

(Mr. Kornienko, USSR)

announced a national programme to develop such weapons: would anyone dare to say that was a legitimate step and that it was not contrary to the Convention? And yet this is in fact what is happening in the case of the SDI in relation to the ABM Treaty.

In an attempt to create confusion in this perfectly clear matter, references are sometimes made to one of the agreed statements annexed to the ABM Treaty which, allegedly, allows the development of ABM systems based on physical principles other than those limited by the Treaty. Now, since the SDI programme involves the development of such basically new ABM systems as lasers, directed energy beams and so on, it is argued that this would not be contrary to the Treaty.

It is time that one of the statements annexed to the Treaty indeed does not rule out the possibility of the emergence of "ABM systems based on other physical principles". The point is, however, that such a possibility is permitted only in regard to the limited ABM areas authorized by the Treaty and only to fixed land-based systems. The text of the statement does not allow for any other interpretation. We are not alone in saying this. It is also the view of prominent American lawyers, including those who were directly involved in the preparation of the ABM Treaty.

Furthermore, a report submitted to the United States Congress by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency already under the present Administration, I repeat, already under the present Administration, states in no uncertain terms that "the ABM Treaty prohibition on development, testing and deployment of space-based ABM systems, or components for such systems, applies to directed-energy technology (or any other technology) used for this purpose".

I repeat, all this is stated in an official document of a United States Government agency. What is going on, then? The answer is quite simple: the report in question was sent to the United States Congress six weeks before President Reagan announced the SDI programme in March 1983. It was after that that Washington began its strenuous efforts to pass a pig for a carp.

Finally, when all conceivable and inconceivable arguments would seem to have been exhausted, the question of verification is dragged out by the opponents of disarmament, as always happens in such cases. It is alleged, that, anyway, scientific research cannot be banned because it does not lend itself to verification, and, generally, human thought cannot be stopped.

Indeed, human thought cannot be stopped. But no one is proposing that, ourselves least of all. Of course, basic scientific research can and should be conducted: not for the purposes of destruction, however, but in pursuit of constructive goals.

Without basic research in the nuclear field, carried out by many scientists in many countries over many years, there would be no nuclear weapons, but neither would there be nuclear power plants, nor the numerous other benefits that the peaceful atom has given mankind.

The same is true of basic space research: its results can be used either to develop weapons for waging "Star Wars", or else they can and should be used to benefit mankind, to achieve what we call "Star Peace", or in other words wide-ranging international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.