

**What could be the specific strategy of A2000 now that the TPNW has entered into force...** but only for NNWS and without any perspective of seeing the P5 as well as the P9 joining it?

Nuclear disarmament has reached an impasse. Abolition has reached an impasse. So has the abolition movement. So has the Abolition 2000 Network itself.

Why? Because the conference that negotiated the Treaty lost sight of its original mission and objective: to advance **multilateral** disarmament. Because ICAN lost sight of what its acronym means: International Campaign to **ABOLISH** Nuclear weapons. Because the **Abolition** 2000 Network, without debate, has effaced itself behind ICAN.

A2000 affirms in its constitutive declaration that there is an « "inextricable link" between "peaceful" and warlike uses of nuclear technologies - the threat to future generations inherent in creating and using long-lived radioactive materials must be recognized. We must move toward reliance on clean, safe, renewable forms of energy production that do not provide the materials for weapons of mass destruction and do not poison the environment for thousands of centuries. The true "inalienable" right is not to nuclear energy, but to life, liberty and security of persons in a world free of nuclear weapons. »

Is it normal that this network calls for signatures on a treaty which affirms in its preamble « an "inalienable right" to nuclear energy » ? That provides for no negotiation between the nuclear States but simply invites them to disarm unilaterally? A contradictory, even incoherent Treaty, which requires of its parties a total and "irreversible" renunciation of nuclear weapons, yet authorises them (article 17, 2 & 3) to withdraw from it without discussion, simply by giving a year's notice?

**These questions need to be the subject of a substantive debate.**

**Jean-Marie Matagne, Action des Citoyens pour le Désarmement Nucléaire (ACDN)**