

A related non-governmental plan is to declare all of Canada a NWFZ. Canada could do this unilaterally, but it would have repercussions on the relationship with the US, since it would ban not only the stationing of nuclear weapons (which is already a fact), but also all transit over land, by sea and in airspace. Nuclear weapons are still carried by US ships that visit Canadian harbours, and overflights of bombers carrying H-bombs also occur. The frequency of these events is unknown publicly, since the US does not declare what its vessels are carrying. However, if a Canada-wide NWFZ were to be seriously enforced, all these transits would have to stop. No one claims that being a NWFZ would save Canada from destruction in case of nuclear war; but it might contribute toward making the outbreak of nuclear war less likely. It would be a "New Zealand" option; but the two countries differ greatly, especially in their proximity to the US.

A reorientation of strategic thinking which has been variously called non-offensive defence (NOD), "defensive defence" and "non-provocative defence" has been studied rather widely, especially in Europe. (See Bibliography by Michael Johansen, 1985.) Two well-known books on the subject are There Are Alternatives by Johan Galtung (1984) and Preventing War in the Nuclear Age by Dietrich Fischer (1984). There is also a "NOD Newsletter" published in FRG, which brings news of further developments and suggestions. The Group of 78 in Canada is just completing a study of alternative defence, inquiring into possibilities of applying NOD concepts to Canadian defence planning.

NOD is not a single plan, but a new way of thinking. Galtung explains that national security (inviolability of one's territory) depends not only on the ratio of offensive strengths (of ourselves and a potential adversary), but also