

WHAT IF THE NEXT CRASH COULD BE STOPPED BEFORE IT HAPPENS?

We can build machines that fly, drive and respond on their own. So why are people still left with so little real-time help when an aircraft suddenly loses control?

A public call to research better onboard safety intelligence, live ground support, and real-world testing using RC aircraft and drones.

Aviation Intelligence for the Preservation of Life

A proposal for research and public discussion — not a finished technology

Behind every accident are people.

A flight crew, passengers, families expecting someone home. When an emergency unfolds, there may be only seconds to understand what has gone wrong. Pilots already have sophisticated instruments, warnings and autopilots, but those tools cannot solve every unfamiliar or rapidly developing failure.

The warning signs are real.

- **Aircraft and helicopter collisions**
  In January 2025, a passenger jet and a military helicopter collided near Washington, D.C., killing 67 people. Investigators identified systemic safety failures. This was not simply an aircraft-recovery problem; it shows why better coordination, data sharing and prevention deserve attention.
- **Sudden loss of control**
  Some emergencies involve stalls, unusual attitudes, mechanical faults or confusing instrument readings. We should study whether new software could recognize danger earlier and help crews choose among tested responses.
- **The Titan warning**
  The 2023 Titan submersible tragedy killed five people. Investigators found serious engineering, testing and monitoring failures. Titan is not evidence that AI would have saved the occupants. It is a lesson that innovation without strong validation and oversight can cost lives.

The point is not to replace pilots.

It is to give them a better chance: earlier warnings, clearer information, proven recovery guidance and qualified people on the ground who can see what is happening.

November 1, 2026 | Palm Beach County, Florida

Nine people died when a Learjet 60 crashed near Greenacres. The crew had reported icing, turbulence and precipitation. Flight tracking recorded a rapid descent. Investigators have not yet determined the cause.

This tragedy raises a question far beyond one flight: could earlier warnings and better diagnostics, backed by ground experts, give future crews more time to act?

Sources: Flightradar24 (Nov 1, 2026); NBC 6 South Florida (Nov 1, 2026).

A second set of eyes. In real time.

Imagine an independent safety assistant watching flight information throughout a journey. It notices a problem, checks the signals against each other, and immediately gives the crew a clear explanation of what it knows — and what it does not.



- **Onboard intelligence**
  Read aircraft attitude, speeds, control responses, engine status and other available sensor data. Detect unusual patterns and flag possible emergencies early.
- **Support without information overload**
  Explain likely causes in plain language and show only procedures independently validated for that aircraft and situation. If the answer is uncertain, say so.
- **Live ground expertise**
  Securely share essential data with qualified ground specialists, rather than depending entirely on a distressed pilot to describe the problem over the radio.
- **Safe by design**
  Keep pilots in command for advisory functions. Any automatic control intervention would need separate certification, fail-safe limits, cybersecurity and testing across failure conditions.

Start small. Learn from the real world.

RC pilots already fly an extraordinary range of aircraft — light trainers, scale jets, helicopters and drones. That variety could help researchers collect flight data and learn what changes when an aircraft is heavier, lighter, slimmer, more stable, or harder to control.

- **1. Build the simulation**
  Start with existing flight simulators and autopilot software. Measure whether experimental AI identifies danger faster and more accurately than current systems.
- **2. Invite RC pilots to contribute**
  With permission, collect anonymized, documented sensor and control data from different airframes. Test under controlled, lawful conditions with pilot override and safety limits.
- **3. Test across sizes and shapes**
  Train on some aircraft and evaluate on unseen ones. Compare mass, wing loading, balance, wind, sensor errors and response to control inputs.
- **4. Validate before scaling up**
  RC aircraft supply valuable real-world evidence, but are not a perfect miniature of a full-size jet. Airflow, structural strength and other physics change with scale. Full-scale simulators, wind tunnels and certified test programs must close that gap.

What we are asking for

An open, independently reviewed research effort connecting pilots, RC communities, universities, aviation manufacturers, safety agencies and AI engineers. Fund carefully designed experiments. Publish what works — and what fails. Put the preservation of life first.

Innovation only matters if it is safe.

The Tesla Roadster and its publicly described cold-gas thruster technology show how familiar engineering principles can be combined into an unusual prototype. But an eye-catching demonstration is not proof of safety in everyday use. The Titan disaster shows the far more serious stakes of skipping validation. Those examples point to the same standard: test ambitious ideas rigorously before trusting people’s lives to them.

AI is not a magic rescue button.

A computer can process far more flight data than a person can read at once. That does not mean it will always understand a failure correctly. Sensors can mislead it; training data can miss rare events; and an unsafe suggestion can make matters worse. This is why the first goal should be a transparent, independently tested assistant — not a system that guesses and takes over.

What should happen next?

- **Independent evaluation**
  Ask aerospace specialists to identify what is already solved, what is missing and which experiments are most valuable.
- **Open collaboration**
  Make space for RC pilots, simulation developers, researchers and experienced flight crews to contribute real evidence.
- **Measured results**
  Publish comparisons against existing safety systems, including false alarms, failed recoveries, sensor faults and cases where the AI must defer.

“We cannot promise that one new system would have prevented a particular tragedy. But we can ask a better question: what knowledge, data and technology are we still failing to put to work?”

A public conversation worth having.

The next step is not a promise to make every aircraft crash-proof. It is a commitment to find out where intelligent monitoring, better emergency communications and rigorous testing can genuinely improve safety.

What already exists — and what could improve

Modern aviation is not starting from zero. Some aircraft already have envelope protection and emergency automatic-landing capability. International systems can automatically report an aircraft in distress. The challenge is investigating additional, reliable help for unusual emergencies — especially when pilots and ground responders lack a shared, immediate picture.

Sources for readers and journalists

NTSB: 2025 Washington midair collision
https://www.ntsb.gov/investigations/pages/dca25ma108.aspx

NTSB: Titan hull failure investigation
https://www.ntsb.gov/investigations/pages/dca23fm036.aspx

TSB Canada: Titan investigation findings
https://www.tsb.gc.ca/eng/medias-media/communiques/marine/2026/m23a0169-20260617.html

ICAO: Global Aeronautical Distress and Safety System
https://ganpportal.icao.int/ASBU?IDs=265

FAA: AI/ML aircraft certification research
https://www.faa.gov/aircraft/air_cert/step/disciplines/artificial_intelligence

Garmin: Emergency Autoland and limitations
https://www.garmin.com/en-US/legal/aluse/

Tesla: Roadster and proposed thruster configurations
https://www.tesla.com/roadster

MEDIA NOTE: This is an independent public research proposal. It does not claim that AI could have prevented any cited accident, or that a specific unproven system is ready to install in crewed aircraft.