

on the ratio of invulnerabilities (defensive strengths). It makes more sense for the two adversaries to spend money on obtaining invulnerability than on increasing offensive capability, since the latter leads to an open-ended arms race and the former does not. It is also far less dangerous and more stable in crises. Galtung points out that "trans-arming" to non-violent defence (as advocated by Gene Sharp, Adam Roberts, and others) may be too drastic a step for military people, while trans-armament to purely defensive weapon systems might not be. The art of NOD is to install only such systems that would make invasion or attack very difficult, but which at the same time could not possibly be used to mount an attack of our own; that way, we would never be a danger to others, but would be difficult to swallow, like a hedgehog or a porcupine. It might be an interesting suggestion for arms-reduction negotiations in Europe to try not only to reduce the quantity of weapons on both sides, but also to change the quality (kind) of weapons to reflect non-offensive intent. Thus declarations of non-aggression could be supplemented and made credible by the kind of weapons one deploys.

Non-Violent defence is also still receiving attention. Richard W. Fogg, Director of the Center for the Study of Conflict in Baltimore, is working on "a proposal for non-military defense in case of nuclear crises," which recently received favourable attention from the UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

Bella (1984) suggested new alternatives for deployment of nuclear missiles designed to delay possible launching. One such scheme suggests storing the missiles and the warheads separately, with monitoring to verify that this has been done.