

EVENT SUMMARY:

Approaching a new nuclear threat age - what can we learn from Hiroshima?

With speakers Michimasa Hirata, Dr Rebecca Johnson and Tsutomu Ishiai

Thursday 29 November 2018

Introduction by Sir Peter Williams:

Just a couple of comments before I hand over and begin to introduce you to our distinguished speakers this evening. I'm a physicist by background, and I was thinking over the weekend that by pure chance in my first year at Cambridge I was taught in lectures and tutorials by a man called Otto Frisch, and it was Otto Frisch with his aunt Lise Meitner and Otto Hahn who of course discovered nuclear fission and explained the phenomenon. It was Frisch, with Rudolf Peierls, who in 1940 at Birmingham University published a memorandum postulating the idea of an airborne nuclear explosive device. Everything that has transpired in all the decades since has its roots in that particular point, and we're going to dwell with the fascinating insights that our three speakers will share with us this evening.

Without more from me, it's my very great pleasure to introduce Professor Hirata, who is a very rare gentleman. He was telling me earlier of the very small number of survivors who are still alive today. It is an honour and a privilege to welcome you to the Foundation. If you would address us first, please.

Michimasa Hirata's Talk:

I'm going to speak about my little experience in Hiroshima. I was born in Hiroshima and experienced the 'A-bombs' there at the age of nine. That's how my life began as a 'hibakusha'. Hibakusha, as you probably know, means 'survivors of the A-bomb' in Japanese. It was officially used last year in the preamble of the Nuclear Ban Treaty, which Rebecca will talk about later. Throughout my speech I will interchangeably use A-bombs and nuclear bombs. When you hear the word A-bomb, you probably envision these so-called 'mushroom clouds'. This photo was taken by the US Army, far away on a

plane, showing these mushroom clouds, an almost 'beautiful' scenery. However, actually being under the mushroom clouds is quite different. It's like an inferno on earth.

It's important for me to say that the current nuclear situation is much, much worse than we expected. The international dialogue portion of this talk will be left to Rebecca, and Ishiai-san will talk about the current political situation as well as the future. Everyone at the talk today knows the severity of the damage nuclear bombs cause, but I would just like to reiterate this. It's easy to forget about it, when you live in a peaceful society like Japan. I would say the situation right now is similar to the Cold War.

This first slide shows the uses of atomic energy. Nuclear power stations are the root of both military and peaceful usage of atomic energy. In history, the A-bomb has been used twice. The first was Hiroshima, on August 6, 1945. The second was Nagasaki, three days later, on August 9.

The Occupied Allies mainly consisted of Americans, but I also remember there were soldiers from Australia and New Zealand who occupied Hiroshima, right after the War. The Occupied Forces issued a press code on the A-bomb. People generally don't know exactly what an A-bomb is, or the damage it causes. For seven years, after the end of World War II, this press code was used. In 1952 the press code was lifted.

I would like to make a short explanation of the characteristics of the bomb. Firstly, the magnitude and damage of the bomb, area-wise and distance-wise. Second is the variety of damage: heat, blast and radiation. In the past, we Japanese called the A-bomb 'pika-don'. 'Pika' means flash. 'Don' is a blast. However, we did not know much about radiation at the time. Radiation causes long term damage different from ordinary weapons.

The magnitude of damage can be measured through area size. I would like to point out that the death toll from two bombs, just two bombs, was 210,000. If we laid the corpses side by side, it would go on for 100 km, from London to Brighton. Next, I will discuss the variety of damage. First was the heatwave: the burning of human beings and the fires. At the time of the bombing, Japanese houses consisted mainly of wood, so every flammable substance caught fire by the heat wave. This gentleman, my friend, Taniguchi-san, who was 16, was entirely burned on his back. He had to lie down on his chest for a year and a half. Later in his life he went to the American Embassy and showed his burns to diplomats. He passed away last year; he was an exceptional person, and was active up until last year. He was very pleased to know that the ban treaty was adopted.

This photo is famous. It was taken three hours post-bombing. It was taken by a professional camera man working at a newspaper company. He was going back to the head office, but he couldn't enter the

city, because of the fires. You can see the smoke, and the people. Hiroshima Peace Museum asked Hibakusha to make a painting in accordance with their memory. Here are a few examples:

This is one of the paintings, titled 'The Lines of Ghosts', which depicts the burned people. Their skin was dangling off. That day, my father pushed me into a shelter. There were these lines of crowds going out of the city to the evacuated safe area, and we could not distinguish whether they were male or female, young or old.

This is another painting, titled 'Seeking Water'. The burned people were desperate for water.

Another painting, 'Surface of the River'. The river was so full of corpses, floating around.

I would like to make an important point, that we are still in a high alert situation. If either Russia or the US launch their nuclear weapons, by chance or intentionally, the other party will reciprocate the attack within just a few minutes.

The Doomsday Clock, is a clock that shows how many minutes till midnight remain before a global disaster. This year it has the smallest time frame of 2 minutes to midnight because of the tension between the US and North Korea, as well as Trump's tough nuclear policy.

Finally, my last point I would like to make is that Japan has had three major nuclear experiences. The first is the two dropping, the second is the hydrogen bomb victims, and third is the Fukushima accident. As the only country which has suffered from bombing, Japan should act as the bridge between nuclear weapon countries and non-nuclear weapon countries. At the same time, it should lead the abolitionists in abolishing nuclear weapons.

Dr Rebecca Johnson's Talk:

It's an honor to be invited back to the Daiwa Foundation. I also feel incredibly honored to be speaking after Hirata-sensei, and to be sharing the panel with Mr. Ishiai, and to be addressing this issue with all of you. I will follow on from what Hirata-sensei was talking to you about because what I'm going to be addressing is three kinds of elements: firstly, tackling today's nuclear challenges. I think we would all agree that after a period of time at the end of the Cold War, it appeared as if there was some control. We saw massive reductions, particularly in the theatre and the tactical nuclear weapons, but there were also a number of further treaties. There was a sense that at least the nuclear problem was being tackled. But now there's a growing fear that actually the nuclear problem didn't go away; it just changed into something a bit different.

The second element I would like to talk about is the importance of nuclear treaties and reinforcing nuclear prohibition, as well as the steps to prevent nuclear use, eliminate the weapons and end proliferation. As sensei said, since Hiroshima, we've had choices, and the essential choice was to carry on business as usual, in which we would end up with more proliferation. It might have slowed down, but with the almost certain risk that nuclear weapons would, in fact, at some point be used. Or, we tried to control a lot of them through banning and collective treaties and the rule of law for cooperative security.

Let's first look at the rule of law. The very first resolution in the UN General Assembly in 1946 called for control of this new nuclear technology, solely for peaceful purposes. We got things like the Baruch Plan. We moved through various attempts to get treaties, mostly they were limited, they were partial, but we did get the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968, and of course it was the 50th anniversary this year of its signature. I've included the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention and also the Chemical Weapons Convention because I think it's important to recognize how these link up. You can't just deal with a weapon system like nuclear, bad though it is, completely in a vacuum. You have to look at its connection to the other weapon systems that are arising and developing, and so on.

I myself, as an activist, became very involved and actually gave up the first PhD I was intending to do, which was back in 1981-82, which was going to be on women's political participation in Japan. I was very much into Japanese politics and culture, following a Master's at SOAS and had been accepted for a PhD. But I became an activist down at Greenham Common. I don't know how familiar that is, but it was a US base at that time, earmarked for a new generation of the cruise missiles coming in as part of the so-called dual-track NATO strategy, which was itself a response to the SS-20 theater nuclear weapons being deployed by the Soviet Union. When we got the INF Treaty in 1987, I turned my attention to the CTBT, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. In the INF Treaty, we started off being very political about it, but we had more and more Hibakusha come to us from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Test victims came to us from Australia and the Pacific and Nevada, and told us about the humanitarian impacts of these nuclear explosions.

I worked for Greenpeace for a number of years, so I reframed their test ban campaign in a humanitarian and environmental context. We had people working, particularly in the five major nuclear-armed states at that time, to deal with trying to bring the governments to the negotiating table, which indeed finally happened in 1994. Following a series of moratoria, which were very much pushed by civil society in a number of key countries, particularly Russia, the United States, and France.

When we look at 2020, you know, what is the record that we see in the non-proliferation treaty? The CTBT has not entered into force. I mean, this was a treaty that I felt would get written on my

gravestone, along with the NPT probably, but at least now there's some other things. But because of the games that got played in that disarmament process, it's still not entered into force. We have to take these things into account. 1995, at the time of the NPT, 25 years ago, when the NPT was being indefinitely extended, we got the mandate to negotiate a ban on the production of fissile materials - a fissile material treaty. But it hasn't been negotiated. In all those years, it hasn't been negotiated. Of course, we see more recently, when North Korea withdrew from the NPT, continued proliferation, and so on.

Two events have happened this year: the announcement of the US pulling out of the Iran nuclear deal, which, let us not forget, was not just about the US and Iran. It was not a bilateral deal. It was with the US, UK, France, China, Russia, Germany, and with the European Union also playing a very important role, as well as with Iran. But the US has unilaterally announced its withdrawal. We have to hope that that is stopped. But on this bilateral treaty, again, the Trump withdrawal.

There was also a new Russian cruise-type weapon being tested, and even the Obama administration picked this up in 2014. So there were some reasons for needing to be looking at this treaty and how it's operating and be working on ensuring implementation. By announcing withdrawal, Trump is actually playing into Putin's hands. I think it's a very, very dangerous situation.

We're getting into a situation where nuclear weapons are designed to be more usable. So do we want to assure WMD forever? Increasing regional and international instability, especially relating to the nine nuclear-armed states, are themselves involved in a lot of the key elements of the instability, although they keep billing nuclear weapons as if they provide stability. There is continuing proliferation, both vertical and horizontal. As Hirata-sensei said, thousands are still on high alert. It's also in a context where there is further arms racing, not just nuclear, but we see cyber, we see autonomous weapons, so-called killer robots coming in, and potential space weapons. These have to be looked at in the whole when we talk about what needs to happen.

The 2005 NPT review conference was an absolute disaster. John Bolton, who is now very much playing a role in Trump's current policy, was very much behind the complete collapse of the 2005 NPT review conference. I know this because I was there, because I've been to every NPT meeting since 1994. We decided that if we couldn't keep playing the arms control game, we had to go back to that first principle of what happens to people, recognising cities are the targets.

You heard very cogently, very movingly from Hirata-sensei, exactly these kinds of elements that we remobilized to touch people's feelings. Do you want this to happen to your family, to your people, to your country, or in your name, to some other people in some other town, some other city, some other

country? We also added this element that had been very persuasive for Reagan and Gorbachev at the time of the INF Treaty, which was an environmental catastrophe and nuclear winter. The data was updated using new climate data and calculations, and showed that actually if just half of the current arsenals of India and Pakistan were used, about 50, that could cause a nuclear winter. They even took the baseline down, and calculated it using 100 Hiroshima-sized weapons, which is actually less in terms of explosive power than carried by one UK nuclear-armed Trident submarine.

Dr. Ira Helfand, an eminent physician in Boston and part of ICAN's steering group, and also a physician for social responsibility, did a study looking at rice growing, wheat growing, potato growing in certain key regions, and he estimated that it could be up to two billion people within 10 years of a limited nuclear war in which cities were targeted so the dust goes round and round and causes an abrupt global freezing. Be under no illusion it is not an answer to global warming, because what you actually are getting is massive climate disruption. Food would not grow in some places. You'd get deluges in some places, complete desertification and drought in others. Of course, it would be the most vulnerable who would die first, which includes places like Africa, where the whole continent is a nuclear weapon-free continent, as is Latin America and a lot of the Pacific.

We went to recognize the victims. That was an important part. This was at the Nayarit conference. We started to mobilize, to raise awareness again of the humanitarian impacts. There were three conferences and two UN working groups. At the second conference in Mexico, we had specifically had a panel for Hibakusha on the panel. We also had Marshall Islands represented and the senator spoke there. We also brought in this other part that hadn't been really looked at very closely. Chatham House did a report and Dr. Patricia Lewis spoke to that report, which was on 'Too Close for Comfort', which assessed that there'd been 13 near-nuclear misses since the Cuban missile crisis.

Here we have Peace Vote who came together with a bunch of us in New York at the time in 2016 when we were pushing and successfully got the UN general assembly to adopt a resolution to negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons leading to their total elimination. The following year, negotiations took place. The chair was from Costa Rica, Ambassador Elaine White-Gomez. As we know, the treaty was adopted on the 7th of July and opened for signature by the UN Secretary General in September.

The preamble in the treaty is what frames it, what talks about the aspirations and also the purpose. It's a very strong humanitarian framing, recognises the humanitarian consequences, explicitly, as Hirate-sensei said, references the experience of the Hibakusha for nuclear testing and for nuclear use. All these other impacts that are often left out, like the development, the socioeconomic, the health, etc., and recognising disproportionate health impacts on women and girls, as well as indigenous

peoples, mostly because that's where the testing took place. Compatibility with relevant treaties, effective participation of women as well as men in nuclear disarmament, because recent studies have shown that's what you need to get a sustainable agreement. Of course, peace and disarmament education, which I know Japan has been very much a champion of.

Key prohibitions cover almost all the physical and operational activities that a state or indeed a non-state actor, would need to undertake in order to be positioned and prepared to be able to use and threaten to use nuclear weapons. So use and threat of use of nuclear weapons is a very key part of this kind of a treaty. It looks at all the activities that would make it possible for someone to use. Those things, in a very key way, are prohibited, echoing but going beyond the prohibitions in the NPT. This part recognises that the nuclear-armed states, the nine of them, are all different. One size does not fit all, and that it wouldn't make sense to have a very careful verification thing put in now. There are two ways. You can sign and negotiate a timetable, or you can do what South Africa did, eliminate and join.

This is Setsuko. If anyone was going to get a Nobel Peace Prize for the treaty, I felt it should be the Hibakusha. But when it was ICAN, we insisted that there should be a Hibakusha as one of the people accepting the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of ICAN.

This is the place that was the base for the cruise missiles in the UK in the 80s. That was when it was just about ready, the nuclear silos, to house the cruise missiles in 1983, and that's what it is now. But if the INF Treaty is allowed to be sacrificed, then we could find ourselves going back to nuclear weapons trundling our roads and railways.

Our next steps. I think we have to defend the JCPOA, the INF, the NPT and, of course, the TPNW. Learning from the past to build peace and security, and create a safer, more responsible future. I think that's where I will finish.

Tsutomu Ishiai's Talk:

I'm very pleased to be here today to speak about the role of the media. I'm going to quote someone important. Her name is Marta Argerich. She is a legendary pianist. She came to Hiroshima in 2015 for the 70th anniversary. Usually she spends her summer in Salzburg or Zürich for summer music festivals, but this particular year she came to Japan. I had the honor of interviewing her after the concert. She compared the Holocaust and Hiroshima, saying both were human tragedies. She said "Nobody denies the Hiroshima tragedy, but there are revisionists who say the Holocaust didn't happen. So it's important to say whenever possible that both happened."

I will start by summarising the role of journalism in terms of reporting nuclear issues. I think it's about documenting facts, of course, as well as experiences and memories, like reporting the voices of Hibakusha, like Hirata-san. His name has appeared many times in my newspaper. We have also invited Rebecca-san many times to Japan as we host annual nuclear conferences in Hiroshima and Nagasaki every summer. We also spread messages from citizens, including Hibakusha, to the world.

As Rebecca-san explained, a new nuclear threat age has come. What does this mean for us? It's political uncertainty, of course, by Trump, mainly, and some others, and unstable international law and order, as well as revival of power politics by superpowers. I think it's a new kind of Cold War, and the deterioration of the NPT regime. There could also be nuclear ambition by rogue states and some extremists, as well as fake news and revisionism.

I will now discuss two very famous films. The first time I watched 'Barefoot Gen', I was in elementary school, and my parents took me to the cinema and I saw it. It was quite moving. I first visited Hiroshima at the age of 17 when I was a high school student for the school excursion. When I was in university, there was an anti-nuclear movement in Europe.

The other film is 'When The Wind Blows', it's a British film. It's about the ordinary life of an aged couple, facing a nuclear war all of a sudden. They don't know anything about radiation, or about any of the side effects. It was a very serious film.

If you recall pacifism in the 70s and 80s in Japan, I think the movement was mainly about sympathizing with the victims and about human suffering, as well as anti-war sentiments. The poster of 'Barefoot Gen' says 'War is unjustifiable,' and also nuclear weapons are unjustifiable. But at the same time, I have to say it was also a kind of political taboo. Open criticism of the US was taboo at the time because the US was the most important ally for Japan. Hibakusha's slogan was, 'no more Hibakushas.' But it was difficult at the time to actually affect policy making, unfortunately.

I became a correspondent to Washington, D. C. for the first time in 1996. In 1995 there was a controversial exhibition of 'Enola Gay'. It was a B-29 bomber which dropped the bomb on Hiroshima. The Smithsonian Museum decided to display this airplane at their museum. In the explanation, it didn't mention anything about the human suffering that occurred as a result, or about Hibakusha, instead simply mentioning its innovative technology. At the time, President Clinton said something like "We owe no apology to Japan for dropping these bombs", also saying the President at the time, Harry Truman "made the right choice to use the bombs". Currently, some US citizens and US leadership maintain this kind of attitude. In short, there is a kind of realism type of sentiment amongst

the elites and politicians in the United States. Essentially saying that war is sometimes necessary and the use of nuclear weapons is sometimes acceptable.

The question is how to overcome these dilemmas in peace movements and journalism. There has always been controversy between pacifism and realism. I will show the comparison between the two. The left side represents an anti-war sentiment and the right justifies war.

When I visited Hiroshima in the mid-90s, they tried to change the contents of the display in the museum. Hiroshima itself tried to recognize its war responsibility as a military industrialized city. They also admitted the historical responsibility of the Japanese aggression towards Asia during war time. Not only emphasizing the victimized sides of Hiroshima, but also accepting that Hiroshima or Japan as a whole had responsibility in this war. They showed solidarity to other areas in Asia, especially the South Pacific, Tahiti and Marshall Islands. Every summer those victims of Tahiti and Marshall Islands are invited to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Those are the efforts being made to transform Hiroshima from a Japanese tragedy into a more human tragedy, like the Holocaust.

At the same time, there's a dilemma for journalism itself, because there is a division in journalism; those peace movements and Hibakusha and NGOs are usually covered by the city news section, 'shakaibu', and those reporters cover these events. On the contrary, Japanese diplomacy and national security are covered by the political news department. The international news department, which I work in, covers international politics and conflicts and disarmaments. So every department covers a different issue from different perspectives, and as a result, what happens is that every newspaper reporter or correspondent has different ideas - some are idealists, while others are realists. So there is a kind of conflict even among journalists. I was lucky enough to belong to the city news section, political news section and international section. So I'm overlapping all of them.

There are so many questions like this. These are not clear yes or no questions. Even journalists feel conflicted when answering these questions.

20 some years ago, on the 50th anniversary in Hiroshima, we created a special team, and I was one of them. This book was published, both in Japanese and English; I have brought a copy today, if anyone would like to read it. This team was set up in Osaka, made up of reporters in the City News Department. Usually this section covers Hibakusha, but this team decided to cover nuclear related international politics. I myself visited Tahiti, New Zealand and Washington. I found out many things. In Tahiti, nuclear issues are really a decolonization issue. In New Zealand, they talk a lot about nuclear-free policy. I met the former Prime Minister David Rang. In Washington, they talked about The Peace Dividend. Some of the experts really questioned the necessity of having nuclear weapons.

The head of the team was Tadaomi Saito, who later became the director general of the Hiroshima Peace Cultural Foundation. He strongly argues that the idea of nuclear deterrence is necessary. Sometimes we think it's just an ideal thing to call for abolishing nuclear weapons, but we have to really tackle this issue from the ground. After 20 years, I think that combining the idealism of abolishing nuclear weapons with real politics is the outcome of this nuclear ban treaty. I also met with Beatrice Fihn, the executive director of the ICAN. She also spoke a lot about nuclear deterrence.

I think there has been a certain step towards a nuclear free world. I think there are more journalists now who are not only advocating for the peaceful movement but also casting a doubt on nuclear deterrence, and revealing injustice, inequality and discrimination behind nuclear weapons.

I would like to talk about Samuel Pisar. He passed away before I met him, but he is a Holocaust survivor. He wanted to combine the memory of the Holocaust with Hiroshima, and wrote a book titled 'Of Blood and Hope'. He was an international lawyer and also an advisor to John F. Kennedy. He also wrote the text that accompanied Leonard Bernstein's Symphony No. 3, also known as 'Kaddish'. Every time it was performed, he narrated his own text. He wanted to put the words Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the text. And he did it. Like this.

I also happened to meet his stepson. At the time, he worked as Deputy Secretary of State, Anthony Blinken. He talked about his stepfather that experienced genocide. He thought that nuclear weapons had the potential to do the same thing as genocide on a large scale.

I think there has been a gradual process of understanding that Hiroshima was a human tragedy, and has to be dealt with by humanity. Thank you so much.

Sir Peter Williams:

Before I call people to the floor, I would like to ask Paul Schulte, from the University of Birmingham to say just a few words on his perspective on nuclear arms weapons.

Paul Schulte:

Thank you. I was delighted to be invited to this, as I have been wanting to come to Daiwa for some time. I wanted to hear from Mr Hirata, as there is an authenticity that comes through his experience.

I've been brooding on this subject since I was 12, and I've reached very different conclusions. Let's go back to the misery of the mid-20th century and just looking at Hiroshima, it is worth remembering

that, without diminishing anything, more people were killed in the firebombing of Tokyo in March that year, including women and children who were boiled alive in the canals.

We, the gentle British, baked thousands of Germans alive in the deep bombshells in Dresden: that was happening throughout the world. It's an agonizing decision about the dropping of the bomb, I don't have strong views about it, but it is worth remembering that if that war had gone on, thousands of Japanese would have died of malnutrition, and the Americans had sunk all the transpor.

A film one should remember is 'Grave Of The Fireflies' which shows children dying of deprivation. That was happening and would have accelerated. Throughout the Asia-Pacific region, thousands were dying in China and Southeast Asia, everywhere. Continuing that war would have had horrible consequences. Now, is it to be asserted that the people who died in Hiroshima and Nagasaki horribly were more important than those people who were kept alive in other places who did not die horribly from starvation or being murdered in prison camps? So that's an issue I think we have to think about.

We have to think about why that war happened. It happened because of aggression, which was not deterred. It happened because treaties were broken. It is worth remembering the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, outlawing war in 1928, was in force and some people believed, British and French and others, that we did not need to prepare against and deter aggression because of these treaties. I am radically concerned about the dependability of treaties.

I spent 20 years on and off working on the Chemical Weapons Convention, and what I'm struck by every day in Syria is: we do not have an architecture which is adequate to ban weapons of mass destruction. The biological weapons ban was mentioned. Anyone who's seriously written or read on this believes that the Russian Defense Ministry still has strains for offensive biological weapons, including new strains, which have never been experienced before, mutated smallpox, etc. They've started now denying that they had done this. That's how dependable that treaty is.

The Syrian case shows us that even where you know chemical weapons are being used, even when you see dead children, you cannot pin the guilt on the perpetrators if they have a disinhibited, absolutely ruthless patron in the UN Security Council. So I repeat, we do not have an architecture which is capable reliably of disarming and keeping disarmed.

It's not irrelevant that both the British and the Japanese governments have decided not to ban it. Perhaps not to sign the TPNW. Consider in Japan what it would mean if you signed. It would mean the rupturing of your extended deterrence relationship with the U.S. It would mean you were no longer under the U. S. umbrella. Do you feel good about that? Do you think that you already, as I understand it, feel under pressure from China which uses composite, conventional, and nuclear

coercion. The day after the treaty, what do you think is going to be the behavior of the Chinese media? What is the point of building the new class of aircraft carriers if you'd signed this treaty while the Chinese will certainly not sign the treaty. Incidentally, countries representing 60% of the human race, the big countries, will not sign the treaty.

You would be faced with a nuclear-armed China, which is already pushing you around and could now threaten nuclear coercion when you had no American nuclear umbrella to restrain this. Does that sound like a good idea to you? Because that is what is being proposed. It's the destabilization of international arrangements. Nuclear weapons have a restraining force field, ugly though it is to think about. Do you suddenly want to change them, in a world where the Russians and Chinese have to think that if they were to sign up, it would be to make the world safe for domination by American conventional weapons. What are the chances that they will sign up? Do you want to live in a world right next door to China when the Chinese don't sign up, and you've ruptured your protective relationship with the US. These were points which, strangely enough, were not mentioned.