

E31 020

PRESS RELEASE

July 9, 1955

The accompanying statement, which has been signed by some of the most eminent scientific authorities in different parts of the world, deals with the perils of a nuclear war. It makes it clear that neither side can hope for victory in such a war, and that there is a very real danger of the extermination of the human race by dust and rain from radio-active clouds. It suggests that neither the public nor the Governments of the world are adequately aware of the danger. It points out that an agreed prohibition of nuclear weapons, while it might be useful in lessening tension, would not afford a solution, since such weapons would certainly be manufactured and used in a great war in spite of previous agreements to the contrary. The only hope for mankind is the avoidance of war. To call for a way of thinking which shall make such avoidance possible is the purpose of this statement.

The first move came as a collaboration between Einstein and myself. Einstein's signature was given in the last week of his life. Since his death I have approached men of scientific competence both in the East and in the West, for political disagreements should not influence men of science in estimating what is probable, but some of those approached have not yet replied. I am bringing the warning pronounced by the signatories to the notice of all the powerful Governments of the world in the earnest hope that they may agree to allow their citizens to survive.

- BERTRAND RUSSELL

LETTER TO HEADS OF STATE

Dear . . .

I enclose a statement, signed by some of the most eminent scientific authorities on nuclear warfare, pointing out the danger of utter and irretrievable disaster which would be involved in such warfare, and the consequent necessity of finding some way other than war by which international disputes can be settled. It is my earnest hope that you will give public expression to your opinion as to the problem dealt with in this statement, which is the most serious that has ever confronted the human race.

Yours faithfully,

BERTRAND RUSSELL

Press Release

July 9, 1955

A STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

In the tragic situation which confronts humanity, we feel that scientists should assemble in conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction, and to discuss a resolution in the spirit of the appended draft.

We are speaking on this occasion, not as members of this or that nation, continent or creed, but as human beings, members of the species Man, whose continued existence is in doubt. The world is full of conflicts; and, over-shadowing all minor conflicts, the titantic struggle between Communism and anti-Communism.

Almost everybody who is politically conscious has strong feelings about one or more of these issues; but we want you, if you can, to set aside such feelings and consider yourselves only as members of a biological species which has had a remarkable history, and whose disappearance none of us can desire.

We shall try to say no single word which should appeal to one group rather than to another. All, equally, are in peril, and, if the peril is understood, there is hope that they may collectively avert it.

We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, for there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: what steps can be taken to prevent a military contest of which the issue must be disastrous to all parties?

The general public, and even many men in position of authority, have not realised what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs. The general public still thinks in terms of the obliteration of cities. It is understood that the new bombs are more powerful than the old, and that, while one A-bomb could obliterate Hiroshima, one H-bomb could obliterate the largest cities, such as London, New York and Moscow.

No doubt in an H-bomb war great cities would be obliterated. But this is one of the minor disasters that would have to be faced. If everybody in London, New York and Moscow were exterminated the world might, in the course of a few centuries, recover from the blow. But we now know, especially since the Bikini test, that nuclear bombs can gradually spread destruction over a very much wider area than had been supposed.

It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima.

[SEE Statement 2. . .

Statement 2

Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radio-active particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

No one knows how widely such lethal radio-active particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race. It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal death - sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say, is that these results are possible, and no one can be sure that they will not be realised. We have not yet found that the views of experts on this question depend in any degree upon their politics ^{or} prejudices. They depend only, so far as our researches have revealed, upon the extent of the particular expert's knowledge. We have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy.

Here, then, is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful, and inescapable: Shall we put an end to the human race: or shall mankind renounce war? People will not face this alternative because it is so difficult to abolish war.

The abolition of war will demand distasteful limitations of national sovereignty. But what perhaps impedes understanding of the situation more than anything else is that the term "mankind" feels vague and abstract. People scarcely realise in imagination that the danger is to themselves and their children and their grandchildren, and not only to a dimly apprehended humanity. They can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love are in imminent danger of perishing agonisingly. And so they hope that perhaps war may be allowed to continue provided modern weapons are prohibited.

This hope is illusory. Whatever agreements not to use H-bombs had been reached in time of peace, they would no longer be considered binding in time of war, and both sides would set to work to manufacture H-bombs as soon as war broke out, for, if one side manufactured the bombs and the other did not, the side that manufactured them would inevitably be victorious.

[SEE Statement 3. . .

Statement 3

Although an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments* would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes. First: any agreement between East and West is to the good in so far as it tends to diminish tension. Second: the abolition of thermo-nuclear weapons, if each side believed that the other had carried it out sincerely, would lessen the fear of a sudden attack in the style of Pearl Harbour, which at present keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We should therefore welcome such an agreement, though only as a first step.

Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but, as human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether White or Black, then these issues must not be decided by war. We should wish this to be understood, both in the East and in the West.

There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our quarrels? We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new Paradise; if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.

RESOLUTION: We invite this Congress, and through it the scientists of the world and the general public, to subscribe to the following resolution:-

"In view of the fact that in any future world war nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and that such weapons threaten the continued existence of mankind, we urge the Governments of the world to realise, and to acknowledge publicly, that their purposes can not be furthered by a world war, and we urge them, consequently, to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them."

Professor F. W. BRIDGMAN (Professor Harvard University;
Foreign Member of Royal Society, London; Nobel
Prize for Physics.)

ALBERT EINSTEIN

Professor L. INFELD (Professor University of Warsaw;
Member of Polish Academy of Sciences; Joint
author with Einstein of THE EVOLUTION OF PHYSICS
and of THE PROBLEM OF MOTION.)

[SEE Statement 4...]

=====

* Professor Muller makes the reservation that this be taken to mean "a concomitant balanced reduction of all armaments."

Statement 4

Professor H. J. MULLER (Formerly a professor in Moscow,
India, etc. Now a professor at University of
Indiana; Nobel Prize in physiology and medicine
for DISCOVERY OF THE PRODUCTION OF
MUTATIONS WITH THE HELP OF X-RAYS.)

Professor C. F. POWELL (Professor Bristol University; Nobel
Prize for Physics.)

Professor J. RCTBLAT (Professor of Physics in the University
of London, at St. Bartholomew's Hospital Medical
College.)

BERTRAND RUSSELL

Professor HIDEKI YUKAWA (Professor Kyoto University;
Nobel Prize for Physics.)

-----o0o-----

E31 020

Text of the statement issued on 9th July, 1955,
over the names of B. Russel and other 10 scientists

In the tragic situation which confronts humanity, we feel that scientists should assemble in conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction and to discuss a resolution in the spirit of the appended draft.

We are speaking on this occasion not as members of this or that nation, continent or creed, but as human beings, members of the species Man, whose continued existence is in doubt. The world is full of conflicts; and, overshadowing all minor conflicts, the titanic struggle between Communism and anti-Communism.

Almost everybody who is politically conscious has strong feelings about one or more of these issues; but we want you, if you can, to set aside such feelings and consider yourselves only as members of a biological species which has had a remarkable history and whose disappearance none of us can desire.

We shall try to say no single word which should appeal to one group rather than to another. All, equally, are in peril and, if the peril is understood, there is hope that they may collectively avert it.

We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, for there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: What steps can be taken to prevent a military contest of which the issue must be disastrous to all parties?

The general public, and even many men in positions of authority, have not realised what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs. The general public still thinks in terms of the obliteration of cities. It is understood that the new bombs are more powerful than the old and that, while one A-bomb could obliterate Hiroshima, one H-bomb could obliterate the largest cities such as London, New York and Moscow.

No doubt in an H-bomb war great cities would be obliterated. But this is one of the minor disasters that would have to be faced. If everybody in London, New York and Moscow were exterminated, the world might in the course of a few centuries, recover from the blow. But we now know, especially since the Bikini test, that nuclear bombs can gradually spread destruction over a very much wider area than had been supposed.

It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima. Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radio-active particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

No one knows how widely such lethal radio-active particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race. It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal death—sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say is that these results are possible, and no one can be sure that they will not be realised. We have not found that the views of experts on this question depend in any degree upon their politics or prejudices. They depend only, so far as our researches have revealed, upon the extent of the particular expert's knowledge. We have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy.

Here, then, is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful and inescapable:

Shall we put an end to the human race: or shall mankind renounce war?*

People will not face this alternative because it is so difficult to abolish war. The abolition of war will demand distasteful limitations of national sovereignty.* But what perhaps impedes understanding of the situation more than anything else is that the term “mankind” feels vague and abstract. People scarcely realise in imagination that the danger is to themselves and their children and their grandchildren, and not only to a dimly apprehended humanity. They can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love, are in imminent danger of perishing agonisingly. And so they hope that perhaps war may be allowed to continue provided modern weapons are prohibited.

This hope is illusory. Whatever agreements not to use H-bombs had been reached in time of peace, they would no longer be considered binding in time of war, and both sides would set to work to manufacture H-bombs as soon as war broke out, for, if one side manufactured the bombs and the other did not, the side that manufactured them would inevitably be victorious.

Although an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments** would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes.

First: any agreement between East and West is to the good in so far as it tends to diminish tension.

Second: the abolition of thermo-nuclear weapons, if each side believed that the other had carried it out sincerely, would lessen the fear of a sudden attack in the style of Pearl Harbour, which at present keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We should therefore welcome such an agreement, though only as a first step. Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but, as human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether White or Black, then these issues must not be decided by war. We should wish this to be understood both in the East and in the West.

There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our quarrels? We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new Paradise; if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.

Resolution: We invite this Congress, and through it the scientists of the world and the general public, to subscribe to the following resolution:—

“In view of the fact that in any future world war nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and that such weapons threaten the continued existence of mankind, we urge the Governments of the world to realise, and to acknowledge publicly, that their purposes can not be furthered by a world war, and we urge them, consequently, to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them.”

P. W. BRIDGMAN	ALBERT EINSTEIN	MAX BORN	L. INFELD
F. JOLIOT-CURIE	H. J. MULLER	L. PAULING	C. F. POWELL
J. ROTBLAT	BERTRAND RUSSEL	HIDEKI YUKAWA	

* Professor Muller makes the reservation that this be taken to mean “a concomitant balanced reduction of all armaments.”

** Professor Joliot-Curie makes the reservations that Governments should renounce war “as a means of settling differences between States”; and that limitations of national sovereignty should be agreed by all, and be in the interests of all.

1955年7月9日パート
学者の署名をもつて発

人類の直面する悲劇的な現状に於て、われわれは、
大量破壊兵器の発達の結果として生じた危険を正
しく評価し、また下記の草案の趣旨のようは決議を
討議する為、科学者が会議をひらくべきだと考え
ます。

われわれは今、ある一国の国民としてではなく、
又ある一地域に住むものとしてでもなく、更に一つ
の階級をもつものとしてでもなく、その存続が及び
やかされている人類、人という種族の一人として、
発言しているのです。

世界はいろいろな紛争に赤ち満ちています。もし
てすべての小さい紛争の上にのしかかっているのは
共産主義と反共産主義の巨大な紛争です。政治的な
意識をもつ人は、殆んど懸てこれらの問題のいくつ
かに強い感情をいだいています。しかしわれわれが
皆さんに望むのは、可能ならば、そのようは感情を
しばらく抑えて下さる事です。この生物が地球上
しい歴史をもつて下さる事です。この生物が地上
ら消えて無くなることは、われわれの誰一人とし
望まないことでもあります。そしてこの生物の誰一人とし
われわれは、ここで、一つの集団にや
団に對するよりも強く訴へるような
危険にさらされています。われ
れれば、皆が一緒にな
があるのです。われ
ようにならな
らにもせ
るよ
人

るのだに考
のに比べて遠に激
市を採掘したが、われ
きな都市、ロンドンやニ
を地上から消滅させてしま
ています。

一塔の水素爆弾が巨大なる都市な
は寂ありません。しかしそれはそ
る小さな災害のはんの一部として
ロンドン、ニューヨーク或はモ
べて死んでしまつたとして、
の打撃から世界が恢復
われわれは、とくに
弾は想像されて
に破壊を蒙
た

1955 年 7 月 9 日 バートランド・ラッセル他 10 名の
学者の署名をもつて発表された声明原文

人類の直面する悲劇的な現状に於て、われわれは大量破壊の兵器の発達の結果として生じた危険を正しく評価し、また下記の草案の趣旨のような決議を討議する為に、科学者が会議をひらくべきだと考えます。

われわれは今、ある一国の国民としてではなく、又ある一地域に住むものとしてでもなく、更に一つの信条をもつものとしてでもなく、その存続がおりやかされている人類、人という種族の一人として、発言しているのです。

世界はいろいろの紛争に充ち満ちています。そしてすべての小さい紛争の上にしかかっているのは共産主義と反共産主義の巨大な紛争です。政治的な意識をもつ人は、殆んど総てこれらの問題のいくつかに強い感情をいだいています。しかしわれわれが皆さんに望むのは、可能ならば、そのような感情をしばらく置いて、ただ人間という生物学的種族の一人として考えて下さることです。この生物はすばらしい歴史をもっています。そしてこの生物が地上から消えて無くなることは、われわれの誰一人として望まないことであります。

われわれは、ここで、一つの集団に対し、他の集団に対するよりも強く訴えるような言葉は一言も使わないようにしましょう。われわれは総て、一様に危険にさらされています。そしてその危険が理解されれば、皆が一緒になつて、それを避けられる見込があるのです。われわれは新しいやり方で考えるようにならなければなりません。われわれは、どちらにもせよ、われわれの好む集団が軍事的勝利を得るような手段を求めないようにしなければなりません。なぜならば、今ではもうそうした手段は無いのですから。われわれの考えるべき問題は、われわれの総ての側にいたましい害を与えるにちがいない軍事的な争を防ぐには如何なる手段をとつたらよいのかということです。

一般の大衆、権威ある位地に在る多くの人々でさえ、原爆戦争によつて起る事態を自覚していません。一般の大衆は、今でもいくつかの都市が消滅す

るのだ位に考えています。新しい爆弾が以前のものに比べて遙に強力であり、一発の原子爆弾が広島市を抹殺したが、一発の水素爆弾は、世界で最も大きな都市、ロンドンやニューヨークや或はモスクーを地上から消滅させてしまうということは理解されています。

一発の水素爆弾が巨大なる都市を抹殺し去ることは疑ありません。しかしそれは、われわれの直面する小さな災害のほんの一部でしかありません。もしロンドン、ニューヨーク或はモスクーの住民達がすべて死んでしまつたとしても、数世紀かかれば、その打撃から世界が恢復するでしょう。しかし今やわれわれは、とくにビキニ実験の行われた後、水素爆弾は想像されていたより遙に広い地域に亘つて徐々に破壊を齎すことを知りました。

信頼できる権威ある筋から、今では広島を破壊した爆弾よりも、2,500 倍も強力な爆弾を作ることができるということが述べられています。そのような爆弾が地上近く、又は水中で爆発させられたなら、放射能を帯びた粒子を空中高く吹き上げ、その粒子は、徐々に恐ろしい灰又は雨の形となつて、地表に降下して来ます。この灰が日本の漁夫とその捕獲した魚を汚染したのです。

そのような放射能を帯びた死の粒子が、どの位広くひろがるものか、誰も知るものではありません。しかし最も権威ある人々は、水爆による戦争は、人類を絶滅させる可能性が充分にあることを一致して指摘しています。もし多数の水爆が使われたとしたらその結果はすべてのものが死滅することでしょう。瞬間的に死ぬものはほんの僅かだが、多数のものがじりじりと病気の苦しみをなめて肉体は崩壊してゆくでしょう。

すぐれた科学者と軍事的戦略の権威者達によつて多くの警告が発せられました。これらの人々は誰も最悪の結果が確実に起るといおうとしてはいません。彼等のいつているのは、そうした結果が起る可能性があるということです。又そういう事態が起らぬとは誰も明言し得ないのです。この問題について

...; or shall mankind renounce war?*

...ing of the situation more of imagination that the

...stasteful because it is so difficult to abolish war. The

...ed humanly. They can scarcely realise in time of war, and both

...those whom they love, are in imminent danger of perishing agonisingly.

...hope that perhaps war may be allowed to continue provided modern weapons

...illudory. Whatever agreements not to use H-bombs had been reached

...they would no longer be considered binding in time of war, and both

...work to manufacture H-bombs as soon as war broke out for, if one

...the bombs and the other did not, the side that manufactured them

...an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction

...would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important

...ment between East and West is to the good in so far as it tends to

...of thermo-nuclear weapons, if each side believed that the other had

...lessen the fear of a sudden attack in the style of Pearl

...keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We

...such an agreement, though only as a first step. Most of us

...be human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues

...decided in any manner that can give any possible

...Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European

...black, then these issues must not be decided by war.

...ood both in the East and in the West.

...e, continual progress in happiness, knowledge and

...th, because we cannot forget our quarrels? We

...es: Remember your humanity, and forget the

...to a new Paradise; if you cannot, there lies

...through it the scientists of the world and

...resolution:—

...war nuclear weapons will certainly be

...continued existence of mankind, we urge

...knowledge publicly, that their purposes

...them, consequently, to find peaceful

...en them."

Y BORN

...LING

YUKAWA

L. INFELD

C. F. POWELL

...oncomitant balanced

war "as a means

...ty should be

の専門家の見解が、政略や偏見に基いたという事例にあつたことはありません。われわれの調査で明らかになつた限り、これらの見解は、それぞれの専門の知識の範囲に基いて出てきているのです。そして一番よく知つている人が、一番暗い見透しをもつてゐることがわかりました。

さてわれわれが、ここであなた方に提出するのは次のような問題です。それは厳しく、恐ろしく、回避できぬ問題です。人類を絶滅させるか、そうでなければ人類が戦争を放棄するか、というのがそれです。

人々はこのような二者択一という問題を面と向つて取り上げようとしなideせう。というのは戦争を禁止することがあまりにも難しいからであります。戦争を禁止するということは、国家の主権に好ましからぬ制限を要求することになるであります。

しかし何よりも実情の理解を妨げるものは、「人間」という言葉がばくぜんとしており、抽象的だと感じられる点にあるのでせう。危険が、ばく然と考えられる人類に対して存在するだけでなく、実際に彼等自身に、彼等の子供等、そして彼等の孫たちに危険が迫つてゐることを想像し理解するのは容易ではありません。彼等にとつて、彼等みづからが、又彼等の愛するものが、さし迫つた苦悶の死の危険にさらされているということをはつきりと掴むことはほとんどできないのです。そこで彼等は近代的な武器が禁止されさえしたら、戦争はやめなくてもよいだろうと考えています。

この希望は単なる幻想です。平和な時代に水爆を使用しないというどんな協定を結んでも、戦争となつた場合は、も早それを守ろうとはしないのでせう。戦争が始まれば両方の側ですぐに水爆の製造を開始するでせう。なぜなら、一方が水爆を作り始めたのに他方が手をこまねいていたとしたら、水爆を作つた側が勝つ事は必然だからです。

一般的軍縮の一部として、核兵器を放棄するという協定のできることは、それだけでは最終的な解決にならぬとしても、若干の重要な諸目的を実現するのに役立つことは確であります。

第一に、どんな東西間の協定でも、それが緊張を緩和する傾向をもつ限り、それは有益であります。

第二に、熱核兵器の禁止は、それぞれの側が、他の側でそれを誠実に実行したと信じたなら、パール・ハーバー式の不意打の恐怖を減ずるでせう。この恐怖のために両方の側が神経質になつてゐるの

す。それ故にわれわれは、解決の第一歩としてではあるが、そのような協定を歓迎せねばなりません。

われわれの大部分は、感情的には中立ではありません。しかし人類として、次の事を銘記せねばなりません。もし東西間の問題が、誰にでも、共産主義者であろうと、反共産主義者であろうと、アジア人であろうとヨーロッパ人であろうと、又はアメリカ人であろうと、或は白人であろうと黒人であろうと誰にでも満足を与えるやり方で決定されねばならないとすれば、その問題は戦争によつてきめられてはならないのです。われわれはこのことが、東に於ても、西に於ても共に理解するべきことを望むべきであります。

もしわれわれがそうしようと思えば、われらの前途には、幸福と知識と英智の絶えざる進歩があります。われわれの争を忘れることができぬと云う理由で、そのかわりに死を選んでよいのでしょうか？ われわれは人類として人間に訴えます。あなた方の人間性を心のなかにとどめ、そして他のことは忘れて下さい。もしあなた方にそれができるならば、新しい樂園への道が開かれます。もしそれができないならば、あなた方の前には一般的な死の危険が横わつてゐるのです。

決議 われわれはこの会議を召請し、そこを通じて世界の科学者及び一般公衆が下記の決議に賛意を表されることを要請します。

「将来の戦争に於ては、核兵器が必ず用いらるべきこと、しかもかかる兵器が人類の存続を脅かすものであることに鑑み、われわれは世界各国政府に対し、彼等の目的は世界戦争によつては遂げられないということを、彼等が自覚し、かつ公に確認することを強く勧告する。そして結論としてわれわれは、各国間に紛争のある総ての事項の解決に当つては、平和的手段を見出すべきであるということを彼等に対し強く勧告する。」

※ジョリオキュリー教授は、各国政府は「国際間の意見の相違を調整する方法」として戦争を用いるべきでない。そして、「各国の主権は、総てのものの一致した意見によつて、又すべてのものの利益のために、制限されるべきであるという保留をつけられた。」

※※ミューラー教授はこの文章は、「すべての兵器の随伴する、釣合の取れた縮少」を意味すると解釈するという保留をつけられた。