

## The Stuff of Dreams

It's not quite as sexy as a Colt M4A1 with M203 grenade launcher, or even a serious pump action shotgun ("Make my day.") but there is something very cool about **this piece of kit**. Oh, the satisfaction one might get, if, upon being attacked by a would-be rapist, one's jacket would coolly deliver an 80,000-volt shock to him.

Once the jacket is armed, a squeeze on the trigger will deliver a 30-second shock of 80,000 volts. A single nine volt battery provides enough power for at least 20 shocks.

Ms Nugent said: "It's like armour but we have designed it so that you can wear it just like any jacket. If you are in an area where you feel nervous, you just arm it. I wanted to create something like a safe space around yourself."

The couple had the idea after Ms Nugent complained of feeling frightened walking home in Boston after parking her car.

One in three American women will be the victim of violent crime in her lifetime, according to FBI statistics. Most of these attacks, Mr Whiton found, involved "grabbing and grappling, often seizing the victim from behind", rather than an attack from a distance with a weapon. In Britain, police record 2.6 million violent crimes a year.

So far, 10 of the jackets have been made, some experimenting with different styles and technology. Three are now being "test worn" by friends of the inventors and volunteers. All the women say that they feel a new sense of safety when they wear it although none has yet used it in anger.

If you need more guineapigs for the tests, **Setting The World To Rights** will be *delighted* to help. Oh yeah, one small problem to iron out first: this jacket would be illegal in England, given that **self-defence** is a crime here. D'oh!

I want one like... **right now!**

by **Leo** on Mon, 06/09/2003 - 01:30 | [reply](#)

**mmmmmmm, Voltage...**

mmmmmmm, Voltage

by **Daniel Strimpel** on Mon, 06/09/2003 - 16:20 | [reply](#)

**Worth testing?**

Would it be worth testing in the courts the illegality of this jacket in the UK? It is so clearly for self-defence, would a jury really convict a woman of a crime (what crime?) if she was wearing it armed when attacked?

by a reader on Tue, 06/10/2003 - 12:39 | [reply](#)

**I notice they have a model pl...**

I notice they have a model planned for use against domestic violence. Um, isn't that just a little bit...crazy? Who's going to walk around their house with a protective device in the event of a domestic brawl? And what routine abuser is going to let it slide?

by a reader on Thu, 06/12/2003 - 00:59 | [reply](#)

**About the domestic violence m...**

About the domestic violence model--I agree with the previous poster, it sounds crazy. The abuser would be enraged and liable to further violence.

by **Sylvia Crombie** on Thu, 06/12/2003 - 08:38 | [reply](#)

**Re>About the domestic violence model**

Sylvia Crombie:

Something doesn't have to be useful in every single case to be useful. It is enough if there's a certain type of situation in which it is useful, even a fairly unusual one.

by a reader on Thu, 06/12/2003 - 13:32 | [reply](#)

**"Would it be worth testing in...**

"Would it be worth testing in the courts the illegality of this jacket in the UK? It is so clearly for self-defence, would a jury really convict a woman of a crime (what crime?) if she was wearing it armed when attacked?"

But Your Honour, if I'd not been wearing that jacket, I would have

ended up like the 17 women he is known to have raped and murdered.

...

But Your Honour, you don't understand! It was self-defense!

...

Self-defense isn't legal?

...

D'oh!

\*dvgbits bows\*

by [dvgbits](#) on Tue, 06/17/2003 - 11:50 | [reply](#)

---

Copyright © 2005 Setting The World To Rights