A ban treaty would “have a destabilizing effect on regional and international security … because it would generate uneven pressure on the different nuclear-weapon States, particularly those that, like France, have already taken significant steps towards nuclear disarmament.”

A ban treaty will generate more pressure on France than on other nuclear-weapon states, and this will be difficult to resist.

“A ban treaty runs the risk of undermining regional security. We cannot deny the reality that nuclear weapons continue to play a role in maintaining peace and stability in some parts of the world. We ignore that reality at our peril. This could further foster uncertainty in regions as states are forced to reevaluate their security environment.”

A ban treaty runs the risk of forcing our allies to reduce their reliance on nuclear weapons.

A ban treaty “fundamentally breaks the established algorithm of multilateral work on nuclear disarmament, which so far has been carried out within the NPT. … Let us recall that in line with the NPT, nuclear weapons that the five nuclear powers possess are absolutely legitimate. … Now there is a proposal to outlaw nuclear weapons within a new international agreement with more limited membership. As a result, two parallel legal regimes with mutually excluding provisions regarding the status of nuclear weapons could emerge.”

A ban treaty will destroy the ability of the NPT to legitimize the indefinite retention of our nuclear weapons.