

Role of Support Responsibility in the Promotion of International Law Strategies to Deal with Threats Posed by Nuclear Weapons

Saeed Daryae Baghdad Abadi¹, Saeed Ahmadian, Abolfazl Salimian³

¹Faculty member, Department of Law, Faculty of Humanities, Bafgh Islamic Azad University.

^{2,3}Master of Private Law, Department of Law, Faculty of Humanities, Maybod Islamic Azad University.

Received: May 14, 2015

Accepted: August 27, 2015

ABSTRACT

Discussion of international law prohibiting the production and proliferation of nuclear weapons should be in three areas, prohibit the use of these weapons until the complete removal and destruction of existing weapons be considered. In recent years, the theory of support responsibility has been offered And the nuclear weapons considered as threat for international security According to theory of responsibility to protect, multi-layered action is necessary to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The first layer of an effective strategy to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to reduce the demand for it has not been universal tool. The second layer should contain global instruments relating to supply them. To limit the capacity of state and non-state actors to acquire nuclear weapons and the materials and expertise needed to build them. The third layer must consist of Security Council enforcement measures analysis of the information is reliable. The fourth layer to the level of protection of public health and national and international civilians.

KEYWORDS: support responsibility. International law strategies, nuclear weapons

INTRODUCTION

Comprehensive risk of the spread of these weapons and destructive and irreversible effects of the proliferation and use of, the international community is faced with a serious security threat that countries having nuclear weapons should take steps to disarm this. The first and most immediate concern is that countries with a current membership of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, as a covert and illegal weapons programs to develop wide. The second concern is about the erosion of long-term break the treaty system is possible. Currently, approximately 60 countries had nuclear power or research reactors are operating or construction. At least 40 countries have industrial and scientific infrastructure which enables them to feel free of nuclear weapons during the short time that the treaty should not be normative barriers, to build. Both concerns are now fully comply with reality. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty such as the former is not an effective deterrent. In 1963, when only four countries had nuclear arsenals, the United States Government predicted that in the next decade can be seen between 15 to 25 countries that have nuclear weapons. Powerful system of nonproliferation in the International Atomic Energy Agency and treaty three basic methods shared this: Normative prohibition of ownership, use and proliferation of such weapons strengthened And ensuring that governments can take advantage of the benefits of nuclear technology, but with supervision And governments about the capacities of neighbors and potential rivals gave assurance And preventing a nuclear arms race was unnecessary. Today, a large percentage of the total amount of uranium in the world is very large and many storage sites are not secure enough. States have publicly confirmed 20 cases of nuclear diversion And more than 200 cases involving illegal transport of nuclear materials has been registered over the past decades. Nuclear non-proliferation regime is now at risk And we're getting to the point that the destruction nonproliferation regime can be irreversible and lead to a wave of proliferation of nuclear proliferation.

The fundamentals of the issue of nuclear weapons in theory of support responsibility:

Responsibility to protect is divided to three specific responsibilities: 1. The responsibility for prevention: Regarding prevention, the international community must identify the causes of catastrophes, measures to prevent the crisis in the fall. The international community and especially the General Assembly and the Security Council must identify the triggers of the crisis of human rights, by adopting appropriate mechanisms in each case, the prevention of human rights violations. 2. Responsibility for reaction in response to situations that need for action to be felt. These measures could include repressive measures like sanctions and international trial and in extreme cases, military intervention 3. responsibility for Reconstruction, including measures that after the decision of military intervention under UN auspices and with the assistance of the international community and the government and legal institutions of the case, to look like the establishment of lasting peace and security,

* **Corresponding Author:** Saeed Daryae Baghdad Abadi, Faculty member, Department of Law, Faculty of Humanities, Bafgh Islamic Azad University. E-mail: Saeed_daryae@yahoo.com

reconstruction of buildings and roads have been destroyed, criminal trial and so on. [1] This doctrine is an unwritten social contract between a government and the international community as a whole is thought that the government supports its own nationals. Instead, the international community and respect its sovereignty [2]. The final document of the 2005 UN World [3] Summit that framework of the responsibility to protect can be explained in two ways. Sovereignty as responsibility and international responsibility in extreme circumstances [4]. Section 138 of document states: each country is responsible to protect the subjects against genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility requires the application of appropriate and necessary tools to prevent such crimes. Also Since collective action in accordance with paragraph 139 response times are within the responsibility of supporting the military intervention, are described. For this reason, the responsibility of responding directly linked with aspects of international responsibility. And in apparent contradiction with the principle of non-interference enshrined in paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter [5]. Sponsors of doctrine in response to this objection noted that decisions about military intervention by the Security Council on the basis of the Charter. Some of these countries also have noted that the license should be issued when there is no other solution [6] Because Section 139 is not legally binding, therefore we can not currently support responsibilities as a new law on international law be considered [7] However, Article 139 provides the background necessary for collective action. Of course if the international political for it will exist. Since this clause also refers to collective action, political commitment is not binding. This document should also do not offer that if the Security Council fails to answer about the mechanisms appropriate to each case to decide, what to do. [8] what can be used as the basis for the responsibility to protect nuclear weapons is, in theory, is that the theory of the need to eliminate threats to international security talks. And one of the most important threats are nuclear weapons. Because of the pervasive spread of this destructive and irreversible effects of the proliferation and use of weapons and that the international community is faced with a serious security threat.

Guidelines of international law towards the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons:

Here we are in the light of the general rules of international law and international instruments and the advisory opinion of the Court [9] [10], the position of the international law of nuclear weapons is explained. But before it is necessary to study the nature and characteristics of nuclear weapons. In the field of production and proliferation of nuclear weapons, the international community's approach has been that as many countries as discriminatory, of the pursuit of nuclear weapons is prohibited. But despite the requirements of countries with nuclear weapons to pursue their formal and complete nuclear disarmament so far have shown little enthusiasm to fulfill this obligation. In the context of a ban on the use of nuclear weapons, to date no way binding treaty that explicitly and in countries in armed conflict are prohibited from using these weapons do not exist. But there are general rules and binding with respect to the characteristics of nuclear weapons, accompanied by lack of respect for the rules of use of nuclear weapons. In light of these general rules can be said that the use of nuclear weapons with international requirements (for world peace) is incompatible. Here we refer to some of these general rules:

A) The spirit and purpose of the Charter:

The main purpose of the establishment of the United Nations, the establishment of international peace and security in the whole of the international community to adopt peaceful means to resolve international disputes. If only benefit nuclear weapons (as has been said), and its inhibition. This feature though is the way to prevent armed conflict, But the peace in an environment of fear appears, is incompatible with the spirit of the UN Charter. On the other hand the production and proliferation of nuclear weapons states to cooperate with the disarmament and arms regulation (paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Charter) does not match. The arms race, especially in nuclear weapons, never agreed with the development of friendly relations (paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter) and the development of international cooperation in order to promote philanthropic behavior (paragraph 3 of Article 1) shall not be considered. [11]

B) Rules relating to the means of war:

Use of nuclear weapons in terms of their characteristics, with rules limiting devices that are part of international humanitarian law constitute war are incompatible. Therefore, some of the lawyers know the legitimacy of use of nuclear weapons as a matter of course. For example, Article 36 of 1977 Protocol I Additional to the 1949 Geneva Conventions has been emphasized on need for compliance with general rules of international weapons. Also in Article 22 of the 1899 and 1907 Conventions on the laws and customs of war on land stated: "right of hostiles in the use of means of hitting the enemy is not unlimited. [12] The destructive power of nuclear weapons and the damage is such that it could easily be the nature of weapons causing unnecessary suffering and irreversible considered. Also according to the characteristics of nuclear weapons that can distinguish between military targets from civilian use, it almost does not exist, we can say that the use of nuclear weapons is not permitted under international law.

Certain provisions relating to nuclear weapons:

A) Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty:

According to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty 1968 horizontal expansion (increasing the number of holders of weapons) under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency is under control. However, prevention of vertical development of these weapons (both quantitative and qualitative development by the possession of weapons), the treaty shall not result in a moral and ideological commitment remains. Under the treaty, countries with nuclear weapons refrain to transfer nuclear weapons or other explosive devices directly or indirectly to other nuclear countries to And also refrain to help and encourage or encouraging states without nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons or other explosive devices in the building or acquisition of nuclear weapons or explosive devices.[13]

B) Treaties banning nuclear tests:

Treaty banning nuclear tests in part is known as PTBT. The treaty on August 5, 1963 in Moscow by three countries, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union was signed. According to the brief treaty (including five articles), for the purposes of the United Nations and member states pledged to reach an agreement to end the arms race, refrain of any explosive testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere and outer and under water (at sea). The treaty since it became part did not prohibit testing underground. Treaty banning nuclear tests comprehensively, known as the CTBT and the second treaty in this area. On September 24, 1996 was opened for signature countries. 180 days after 44 countries have ratified the treaty of nuclear power or a nuclear research reactor, shall come into force. Of the 44 countries that have ratified the treaty, it is necessary for entry into force, the three countries of North Korea, India and Pakistan have not signed it yet And seven other nations including Iran, the United States, Israel, Egypt, Indonesia, China and Colombia signed despite still not ratified the treaty, For this reason the treaty has not entered into force. In addition to these multilateral treaties, other bilateral treaties between the two Cold War superpowers (USA and USSR) to limit nuclear tests in 1974 (known as TTBT) and 1976 (the so-called PNET) had been signed.[14]

C) Treaties on nuclear weapon-free zones:

The idea of keeping some areas free of nuclear weapons, is another way that 1959 is the international legal literature. Some of these agreements include: Antarctic Treaty in order to keep free the Antarctic in 1959, a treaty banning the deployment of nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean 1967 (known as the Tlatelolco), the Treaty on the Asia-Pacific region free of nuclear weapons, 1985 (the so-called Rarotonga), Southeast Asia free of nuclear weapons treaty of 1995 (known as Bangkok) And treaty making Africa a nuclear weapons free zone in 1996 (known as Plyndaba).[15]

These treaties are to strengthen world peace and the prevention of the nuclear arms race and each step taken in the direction of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Treaty member state free of nuclear weapons development and acquisition of such weapons is not only the right but not in any way accept the deployment of nuclear weapons on its soil.[16]

D) Resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

One of the most important resolution expressly prohibits the use of nuclear weapons in contravention of international law is known, resolution No. 1653 dated 24 November 1961 Declaration on banning the use of nuclear weapons. The resolution is based on general rules on the prohibition of the use of weapons destruction. Many resolutions without referring explicitly to ban the use of these weapons, disarmament and non-nuclear weapons and banning tests of nuclear weapons some areas or stop such practices, were issued. The resolution seek the nuclear-weapon states to achieve international agreement on the prohibition of the use and destruction of nuclear weapons in any circumstances. Resolution to prohibit the production of new generation nuclear weapons And resolution on the nuclear test ban treaty And resolutions on the establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons (the Indian Ocean, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and the Middle East) Including the most recent international efforts to prohibit the threat or use of nuclear weapons and prohibit the production and replication of that.

E) Guarantees the nuclear weapon states and the Security Council resolutions:

The nuclear weapon states have been promised repeatedly by issuing a unilateral declarations of nuclear weapons against countries without nuclear weapons will not use. This procedure can lead to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons is customary. Russia, Britain, the United States, France and China as a nuclear power committed five knew that no nuclear weapons against countries, such weapons are not used. [17]

The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice [18]

About legitimate or illegitimate use of nuclear weapons has twice the International Court of Justice advisory opinion is requested. Beginning in 1993, the World Health Organization requested the Court to answer this question: Due to health and environmental effects of the use of nuclear weapons, would use nuclear weapons in war or in any armed conflict, in violation of international law and obligations arising from the World Health

Organization's Constitution or not? Court question the jurisdiction of the World Health Organization announced that the organization did not and could not announce the advisory opinion. The United Nations General Assembly in 1994, the Court requested the advisory opinion. The text of the question is: "Is it in accordance with international law, the threat or use of nuclear weapons is permitted in all circumstances? Court announced its opinion as follows: (A) customary international law and agreement on any specific authorization of the threat or use of nuclear weapons there. (B) any prohibition in customary international law and the contract itself a comprehensive and global threat or use of nuclear weapons there. (C) the threat or use of force with nuclear weapons is contrary to paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the UN Charter and without all the conditions of Article 51, it is illegal. (D) threat or use of nuclear weapons must comply with the provisions of international law in armed conflict entered into force, In particular the principles and rules of international humanitarian law, As well as comply with the obligations foreseen in the Treaties and other commitments are explicitly related to nuclear weapons. [19]

According to the conditions mentioned above, the conclusion is reached that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular is contrary to the principles and rules of humanitarian law. However, the current state of international law, the Court is unable to conclude that in certain circumstances that the country is highly vulnerable to the destruction of the threat or use of nuclear weapons as a defense, legitimate or illegitimate. The Court, after reviewing the resolutions of the General Assembly and bilateral or multilateral treaties and other international instruments on the law of armed conflict and humanitarian law principles, concluded that: First, a special permit for the threat or use of nuclear weapons there; Second, the threat or use of nuclear weapons against the general rules of international law and the principles of humanitarian law is not permitted; Thirdly, the specific characteristics of the threat or use of nuclear weapons is such that it generally leads to a violation of the general rules of international law, But the Court, accompanied by the kind, can not be prohibited or legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons in conditions that endanger a country's existence is inferred. International law on the use of legal or illegal nuclear weapons in certain circumstances and acute self-defense, is quiet and there are no rules. [20]

Role of support Responsibility in strengthening the international legal guidelines for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons

In theory of support Responsibility, approaches taken action to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be multilayered. The first layer of an effective strategy to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to reduce the demand for it has not been universal tool. The second layer should contain global instruments relating to supply them. To limit the capacity of states and non-state actors to acquire weapons and the materials and expertise needed to build them. The third layer must consist of Security Council enforcement measures are based on reliable data analysis.

Strategies to reduce demand:

Despite the commitment of the Security Council (Resolution 984 dated 1995), countries with nuclear weapons had become increasingly determined to ensure the non-use And wants to maintain the right to retaliate with nuclear weapons against nuclear weapons and chemical and biological. Despite an end of the Cold War, nuclear weapons states to fulfill their obligations to disarm only to have a different level. While America and Russia Brchydhand about half of their weapons and to reducing strategic warheads, and the vast majority of non-strategic weapons have been removed, However, the progress made has been overshadowed by recent developments. In 2000, countries with nuclear weapons participated in 13 practical steps for nuclear disarmament. All of which by all of them in 2004 during a meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the 2005 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty review was denied. Countries with nuclear weapons should take steps to restart disarmament plan: These countries must fulfill their obligations under Article 6 of the Treaty on the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to move towards disarmament and prepare specific measures to fulfill those commitments, adhere. They have their previous commitments on non-use of nuclear weapons against countries that do not have nuclear weapons, they reaffirmed. They must reduce the perceived value of nuclear weapons And international cooperation to stop the spread of these weapons to strengthen And they recognize these obligations in unfinished current and future agreements related to nuclear weapon-free zones. America and Russia and other countries possessing nuclear weapons and states not party to the Treaty on the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should commit to practical measures to reduce the risk of nuclear war Including where appropriate in a dynamic program to disable its nuclear strategic weapons, participate. In addition, we believe that it would be valuable if the Security Council so outspoken, committed to collective action in response to a nuclear attack or the threat of such an attack on a country's non-nuclear weapon. Given the challenges the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons by countries that are not members, will be felt And by recognizing its impact on regional security challenges, We recommend that negotiations to resolve regional conflicts include confidence-building measures and steps towards disarmament be performed. States Parties to the Convention on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons are committed to non-proliferation and disarmament should be In a way that demonstrates their commitment to ratify the nuclear test ban treaty entirely, be And also indicated their support for the negotiations on the fissile material treaty Stop

nuclear and non-nuclear countries are the same, both to be. We strive for peace in the Middle East and South Asia, we recommend As well as nuclear disarmament talks recommended because it can lead to a nuclear weapon-free zones in those regions similar to those in Latin America, the South Pacific and South East Asia there is.[21]

Strategies for reducing the supply:

We agree that nuclear energy is an important source of power from the perspective of many for civilian use, and even can be used as a global effort to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and emissions of greenhouse gases considered more important. But at the same time that all signatories of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the efforts to develop their civilian nuclear industry. But the reality is that the international system needs to achieve a more efficient system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, be taken into consideration. Article 4 of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the right of Member States to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is guaranteed. The treaty specifies that this right must be compatible with materials used one and two. This commitment must also be respected. In recent years it has become clear that the dangers of uranium enrichment and reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel is high and increasing. In particular, the two processes that create a route by which Treaty signatories can be clandestine and illegal activities that are not compatible with the Treaty seeks to (in places where have) And are carefully designed to allow them to acquire nuclear weapons capability it offers. The solution is required. First, the rules for inspection and verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency governing the mid-90s have been proven inadequate. International Atomic Energy Agency inspection rules in the Model Additional Protocol established difficult. But so far only one-third of the States Parties to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of nuclear weapons have signed this Protocol. Board of Governors of the IAEA Additional Protocol as a measure of the current pattern to identify the IAEA Safeguards and the Security Council must take action in cases of serious concerns about the lack of adherence to the rules of the Treaty and the safeguards to be ready. Second, insist that talks take place without delay and as soon as arrangements based on the provisions contained in Articles 3 and 9 of the Statute of the IAEA, which the Agency to act as guarantor for the supply of fissile material for civilian nuclear use enables, be considered. Such an arrangement requires the agency is in a position through authorized suppliers, demand for the supply of nuclear fuel for reprocessing of low-enriched uranium and spent fuel at market rates provide. And uninterrupted supply of such services until safeguards or inspection procedures at the facilities in question have not been violated, the groups said. enrichment or reprocessing establish. However, with the commitment that the moratorium declared by the supplier for the supply of fissile material available with market rates, guaranteed. Recent experience of the activities of the AQ Khan network, the need for and value of the measures on the prohibition of trafficking and clandestine trade in components for nuclear programs has made it clear. The problem now is on a voluntary basis by the Proliferation Security Initiative is taken into consideration. We believe that all countries should be encouraged to join this voluntary initiative. In order to implement the provisions of international law in regard to drug trafficking and nuclear weapons, the current negotiations on the International Maritime Organisation to amend the 1988 Convention on the Prevention of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, should be completed within a time frame. The Security Council may need to be prepared to consider mandatory action. However, if progress in negotiations is not satisfactory Convention. While the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to achieve the right to withdraw from treaty countries should be required not to exercise that right. Countries that are outside should be held accountable for violations of its obligations in the membership treaty. Declaration of withdrawal of a country from the Treaty must be immediate verification of its compliance with the country's treaty to be followed and, if necessary, by the Security Council's mandate. Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency have agreed that in the event of any breach of the assistance provided by the Agency to be withdrawn from trespassing. A short-term immediate action to defend against the possible terrorist use of nuclear weapons is necessary. Higher priority should be to consolidate, secure and if possible eliminating potentially hazardous materials and implementing effective export controls directed. To this end, we welcome the initiative to reduce global threats that facilitates the following: Reduce stockpiles of highly enriched uranium in the world. And convert research reactors HEU proliferation-resistant reactors. And the weakening of HEU available. Time global threat reduction initiative proposed for implementation should be reduced from 10 years to 5 years [22]. Security Council action under Resolution 1540 dated 2004 can state model legislation for security, criminalization and export controls proposed and by 2006 minimum performance standards, and the UN member countries to develop. To achieve this goal, the Executive Committee of Council Resolution 1540 should be a permanent core of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the Nuclear Suppliers Group to establish. IAEA member states should budget for programs that will help to establish and secure radioactive sources and programs that will help countries in the internal favorable legislation, increased. In addition, the Conference on Disarmament should without further delay to negotiate a verifiable treaty to stop the production of fissile materials in accordance with a set process to produce highly enriched uranium for weapons and other weapons end. Today, the Security Council has a few arrows in his quiver other than sanctions and military force to enforce non-proliferation agreements. In addition, a special referral to the Security Council to generate credible information about possible cases of proliferation should be strengthened. In order to have

communication between the IAEA and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the Security Council be strengthened. General Managers must be invited by the Security Council twice a year on the status of safeguards and verification processes as well as about any concerns that they may be less serious than an actual violation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Chemical Weapons Convention report to the Council. The Security Council needs to deploy inspection capacities for suspected nuclear and chemical violations ready And capabilities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to design.

Conclusion

The threat of nuclear proliferation and the challenges facing the international community so that the total risk of the spread of this destructive and irreversible effects of the proliferation and use of weapons and that the international community is faced with a serious security threat. It is necessary to take steps to disarm nuclear weapons possessor states to re-take But the nuclear non-proliferation regime is now at risk because of the lack of strict adherence to existing commitments, withdrawal or threats of withdrawal from the treaty to evade its obligations, international security environment variable and dissemination of technology We're getting to the point that the destruction of the nonproliferation regime could become irreversible and lead to a wave of proliferation of nuclear proliferation. Governments are, the more widespread And the need to explain the new situation, the responsibility of governments to explore the causes of responsibility and put again. It is through taking responsibility to protect that state sovereignty is under threat because it challenges the sovereignty of states. The challenge is that human rights are within the jurisdiction of the government. The responsibility to protect three specific responsibilities: Responsible for reconstruction Responsibility for reaction ,Responsibility for prevention. In this case, what can be used as the basis of the responsibility to protect nuclear weapons theory is that the theory of the need to eliminate threats to international security talks Therefore it is necessary to take steps to disarm a nuclear weapon states to stop this. The first and most immediate concern is that the countries covered by its current membership in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in secret and illegal weapons programs to develop wide Or they act within the framework of the term but probably not in the spirit of the treaty. The second concern is that the long-term erosion and possible collapse of the entire system of compact. So now and then mentioned above can be easily inserted into the cause and the responsibility to protect nuclear weapons in theory. But it should be mentioned that the international community is also aware of the threat of nuclear weapons to international security and the measures taken. The guidelines of international law towards the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the light of the general rules of international law and international instruments and the advisory opinion of the Court, to explain its position of international law to nuclear weapons. Disarmament and arms control issues (nuclear weapons is an example of it) as one of the most important issues of international law and a step towards the realization of the dream of peace and security is considered. International law prohibits the production and proliferation of nuclear weapons should be in three areas, prohibiting the use of these weapons until the complete removal and destruction of existing weapons be considered. In the context of a ban on the use of nuclear weapons, to date no way binding treaty that explicitly and countries from using these weapons in an armed conflict does not prohibit. NPT. P. T. Also includes provisions that prohibit countries from using such weapons. But there are general rules and binding with respect to the characteristics of nuclear weapons, accompanied by lack of respect for the rules of use of nuclear weapons. In other words, the use of such weapons is not possible without violating the general rules. Thus, the legal rules governing the nuclear weapons can be in the light of the general rules of international law and the specific provisions of this weapon, which has been reflected in international instruments studied. In light of the general rules that could theoretically use of nuclear weapons with international requirements (for world peace) is incompatible no thought of these weapons are allowed. Here are some general rules are: The spirit and purpose of the Charter: the purpose of the establishment of the United Nations, to maintain international peace and security in the whole of the international community to adopt peaceful means to resolve international disputes. If only benefit nuclear weapons, as has been said, its inhibition properties, this feature though is the way to prevent armed conflict, but peace in an atmosphere of panic and fear that it appears, in the spirit of the UN Charter not compatible. In light of the specific provisions relating to nuclear weapons, it can be noted that the system of multilateral disarmament treaties have been looking The achievement of international efforts in the field of nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction is one of the examples, except in a few cases the treaties to keep some areas free of nuclear weapons and the prohibition of nuclear tests above, is nothing more than the creation of horizontal non-proliferation regime . Treaties banning nuclear tests in the steps that have been taken to prohibit reproduction. The first is treaty banning nuclear tests in part. Comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests in this context that the second treaty after the September 24, 1996 resolution of the UN General Assembly, New York City was open for signature by states. The treaty has not entered into force. Treaties without some areas of the nuclear weapons that the concept of a zone free of nuclear weapons are essential to widen the concept of expansion. The obligations of States Parties to the NPT to ban the production, acquisition or control of nuclear weapons is limited while the nuclear-weapon states can allow such weapons to non-nuclear weapon states in the soil under the supervision of the incumbents have. The State party to the Convention free of nuclear weapons development and acquisition of such weapons is not only the right but not in any way accept the deployment of

nuclear weapons on its soil. But in answer to the question of the responsibility to protect, strengthen the existing mechanisms of international law in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is what can be said that Responsibility to protect these guidelines theory and the theory of responsibility to protect the approaches taken action to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be laminated. The first layer of an effective strategy to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to reduce the demand for it has not been universal tool. Countries with nuclear weapons should its previous commitments on non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states that are reaffirmed. They should be perceived value of nuclear weapons reduction and international cooperation to stop the spread of these weapons to strengthen. The second layer should contain global instruments governing the supply is to limit the capacity of state and non-state actors to acquire weapons and the materials and expertise needed to build them And coincide with the goals of achieving a more efficient system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the right of all signatories of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to develop civilian nuclear industry, considered And the third layer should consist of Security Council enforcement measures according to reliable information, analysis and communication among Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Security Council to be strengthened.

REFERENCES

1. 2001 ICISS Report (The Responsibility to Protect).para3-8
2. Peters, Anne, (2009), 'Humanity as the A and of Sovereignty', *The European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 20 No. 3.p, 535
3. UN.Doc A/RES/60/1)
4. Badescu Cristina G., (2009), & Bergholm, Linnea, the Responsibility to protect and the Conflict in Darfur: The Big Let-Down, *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 40, No. 3 p, 290
5. McClean, Emma, (2008), 'the Responsibility to Protect: The Role of International Human Rights Law, *Journal of Conflict & Security Law*, Vol. 13 No. 1, p 150
6. Bellamy, Alex J., (2008), 'The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of Military Intervention' , *International Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 4, p.621
7. Focarelli, Carlo, (2008), 'The Responsibility to Protect Doctrine and Humanitarian Intervention, *Journal of Conflict & Security Law*, Vol. 13, No. 2,p.200
8. Nasu, Hitoshi, (2009), Operationalizing the 'Responsibility to Protect' and Conflict Prevention, *Journal of Conflict & Security Law*, Vol. 14, No. 2,p.209
9. W.H.A.Res.46/40, 14 May, 1993.
10. G.A.Res. 49/75k, Dec., 1994.
11. Momtaz, Jamshid , The legitimacy of the use of nuclear weapons in public international law, *Portal of Humanities*, 2006, Page 3
12. Professor Charles Rousseau, law of armed conflict, translated by Dr. Seyed Ali Hanjan, first edition 1990, Vol. I, p. 142.
13. saed,nader, international law and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, *Institute of Legal Studies and Research in knowledge*, first edition 1384, p. 109
14. Fragvnd, hadi, the international community and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, *Journal of Imam Sadiq University*, No. 18 and 19, 1388, Page 34
15. Jozef Goldblat, nuclear weapon free zone a history and assessment, *The Non proliferation: Review/Spring-Summer 1997*, P.23
16. Kerstin Vignard, Nuclear-weapon-free zones, *Disarmament Forum*, June 2011, P, 40
17. Joint Declarations five nuclear power member of the NPT On 6 April 1995
18. Advisory opinion, I.C.J.Reports ,Legality of the use by a state of Nuclear Weapons in Armed Conflicts, , 1996,p.10,paras .20 and 21.
19. Doswald-Beck,L., "International Humanitarian Law and the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, " *International Review of the red Cross*,1997,p.54
20. Hearn,W., "The international Legal Regime Regulating Nuclear Deterrence and Warfare, " *British Yearbook of International Law*, 1990,p.238.
- 21- Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, Choices for the 21st Century Education Program, Nuclear Weapons: What Should Our Policy Be?, available at: www.choices.edu/resources/ballots.php.
22. <http://www.un.org/secureworld/>