choose to defend yourself?

The discourse now follows whether you are confident enough to rely on materials to defend your hitbox, or confident enough to rely on chances. This is a hypothetical situation in which can possibly advance existing military infrastructures. The idea of fabric vs. concrete may be something to pursue. Concrete is certain of its strength and defense, though limited to its planar and pragmatic usage. Fabric is weak, but can be utilized for planar advantages. It can also be used for its flexibility to be transported and reconditioned to different areas within the perimeter — hence, adding more mobility of infrastructures.

A possible idea here is to use long-span fabric infrastructures to hide military activities within its perimeter. No need to wait for concrete curing, nor expose positional placement of infrastructures by adversary's analysis using satellite technology. All actions are hid by this long-span material. From here, we can add concrete infrastructures under this canopy; all actions are hid.

Against adversary air offense, these fabric enclosures can be used to hide anti-air infrastructures, which these enclosures can open when the enemies are engaging. Another element of surprise. Thus, testing the adversary pilot's impromptu decisions.

(To be updated)

-C. Lance Rellve (2017)