

The idea of solving two big problems (the arms race and underdevelopment) in one plan is attractive. Marek Thee (1981) and Alan and Hanna Newcombe (1982) have both provided plans. Thee reminds us that Edgar Faure (France) proposed a disarmament-development link as far back as 1955; the USSR in 1958 called for 10-15% reductions of the great powers' military budgets, with the allocation of a part going toward development: and in 1973 the USSR advocated a one-time 10% reduction of the military budgets of the 5 permanent members of the Security Council and allocation of 10% of the funds saved to development. Thee calculates that about 2/3 of the contributions would come from the 5 nuclear powers; of this, US would pay 40%, USSR 40%, China 10%, UK 5%, and France 5%. The other states would pay the remaining 1/3. The Newcombes' plan is of the armaments levy type. There are 4 kinds of nations: A (rich and overarmed), B (rich and underarmed), C (poor and overarmed), and D (poor and underarmed). In general, under the plan, A pay into the fund and D receive from the fund, B neither pay nor receive, and C may pay or receive depending on the degrees of their poverty and overarmament.

Also in the process of negotiation is the treaty to ban chemical weapons. One of the new principles in it is "challenge inspection," a form of on-site inspection, in which inspectors would go immediately to inspect a site in country A if country B challenges that site to be under suspicion. Treaty compliance is to be managed by something similar to the Standing Consultative Commission which is operating under the SALT Treaties. The Markland Group, which has been meeting in Hamilton, Ontario, believes that this is insufficient, and are working on designing a full-fledged Treaty Administering Agency for this treaty (to become a model for other treaties), that would make use of third-party decisions about violations,