

Research Article

REGIONAL DISARMAMENT, WITH EMPHASIS ON CENTRAL ASIA

***Maryam Tabaraki¹ and Hamidreza Jamali²**

¹*Department of International Relations, Islamic Azad University of Shahreza Branch*

²*Islamic Azad University, Shahreza Branch*

**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT

Nuclear-weapon-free zones fundamental step towards nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and complex process but it is not impossible. The ultimate goal of nuclear-free zones is the elimination of nuclear weapons within a specific geographic area that in addition, an issue that is essential to reduce the risk involved in a nuclear war, but also, governments in the region free of nuclear weapons would enhance regional security. Their agreements not to manufacture nuclear weapons and not to be host nuclear weapons for the others. Central Asia is one of the six nuclear weapon-free zones. This research is in response to the question "What is Central Asia regional disarmament process? and with a descriptive analytical method, in addition to introduction of nuclear weapon-free zone treaties, In particular, evaluate Simipalatinsk treaty. And these points will clarify that nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty in Central Asia is a unique treaty. Because it has done the first crucial negotiations on a nuclear weapons-free zone in the northern hemisphere and has a common border with two nuclear weapon power. And consider as a valuable asset to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Keywords: *Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone, Simipalatinsk, Treaty, Disarmament, Additional Protocol*

INTRODUCTUON

Arms control and disarmament, particularly after the Second World War has been an important issue in the field of strategic and efforts in this field in three levels of nuclear weapons, non-nuclear and biological weapons, often from the United Nations and the two countries of America and the Soviet Union and other regional and international organizations has been made. Yet still, the international community has witnessed the failure of arms control and lack of general disarmament. The first nuclear test was done on 16 July 1945 in New Mexico, United States of America and its power was equal to 6/18 tons of TNT, respectively. Nuclear power was first used for military purposes and to build the atomic bomb. The first two atomic bombs were launched on 6 and 9 August 1945 respectively in the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan. In this nuclear explosion, tens of thousands lost their lives and many were suffering from diseases caused by nuclear radiation. Destructive power of the atomic bomb and nuclear weapons showed that the types of weapons are quite different from any other weapons of mass destruction (eg chemical and biological weapons). Following these events, the international community decided to conclude an international treaty to stop from developing nuclear weapons (the theory of general and complete disarmament).

To achieve this goal, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was adopted in 1968 and agreements on nuclear weapons free zones were followed.

Currently, there are six regions across the world that in these areas, there are conventions make up the basis legal system of nuclear-free zones. These areas are: 1) The Antarctic "Antarctica" Under the 1959 Treaty of Washington 2) Latin America and the Caribbean, "called Telateloloco" which was opened on 14 February 1967 in Mexico City and was forced in April 1969. 3) South Pacific "called Rarotonga" that was opened on August 6, 1985 in Rarotonga in the Cook Islands and was forced in 1986. 4) Southeast of the Asia ", known as the Bangkok Agreement" that was signed in December 1995 in Bangkok, capital of Thailand and entered into force on 27 March 1997. 5) Treaty of Africa "called Palin Daba", which was opened on 11 April 1996 for signature in Cairo and was in force on July 15, 2009. 6) Central Asian region "called the treaty of Simipalatinsk" which was opened for signature in Simipalatinsk Kazakhstan on September 8, 2006, and was in forced on March 29, 2009. Nuclear weapons-free zone treaties, including

Research Article

treaties that are in line with the strengthening of international peace and preventing a nuclear arms race and ultimately lead to banning proliferation of nuclear weapons.

This study will assess the treaty of Simipalatinsk. It has written in descriptive and analytical method and deal with this question. What is regional disarmament process of Central Asia? It seems that regional disarmament process of Central Asia is a process that because of the risks of illegal nuclear activities by regional governments and proximity to nuclear states and America's military presence with the implementation of all phases negotiated and signed by the governments of Central Asia.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Typically, a theoretical study is based on rational analysis and logical reasoning is based on library studies.

Conventions on Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones

First, each regional convention will be briefly study, then, the treaty of Simipalatinsk specifically will be discussed.

Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty of Antarctic Called Antarctica

Antarctica is a non-residential and civilian area, and from 1 December 1959 was declared as a zone free of nuclear weapons, and is mandated on June 23, 1961. The number of members is forty-eight members and twelve members of them are original and twenty-eight are members of the advisory. Twenty-one members are non-advisory council or state observers. United States of America is the depositary of the treaty. According to this treaty the use of any arms, nuclear explosions and venting radioactive residual is prohibited. The treaty allows each side to inspect all ground and aircraft facilities of Antarctic to ensure the implementation of all provisions of the Treaty (Talayee and Mansouri, 2007).

Nuclear Weapons Free Zones Treaty, Latin America and the Caribbean Region, Known as the Telatelolko

The 1967 Treaty of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean region known as the Treaty Telatelolko as the first nuclear weapons free zone treaty was opened for signature at Mexico City. The Treaty located the Latin American and Caribbean region as a zone free of nuclear weapons. Telatelolko treaty even before an international treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, "the NPT" was adopted in 1968. Telatelolko treaty entered into force on the twenty-five in April 1969 (Redick, 1999).

Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty of South Pacific Called Rarotonga

In 1985, the South Pacific Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Rarotonga, based on creating South Pacific as a zone free of nuclear weapons was opened for signature in Rarotonga in the Cook Islands.

In Article 6 of the Treaty, Member States are prohibited of all nuclear tests even peaceful, means the progressive development of international law on the prohibition of nuclear tests and this treaty could cover peaceful nuclear testing. Rarotonga Treaty was enter into force on 11 December 1986. The Offer of creating this area was made by Australia (Hamel-Green, 1998).

Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in Southeast Asia Known as the Bangkok Agreement

In December 1985, the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty, Bangkok known as Bangkok agreement, that free Southeast of Asia from nuclear weapons opened in Bangkok, the capital of Thai. The Bangkok Treaty has its origins in the 1971 Declaration of Kuala Lumpur that include request of Southeast governments of Asia, "ASEAN" to establish and maintain regional peace, freedom and neutrality in Southeast Asia and was in force on 27 March 1997 (Subede, 2008).

Africa Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone Treaty, Called as Palin DABA

In 1996, Africa nuclear weapons free zone treaty known as the Treaty of Daba Palin based on declaring Africa as nuclear weapons free zone was opened in Cairo. The Treaty Is mandated on 15 July 2009 by submitting twenty-eighth instrument of ratification (James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2013).

Research Article

Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone in Central Asia, Known as the Treaty Simipalatinsk

Nuclear weapons-free zone in Central Asia was opened for signature on 8 September 2006 and was in force on 21 March 2009 by the signatories of the five countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan), (James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2013).

The Geographical Position of Central Asia

Middle Asia (Central Asia) is a vast land in Asia that has no border with the open waters of the world. Although the exact boundaries of the land is not defined but usually know it to include the countries of Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. Middle Asia has historically been emphasized by nomads and the Silk Road and has been as a road to link the movement of goods and ideas between Europe, Middle East, South Asia and East Asia. What is now called Central Asia is more or less the same "Transoxiana" in Arabic and Persian most ancient sources. In addition, "Turkestan" is another name sometimes given to the land (Shirazi, 2004).

Background of the Project in Central Asia and the Position of Countries in Relation to it

The idea of a nuclear-free zone in Central Asia and initiatives in Mongolia dates back to 1992; In addition to the above, Mongolia proposed that the Central Asian region to be announced as a zone free of nuclear weapons. But the first formal proposal, in 1993, the forty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly was presented by "Islam Karimov" the President of Uzbekistan. Subsequently, Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia in 1996-1994 began to design the issue but there was no improvement in practice. The first formal attempt to put this proposal took place with the "Almaty Declaration" on February 27, 1997. The Declaration was the result of agreed at the summit of the area and approved the initiative of the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty (Almaty Declaration, February 27, 1997).

After the announcement, the international support in the form of United Nations resolutions and statements promising nuclear power was concerned about the idea. In such circumstances, and with the assistance of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Japanese government subsidies, a working group made up of diplomats from countries officer drafting the treaty; the real barriers to those agreements were evident as a result, from mid-2000 to 2002, no progress was made in negotiations. The main reason for the lack of progress in negotiations to resolve the differences between the Central Asian countries during the negotiations was appear concerning the limits of boundaries between some countries, the legal position of the Caspian Sea, regional competition and the relationship between some of these countries with the Russian Federation. In fact, due to the large number of countries like Kazakhstan cooperation and security ties with Russia, the principles of this contract including not to allow to cross and settlement of nuclear weapons in the region was conflicting with the contents of security contracts of these countries with Russia. At the same time, the relationship with other international treaties such as the Convention on Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and in particular the 1992 agreement Tashkent to create a collective security mechanism between Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan -that Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan were not their members - was another problem. This disagreement was to stop any progress. Russia in the years 1998- 1997, although was opposed to the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty, but with the expansion of NATO and UN operations in the Balkans proposed interpretations of a possible settlement or passing nuclear weapons through the region at the request of the Tashkent Agreement members.

On the other hand, the Tashkent Agreement members suggestion that the provisions of this Treaty shall not affect prior agreements, was rejected by opposition of Uzbekistan and specially Turkmenistan, even Turkmenistan refused to attend in expert group meeting in 2000. However, the occurrence of a series of changes caused to resolve the differences in mid-2002; Affected by the attacks of September 11, 2001 it changed the geopolitical balance in the region. After these events, US became more active in Central Asia and deployed its troops in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. As a result, not only the pressure dependence of Russia on the one hand and fear in the region of the country has declined, but Russia is also accepted the America's active presence in the region. Second, the sense of vulnerability in the region, particularly in this area that has the potential for nuclear terrorism, nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty as an urgent need for countries in the region were discussed.

Research Article

In addition, the Ambassador "Jyantadnapala" Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations Disarmament Affairs to strengthen the incentive to compromise over the dispute. As a result, the summit region of Samarkand from 27 to 25 September 2002, they agreed on the wording of the treaty. On 8 February 2005 the draft text was adopted in Tashkent. The treaty was open for signing on September 8, 2006 in "Simpalatinsk" Kazakhstan that was a Soviet nuclear test site which was closed for ever in 1991, and thirty days after the instruments of ratification, entered into force (Blujy, 2003). Resolution 61/88 of the General Assembly in December 2006, welcomed the signing of the Treaty and considered strengthening of the region as an important step towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime, promoting cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, recovery of areas affected by radioactive contamination, strengthening regional and global peace, security, effective measures to combat international terrorism, preventing nuclear materials and technologies nuclear technology available to terrorists and non-State actors (UN, General Assembly Resolution 6188, (LXI) 2006).

On incentives for nuclear weapons-free zone in Central Asia should be said, in comparison with other regions of the world, the Central Asian region for decades has been less attention because of Soviet domination. But after the Soviet collapse, attention to this area dramatically increased. Regional and trans-regional powers competing for influence in the region indicates the significance of the area. Since the beginning of the fight against terrorism, because of its proximity to Afghanistan, the Central Asia has been at the forefront of this struggle. With regard to nuclear weapons Central Asia is also important, because the Soviet nuclear legacy, particularly in Kazakhstan, one of the four major Soviet nuclear facility, And also because of the possibility of a nuclear summit through Central Asia to other regions of the world and possibility of terrorist groups to access these weapons, Central Asia has been the focus of many international actors. So it is natural that one of the concerns of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in a special relationship with the region; As a result of nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty not only eliminates these concerns but also avoids potential of nuclear challenges; Looking the issue of weapons of mass destruction in Central Asia is well known.

In Soviet times, Central Asia was one of the main sources of uranium mining and all countries except Turkmenistan uranium resources are great. 456 Soviet nuclear device was tested in Kazakhstan. Around 1410 the Soviet Union had deployed nuclear warheads in Kazakhstan. In addition, several Soviet biological and chemical weapons had been done in this area and many of these weapons were produced in this region. At the time of independence, these centers and equipment had inherited for Asian countries. Subsequently, America alarmed by the spread of weapons of mass destruction, performed through various mechanisms, such as programs to reduce the risks of unilateral disarmament by helping these countries. Despite these measures, the concern remains spread in different ways. However, the five Central Asian countries are members of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, there is a risk that illegal activities including the resumption of nuclear weapons program, in collaboration with countries and other actors in this regard as well as the establishment or passing nuclear weapons through the region, especially because of the proximity of Russia and China, America's military presence in the region will be done. All these risks that have certain predictable consequences provide incentive to be free of nuclear weapons treaty (Parrish, 2001).

Occurrence of Agreement and Review its Provisions

As noted above, the Treaty of nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia called "Semi Palatinsk" on September 8, 2006, was opened for signature in Kazakhstan Semi Palatinsk and contains 18 articles and an Additional Protocol. The treaty has been approved, by signing of all the owners that are the five countries of Central Asia; The last approval was adopted on December 11, 2008 and the final document was approved on February 20 2009. Treaty entered into force on 21 March 2009. Kyrgyz government is the depositary of the treaty.

Zone Treaty

*Article 1(a) Zone Treaty:

According to Article 1(a) of the Semipalatinsk Treaty, the Central Asian nuclear weapon-free zone includes Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. A provision

Research Article

envisaging the possible expansion of the zone to neighbouring States was eventually deleted at the insistence of the United Kingdom, the United States and France, which were worried that participation in a nuclear weapon-free zone might be used by Iran in order to shield its nuclear programme. From a geographical point of view, the zone covers “the land territory, all waters (harbors, lakes, rivers and streams) and the air space above them, which belong” to the above- mentioned five States(Article 2(a). It appears that, in the Sapporo meeting of October 1999, the Central Asian States agreed that the zone should not include any portions of the Caspian Sea, the waters of which have not been clearly delimited yet. If interpreted according to the ordinary meaning of the terms employed, however, Article 2(a) does not explicitly (and permanently) exclude the Caspian from the scope of application of the treaty.

Indeed, according to the prevalent view the Caspian is not a “sea” but rather an international lake not governed by the law of the sea, and lakes are included in the list contained in Article 2(a). What presently prevents the Caspian’s inclusion in the zone is the fact that no agreement among the littoral States has been reached on the delimitation of its waters and thus no part of them un controversially “belongs” to Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan.

Nonetheless, once such an agreement will be concluded and relevant portions of the Caspian waters will be determined to belong to the two Central Asian denuclearized States, those waters will constitute part of their territory and will consequently be included in the zone, in accordance with Article 2(a) of the Semipalatinsk Treaty.

This interpretation is supported by the inclusion of the precautionary clause contained in the second paragraph of Article 2, according to which “nothing in this Treaty shall prejudice or in any way affect the rights of any Central Asian States in any dispute concerning the ownership of or sovereignty over lands or waters that may or may not be included within this zone” (James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2013).

If read together, the two paragraphs of Article 2 of the Semipalatinsk Treaty seem to say is that the extension of the application of the Semipalatinsk Treaty to any portion of the Caspian depends on the successful conclusion of the negotiations on the delimitation of its waters, matter which is left unaffected by the treaty.

It follows from the above considerations and in particular from the qualification of the Caspian as a lake that the law of the sea problems related to the freedom of navigation of foreign ships carrying nuclear weapons through the territorial sea and exclusive economic zones of denuclearized States, emerged in connection with the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Bangkok, do not arise with regard to the Semipalatinsk Treaty. The only controversial issue would be the entry of foreign nuclear ships into the denuclearized States’ harbours and the over flight of the denuclearized States’ territories by aircraft with nuclear weapons on board.

*Foreign Ships, Aircraft, and Ground Transportation Article (4):

Article 4 provides that “without prejudice to the purposes and objectives of this treaty, each Party, in the exercise of its sovereign rights, is free to resolve issues related to transit through its territory by air, land or water, including visits by foreign ships to its ports and landing of foreign aircraft at its airfields”. This provision introduces an exception to the obligation contained in Article 3(1)(d). the obligation not to allow on the State party’s territory the possession of or control over any nuclear explosive device by anyone.

Obligations of Members

*Basic Obligations Article(3):

1) *Each Party Undertakes*

a) Not to conduct research on, develop, manufacture, stockpile or otherwise acquire, possess or have control over any nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device by any means anywhere; only the Pelindaba Treaty contains a similar prohibition (Article 3), while the other nuclear weapon-free zone treaties are silent on this point.

b) Not to seek or receive any assistance in research on, development, manufacture, stockpiling, acquisition, possession or obtaining control over any nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device;

Research Article

c) Not to take any action to assist or encourage the conduct of research on, development, manufacture, stockpiling, acquisition or possession of any nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device;

d) Not to allow in its territory:

i) The production, acquisition, stationing, storage or use, of any nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device;

What Article 3(1) (d) (i) of the Semipalatinsk Treaty does expressly say is that the contracting parties must not allow the use of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices in their territory. This entails an obligation on the Central Asian States to prevent a nuclear weapon State from launching such devices from anywhere within their territory.

ii) The receipt, storage, stockpiling, installation or other form of possession of or control over any nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device;

iii) Any actions, by anyone, to assist or encourage the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition, possession of or control over any nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device.

iiii) Each Party undertakes not to allow the disposal in its territory of radioactive waste of other States.

***Prohibition of Testing of Nuclear Weapons or Other Nuclear Explosive Devices Article(5):**

Each Party undertakes, in accordance with the CTBT:

a) Not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion;

b) To prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control;

c) To refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion (Cassese, 2005).

***Environmental Security Article(6):**

Each Party undertakes to assist any efforts toward the environmental rehabilitation of territories contaminated as a result of past activities related to the development, production or storage of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, in particular uranium tailings storage sites and nuclear test sites. Unlike the Bangkok Treaty (Article 6), the Semipalatinsk Treaty does not provide for the obligation of early notification of a nuclear accident. On the other hand, the Central Asian treaty contains a “green” provision not appearing in any other nuclear weapon-free zone treaty. According to Article 6, “each party undertakes to assist any efforts toward the environmental rehabilitation of territories contaminated as a result of past activities related to the development, production or storage of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, in particular uranium tailings storage sites and nuclear test sites”.

*** Use of Nuclear Energy for Peaceful Purposes Article (7):**

No provision of this Treaty shall prejudice the rights of the Parties to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

*** IAEA Safeguards Article(8):**

a) To use for exclusively peaceful purposes the nuclear material and facilities which are within its territory, under its jurisdiction, or under its control anywhere;

(b) To conclude with the IAEA and bring into force, if it has not already done so, an agreement for the application of safeguards in accordance with the NPT (INFCIRC/153 (Corr.)), and an Additional Protocol (INFCIRC/540 (Corr.)) not later than 18 months after the entry into force of this Treaty;

(c) Not to provide: (i) source or special fissionable material or (ii) equipment or material especially designed or prepared for the processing, use or production of special fissionable material, to any non-nuclear-weapon State, unless that State has concluded with the IAEA a comprehensive safeguards agreement and its Additional Protocol referred to in paragraph (b) of this article.

***Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Equipment Article(9):**

Each Party undertakes to maintain effective standards of physical protection of nuclear material, facilities and equipment to prevent its unauthorized use or handling or theft. To that end, each Party undertakes to apply measures of physical protection to nuclear material in domestic use, transport and storage, to nuclear material in international transport, and to nuclear facilities within its territory at least as effective as those called for by the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material of 1987 and by the recommendations and guidelines developed by the IAEA for physical protection.

Research Article

Thus, as can be seen. The obligation of physical protection of nuclear material, facilities and equipment included in Article 9 could also make the Semipalatinsk Treaty an effective tool against the risk of nuclear terrorism (Roscini, 2008).

*Consultative Meetings Article (10):

The Parties agree to hold annual meetings of their representatives, on a rotating basis, as well as extraordinary meetings, at the request of any Party, in order to review compliance with this Treaty or other matters related to its implementation.

Settlement of Disputes Article (11):

Disputes between the Parties involving the interpretation or application of this Treaty shall be settled through negotiations or by other means as may be deemed necessary by the Parties.

Other Agreements Article (12):

This Treaty does not affect the rights and obligations of the Parties under other international treaties which they may have concluded prior to the date of the entry into force of this Treaty.

The Parties shall take all necessary measures for effective implementation of the purposes and objectives of this Treaty in accordance with the main principles contained therein.

Reservations Article (13):

This Treaty shall not be subject to reservations.

*Entry into Force and Duration Article (15):

(a) This Treaty shall enter into force 30 days after the date of the deposit of the fifth instrument of ratification.

(b) This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration (James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2013).

*Withdrawal from the Treaty Article(16):

(a) Any Party may, by written notification addressed to the Depositary, withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject-matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized its supreme national interests. Such notification shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme national interests.

(b) Withdrawal shall take effect 12 months after the date of receipt of the notification by the Depositary, who shall circulate such notification to all Parties to the Treaty and to the signatories of the Protocol.

The inclusion of such clauses in disarmament treaties has been the object of discussion. According to Sims, “the logic of withdrawal clauses implies at least a partial reversibility of the treaties in which they are incorporated. Now, it is by no means generally agreed that a disarmament treaty should be reversible”.

On the contrary, Cannizzaro doubts that nuclear non-proliferation treaties such as the NPT are irreversible .97. The (scarce) practice seems to support the latter view. None of the Security Council resolutions concerning the North Korean withdrawal from the NPT qualifies such withdrawal as illegal, but on the contrary they try to persuade the Asian State with different degrees of pressure to retract its announcement and return to the NPT (Sachariew, 1988).

Protocol treaty and a position of great power in relation to the granting of security guarantees:

The treaty has an Additional Protocol. According to Article (1) each of the parties of the protocol will commit that do not use or threatening nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices against the other party to the treaty. According to Article (2) each of the parties of the protocol will commit that any action as a violation of the Convention or its protocols are not attributed to any party. According to Article (3) each of the parties of the protocol will commit that by written notice to the depositary, inform its reception or any change in its commitment under the Protocol, which may applied as amended Treaty by Article 17 and in accordance with Article 4 of the Protocol has opened for signature by France, China, Russia, Great Britain and Northern Ireland United States of America. The protocol for each of the parties shall apply from the date of transfer to the trustee or the date of implementing the Convention; So far, none of these protocols have been signed by the nuclear weapon states; China and Russia have announced that they will support the treaty; The United States and Britain and France did not support this view as former security programs, such as "1992 Tashkent Collective Security Treaty" is possible to prejudge in the case of armed conflict, (James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2013).

Research Article

Recent developments suggest that on 22 April 2013 NPT review Preparatory Committee was held in Geneva. Government of Kazakhstan on April 23, in a statement emphasized on the Central Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty of SimiPalatynsk and its valuable contribution to international peace and security and praised its innovative features in removal of environmental damage and demand the nuclear weapon states by providing practical advice on the steps taken to effect the treaty. In relation to the position of the government, especially the major powers it must be said that the recognition of a nuclear weapons-free zone treaty is important, because otherwise, the risk of violating the provisions of the settlement and the passage of nuclear weapons treaty that is possible only by holders, threateninig the integrity of the treaty.

Moreover, given the region's commitment to abandon nuclear weapons option, return to nuclear power through the Additional Protocol to the Treaty, to commit themselves in contrast to those countries will not resort to nuclear weapons. (Security guarantees).

In practice, the nuclear weapon states rather than to sign the protocol, presented independent statements. To justify such a situation, these countries have appealed the general provisions of the treaties mentioned such as reservations about the freedom of the seas and etc. In relation to nuclear weapons-free zone treaties on the Central Asia region, the countries began to meet and discuss with representatives of the five nuclear powers (America, Russia, Britain, France and China). The objective of the negotiations would be necessary in order to guarantee the security of the region, in addition to reporting the status of negotiations related documents handed to them.

In contrast, nuclear power in order to assess more precisely the documents was requested more time. As a result they delayed signing the treaty. Meanwhile, according to the specific situation of Russian influence and deal with some of the countries in the region, it is expected that The Great Powers to be a more sensitive, although the region countries in order to avoid such problems, have chosen wording vague and general and finally implicitly emphasized on having no impact on safety regulations and other agreements.

However, nuclear powers in general agreed with the idea of a nuclear weapons-free zone in Central Asia, but they have been observed about the quality of their commitment to the Treaty. Besides Russia, America also did not support actively the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia and postponed any actual position to the final text of the treaty. Given the current state of America's policy in relation to disarmament and new bases in the region that America has achieved, full and unconditional support of America for the deal seems unlikely.

Britain and France may have a position similar to America's position. Only China fully and explicitly supported the treaty; In relation to the performance of the United Nations it should be noted that in all nuclear weapons-free zone treaties, technical assistance and official recognition of the United Nations is very efficient in conclusion of agreements and facilitate the entry into force of the Treaty. In fact, after the nuclear powers, supported by the United Nations consider as a global support of the treaty. In connection with the Treaty of nuclear weapons-free zone in Central Asia, United Nation has fully supported it from the beginning of the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on the subject. In this regard, the United Nations has adopted the following resolutions. 52/38 (9 December 1997), 77/53 (4 December 1998), 55/33 (20 November 2000).

In these resolutions, in addition to supporting of regional initiatives, the UN Secretary General has called for to help countries to reach agreement on coordination. To run this application, Deputy Secretary General of the Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific disarmament in the vice, have been done technical and expertise assistance to the countries of the region.

Financial and technical assistance and advices of these center, expert groups have an important role in advancing negotiations have an important role in advancing negotiations of expert groups and to help finalize the text of the treaty, Deputy Secretary General also visited the area and met with senior officials of the five countries of Central Asia. After finalization of the text of the treaty, the Vice President, provided the meeting of representatives of countries with nuclear power (James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2013).

Research Article

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

In relation to Simipalatinsk treaty, domestically, no research have been published after the entry into force of this Treaty, world-class research in the field of Simipalatinsk Treaty is small and some are paid only passing reference to the Treaty; The only research that focuses exclusively on this treaty is the research by the "Marco Rossini" in 2008. So this study is the first study to assess the treaty after the entry into force of the treaty after March 2009, In addition to evaluate the Central Asian state's efforts to establish a zone free of nuclear weapons treaty, know it as a unique treaty. As noted above, Central Asia is one of the most sensitive security areas due to the possibility of proliferation of nuclear weapons. In addition competing of Great Powers to influence and presence in this area increases the risk of settlement or transit of nuclear weapons in the region. Therefore, the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty appropriate response to this challenge. Creating this zone is relatively long and has led to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia. However Symypalatynsk Treaty, is a unique one and is considered as an important step towards strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime, promoting cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, rehabilitation of areas affected by radioactive contamination, maintaining international peace and security and effective action to combat the threat of international terrorism because the treaty for the first time establishe a full zone free of nuclear weapons in the northern hemisphere which is in borders with the two nuclear powers China and Russia and in proximity of the two nuclear countries, India and Pakistan that are not the members of NPT; So the Treaty can help the geopolitical stability and security in Central Asia and thus is a valuable asset to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

First it is recommended for successful of disarmament process that inspection mechanism has a supervisory role, not merely an advisory role.

Secondly, the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty reflects the special character of the area that the treaty will apply in it. Simipalatinsk treaty, for greater success, should establish a compromise between the interests of the nuclear weapon states and bring the benefits of nuclear power.

Third, the legal authority should exist to provide security guarantees for nuclear weapons by the nuclear weapon states. In the hope that day that security guarantees become binding and global. Leads to stabilization of the success and increase the effectiveness of the existing logic.

REFERENCES

Almaty Declaration, February 27, 1997.

Blvjy Haider Ali (2002). nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia is a step toward sustainable security. *Caucasus and Central Asian Studies Journal of Human Sciences* **40**(4) 29.

Cassese Antonio (2005). *International Law* (Oxford, Oxford University Press) 179.

Hamel-Green and Michael (1998). *The South Pacific: The Treaty of Rarotonga In Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones*, edited by Ramesh Thakur (Great Britain, Macmillan Press LTD) 59.

Hasan Shirazi, Habibullah Majidi and Muhammad Reza (2003). *Policy and Government in Central Asia* (Ghomes publication, Tehran) 43.

James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies (1996). African Nuclear Weapon Free Zone of Pelindaba Treaty. Available: http://www.nti.org/e_research/official_docs/inventory/pdfs/anwfz.pdf. {2013}.

James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies (2006). Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty of Semipalatinsk. Available: http://www.nti.org/e_research/official_docs/inventory/pdfs/seanfz.pdf. [Accessed on September 8 2006] {2013}.

Parrish Scott (2001). Prospects for a Central Asian Nuclear- Weapon- Free Zone. *The Nonproliferation Review CNS Monterey Institute of International Studies* **8**(1) 142.

Redick John R (1999). Precedents and Legacies: Tlatelolco's Contribution to the Next Century, Centre for International Studies, University of Virginia. Available: <http://www.opanal.org/articles/avin.30/sanders.html> [Accessed on 7/5/1999].

Research Article

Roscini Marco (2008). Something Old Something New: The 2006 Semipalatinsk Treaty on a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in Central, Asia. *Chinese Journal of International Law* 7(3) 598.

Sachariew K (1988). State Responsibility for Multilateral Treaty Violations: Identifying the Injured State and Its Legal Status. *Netherlands International Law Review* 35.

Subede Sorya P (1999). Problems and Prospect for the Treaty on the Creation of a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Peace Studies* 4, Available: [http:// www.gmu.edu /programs/icar/igps/index.htm](http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/igps/index.htm) [Accessed on 1/7/2008].

Tlaey Farhad and Mansouri Frngtaj (2007). New view on the legal status of Antarctica: Antarctica is the common heritage of mankind. *Journal of Human Sciences, Shiraz University* 47(3) 100.

UN. General Assembly Resolution 6188, (LXI) 2006.