the tides. Taking this factor of uncertainty into account, we have not detected any danger for the environment even on the closest approaches to the ship. As an example, it is possible to cite the American submarines, "Thresher" and "Scorpion" which have sunk. A few years ago there was a report that one of our nuclear submarine had sunk. I was not closely connected with this affair, but, undoubtedly, samples were taken in the zone of the sinking. And not once were there any reports either in technical literature or in the press; this means that nothing was detected. Otherwise our "friends" would not have given up the chance to proclaim this to the entire world. This is an indirect confirmation of our evaluation.

And here is one more confirmation. Until recently, radioactive wastes were "buried" in the Atlantic Ocean. At a specific point the containers of waste were cast into the ocean. But if radioactivity was observed in the Irish Sea, then it was only due to the fact that a factory in Winscaley was dumping its own waste through a three kilometer long pipeline directly into the sea. I do not want to say, that they exceeded the permissible levels; no, they dumped what the medical experts permitted. But nevertheless...

"Nuclear-powered ships, just like ordinary ships, are not permanent. Now the write-off period for the ice-breaker "Lenin" is approaching. Has the scientific problem, if it is possible to express it this way, of what to do with of ships powered by nuclear energy power-plants been solved?

With the ice-breaker "Lenin" the matter is still not resolved. Its service life has expired, and it should now be scrapped. But there is the idea