

проведения любых ядерных испытаний. В этой связи следует отметить, что к настоящему времени все официально признанные ядерные державы добровольно воздерживаются от проведения ядерных испытаний: Россия, США и Великобритания – с конца 1980-х гг., а Франция и Китай – с середины 1990-х. Непризнанные же "ядерные государства" – Индия и Пакистан в 1998 году провели ядерные испытания, но сегодня они также придерживаются моратория.

Генеральная Ассамблея ООН в своей резолюции, принятой на 58-й сессии 19 декабря 2003 года, еще раз призвала государства скорее подписать и (или) ратифицировать ДВЗЯИ, а также воздерживаться от действий, которые лишили бы его объекта и цели.

1. Закон Республики Казахстан от 30 мая 2005 г. № 54-III ЗРК "О международных договорах Республики Казахстан" // Казахстанская правда. – 2005. – 4 июня (Далее Закон РК "О международных договорах...").

2. Там же.

3. Там же.

4. Действующее международное право. В 3-х томах. Составители Ю.М. Колосов и Э.С. Кривчикова. Т. 2. – М.: Изд-во Московского независимого института международного права, 1997. – С. 339, 340.

5. Там же. – С. 349, 350.

6. Там же. – С. 372-373.

7. Информационная система "Параграф", 2011. Режим доступа: < http://online.prg.kz/Document/Default.aspx?doc_id=30366217>

8. Конституция Республики Казахстан. – 2-е изд. – Алматы: Жеті жарғы, 1998. – С. 6.

9. Закон РК "О международных договорах...".

10. Постановление Конституционного совета Республики Казахстан. г. Астана, 11 октября 2006 г., № 18/2. Об

официальном толковании пункта 3 статьи 4 Конституции Республики Казахстан // Казахстанская правда. – 2000. – 28 октября.

11. Информационная система "Параграф", 2011. Режим доступа: < http://online.prg.kz/Document/Default.aspx?doc_id=30776062>

12. См.: Пояснительная записка Министерства энергетики и минеральных ресурсов РК к проекту Закона Республики Казахстан "О ратификации Соглашения между Правительством Республики Казахстан и Подготовительной комиссией Организации по Договору о всеобъемлющем запрещении ядерных испытаний о проведении мероприятий, включая постсертификационные мероприятия, на объектах по международному мониторингу в поддержку Договора о всеобъемлющем запрещении ядерных испытаний", совершенного в городе Вене 9 сентября 2004 года, в Мажилис Парламента Республики Казахстан.

13. Закон РК "О международных договорах...".

14. Соглашение между Правительством Республики Казахстан и Подготовительной комиссией Организации по Договору о всеобъемлющем запрещении ядерных испытаний о проведении мероприятий, включая постсертификационные мероприятия, на объектах по международному мониторингу в поддержку Договора о всеобъемлющем запрещении ядерных испытаний от 9 сентября 2004 г. с Приложением I // Текущий архив Министерства иностранных дел Республики Казахстан.

15. Там же.

16. Действующее международное право. Документы в 2-х т. Т. 1. Составители Ю.М. Колосов, Э.С. Кривчикова. Учебное пособие. – М.: Междунар. отношения, Юрайт-Издат, 2007. – С. 522.

Аталмыш мақалада ядролық сынауларға жан-жақты тыйым салу туралы Шартты қолдауға қатысты Қазақстан Республикасының ресми көзқарасы ғылыми тұрғыдан жинақты қорытындылады.

The article generally considered from a scientific point of view, the official position of the Republic of Kazakhstan to support the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty.

Б. Айтхожаева

THE PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS OF THE WORLD NUCLEAR POLICY

The getting rid of nuclear weapons is the desire of many people of goodwill from the outset of the nuclear era. There are few countries as Kazakhstan, which was fully cognizant the horrors of nuclear testing, closed the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site and voluntarily renounced the world's fourth largest nuclear missile potential, and at present is a staunch supporter of global non-proliferation process and to reduce the nuclear threat in close cooperation with the IAEA. Kazakhstan has always been in the

forefront of the antinuclear movement. In addition to the principle persuasions of non-proliferation of these weapons, Kazakhstan proposes concrete steps to get better the global situation. And, what about other countries, which have opportunity to deploy nuclear weapons? What is their main policy of deploying of WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction)? Before turning to these cases, we first dwell on some important facts of history.

So, the nuclear-missile confrontation between the USSR and the U.S.A had begun at the base and in terms of the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations - the world order, which was established by the victorious powers in the Second World War - and in a certain sense it was both transformation and development of that world order at the same time. That fact imposed the tangible restrictions on confrontation and political use of nuclear deterrence: it would be politically difficult to destroy the world order which had been extracted so dearly, the consequences of its destruction risked to remain illegitimate not only in the eyes of the world community, but also from the standpoint of internal law of the State destroyer for a long time [1, C.1].

Today there are about 40 states which have the technical capacity to produce nuclear weapons. And, if possession of the WMD has been the privilege of strong states in the twentieth century, that the reverse trend is fixed in the XXI century. This weapon attracts weak states, calculated to compensate for its military-technological lag with its help. It is therefore quite natural that, although the role of nuclear deterrence of the Great Powers is getting down, none of them will have ever renounced its nuclear status. In accordance with the NPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty), only those states had carried out and tested the nuclear weapons before 1 January 1967 were recognized as nuclear powers. These countries are the USA, Russia, Britain, France and China. Let us regard the nuclear policy of these five countries.

The USA were the first country in the world, became the owner of nuclear weapons. Also they did not only the first conduct nuclear tests in July 1945, but the first (and only!) which used it for military purposes - destroyed the Japanese cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in August the same year.

The USA's nuclear doctrine has repeatedly changed for over six decades. In January 2002 a report on the status of nuclear weapons was presented to the U.S. Congress, which set out the main provisions of the U.S. nuclear strategy and the directions of development and transformation of the U.S. nuclear forces the next 5-10 years were planned [3, C. 5]. The report noted that the nuclear capability of the United States had unique properties, played an important role in the defense system the United States, its allies and friends, afforded to solve important strategic and political objectives, provided the military capability to deter a wide range of threats, including the WMD and large-scale conventional arms forces. Nuclear forces are the main means of an effective containment

strategy against a wide range of potential enemies in a variety of unexpected situations.

The Opportunities of nuclear strikes of various sizes, coverage and direction will be supplemented by other military means. Therefore, the U.S.A. need a new combination of nuclear, nonnuclear and defensive forces to repel a variety of enemies and unexpected threats, the United States may face in coming decades. Thus, the Pentagon established a new strategic triad, consisting of [4, C. 5]:

- Offensive strike systems (nuclear and non-nuclear);
- Defensive (active and passive);
- Update the defensive infrastructure to provide new opportunities to counter emerging threats.

In this case, the first component of the triad - offensive - should exceed the triad since the Cold War - intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), ballistic missiles launched from submarines and nuclear bombers of a long range action. Defensive systems, not allowing limited strikes and reducing their effectiveness, in combination with the ability of the United States to strike back could prevent an attack and create new opportunities for settlement crisis situations, to get improve the situation of the United States in a regional confrontation, to provide safeguards against the means destruction of any traditional deterrence. Updated nuclear infrastructure should allow the U.S. to get rid of unnecessary weapons and reduce the risk of technical problems [4, C. 6].

Russia. Works on mastering the nuclear energy began in the Soviet Union a little later than in the U.S. - 11 February 1943, when № 2 Laboratory of Academy of Sciences of the USSR was established "... to disclose the ways of mastering the energy of the fission of uranium and studies the possibility of military application of energy uranium " [4, C.6]. And just as in the U.S., after 6 years - August 29, 1949 - at the Semipalatinsk test site successfully completed the first Soviet explosion of a nuclear bomb. Thus U.S. nuclear monopoly ended only four years. Thus, a plan of Joint Chiefs of Staff U.S. Armed Forces (Plan "Pincher") to conduct a nuclear war against the Soviet Union was in fact disavowed [4, C.6].

As for Russia, the "National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation until 2020 and the Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation stated that "... in modern conditions the Russian Federation proceeds from the need to possess nuclear capability that can guaranteed provide infliction of set damage to any aggressor (state or coalition of states) in all conditions. In this case, nuclear weapons, which are equipped with the Armed Forces of the Russian

Federation are regarded as a factor in deterring aggression, safeguarding the military security of the Russian Federation and its allies to maintain international peace and stability by the Russian Federation " [4, C.7].

United Kingdom is the third in the world of nuclear power, which carried out their first nuclear test on Oct. 3, 1952. Works on the British atomic project had begun in 1940, scientists not only from England but also from the U.S., Canada and France were participated in it. Creation of the atomic bomb took 12 years and cost 150 million pound sterling

According to the executive director of the British-American Security Information Council (BASIC), in February 23, 2006 *United Kingdom* took part in the so-called subcritical nuclear weapons tests in the framework of the U.S. nuclear stockpile management program in Nevada desert, the U.S., through which the safety and reliability nuclear weapons of the USA are ensured. He also mentioned the investment about 1.7 billion dollars, intended to ensure the safety of the existing arsenal of Trident nuclear missiles in the English nuclear center, Aldermaston. Nevertheless, the director of the BASIC said that additional subsidies might mean that currently an elaboration of a new type of nuclear weapons was being developed [5, C.3].

At the end of 2006, British Prime Minister Tony Blair said that he planned to launch the mechanism of replacement and modernization of the state's nuclear arsenal before his departure. Trident missile system, placed on four nuclear submarines of a class "Vanguard" should be fully updated to 2025 years. This program is required about 25 billion pound sterling (\$ 46 billion) [6, C. 8]. The British government intended to reduce their nuclear arsenals by 20%. The exact number of British nuclear warheads, remaining on fighting duty, will be significantly reduced and consist of less than 160 units [6, C. 8].

At the same time, in February 2009, British Foreign Minister David Miliband called on leading countries to begin negotiations on nuclear disarmament. He expressed a hope that the United States, China, France, Britain and Russia could find a way to "possibly complete elimination of nuclear arsenals." In addition, David Miliband, told in favor of maintaining a strict policy in the sphere of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in particular, with respect to Iran, and called on leaders of major nuclear powers to hold a meeting on nuclear disarmament [6, C.9].

Great Britain, giving priority to political, diplomatic and economic means to achieve national objectives clearly defines its desire to resolve

conflicts in the world from a position of power and maintain the principles of nuclear deterrence while maintaining the leading role of strategic nuclear deterrence at the global level in military doctrine.

France was the fourth country, became the owner of nuclear weapons and performed nuclear testing using American equipment in the Sahara Desert, on Feb. 13, 1960. "The White Paper on Defense" («Белая книга по вопросам обороны»), which was published in 1994, stated that the basis for France's military doctrine was a strategy of deterrence and containment, which was based on the position of the obligatory presence consisting of the Armed Forces of the country's strategic nuclear forces and tactical nuclear weapons, which had been considered as a means of "last warning" potential enemy about France's readiness to strike strategic nuclear weapons. The core of that strategy was to "prevent any potential aggressor to encroach upon the vital interests of France by creating threats that it would be undergone in this case." And further it stated that "it was talking about a causing the damage to the aggressor, which was equal in size, at least, for a benefit, which France expected." As potential enemies, the objects which could be applied the nuclear weapons, potential possessors of nuclear weapons have been considered, capable of resorting to its use against France " [7, C.7].

Actively France started rethinking the problems of the nuclear weapons after re-election of Jacques Chirac in 2002. The French strategic doctrine of nuclear deterrence, which inserting into the coalition of NATO nuclear strategy, envisages that the French warheads are focused not only on countries that possess nuclear weapons. Now, any country (nuclear or non-nuclear) that threatens national security or strategic interests of France may be subjected by the French striking strategic forces [8, C. 3].

In modern conditions France considers the nuclear forces not only as a tool to deter the enemy, which the nuclear potential is greater than the French, but also as a deterrent to potential owners of weapons of mass destruction, capable of resorting to its use against France [9, C.2].

China closes the list of de jure nuclear weapon states. Military-political leadership of China issued from the fact that the country should have the Arm Force with modern weapons, including the nuclear since the first years of China establishment [10, C.1]. The first Chinese nuclear program, adopted in 1951, was for purely peaceful purposes, but in the mid 1950's it was supplemented by secret section with a point to establish their own nuclear weapons and its carriers. Decision to produce the atomic

bomb was made by Mao Zedong on 15 January 1955 in response to the U.S. threats to use nuclear weapons against China. The first Chinese atomic bomb was tested in 13 years – on October 16, 1964.

Immediately after testing its first nuclear device on Oct. 16, 1964, China declared the refusal of using the nuclear weapons first. China followed the path of preemptive production of the thermonuclear nuclear weapons and creation of the ballistic missiles and land-based aircraft bombs. Currently, China has both strategic and nonstrategic nuclear weapons. China's nuclear forces include the strategic rocket forces (CRP), a strategic aviation (SA) and a nuclear missile fleet. The total number of nuclear weapons delivery vehicles of the strategic fixing had consisted 244 units by 1 January 2007.

China's nuclear policy is directed toward at ensuring the implementation of the national development strategy. The main tasks of China's current nuclear strategy can be formulated as follows [10, C.4]:

- maintenance of great power status;
- preventing all forms of influences by other nuclear powers in the policy and economy of China by means of nuclear deterrence;
- maintaining superiority over the rival countries and of China in the Asia-Pacific region.

The role of nuclear weapons in the framework of a national security is expressed primarily in the concept of a limited nuclear strike-back, providing for a limited construction of the nuclear deterrent force on the fighting strength, capable by creating a threat of striking of a significant damage to the potential enemy to make it to renounce the use of nuclear weapons against China. Thus, we can say that China's nuclear doctrine is differential: at the strategic level, it continues to lean on minimum deterrence, but at the regional level, is based on limited deterrence.

At the same time, according to SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute), by state in January 2007, in addition to nuclear five, at least another four states possess nuclear weapons. These are: India - about 50 nuclear warheads, Pakistan – 60, Israel - about 100, North Korea - about 6 nuclear warheads [11, C.7]. Why do these countries deploy nuclear weapons, while the main actors of international relations are trying to take measures to reduce this type of the WMD? India and Pakistan are good examples to find an answer this question.

India received nuclear weapons in 1974. In the current conditions the strategic concepts of India are based on the implementation of reliable minimum

nuclear deterrence and the ability to an adequate retaliation if deterrence is an ineffective. In January 2003 the Government of India announced the establishment of a strategic nuclear command, which was called on to streamline and formalize the procedure for making decisions on the use of nuclear weapons by India. At the same time a new nuclear doctrine was approved, which the provisions of it could be summarized as follows [4, C.14]:

- India plans to build and develop the potential of minimally rational containment;
- India proclaims the principle of non-application the nuclear weapons first - it can be used only as a reply to a nuclear attack on Indian territory or the Indian Military Power;
- the nuclear strike, which can be defeated only with sanctions of the civil political leadership of the country, will be massive, with the calculation result in irreparable damage;
- the nuclear weapons can not be applied against non-nuclear state;
- India reserves the right to answer nuclear strike in the case of large-scale military attack with the use of chemical or biological weapons against India or Indian Military Power.

Thus, the US-Indian cooperation in the nuclear sphere is actively growing, despite the fact that India has never signed the NPT. In addition, India and the United States started consultations on the implementation of the US-India agreement on partnership in civil nuclear energy, signed in March 2006. The document provides for the separation of Indian civilian and military nuclear programs to the transfer of peaceful development, and 35 civilian nuclear facilities under the control of the country of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In return, the U.S. pledged to provide India the technology of reactors and nuclear fuel for its civilian programs.

Pakistan started its nuclear program in 1965, and it put the first nuclear tests over a third-century – on 28 May 1998. There is no nuclear doctrine in the form of an official document in Pakistan, but in practice the Pakistani leadership adheres to the following key principles [12, C.3]:

- A minimum persuasive nuclear deterrence, focusing on India;
- The principle of massive retaliation;
- Policy for use nuclear weapons first;
- Targeting the equivalent of nuclear weapons;
- Decentralized structure of the nuclear command and control (control).

Leaning, in contrast to India, on the principle of using nuclear weapons first, Islamabad has

formulated four basic factors, when Pakistan uses the nuclear weapons against India:

- Conventional or nuclear attack Pakistan by India and its occupation of much of Pakistan's territory (space threshold);
- Destruction of the most ground or air forces of Pakistan (military threshold) by India's;
- A significant economic damage to Pakistan by India or the economic blockade against Pakistan (economic strangling), organized by India;
- Implementation of political instability or major sabotage inside the country (domestic destabilization) by India's.

According to the official position of Pakistan, the main function of its nuclear arsenal is not to give India an opportunity to take up the country in any way. The second objective of Pakistan's policy in the sphere nuclear weapons is to deter India's superiority in the attack on Pakistan aircraft with the use of conventional weapons.

All these countries that can create nuclear weapons and do not fall into one or another system of guaranteed its security (North Korea, Iran), do not abandon its creation as we see. And today, according to various estimates, there are from 20 to 45 countries are able to create nuclear weapons. Why do so many countries want to have the nuclear weapons? The answer is easy: the nuclear weapons are often designed to intimidate others, and being developed, serves as an instrument of such deterrent. For example, In 2008, Russia had threatened Poland and the Czech with nuclear strike if they agreed to participate in the planned while placing U.S. missile defense system. In 1996, one of the representatives of China threatened to wipe out Los Angeles if the U.S. undertook certain commitments to Taiwan's defense. Unlike the U.S., the Russian military doctrine spelled out the options when Moscow could use nuclear weapons for a first strike [4, C.16]. As for Iran's nuclear program, then at least, does someone believe that they are not motivated by the desire of frightening. Thus, the desire to possess nuclear weapons becomes insurmountable if the relationship with neighbors is too saturated with hostility and distrust. For instance, the mistrust between India and Pakistan is so deeply that both one and the other side consider that without its own military atom they can not exist at one time. And, of course, many countries have nuclear weapons necessary for defense. Exactly case is going with 31 states, which are under U.S. nuclear umbrella - in this scheme the United States commit itself to maintain its own nuclear arsenal and use it in defense of other countries. Most of these countries refused to develop its own nuclear

weapons, on condition that the U.S. weapons of deterrence would continue to exist and properly perform its functions.

Supporters of "the world's nuclear scratch" sometimes argue that if the U.S. and Russia destroy its nuclear arsenal, the other countries will follow suit. But where is the evidence of this? The United States has been moving toward nuclear disarmament unilaterally since 1991: during this period the number of warheads on combat duty has been reduced from 13,000 to less than 2200; nuclear tests have been ceased, no new warheads have been developed and produced, even the production of fissile materials for nuclear warheads has been discontinued. However, no one of nuclear state persuaded to move in that direction with all these actions.

As long as even one country would threaten other nuclear weapons, they need to have the possibility of nuclear response. Even the suspicion of nuclear blackmail would give a reason for the requirements to maintain an appropriate deterrent. Supporters of "zero" argue that such suspicions can be overcome rigid screening procedures. But the facts tell a different story: did checking of the International Atomic Energy Agency prevent the holding of secret and illicit programs in North Korea? And in Iran? And in Iraq? And when do you find that, for example, Iran, in violation of international law has developed nuclear weapons that the UN or "international community" can concretely do something to protect those countries that these weapons will endanger directly?

We can imagine that all countries without exception seriously has thought about the renunciation of nuclear weapons and agreed inspection regime in principle. But would it be not true to expect that someone would dare to deceive others, especially considering that at the approach to "global zero" it would be an opportunity to become the only nuclear power on the planet in this case? From current national leaders it would be irresponsible not to consider such options.

There are other, even more correct ways to reduce the possibility of practical use of nuclear weapons. In 2004 the resolution number 1540, which requires all members of the adoption and enforcement of national laws to ban the production and trafficking of nuclear materials, was adopted by UN Security Council - but many countries need assistance in implementing these measures. Considerable progress has been made under the Initiative to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (Proliferation Security Initiative), promoting multilateral cooperation to interdict

nuclear materials during their international flights.

The second version of refusing nuclear weapons is an initiative of the "Global Zero". A group of prominent politicians and military men from around the world, united in the framework of the "Global Zero", presented a plan for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons on the planet in 2030 on the eve of the visit of United States President Barack Obama to Moscow [13, С.10]. It includes four stages:

- The U.S. and Russia agree to reduce their arsenals to 1,000 warheads.

- Moscow and Washington will lower the threshold to 500 units by 2021. All the other nuclear powers (China, Britain, France, India, Pakistan, Israel) agree to freeze and subsequently reduce their arsenals of strategic weapons.

- From 2019 to 2023 - the conclusion of an Agreement on "Global Zero", with phase-out schedule verifiable reductions in all nuclear arsenals down to a minimum.

- From 2024 to 2030 - the process should be finalized, and the verification system would continue to work.

Thus, at present, all official nuclear powers, while supporting the trend to some quantifiable reduction of their nuclear arsenals, are not going to completely abandon nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future.

Formal basis for today's talk on a nuclear-free world is the Article VI of the NPT (opened for signature in 1968 and came into force on March 5, 1970), which states: "Each Party to the Treaty undertakes to pursue in good faith negotiations on effective measures to halt the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control" [14, С.2].

It is necessary to imagine where the existing world is going, in what ways it will develop to understand whether all possible transition to full and universal nuclear disarmament. And in what ways its safety will be ensured.

Such vision of the future reinforces the belief that nuclear weapons, most likely, will not disappear from the arsenal of political and military means in the coming century and will be present

and accounted for in the relations between the nuclear powers and the rest of the world even indefinitely. Though the struggle of the international community for nuclear non-proliferation is enhanced in many countries the possession of nuclear weapons would be a vital prerequisite for our own survival.

1. Косолапов Н.А. Ядерное сдерживание в современном постбиополярном мире: логика идеи и средства реализации.//

<http://www.nationalsecurity.ru/library/00029/index.htm>;

2. Соловьев В. Ядерная доктрина США. Независимое Военное Обозрение, 2002, 22 марта, http://nvo.ng.ru/wars/2002-03-22/1_doctrine.html;

3. Васильевич Р.А. Большая ядерная игра в XXI веке: разоружение или война?// http://www.perspectivy.info/rus/konturi/bolshaja_jadernaja_igra_v_xxi_veke_razoruzhenije_ili_vojna_2010-04-02.htm;

4. Великобритания провела первые за четыре года ядерные испытания, 2006, 24 февраля, <http://www.lenta.ru/news/2006/02/24/bomb/>

5. Кирилов Р. Блэр открывает дебаты по ядерному оружию, РБК Daily, 2006, 20 ноября, <http://www.rbcdaily.ru/2006/11/20/focus/250424>

6. Невзоров А. Ядерный национализм по-французски-2. Агентство политических новостей, 2005, 18 февраля, <http://www.apn.ru/publications/article1292.htm>

7. Гусейнов Э.Ф. Франция готова нанести превентивный удар - новая ядерная доктрина Франции. Национальная Безопасность, <http://www.nationalsecurity.ru/library/00028/00028nuclearfrance.htm>

8. Сосновский М.Е. Ядерная политика и ядерное оружие Франции. Национальная Оборона, № 4, 2006, <http://www.iss.niit.ru/pub/pub-98.pdf>

10. Золотарев П.С. Современная ядерная стратегия Китая. 2009, 2 апреля, <http://www.warand-peace.ru/ru/analysis/vprint/34192/>

11. Ежегодник СИПРИ 2007: вооружения, разоружение и международная безопасность. М.: ИМЭМО РАН, 2008. 894 с.

12. Сотников В.И. Ядерная доктрина Пакистана, 2009, 25 марта, <http://www.iimes.ru/rus/stat/2009/25-03-09.htm>

13. Терехов А. Полное ядерное разоружение возможно. Независимое Военное Обозрение, 2009, 10 июля, http://nvo.ng.ru/concepts/2009-07-10/6_razoruzhenie.html

14. <http://www.armscontrol.ru/start/rus/docs/npt.htm>

В статье рассматривается актуальная проблема ядерной политики таких стран, как США, Российская Федерация, Франция, КХР и др. Также затрагиваются принципы военных доктрин стран государств, которые владеют ЯО.

Мақалада АҚШ-тың, ҚХР-дың, РФ-ның, Францияның және т.б. мемлекеттердің ядролық саясаттағы өзекті мәселелері, ядролық қаруға ие мемлекеттердің әскери доктриналарындағы басты қағидалары қарастырылған.