

1. Charter of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Union // Comrade Komsomol. Documents of congresses, conferences and the Central Committee of the Komsomol 1918–1968. – Moscow, Ed. Central Committee of the Komsomol "Young Guard, 1969. – P. 377–379.

2. Program goals and main activities. Charter of the Komsomol of Belarus / 19th congress of the Komsomol of Belarus. – Minsk, 1990.

3. In the rhythm of flying years...: essays on the history of the Komsomol of Belarus / V.F. Gigin [and others]; ed.-st. V.F. Gigin; foreword I.V. Karpenko; editorial board: A.N. Karlyukevich [and others]. – Minsk: Zvyazda, 2018. – P. 280.

4. Yakovleva, G.N. "Few non-party students are accepted and drawn into the party" / G.N. Yakovleva, A.N. Dulov // Study Notes UO "VSU named after P.M. Masherov": Sat. scientific works. – Vitebsk: VSU named after P.M. Masherov, 2021. – Vol. 34. – P. 20–27. URL: <https://rep.vsu.by/bitstream/123456789/31441/1/20-27.pdf> (accessed: 10.11.2022).

THE NORDIC COUNTRIES IN THE PROCESS OF SHAPING EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

Ekaterina Kuzmina

VSU named after P.M. Masherov, Vitebsk, Belarus

Keywords: Norway, Denmark, Sweden, integration, European Economic Community (EEC), European Union (EU), European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

In the 21st century, the trends of globalization and integration are constantly increasing. Integration processes currently occupy a central place in the world. On the European continent integration development has been active since the twentieth century, which has resulted in the current stage of the European Union, which is reaping the undeniable achievements of European integration and is experiencing an increasingly evident crisis.

The aim of the paper is to trace the process and identify the reasons for the Scandinavian countries' accession to European integration.

Material and methods. The study is based on protocols containing a programme for European cooperation on all fronts, as well as on the Nordic agenda within the EU and EFTA. Of particular interest were the scientific publications of Russian researchers L. Babynin "The Nordic Countries and Differentiation in the EU" and O. Aleksandrov. B. "The 'Northern Dimension' in EU Politics". The research employed both general scientific (analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalisation, deductive and logical) and special historical methods.

Findings and their discussion. European integration is based on the idea of the French politician Jean Monnet to form a unified legal framework of European countries and a system of common institutions, having interstate and supranational character 4, p. 54. The member states of integration delegate some national powers to these institutions and transfer the right to make binding decisions and oversee their implementation to supranational authorities. This meant that the countries that supported the development of European integration agreed to transfer part of the sovereign rights of the state to supranational institutions.

There were many pitfalls and obstacles to the implementation of the European integration policy. One of the most important is the reluctance of a number of

countries to hand over part of the sovereign rights of the state to supranational entities. The Nordic countries – Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Iceland – were among them.

Scandinavia expressed a twofold attitude towards European integration. On the one hand, all Nordic states without exception supported integration in terms of state security, enhanced cooperation in the economic, legal, humanitarian and banking spheres. At the same time, all Nordic countries were categorically against creating and participating in supranational political structures, as they not unreasonably feared that in this case they would have to move in the wake of the leading European powers – Great Britain, France and Germany [2].

According to the theory of the famous Hungarian economist Bela Balasz, the first step in the integration process is the creation of free trade zones, the second step is the establishment of customs unions, followed by the formation of a common free market with the possibility of cross-border movement of capital, goods, labour and services. The natural conclusion of this process is the formation of economic and monetary unions. As a result, the states form a political alliance, which adds common interests and actions in foreign and domestic policy in general [1, p. 509] to the monetary and economic alliance.

In the Nordic countries, the question of establishing a common free trade area has never arisen, not even in a theoretical sense. Several projects to create a customs union between them, the first of which were put forward in the last third of the nineteenth century, failed [4, p.56]. Instead, they opted to participate in the EFTA, initiated by the UK.

It is worth noting that the EEC and EFTA had very different objectives and goals from the outset. EFTA was created with the aim to facilitate international trade relations in Europe, while EFTA initially had a serious institutional structure and supranational bodies. Thus, for the Nordic countries, it was preferable to establish international trade relations, as evidenced by their initial decision to join EFTA, rather than the deeper integration that accession to the EEC implied.

Nevertheless, given the impressive economic progress that the EEC countries were making, the Nordic countries could not stay away from pan-European integration for long. It is the Nordic countries that account for most of the exceptions to the common EU rules, they have not only successfully adapted to the integration processes but have also influenced the formation of the differentiated EU structure to a not insignificant extent [3].

The economic success of the EEC countries led to a change in the Nordic countries' strategy towards pan-European integration. In 1972 Denmark joined the EEC. In 1995, Finland and Sweden became full members of the EEC [5, p. 55]. Norway, on the other hand, held two referendums on its accession to the EEC, but both times the population decided not to join.

Due to Denmark's membership in the EEC, the 'Nordic cooperation' itself became more active in economic terms. The focus was on creating free markets for goods and services, removing trade barriers, liberalising capital movements, facilitating exports, regional and fiscal policy issues, and research.

Nordic participation in Nordic co-operation did not burden Danish membership of the EEC in any way, the combination of the two alliances proceeded quite harmoniously. Denmark's participation in the EEC did not put it in a difficult position and did not force it

to take decisions that could contradict the integration processes in the northern region, as the degree of integration in the north of Europe was much higher and was a priority for all the Nordic countries, and for Denmark in particular [7, pp. 23–24].

At the initial stage of European integration, the Nordic countries had no problems in combining regional and pan-European integration. New challenges and problems arose in the 1990s, when the European Union was seriously discussed [7, p. 26].

In 1992 the Maastricht Treaty was signed, transforming the EEC into the European Union. The Treaty laid down the conditions for a complete restructuring and reform of all of the organisation's activities.

The transformation of the EEC into the European Union put Denmark and the other Nordic countries at a standstill, as Denmark's participation in the economic and monetary union and joint work with the other EU partner countries on legal issues could have come into conflict with regional integration in the North of Europe [6, pp. 140–145].

As the Danish government was interested in continuing to cooperate with the EU, it undertook a series of measures which culminated in an agreement known as the National Compromise.

The changes that were taking place in the world had an impact on Nordic politics as a whole. For example, Sweden, which had been pursuing a policy of neutrality, declared "freedom from military alliances" as its renewed foreign policy paradigm. Following Sweden, Finland also moved away from its neutrality. The change in foreign policy tone has encouraged these countries to cooperate within the EU. Increasing integration, the formation of a full-fledged EU internal market and the growing interpenetration of European economies made such cooperation inevitable.

Eventually, Sweden and Finland became members of the EU, as well as Denmark, and embarked on the path of pan-European integration. Norway made another attempt to join the community, but once again the Norwegian people did not approve. Even now, Norway remains outside the EU.

There are several reasons for the country's obstinate stance. First, there is a strong 'no' to the five Norwegian parties versus the two that believe Norway should join the EU. There is also a strong social movement which strongly opposes Norway's participation in the EU. Finally, a majority of the population firmly believes that joining the European Union would greatly disadvantage Norway, rather than help it to prosper [8].

The Norwegian position demonstrates the other side of the coin of the idea of a supranational community such as the EU, and casts doubt on the rightness of the decision to pursue the integration path at all. The Norwegian refusal embodies all doubts of the other half of the European population, which is categorically against the idea of a 'superstate' in Europe [8].

Conclusion. Thus, the Nordic countries' participation in European integration is primarily determined by economic reasons: the expansion of European economic integration, the formation of a full-fledged EU internal market, the growing interpenetration of European economies and the economic success of the EEC countries. Currently, not all of the Nordic countries are members of the EU, and most of its active members are sceptical of many EU initiatives.

1. Alexandrov, O.B. "Northern dimension" in EU policy / O.B. Alexandrov // European integration. – M.: Science, 2011. – P. 509–519.

2. Antyushina, N. M. Northern Europe and integration: vicissitudes of relations with the EU / N.M. Antyushina [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.sice.ru/cnts/1869.html>. – Date of access: 04.11.2022.
3. Babynina, L. The countries of Northern Europe and differentiation in the EU / L. Babynina [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <https://pandia.ru/text/77/462/9273.php> – Access date: 04.11.2022.
4. Voronkov, L. S. Integration processes in the North of Europe / L. S. Voronkov // European integration. – M.: Science, 2011. – P. 52–59.
5. Voronov, K. V. Prospects of EU integration and the specifics of the Nordic Countries / K.V. Voronov // World Economy and International Relations. – 2014. – No. 11. – P. 54–59.
6. Deryabin, Y. S. Northern Europe. The region of new development / Yu. S. Deryabin, N.M. Antyushina. – M.: The whole world, 2008. – P. 508.
7. Isupova, K.B. Northern European regionalism as a factor of cooperation with the European Union / K.B. Isupova // Bulletin of the Northern (Arctic) Federal University. – 2014. – No. 1. – P. 23–27.
8. Helge Heggelund. Report on relations between Norway and the European Union [Electronic resource] / Heggelund Helge. – Access mode: <http://www.norge.ru/norway/euognorge.html> – Date of application 03.11.2022.

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS TURKEY KURDS IN THE 19TH – FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Irina Luzgina

VSU named after P.M. Masherov, Vitebsk, Belarus

Keywords: Great Britain, Türkiye, Kurdistan, foreign policy, international relations, Kurds, Kurdish issue.

In the XIX – the first half of the XX century the British were at the forefront of European expansion into Western Asia. They also played a significant role in Turkish Kurdistan, supporting the insurgent aspirations of the Kurds to weaken, first, the Ottoman Empire, and then the Republic of Türkiye in the Mesopotamia region. The relevance of this study is to identify the goals pursued by the UK, and which are still being pursued by major international players in Kurdistan, which only exacerbates the resolution of the Kurdish issue.

The purpose of the study is to determine the goals pursued by Great Britain, which asserted its direct or indirect influence in Turkish Kurdistan.

Material and methods. The study was carried out on the basis of the work of K.V. Vertyaev “Kurdish Nationalism: History and Modernity”, as well as a number of scientific publications. Particular attention was paid to British documents of the first half of the 20th century, reflecting the British policy towards Turkish Kurds during this period. When writing the work, such general scientific methods as description, analysis, synthesis, as well as the historical-system method were used.

Findings and their discussion. The beginning of the expansion of Great Britain in the Middle East fell on the turn of the 18th–19th centuries – helping the Ottomans in the fight against the French, by 1801 the British, together with the Turks, liberated Egypt from them. From that moment on, the British acted both on the side of the Turks and against them, maintaining the balance of power in the region – this would become one of the main goals of Great Britain until the beginning of the 20th century.