Political Institutions and their Role in the Foreign Policy of Denmark

L. Dubinka-Hushcha

For citation: Dubinka-Hushcha L. Political Institutions and their Role in the Foreign Policy of Denmark. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History,* 2022, vol. 67, issue 1, pp. 174–189. https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2022.112

This article focuses on the historical development of political institutions in Denmark after the Second World War and their influence on foreign policy decision-making. This is in line with an emergent trend in the second half of the 20th century reflected in the increasing power of Folketing (the Danish Parliament) driven by a growing number of special parliamentary commissions responsible for particular aspects of foreign policy. It follows from the study that the political system of Denmark has been characterized by continuity, stability and predictability since the Second World War. The example of Danish foreign policy demonstrates that socio-political stability and a high level of economic development combined with an active multilateral diplomacy is one of the most efficient soft power instruments to enhance the international image of a country. The article distinguishes institutional prerequisites for this development based on the analysis of the political actors and their involvement in the formation of the foreign policy. The unique decision-making system has allowed Denmark to achieve a remarkable success in defending and promoting its national interests, skillfully manoeuvring between great powers and ensuring the continuity of its foreign policy regardless of the coalition in power. In spite of its relevance, there is still a gap in the studies of foreign policy of small states in post-Soviet historiography. The empirical base of this research is comprised of publications in Nordic languages as well as in Polish and Russian, collected and studied by the author in the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen, the National library of Russia in Saint Petersburg, the National Library of Poland, the National Library of Iceland, and from online resources.

Keywords: Denmark, small states, political institutions, foreign policy.

Lizaveta A. Dubinka-Hushcha — PhD (History), Copenhagen Business School, Assistant Lecturer, 24B, Porcelænshaven, Frederiksberg, 2000, Denmark; Ld.egb@cbs.dk

Елизавета Олеговна Дубинко-Гуща — PhD (История), Копенгагенская высшая школа бизнеса, преп., Дания, 2000, Фредериксберг, ул. Порцелавнсхавен, 24B; Ld.egb@cbs.dk

Results of this research were presented in the workshop “Scandinavian Internationalist Diplomacy” organised by Södertörn University on February 23–25, 2021.

Результаты данного исследования были представлены на научном семинаре “Scandinavian Internationalist Diplomacy”, организованном Университетом Сёдертёрна 23–25 февраля 2021 г.

Роль политических институтов во внешней политике Дании

Е. О. Дубинко-Гуща

Для цитирования: *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Political Institutions and their Role in the Foreign Policy of Denmark // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2022. Т. 67. Вып. 1. С. 174–189. https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2022.112

Данная статья посвящена историческому развитию политических институтов в Дании после Второй мировой войны и их влиянию на принятие внешнеполитических решений. Это согласуется с наметившейся со второй половины XX в. тенденцией, которая нашла отражение в усилении власти Фолькетинга (датского парламента), обусловленного растущим числом специальных парламентских комиссий, отвечающих за определенные аспекты внешней политики. Исследование показывает, что политическая система Дании после Второй мировой войны характеризовалась преемственностью, стабильностью и предсказуемостью. Пример датской внешней политики демонстрирует, что социально-политическая стабильность и высокий уровень экономического развития в сочетании с активной многосторонней дипломатией является одним из наиболее эффективных инструментов мягкой силы для улучшения международного имиджа страны. В статье выделяются институциональные предпосылки этого развития на основе анализа политических акторов и их участия в формировании внешней политики. Уникальная система принятия решений позволила Дании добиться замечательных успехов в защите и продвижении своих национальных интересов, умело маневрируя между великими державами и обеспечивая преемственность своей внешней политики независимо от коалиции, находящейся у власти. Несмотря на актуальность, все еще существует пробел в исследованиях внешней политики малых государств в постсоветской историографии. Эмпирическую базу исследования составляют публикации на 10 языках, собранные и изученные автором в Датской национальной библиотеке, Российской национальной библиотеке в Санкт-Петербурге, Польской национальной библиотеке, Исландской национальной библиотеке, а также на официальных интернет-ресурсах Дании. Работа представляет собой вклад в изучение внешней политики малых государств на примере Дании.

Ключевые слова: Дания, малые государства, политические институты, внешняя политика.

Introduction

The Kingdom of Denmark is located at the intersection of important maritime routes from the Baltic to the North Sea, which has historically been the main strategic and economic factor in its foreign policy. Another essential component of Denmark's geopolitical position is its dependent territories in the Atlantic Ocean — Greenland and the Faroe Islands. This region is of key importance for the Denmark's relations with such large states as the USA, Canada, Russia, and China. For instance, Denmark was in the center of attention in connection with the US' plans to modernize the missile defence system in Greenland.

As a small country, Denmark has demonstrated a remarkable success in defending and promoting its national interests, skilfully manoeuvring between great powers and ensuring the continuity of its foreign policy regardless of the coalition in power. Globally, Denmark has proved to be a respectable partner in combating poverty, global warming, and peacekeeping operations. The example of Danish foreign policy demonstrates that so-

cio-political stability and a high level of economic development combined with an active multilateral diplomacy is one of the most efficient soft power instruments to enhance the international image of a country.

The purpose of the article is to show the evolution of political institutions and their influence on the foreign policy of Denmark in the second half of the 20th century. In spite of its particular relevance, there is still a gap in the studies foreign policy of small states in the post-Soviet historiography. This is even more evident since most of the states of the planet are small states with a population of up to 10 million people, who have 2/3 of the votes in the United Nations. The Danish experience is particularly interesting for countries like Belarus, which is situated on the dividing line between East and West and, provided the correct political and diplomatic means, can become a stabilizing factor in the region.

A significant transformation of the Danish political system in the second half of the 20th century was characterized by the following developments: 1) the expansion of parliamentary control over the foreign policy activities of the government expressed in the necessity of the government to receive special mandates from the Foreign Policy Committee (Det Udenrigspolitiske Nævn), the European Affairs Committee (Europaudvalget), the Foreign Affairs Committee (Udenrigsudvalget), and the Defence Committee (Forsvarsudvalget) in order to negotiate foreign policy issues with the EU and other international organizations; 2) the consensus on foreign policy issues among the main political parties, which helped to ensure the continuity of Denmark's foreign policy and sustainability of its political system in case of potential external crises and threats; 3) the increased use of the institution of a national referendum as a foreign policy tool when it comes to making decisions about transferring sovereign powers to supranational authorities, i. e., the European Communities.

The study, based on the analysis of Nordic and Russian literature, utilizing the historiographical method and a single case-study approach focuses on the foreign policy of Denmark rather than on a comparative perspective on small states. The object of study is the evolution of the institutional framework of the Danish foreign policy formation. An array of archival sources, official documents, reports and analytical documents of the Cabinet of Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has enabled to analyse the historical development of Danish political institutions and their influence on the foreign policy making in the period under investigation. The study contributes to an understanding of the changing functions of political and non-political actors and their growing impact on the foreign policy of Denmark. The empirical basis is comprised of the national legislation (documents regulating external non-political powers of authorities and relations of Denmark with other states)[1]. Another group of sources includes official documents, reports and analytical documents of the Cabinet of Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The changes in the institutional framework and the distribution of functions as well

[1] It includes, first of all, the current Danish Constitution from 1953 which determines the sociopolitical structure of the country, delineates the executive and legislative branches of government (monarch, government, parliament) and establishes the limits of their competences in foreign policy making. The current Constitution of Denmark secures the status of the Foreign Policy Committee as the main body for the coordination of the most important foreign political decisions between the branches of government. The main documents regulating the powers of the authorities in foreign policy issues are: the Law "On Ministry of Foreign Affairs" dated 04.13.1983; the Law "On some aspects of the work of the Export Council of Denmark" from 31.01.2000; the Law "On international humanitarian cooperation" dated 06.10.1971 with changes and additions; and others.

as the emerged peculiarities of the decision-making system in Denmark in the second half of the 20th century are illustrated by historical examples which make this study particularly interesting to historians of foreign policy and international relations.

Literature review

A classic work on the history of the Danish foreign policy, covering the period from the second half of the 19th century up until the late 1970s is a monograph by E. Bjøl "Hvem bestemmer" ("Who decides")[2], which contains a comparative analysis of Danish foreign policy actors, socio-political institutions and their impact on its foreign policy. N. Amstrup's "Foreign Policy of Denmark"[3] represents a systematic and structured account of foreign policy decision-making in Denmark, focusing on theoretical constructions and the hierarchy of foreign policy goals as a starting point for foreign policy analysis. The evolution of Danish security policy in 1975–1985 was a subject of a collective monograph by I. Faurby, H.-H. Holm and N. Petersen[4]. This monograph pays attention to the activities of the parliament as a result of its increased influence on Danish foreign policy in this period. The authors admit the correlation between the changes in the international system that created favourable conditions for a new alignment of Danish political forces in the 1980s.

The history of Danish parliamentarism is described in more detail in a collective work edited by N. J. Haagerup and C. Thune "Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken" ("Folketing and Foreign Policy")[5]. Two chapters are of particular interest for this study: K. Østergaard's[6] contribution to the Foreign Policy Committee, and C. Due-Nielsen's chapter on Folketing and foreign policy[7].

The relationship between Denmark's domestic and foreign policy was the subject of a collective monograph edited by E. Bjøl and O. K. Pedersen[8]. In the section "Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark" ("Foreign Policy and Parliamentarism in Denmark"), historian V. Sjøqvist analyses activities of commissions and committees in the Danish Parliament in the context of foreign policy since their creation[9]. More than 100 years' historical perspective allowed the author to evaluate the scale of changes both in the domestic and foreign policy of the country, which is particularly useful when studying the evolution of Denmark's foreign policy.

In "Danmark i en større verden: udenrigspolitiken efter 1945" ("Denmark in a larger world: foreign policy after 1945")[10], H. Branner analyses the evolution of foreign policy decision-making and small states' possibilities for manoeuvre in the politics of great powers within the framework of a bipolar system of international relations.

---

[2] *Bjøl E.* Hvem bestemmer?: studier i den udenrigspolitiske beslutningsproces. København, 1983.

[3] *Amstrup N.* Dansk udenrigspolitik. København, 1977.

[4] *Faurby I.* Kampen om sikkerheden. Nye tendenser i dansk politik. Aarhus, 1986.

[5] Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken / red. N. J. Haagerup, Ch. Thune. København, 1986.

[6] *Østergaard K.* Det udenrigpolitiske nævn // Ibid.

[7] *Due-Nielsen C.* Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken. København, 1986.

[8] *Bjøl E.* Historie og international politik // Nær og fjern: samspillet mellem indre og ydre politik. København, 1980.

[9] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark // Ibid.

[10] *Branner H.* Danmark i en større verden: udenrigspolitiken efter 1945. København, 1995.

In Russian scholarship, Danish constitutional law was analysed by M. A. Isaev[11]. Together with A. N. Chekansky and V. N. Shishkin he also co-authored a monograph on political systems of the Scandinavian countries and Finland[12]. Scandinavian model of parliamentarism was studied by M. Mogunova[13]. The only special study in post-Soviet historiography, devoted exclusively to Denmark, is A. N. Chekansky's monograph "The main problems of the development of institutions of intra-parliamentary democracy in Denmark: 1849–2000"[14], which is the most comprehensive review in the Russian-language literature on the history of formation and development of state institutions in Denmark.

The role of monarch in the foreign policy of Denmark

The political system of Denmark as a constitutional monarchy assumes that the monarch has supreme powers within the limits established by the Constitution in all matters of the Kingdom and exercises this supreme power through the ministers (Article 12 of the Danish Constitution)[15]. Officially, the Danish monarch acts on behalf of the Kingdom in international affairs. § 19 of the Danish Constitution sets out the limits within which the monarch can influence the foreign policy of the state. Thus, "*without the consent of the Folketing, the Monarch cannot sign acts according to which the territory of the Kingdom is increased or decreased, cannot accept obligations, the fulfilment of which requires agreement with the Folketing, or such obligations that are of particular importance; the Monarch has no right without the consent of the Folketing to denounce an international treaty concluded with the consent of the Folketing*"[16]. The monarch may use military forces against any foreign state without the consent of the Folketing only when it is necessary for the purpose of defence, i.e., in case of an armed attack on the Kingdom; however, any acts passed by the monarch are immediately referred to the Folketing.

On the one hand, the monarch's powers in foreign policy are very limited. However, there is a tradition of weekly meetings of the monarch with a prime minister and a foreign minister, in which foreign policy issues are discussed. Due to this practice, the Danish monarch is likely to be the most informed person in the state, who can be compared with an informal permanent minister of foreign affairs, who gains massive experience in international relations while always being in the office, and therefore can provide services and give valuable advice to the formal ministers of foreign affairs"[17].

One should not underestimate the significant role of the monarchy as a symbol of the unity of the nation, which allowed Denmark to maintain its integrity and independence at the most difficult stages of its history, as it was during the First and Second World Wars[18].

The representative role of the monarch in interstate relations is also great as it is (s)he, as the head of state, who signs all of the most important international agree-

[11] *Isaev M. A.* Osnovy konstitutsionnogo prava Danii. Moscow, 2002.

[12] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. Moscow, 2001.

[13] *Mogunova M. A.* Skandinavskii parlamentarizm: teoriia i praktika. Moscow, 2001.

[14] *Chekanskii A. N.* Osnovnye problemy razvitiia institutov vnutriparlamentskoi demokratii v Danii: 1849–2000. Moscow, 2003.

[15] *Danmarks Riges Grundlov* (Grundloven), givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. juni 1953. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/1953/169 (accessed: 20.01.2021).

[16] Ibid.

[17] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 259.

[18] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 64.

ments[19]. According to the protocol, the Minister of Foreign Affairs always accompanies the monarch on foreign visits, taking part in meetings with foreign governments. This, among other things, provides Danish diplomacy with ample opportunities for direct contact with high-level government officials.

Official visits paid by the monarch are valuable in promoting Danish exports abroad. For example, during an official visit to Japan in November 2004, the Danish royal family was accompanied by a delegation consisting of representatives of 52 companies, which were able to conclude a large number of mutually beneficial trade and economic agreements. In 2011, the royal family visited the Russian Federation, which also had a positive effect on relations between the two countries. In total, during the reign of Queen Margrethe II (since 1972), more than 50 official visits took place.

The system of government and its influence on decision-making in foreign policy

Historically, the formation of Denmark's foreign policy was in the competence of the government[20]. In this case, the term "government" serves to denote the fact of a joint meeting of the head of state with members of the State Council; it is in this composition that it forms a constitutionally significant government — a body whose decisions are effective and can constitute a separate source of law[21].

The traditional system of minority governments presupposes frequent and comprehensive coordination of foreign policy with the parliament, in which the government is forced to seek support to carry out its political course. R. B. Pedersen and F. J. Christiansen attribute this to the peculiarities of Denmark's foreign policy as a small state, for which it is extremely important to act consolidated in the international arena[22]. Historically, the growth of parliament's influence on foreign policy was due to the actualization of the Schleswig-Holstein issue in 1918, when the first permanent parliamentary commission was created to negotiate with the government on foreign policy issues[23]. At that time, it was vitally important for Denmark to preserve the unity and integrity of the nation, which made political parties push their individual ambitions aside[24].

The fundamental document which defines the powers of state bodies in shaping Denmark's foreign policy is the Constitution (Danmarks Riges Grundlov). The adoption of the first constitution on June 5, 1849 marked the transition from an absolute to a constitutional monarchy. Since then, the constitution has been adopted four times: in 1866 and 1920 in connection with territorial changes on the southern border with Germany; in 1915 — in connection with the granting of the right to vote to women, and in 1953 — in connection with the adoption of the succession amendment and the granting of the right to self-government to Greenland. As a result of the latter, Denmark ceased to be a colonial power.

---

[19] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 259.

[20] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 64.

[21] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 260.

[22] *Pedersen R. B., Christiansen F. J.* Da udenrigsministeren stod uden for døren // Udenrigs. 2011. № 3. S. 86.

[23] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmarkn. S. 64.

[24] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Rol' politicheskoi sistemy v formirovanii vneshnei politiki Danii kak malogo gosudarstva // Innovatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniiakh. Minsk, 2013. P. 25.

The new Constitution, adopted in 1953, consolidated a number of changes that had a direct impact on the foreign policy of the state. For relations between Denmark and the United States, the status of Greenland, which ceased to be a Danish colony, was important. The powers of the parliament were significantly expanded: the upper house of parliament was abolished; the institution of a nationwide referendum was introduced and became mandatory on important legislative issues that had implications for the international position of Denmark[25]. The preparation of a new draft of the Constitution, the purpose of which was to expand the possibilities of the parliament in the important issues of foreign policy and defence, was entrusted to a specially created constitutional commission in 1946. An important outcome was the constitutional status of the Foreign Policy Committee, which was created in 1923 at the initiative of P. Munch for negotiations between the government and parliament on foreign policy issues[26].

The Foreign Policy Committee performs an advisory function, that is, its competence does not include issuing a mandate to the government for pursuing a particular foreign policy. According to § 3 of Art. 19 of the Danish Constitution, the government is obliged to consult with the Foreign Policy Committee before making any decision on particularly important foreign policy issues and to inform the Folketing about pressing international problems[27]. The committee is a tool that allows elected representatives of the parliament to discuss current foreign policy issues with the government behind the closed doors[28].

It is not allowed to keep minutes and other records at the meetings of the Committee; the confidentiality of Committee's work is guaranteed by Art. 4 of the Law "On the International Affairs Committee", adopted on March 5, 1954[29]. The same law established the number of members of the Committee (17 people). The 1953 Constitution and the law mentioned above increased the Committee's influence to a large extent. Although the decision remains with the government, thanks to this procedure, its adoption is no longer a mere formality. As noted by the former chairman of the Committee Per Federspil, this procedure obliges the government to provide justification for the planned step, including strictly classified information, and to answer questions asked by members of the Committee[30]. In practice, when it came to issues of state security, compliance with this section was fraught with difficulties. An example is the secret consent of the Danish Prime Minister H. Hansen on the deployment of American nuclear weapons in Greenland in 1957[31]. According to the Constitution, before making such an important foreign policy decision, the government was obliged to notify the Foreign Policy Committee.

The most heated debate was caused by Art. 20 of the Constitution "On the delegation of sovereign powers to international organizations in order to promote the development

[25] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Vnutrennie predposylki uchastiia Danii v mezhgosudarstvennykh integratsionnykh ob"edineniiakh vo vtoroi polovine XX — nachale XXI v. // Belarus' v sovremennom mire. Minsk, 2010. P. 31.

[26] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 64–65.

[27] Danmarks Riges Grundlov (Grundloven), givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. juni 1953. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/1953/169 (accessed: 20.01.2021).

[28] *Østergaard K.* Det udenrigpolitiske nævn. S. 29.

[29] Lov om Det udenrigspolitiske Nævn: givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. marts 1954. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/accn/A19540005430 (accessed: 31.03.2019).

[30] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 69.

[31] *Hækkerup H.* På skansen: Dansk forsvarpolitik fra Murens fald til Kosovo. København, 2002. S. 176.

of international law, order and cooperation"[32]. If there is no consensus between the government and the parliament on Denmark's participation in international integration, this issue requires a national referendum. In this regard, some researchers tend to emphasize the special role of the nation as a subject of international relations[33]. The Danish researcher U. Østergaard explains this by the fact that Denmark is historically concerned about its sovereignty after becoming a small nation-state, and therefore is reluctant to transfer powers to supranational bodies[34]. The institution of the referendum has become one of the components of the mechanism for shaping Denmark's foreign policy since paragraph 2 of Art. 20 of the Constitution obliges the government to hold a referendum whenever the transfer of sovereign powers to an international body is not supported by a majority of 5/6 votes of the total number of members of the parliament[35]. This is a unique feature of the Danish political system, unparalleled anywhere else[36]. The aforementioned section of the Constitution has been the subject of a highly debated trial in the Danish High Court. In 1996, a group of Danish lawyers sued then-Prime Minister Poul Nyurup Rasmussen for what they believed was unconstitutional to accede to the Maastricht Treaty as the treaty opened the way for far-reaching political changes not negotiated by the government. The Supreme Court issued its judgment on April 6, 1998, which stated that accession to the Maastricht Treaty did not violate Art. 20 of the Constitution, which provides for the transfer of powers to interstate bodies "to a certain extent" ("i nærmere bestemt omfang")[37].

In most cases, the government plays a primary role as an organ of state power to which the head of state (monarch) has delegated the executive powers[38]. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, as well as other ministers, are empowered to make binding promises on behalf of the state[39]. However, the Constitution provides for the accountability of the government to Folketing, which, according to Art. 15, has the right to dismiss ministers through a vote of no confidence[40]. This allows us to talk about parliamentarianism as a characteristic form of interaction between the highest bodies of state power in Denmark[41]. The influence of the parliament on foreign policy has both legal and practical aspects. As noted by the Danish researcher C. Due-Nielsen, the parliamentary majority can dismiss the government or demand new elections but can hardly pursue an

[32] Danmarks Riges Grundlov (Grundloven), givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. juni 1953. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/1953/169 (accessed: 20.01.2021).

[33] *Østergaard U.* Danish national identity: between multinational heritage and small state nationalism // Denmark's policy towards Europe after 1945: history, theory and options / eds H. Branner, M. Kelstrup. Odense, 2000. P. 139–185.

[34] Ibid. P. 139.

[35] *Rasmussen H.* Folkestyre, Grundlov og Højesteret: grundlovens § 20 på prøve. København, 1996. P. 20.

[36] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 254.

[37] *Petersen N.* National strategies in the integration dilemma: the promises of adaptation theory // Denmark's policy towards Europe after 1945: history, theory and options / eds H. Branner, M. Kelstrup. Odense, 2000. P. 84.

[38] Danmarks Riges Grundlov (Grundloven), givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. juni 1953. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/1953/169 (accessed: 20.01.2021); *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finlyandii. P. 261.

[39] The United Nations in development: reform issues in the economic and social fields: a nordic perspective: final rep. Stockholm, 1991. P. 32.

[40] Danmarks Riges Grundlov (Grundloven), givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. juni 1953.

[41] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 256.

effective alternative foreign policy without the help of the government[42]. The greatest influence of Folketing on foreign policy is manifested in the ability to control the actions of the government through the issuance of special mandates by parliamentary committees[43].

The Committee for the Common Market, later transformed into the European Committee, gradually took one of the leading positions in the decision-making process, which could not but weaken the position of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In addition, a separate Foreign Affairs Committee (Udenrigsudvalget[44]) was created, which, unlike the Foreign Policy Committee, has the right to consider bills and prepare reports for the Folketing[45]. Defence and nuclear policy, as well as security policy, came under the purview of the Defence Committee (Forsvarsudvalget). As a result of these changes, some researchers began to call the Foreign Policy Committee "an anachronism that exists due to the fact that it was once written in the Constitution"[46]. The most influential parliamentary committee became the European Affairs Committee (Europaudvalg), which dates back to the creation in 1961 in the Folketing of the Extraordinary Committee for Negotiations with the Common Market[47]. Its task was to develop a bill for Denmark's accession to the EEC. The subsequent integration of Denmark into the European Communities contributed to strengthening the powers of this committee so much that Prime Minister Anker Jørgensen called it "mini-folketing"[48]. Shortly after the creation of the EU, the ad-hoc Committee was renamed into the European Affairs Committee (Europaudvalget) in 1994. The main tasks of the European Affairs Committee are to perform parliamentary oversight and direct influence on the government policy towards the EU. The committee consists of 17 members and 11 substitutes. The provisions on the functions and powers of the committee are contained in the Law on Denmark's Accession to the European Communities[49]. Article 6 of this Law obliges the government to notify the European Committee of planned decisions in the Council of Ministers, which may have direct application in Denmark, or the implementation of which requires the participation of the Folketing[50]. Thus, Denmark's participation in the EU as a whole contributed to an increase of the parliament's role in shaping foreign policy[51].

According to the MP from the Social Liberal Party in 1984–2000 Jørgen Estrup, who was a member of the International Affairs Committee for 12 years, the 1953 Constitution did not provide for Denmark's involvement in such close economic and political cooperation as the European Union[52]. Since the European Committee, unlike the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has the authority to issue a mandate to the government for negotiations in Brussels, this institution is a vital "insurance policy" against possible government mis-

[42] *Due-Nielsen C.* Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken. København, 1986. S. 82.

[43] Ibid. S. 80.

[44] Not to be confused with Det Udenrigspolitisk Nævn — The Foreign Policy Committee — mentioned above.

[45] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 70.

[46] *Amstrup N.* Dansk udenrigspolitik. S. 25.

[47] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Rol' politicheskoi sistemy… P. 27.

[48] *Amstrup N.* Dansk udenrigspolitik. S. 70.

[49] Lov om ændring af lov om Danmarks tiltrædelse af De Europæiske Fællesskaber og Den Europæiske Union (Danmarks ratifikation af Lissabontraktaten): givet på Christiansborg Slot, den 30. apr. 2008. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/R0710.aspx (accessed: 20.01.2021).

[50] Ibid.

[51] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 71.

[52] *Estrup J.* Uden kompas — dansk udenrigspolitik efter 1945. København, 2001. S. 47.

takes, thereby filling the "gap" in the Danish Constitution[53]. In practice, the European Committee limits the freedom of action of Danish representatives in the EU Council of Ministers, who are guided by the Committee's mandate when making decisions or directives. The government is also obliged to consult with the European Folketing Committee on the most important economic policy issues. Before participating in negotiations on the most significant decisions, the government shall orally notify the Committee of its proposals. If the majority in the Committee supports this proposal, the government negotiates on their basis. However, as noted by R. B. Pedersen and F. J. Christiansen, the government is bound by the mandate not legally, but politically[54]. According to section 15 of the Danish Constitution, the parliamentary majority can dismiss the government[55]. Since a government that does not enlist the support of parliament always runs the risk of receiving a vote of no confidence, in practice parliamentary committees perform not only a control but also an advisory function, which allows the government to test the ground before making any important foreign policy decision and avoid an internal political crisis.

Foreign policy always contains an element of domestic policy, which was particularly evident in the 1980s during the period of "alternative majority" in Folketing. The "red" block, who was in opposition, sought to undermine the confidence in the government headed by P. Schlüter from the Conservative Party. It was difficult to do this through domestic politics since the Social Liberal Party supported the government's economic policy. Then the Social Democrats, together with the Socialist People's Party and the Social Liberal Parties, managed to mobilize the majority on foreign policy issues. The Social Liberal Party, known for its pacifism, supported the initiatives of the Social Democrats to accept reservations to the communiqué within the NATO framework, concerning the reduction of military spending, disarmament, the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe etc.[56] P. Schlüter's government decided to make concessions in matters of security and foreign policy in order to be able to continue the course of economic reforms. The practical implications were minimal as Denmark was not considered a deployment site. Denmark's refusal to pay its share of the costs of the deployment infrastructure irritated other NATO members, and the term "danmarkisation" was coined in relation to countries whose benefits from participation in the alliance significantly exceeded their contribution to the common cause[57]. Thus, 1982–1988 went down into the history of Denmark as a period of "footnote policy" in. In total, from 1982 to 1988, the "alternative majority" put 25 proposals on the Folketing agenda, which forced the government to come up with initiatives that contradicted the general NATO line, generally without violating it[58]. This unique situation in parliamentary practice made sense since opinion polls showed that new elections would lead to minor changes, and the 4-party cabinet would hardly have won an absolute majority of votes. In addition, 4 out of 5 Danes supported the idea of turning Scandinavia into a nuclear-free zone, and 42–49 % wanted to see the territory of Denmark nuclear-free also during crises and war[59].

---

[53] Ibid. S. 70.

[54] *Pedersen R. B., Christiansen F. J.* Da udenrigsministeren stod uden for døren. S. 87.

[55] Danmarks Riges Grundlov (Grundloven), givet på Christiansborg slot, den 5. juni 1953.

[56] *Hækkerup H.* På skansen: Dansk forsvarpolitik fra Murens fald til Kosovo. København, 2002. S. 141.

[57] *Adler D. J.* Det europæiske teater: bogen om raketterne og den nye atomvåbendebat. København, 1984. S. 349–351.

[58] *Estrup J.* Uden kompas — dansk udenrigspolitik efter 1945. København, 2001. S. 76.

[59] Ibid.

The Foreign Ministry of Denmark and foreign policy decision-making

Foreign Ministry officials are directly involved in the implementation of the country's foreign policy and play an appropriate role in decision-making. In some cases, officials in the service of the Foreign Ministry have a better understanding of the situation and have the latest information on current events. According to the former Permanent Secretary of the Danish Foreign Ministry, Eigil Jørgensen (1974–1983), the increased control of the Folketing over foreign policy often deprives diplomats of the opportunity to find a form of work where, on the one hand, it would be possible to maintain secrecy, and on the other hand, to discuss issues of foreign policy and security with parliament[60]. It should be noted that the Foreign Minister is the political head of the Foreign Ministry representing one of the parties that form the cabinet of the government. The minister is a member of the State Council[61]. Often, the Foreign Ministry has one or more ministers "without a portfolio" at the discretion of the incumbent government. For example, after the new cabinet came to power in 2011, several new positions were introduced: Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for European Affairs, Minister for Cooperation with the Nordic States, and Minister for Development Cooperation[62]. In addition, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Denmark has a non-political leadership represented by the position of the head of the ministry (as of date — Departementschefen; in English — Permanent Secretary of State) and directors heading the main divisions (as of date — direktør; in English — State Secretary). Thus, the permanent head of the Danish foreign office is an administrative person who holds this position regardless of political views. This feature, in our opinion, is a guarantee of stability and continuity in the work of the foreign policy department, which makes this system more stable in times of crises.

In the history of Danish foreign policy, there have been examples when, during the period of international crises, it was not possible to hold consultations between the embassies and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and officials assumed the functions of decision-makers in foreign policy. One of such decisions, which laid the foundations for the Atlantic orientation of Danish foreign policy, was the conclusion of an agreement between the Danish Ambassador to Washington H. Kauffmann and the US government on the provision of Greenland territory for the deployment of American air bases during World War II[63]. The employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs provide technical support in decision-making, collecting and processing material in order to give the most objective advice to the minister, regardless of a personal opinion[64]. The activities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are regulated by the Law "On the Ministry of Foreign Affairs" dated April 13, 1983, which sets out the goals and objectives of the Foreign Ministry, describes practical issues related to the organization of the work of diplomatic staff. All diplomatic missions of Denmark abroad are appointed by the monarch, with the exception of the

[60] *Jørgensen E.* Udenrigstjenesten og sikkerhedspolitikken // Nye grænser: den danske udenrigstjeneste 1970–95. Udenrigsministeriet. København, 1995. S. 154.

[61] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 264.

[62] Udenrigsministeriet. URL: http://um.dk/ (accessed: 13.02.2012).

[63] *Lidegaard B.* I kongens navn: Henrik Kauffmann i dansk diplomati, 1919–1958. København, 1996. P. 341.

[64] *Sjøqvist V.* Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. S. 73.

vice-consuls who are appointed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs[65]. Currently, the Kingdom of Denmark has 103 representations abroad: 69 embassies, 17 consulates general, 6 permanent diplomatic missions to international organizations, and other offices[66].

It follows from the Government's Concept of New Foreign Policy Priorities adopted in 2003, that new challenges in international relations place higher demands on the work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whose main goal is to promote Danish interests and values aimed at ensuring freedom, security and well-being of citizens in Denmark and abroad[67]. In 2006, the Danish government adopted the so-called "Strategy of Globalization", which emphasizes the need to develop tools and competencies of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the effective promotion of Denmark's interests in the international arena[68]. New requirements for diplomacy are formulated in consonance with the said Strategy in the program document of the Danish Foreign Ministry "Diplomacy in a world without borders"[69]. In particular, it states that "in today's increasingly globalized world, diplomats must be able to work in an ever-growing number of informal and non-governmental networks (communities) that do not know national borders. The goal is to promote positive political globalization, characterized by strong interaction between countries and cultures, as well as a commitment to broad international cooperation[70]. In parallel with the development of the "Strategy of Globalization", the Danish foreign ministry was reorganized. In 2006, reorganization of the network of embassies began, and in 2008, a decision was made to reorganize the Ministry itself, whose structure had remained unchanged since the end of the Cold War[71]. As a result, in 2010, the division of departments into North and South groups was replaced by a system of centres. For example, the Centre for Global Challenges is responsible for addressing emerging challenges such as climate change, food shortages, and the globalization of financial markets; the Center for Global Security deals with issues of conflict resolution, humanitarian aid, and anti-terrorism.

In addition to these documents, there are a number of special laws regulating certain aspects of the work of the Foreign Ministry: the Law "On Certain Aspects of the Activities of the Export Council of Denmark" dated January 31, 2001[72], and the Law "On International Cooperation in Assisting Developing Countries" dated June 10, 1971, with subsequent changes and additions[73].

---

[65] *Lidegaard B.* I kongens navn: Henrik Kauffmann i dansk diplomati, 1919–1958. København, 1996; Lov om Danmarks tiltrædelse af De europæiske Fællesskaber Bilag 1 til loven: traktat om oprettelse af Det europ. økon. Fællesskab (EØF-traktaten), herunder konvention vedrørende fælles institutioner for De europ. Fællesskaber. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/1972/21167 (accessed: 20.01.2021).

[66] Repræsentationer i udlandet. URL: https://um.dk/da/om-os/organisation/repr/ (accessed: 01.07.2021).

[67] A changing world. The government's vision for new priorities in Denmark's foreign policy. Copenhagen, 2003.

[68] Progress, innovation and cohesion: strategy for Denmark in the global economy: summary. Copenhagen, 2006. P. 30.

[69] En verden til forskel: regeringens bud på nye prioriteter for dansk udviklingsbistand 2004–2008. Udenrigsministeriet. København, 2003.

[70] Ibid. S. 5.

[71] Danish foreign policy yearbook 2009 / eds N. Hvidt, H. Mouritzen. Copenhagen, 2009. P. 34.

[72] Lov om visse aspekter af Danmarks Eksportråds virke: givet på Christiansborg Slot, den 31. jan. 2001. URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2001/53 (accessed: 20.11.2021).

[73] Bekendtgørelse af Lov om internationalt udviklingssamarbejde. Udenrigsministeriet, den 10. juli 1998 URL: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/1998/541 (accessed: 05.12.2021).

The role of political parties in shaping the foreign policy

Most researchers of the Danish foreign policy, regardless of whether they are studying the decision-making process in any particular case or are interested in long-term models of foreign policy in general, recognize the importance of the internal political structure[74]. Political parties in Denmark not only form the official foreign policy of the state, but also implement it in practice[75]. As noted by M. A. Isaev, "the government in parliamentary democracies has long been transformed into a real executive committee of the dominant political party or a coalition of several parties. It is through the government that the party implements program provisions that have received support from voters"[76]. The turning point in the history of the Danish party system came in 1972–1973, when in the process of Denmark's accession to the EU the country was divided on this issue into two camps[77]. The peculiarity of this period, and the 70s in general, marked the emergence of a third subject of domestic political life, in addition to parties and interest organizations, namely — new extra-parliamentary social movements"[78]. 1973 was the most dramatic year in the history of parliamentary elections in Denmark. The Danes "rebelled" against the policy-makers: as a result of the 1973 elections, the number of seats in both the left and right-wing traditional parties almost halved. Social Democrats' seats were reduced from 70 to 46; Socialist People's Party's seats — from 17 to 11; radicals, liberals, and conservatives together lost 30 votes[79]. At the same time, new political forces came to power, as a result of which the number of parties doubled[80]. The elections were the most successful for the Progress Party led by Morten Glistrup. Participation in the first European elections also forced the political parties of Denmark to make their policies clearer, explain their positions, goals, vision of the future political, economic and social development and Denmark's position in European and international politics[81].

As a result of polarization during the period of intensification of economic problems and international tension and the associated appearance of mass popular, anti-war and youth movements, a transition took place from a 5–6-party system to a 10–11-party system, which, according to J. Sartori's scale, allows it to be classified as extreme pluralism[82]. The characteristic feature of the Danish multi-party system is that the government cannot have an absolute majority in parliament. One of the results of this system is the need to conclude agreements between the government and opposition parties on foreign and defence policy for a period of up to 3–4 years in order to avoid disagreements fraught with serious political crises. As noted by R. B. Pedersen and F. J. Christiansen, agreements are unofficial since they are not enshrined in the Constitution or the Regulations on the Work of Parliament[83]. However, the political parties adhere to them despite the change of gov-

[74] *Faurby I.* Party system and foreign policy in Denmark // Cooperation and Conflict. 1979. Vol. 14, issue 4. P. 159–170; *Rosenau J.* Domestic sources of foreign policy. New York, 1967.

[75] *Jacobsen J., Risager J.* Dansk udenrigspolitik: selvbestemmelse eller tilpasning? Herning, 1984. S. 37.

[76] *Isaev M. A.* Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii. P. 261.

[77] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Rol' politicheskoi sistemy… P. 28.

[78] Istoriia Danii, XX vek / eds Iu. V. Kudrina, V. V. Roginskii. Moscow, 1998. P. 199.

[79] *Turner B., Nordquist G.* The other European community. London, 1982. P. 188.

[80] *Faurby I.* Party system and foreign policy in Denmark. P. 168.

[81] *Sørensen C. L.* Danish party policies on European and Nordic cooperation // Cooperation and Conflict. 1979. Vol. 14, issue 4. P. 172.

[82] *Sartori G.* Parties and party systems: a framework for analysis. Cambridge, 1976.

[83] *Pedersen R. B., Christiansen F. J.* Da udenrigsministeren stod uden for døren. S. 88.

ernment. As a result, the Danish system is resistant to changes caused by external factors since changes can be made only with the help of the same consensus as broad political agreements on foreign and defence policy.

One of the examples of this procedure is the Agreement on Danish Efforts in Afghanistan for 2011–2012[84], concluded between the then ruling Liberal Party Venstre, the Conservative People's Party, the Social Democratic Party, the Danish People's Party, the Social Liberal Party, and the Liberal Alliance. The only party not included in this Agreement was the Socialist People's Party, which significantly narrowed the opportunities for the Minister of Foreign Affairs Villy Søvndal from the Socialist People's Party to participate in discussions of this issue.

Despite the differences in views between political parties in relation to the European integration, this priority of Denmark's foreign policy is also based on a broad domestic political consensus, which was reflected in the creation in 2004 of the so-called "EU coalition", consisting of the Liberal Party Venstre, the Conservative People's party, Social Democratic Party, Social Liberal Party, and Danish People's Party.

Mass media do not directly participate in the foreign policy making but they have a straightforward impact on the formation of public opinion on foreign policy issues. This influence is especially evident during election campaigns and nationwide referendums. K. Siune in her study on the role of the media in European politics in Denmark came to the conclusion that the agenda set by the media controls the attention of the Danes and thereby influences the awareness of citizens about various problems[85].

Conclusion

Summing up the influence of the political system on the formation of Denmark's foreign policy, we can make the following conclusions. First, despite the fact that the formation of an official foreign policy is within the competence of the government, in practice this process is an interaction between various internal institutions. The role of the monarch is to guarantee stability and continuity, to maintain a positive image of Denmark abroad. Folketing has the ability to exert a special influence on foreign policy through special parliamentary committees. Social movements, media and business circles have an indirect influence on foreign policy. However, their role can hardly be overestimated during the periods of popular referendums. The use of this procedure in the process of choosing the key directions of foreign policy makes the Danish system close to the form of direct democracy, when the people possess the decisive word on the delegation of any part of powers to the supranational authorities. Employees at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs participate less in the discussion and formation of the Danish foreign policy, being responsible for the technical side of its implementation[86].

It follows from the study that political system of Denmark is characterized by continuity, stability and predictability[87]. Regardless of a party or coalition in power, the con-

[84] Helmand-planen 2011–2012 samt afrapportering for den danske indsats i Afghanistan i 2010. København, 2011.

[85] *Siune K.* EF på dagsordenen. Aarhus, 1991. S. 162.

[86] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Osobennosti vneshnepoliticheskogo mekhanizma Danii vo vtoroi polovine XX — nachale XXI v. // Journal of international law and international relations. 2013. Issue 2. P. 55.

[87] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Vnutrennie predposylki… P. 32.

sensus among the main parties — the Social Democratic, the Liberal Democratic, and the Conservative People's — about the foreign policy priorities has been very stable. This was facilitated by the tradition of unofficial political agreements between major parties, which was respected regardless of their different views on domestic policy[88].

The emergence of new political parties and social movements in the 1970s contributed to the increased participation of small parties in the formation of foreign policy. Parties that cannot form a government, but gain just enough votes to make it to parliament, in such situations can have an influence by playing a role of "kingmakers" when the government has to rely on their support in specific areas because the Danish multi-party system does not allow any party to form a majority government. Thus, in 2001–2011 the Danish People's Party acted as a "kingmaker" of the liberal-conservative government, which had to put a lot of emphasis on value politics.

The growing number of special parliamentary committees empowered to issue mandates to the government to pursue a particular foreign policy, has made the parliament one of the most powerful decision-makers in the Danish foreign policy in the second half of the 20th century.

References

Adler D. J. *Det europæiske teater: bogen om raketterne og den nye atomvåbendebat*. København, Eirene, 1984, 451 s.

Amstrup N. *Dansk udenrigspolitik*. Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1977, 101 s.

Bjøl E. Historie og international politik. *Nær og fjern: samspillet mellem indre og ydre politik*. København, Politiske Studier, 1980, ss. 3–23.

Bjøl E. *Hvem bestemmer? Studier i den udenrigspolitiske beslutningsproces*. København, Jurist- og Økonomforbundets, 1983, 442 s.

Branner H. *Danmark i en større verden: udenrigspolitiken efter 1945*. København, Columbus, 1995, 192 s.

Chekanskii A. N. *Osnovnye problemy razvitiia institutov vnutriparlamentskoi demokratii v Danii: 1849–2000 gg.:* dis. … kand. ist. nauk. Moscow, [s. n.], 2003, 206 p. (In Russian)

Dubinka-Hushcha L. Osobennosti vneshnepoliticheskogo mekhanizma Danii vo vtoroi polovine XX — nachale XXI v. *Journal of international law and international relations*, 2013, issue 2, pp. 51–57. (In Russian)

Dubinka-Hushcha L. Rol' politicheskoi sistemy v formirovanii vneshnei politiki Danii kak malogo gosudarstva. *Innovatsii v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniiakh: materialy mezhdunar. kruglogo stola*. Minsk, Belarusian State University Press, 2013, pp. 25–30. (In Russian)

Dubinka-Hushcha L. Vnutrennie predposylki uchastiia Danii v mezhgosudarstvennykh integratsionnykh ob"edineniiakh vo vtoroi polovine XX — nachale XXI v. *Belarus' v sovremennom mire: materialy 9 mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii, posviashchennoi 89-letiiu obrazovaniia Belaruskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. Minsk, Belarusian State University Press, 2010, pp. 31–32. (In Russian)

Due-Nielsen C. Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken. *Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken*. København, Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forl., 1986, ss. 75–86.

Estrup J. *Uden kompas — dansk udenrigspolitik efter 1945*. København, Gyldendal, 2001, 155 s.

Faurby I. *Kampen om sikkerheden. Nye tendenser i dansk politik*. Aarhus, Forlaget Politika, 1986, 105 s.

Faurby I. Party system and foreign policy in Denmark. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 1979, vol. 14, issue 4, pp. 159–170.

Hækkerup H. *På skansen: Dansk forsvarpolitik fra Murens fald til Kosovo*. København, Lindhard og Ringhof, 2002, 237 s.

Isaev M. A. *Osnovy konstitutsionnogo prava Danii.* Moscow, Muravei Publ., 2002, 337 p. (In Russian)

[88] *Dubinka-Hushcha L.* Osobennosti vneshnepoliticheskogo mekhanizma Danii… P. 55.

Isaev M. A. *Politicheskaia sistema stran Skandinavii i Finliandii*. Moscow, ROSSPEN Publ., 2001, 277 p. (In Russian)
Jacobsen J., Risager J. *Dansk udenrigspolitik: selvbestemmelse eller tilpasning?* Herning, Systime, 1984, 208 s.
Jørgensen E. Udenrigstjenesten og sikkerhedspolitikken. *Nye grænser: den danske udenrigstjeneste 1970–95*. København, Udenrigsministeriet, 1995, ss. 121–157.
Lidegaard B. *I kongens navn: Henrik Kauffmann i dansk diplomati, 1919–1958*. København, Samleren, 1996, 812 s.
Mogunova M. A. *Skandinavskii parlamentarizm: teoriia i praktika.* Moscow, RSUH Press, 2001, 347 p. (In Russian)
Østergaard K. Det udenrigpolitiske nævn. *Folketinget og udenrigspolitikken*. København, Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forl., 1986, ss. 25–35.
Østergaard U. Danish national identity: between multinational heritage and small state nationalism. *Denmark's policy towards Europe after 1945: history, theory and options*. Odense, Odense University Press, 2000, ss. 139–185.
Pedersen R. B., Christiansen F. J. Da udenrigsministeren stod uden for døren. *Udenrigs*, 2011, issue 3, ss. 85–92.
Petersen N. National strategies in the integration dilemma: the promises of adaptation theory. *Denmark's policy towards Europe after 1945: history, theory and options.* Odense, Odense University Press, 2000, ss. 72–100.
Rasmussen H. *Folkestyre, Grundlov og Højesteret: grundlovens § 20 på prøve*. København, Christian Ejlers Forl., 1996, 120 s.
Rosenau J. *Domestic sources of foreign policy*. New York, The Free Press, 1967, 340 p.
Sartori G. *Parties and party systems: a framework for analysis*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976, 342 p.
Siune K. *EF på dagsordenen*. Aarhus, Politica, 1991, 168 s.
Sjøqvist V. Udenrigspolitik og parlamentarisme i Danmark. *Nær og fjern. Samspillet mellem indre og ydre politik*. København, Politiske Studier, 1980, ss. 57–74.
Sørensen C. L. Danish party policies on European and Nordic cooperation. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 1979, vol. 14, issue 4, pp. 171–191.
Turner B., Nordquist G. *The other European community*. London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1982, 307 p.

Статья поступила в редакцию 9 сентября 2021 г.
Рекомендована к печати 17 декабря 2021 г.
Received: September 9, 2021
Accepted: December 17, 2021