

The Debate on Brexit Defaming Globalisation by Constructing it on the Grounds of Nationalism

Roshani Goel

University of Leeds, United Kingdom
goelroshani@gmail.com

Article History: Received: 10 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 28 April 2021

Abstract: This essay tries to examine that why on a very first place Brexit happened. Why people voted in the support of Brexit. After so many years of integration, UK decided to leave European Union. This paper explores, that the debate on Brexit includes more than the issue of sovereignty and national identity. The politics regarding the borders and economy and control over it was the main concern. It is not only Britain but European Union (EU) will be affected mostly by the Brexit. The Brexit has left a space in EU questioning its ideology based on globalisation which bind the international stage in a cooperative and dependable matters on the issue of security, terrorism and power

Keywords: Brexit, Economy, European Union, Globalisation, Immigration, Nationalism, Scotland, Sovereignty

1. Introduction

This, essay tries to underpin three broad concepts that is, first, the meaning of Brexit in relation to EU by trying to argue it from the point of view of the actor (Britain). Second, what all option, opportunities and positions are open up to the actor, after the result and third, how the opportunities going to lead to a rationalised effect of the unintended action taken in the realm of power (authority) to analyse the existential situation (Morgan and Patomaki: 2016: p. 100). The essay concerns itself with the idea of what Brexit means to EU, the politics of Europe, European Union integration and the place of Europe in the world (Oliver: 2016: p. 1321- 1322).

This essay on Brexit is trying to look out for certain answers for the questions on what the reason was behind Brexit to happen. What made people to vote for leave. Is the reason only the economic concern and cost analysis of the country or was it is the feeling of sovereignty and nationality? Were their ideas shaped by political forces or was their own lived experiences that made them to vote for leave? Was there any chance for people to vote for to Remain in Brexit? The statistics regarding result after the vote for the leave or Remain in Brexit is right or is it just any another political move for winning the elections? However, there are several questions, for whom either there is no answer or there are answers which are neutral that is, favouring none of the argument. Therefore, this essay tries to explore these issues and peep into the matter of Brexit more deeply. Under Article 50 of Treaties of European Union, Britain and EU have to land up on the common agreements where the leader of the parties have to agree in order not to make relation worse.

The very concern of identity makes an individual go mad; whether regarding to name or birth, the identity matters as to get a sense of belonging and relate himself to a group and gather a sense of belonging. Similar, conditions were somewhat applied to Britain, according to the countrymen there were no longer able to relate themselves with their nation. The country lost its identity, according to the political

thinkers. Therefore, to regain or to reform the identity it is important to get detach from the content which was covering it and thus, the only solution was left is Britain to exit from EU (Menon and Salter: 2017: p. 4). The very topic of Brexit is looked from the context of 'Realism and Institutionalism' as these two theoretical approaches and belief system have a strong role to play in emancipating the decision of the people (Rees: 2017: p. 559).

The conflict always lies in the nation state identity and the linguistic identity which is always shaped by the argumentative frames and definitions stated in history (Wodak cited in Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.110). Wodak takes the work of Zimmerman who talks about the 'transportable identities' by giving the example of people from Europe living in Britain saying that the people have some 'European-ness' in them.

There are other various social, economic and cultural factors such as economic benefit analyses, national identity and immigration which have played role in Brexit. In addition to this, national integration is more important than the economic budget of the country. These ideas are not self-developed but shaped by media and politicians. However, this has led to the fluctuations in the EU leave vote from 54.2% to 36.5%. Lately, the Remain vote increased among the people after understanding the consequences that can faced by the country which is even bigger than the feeling common national identity (solidarity).

Nevertheless, one should not forget to mention the point that globalisation is another concept which makes the

ground for the strong argument for Brexit. UK assert that anti- globalisation is a true meaning of democracy which helps in development of a nation (Barber: 2017: p. 222).

Scholars argued that the formation of the idea of the national identity according to the political elites it was also drawn by the cultural and historical forces. The identity as a British rather than European or any other identity. The question of identity came into being after sudden identity crises for example the refugees, that is, when people from different parts of the world flew in the European continent due to liberal boundaries of migration; leading to an increase in net migration of the European Continent. However, migration led fluctuations in various other factors making people of that country insecure about their full access to the rights. This, in turn made government to influence and shape people's mind regarding the EU membership as the government of the UK too dependent on EU referendum for all its political decision.

Theoretically, if it is argued then it can be seen that some people resisted the idea of being a member of a wider community which can be seen in the fluctuation of the percentage of the Brexit vote. But the reason for people to leave EU was the political emancipation over the people's mind. Thus, the positive influence made people to vote to Remain and negative influence made people to vote to Leave EU. The voting was also shaped by people 'status quo bias's that is, people vote for the decision made in their interest by their government. As Prime Minister David Cameron voted for Remain while Boris Johnson who is also prominent conservative politician voted for Leave EU. With the result, the nation was shocked and so were the media,

politicians and journalist. They also compared the Brexit situation with that of the US as no one was expecting Trump to win (Sayer: 2016: p. 95). Brexit and Trump voters are driven by identity politics, of which their anti-immigrant sentiments was a central feature (Koch: 2017: p.226).

Another reason for people to vote whether for the Leave or for Remain was affected by the cost and benefit for the membership. People first analysed their circumstance and then analysed about their country. Their decision for vote was shaped by the issues such as economy, finance, terrorism and security, sovereignty, nationality and so on. But however, the main reason was people attitude towards migration that is to immigration. People thought that there be less migration or no migration at all if Brexit will happen and only the people (native) will have access to the rights of the country. People's decision for the leave campaign was shaped by the evaluating structure of the EU (Curtice: 2017: p. 20).

The immigrants are having access to the jobs on which Britons have rights as the natives of the country, because of the immigrants the rate of unemployment has increased which was also affecting the people. The majority of people thought that EU has eroded the British culture as EU plays major role in any political decision-making British government less influential over its own country and on the world. The argument that Clarke and Godwin tried to make is that for people to take decision for EU leave or Remain was more focused on the subjective economic conditions rather than the objective economic system of the country. Also, the vision towards the EU integration was more on the people's choice of attachment to one's own culture and fear of 'other' in the country. This led to the rise of the nationalism among people.

According to a theoretical approach the notion of nationalism is underlying on the basis of discourse analysis. Though the meaning of the nationalism has been defined but that meaning itself had been questioned. The word nationalism has existed and meant a lot for people all over the world from the very history. It is more of a global phenomenon which becomes evident by the various nationalist movements in Asia, Africa, Europe, America etc. These nationalist movements had been done in the name of core religious identity like Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, British, American, African and so on. Making nationalism as the symbol of identification. As it is a global phenomenon thus, it needs a global perspective to treat the concept of nationalism (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.1).

Defining Brexit

On the name of nationalism various wars had been fought as it has shown a varied capacity of identity for the survival all over the world, also in the west in the UK of Great Britain. The topic of nationalism is never closed and is always in discussion because every argument lacks the full global perspective. The new theoretical approach has not been thought of or the old has not been refined yet that is, not taking and considering every viewpoint from global perspective for nationalism (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.1). This is because there is still some recognizable European forms which exist and also there are some cultures and practices which has moved on and are distinct from the West.

The concept of nationalism arises from the very concept of nation- state as pointed out by Benedict Anderson in his concept of imagined communities that is, the national identity is always produced and reproduced. The idea of nationalism and nationhood is connected with the idea of statehood, belongingness, identity of the population

towards that nation (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.1). However, it will not be wrong to say that today nationalism is more than a societal organisation. Under the condition of globalisation there are new definition added to the understanding of nationalism according to the challenges which has been related to the nationalism rather than just considering the demand of the state (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.2). "Globalised communication and movements facilitate nationalism which is also driven by the relentless concern with meaning and identity that is a feature of a present day. It is both a reaction and a product of globalisation" (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.2). Whereas before it was outcome of the modernisation. Now it involves a global perspective; instead of starting from the bottom it has starting from the edge making the boundaries invisible like the European integration taking one identity this has been made more evident by the formation of the European Union.

Further, there is nationalism which is civic and there is nationalism which is ethnic. Civic comprise of citizens and citizenships and ethnic comprises of common blood ties and belonging from a same lineage. According to Kumar the British culture, territory and identity was made up of the civic nationalism which existed before and the central and the east Europe is made up of ethnic nationalism which came later (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.16). But today's history can no longer give any definition and identity to nationalism.

Further the mixture of any culture with another culture does not lead to the crisis of the former culture. Britain has various cultures like Islamic where people were born there, are recognised by their family and religion but are known as the citizens of Britain. However, they do not compete with the idea of Britishness (Madood: 1997: p. B6). Madood points out that one's ethnic identity does not get specified by the individual participation into different cultural practices such as in language, religion or dress, like the people of different religion and ethnic groups living in Britain; they do not get identified as British but are recognized by their own religion and ethnic group with some form of British culture. According to him, the group of any ethnic identity is implicit and is limited to their own ethnic identity. This reflects the group membership which represents the identification with the certain group to which the person belongs (Madood: 1997: p. B6). Nevertheless, the adaptation to different culture is very common among people. This is also a political issue as every ethnic group have some of the 'multicultural britishness' which is sensitive to the cultural differences as it incorporates a sense of belonging to the individual and to the group.

The term nationalism according to the scholars is inseparable from the value- orientation or from the feeling of national consciousness (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.44). Nationalism itself has developed within in itself as an ideology but its existence come into force when it gets meaning through comparison from other sources. Hans Kohn points out that "Nationalism is an active world historical force, rather than a reflection of a pre-existing nationhood" (Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.46).

According to Ruth Wodak there is no single national identities but there are multiple national identities which are produced according to the audience of the ideological narratives from political and economic background, though they are prior to tensions and contradictions (Wodak cited in Delanty and Kumar: 1942: p.106). Across European countries government has various provisions for people to travel and stay in other European countries. According to the researcher while to settle in that particular country migrants are assist to that countries culture and language.

What shaped the votes

The 51% people voted for Brexit were under the campaign influence. The campaign focused only on the sovereignty and the economic cost of EU membership. Well to Remain with EU the Brexit campaign focused on the heavy economic cost and risk that will accompany the vote for Remain Brexit according to the President of Leave Brexit campaign Boris Johnson unlike to the prime minister, governor of the Bank of England David Cameron, who asserted that Brexit would only result in high rate in taxation, which will ultimately shake off the country's budget. Similar to the views of Cristine Lagarde Director of the IMF who said that Brexit will damage the global budget. Thus, the debate surrounds the argument on cost benefit analysis, global relationship, political group together shape the referendum. Hooghe and Marks in Clarke, Goodwin and Whitely asserted that people opinions about the Brexit are shaped by the calculations first, about the cost benefit analysis related to themselves and to the country; second, community- the feeling of nationality and identity whether as British or European and third, cues- people ideology for leave or Remain in Brexit are shaped by the political leaders and political elites.

There is an important structural variation in the ethnic landscapes, political stages, economic circumstances and demographic area for Brexit to happen like, wealthy people voted against the Brexit and their concern about the xenophobia was on the legal basis (Gusterson: 2017: 209). According to the anthropologists the Brexit was triggered by the nationalist populist movement which itself was the outcome of the neoliberal political and economic circumstances which prevailed among the countries from long ago. These circumstances are now increased among people through commodity prices, employment opportunities, land occupancy and ethnic diversity. With the increase in the movement of migrants there has been a relative shift in the capitalism and

economic circumstances of the country (Gusterson: 2017: 210).

There is consensus on two things. First, that the effects of the UK leaving EU could be pervasive, touching many aspects of the economy, society and politics within the UK and beyond. Second, there is a consensus that any effects are highly uncertain (Cowell: 2017: 153). The decision was taken undeniably on the grounds of nationalism, ethnicity, employment and solidarity (sense of belongingness).

However, EU has part in UK's decision-making procedures, take decision in firmer environmental standards, integrated spatial and environmental governance and infrastructure and economic regeneration (Cowell: 2017: 153). Thus, EU has a part in decision making process especially in economic and development process.

However, one thing cannot be ignored that the fluctuations in approval and disapproval in EU membership and integration has been there since first general elections. The approval ranged from 33.0 percent in 2011 to 49.8 percent in 2015 and disapproval ranged from 54.2 per cent in 2012 to 36.5 percent in 2015 (Clarke, Godwin and Whiteley: 2016: p. 6). The dilemma prevailed among people is that whether Britain is worse off or better off after leaving EU. The result showed that it is worse off in the economic and in the financial terms. But it is better off in the immigration context. But it has been pointed out that 41 percent of the population agreed that immigrants are provided with the work which is unlikely to be taken by the Britons (Clarke, Godwin and Whiteley: 2016: p. 11-12).

Britain comprised of people who were British, English, Scottish, Welsh, European and some other nationality. Clarke, Godwin and Whiteley argue that people who are English or Welsh are less favourable to the idea of Remain EU and people who were Scottish and European were more favourable towards EU. But on the other hand, the English and Welsh identifiers were likely to have Britain of EU as they are more likely to have cost-benefit evaluation from that, but also more risk of 'immigration- terrorism evaluation' (Clarke, Godwin and Whiteley: 2016: p.20). It was also expected that Britain was better able to control the economic and terrorist threat after not being part of EU. The negative impact of leave EU was that there is a perception that Britain has lost its control over economy to EU.

The decision to leave EU means an affect whether positive or negative on finances, economic, politics and implications on the nation. The affect has come on the opinions to policies ranging from agriculture to multinational companies, food to health and education to employment (Menon: 2016: p.4). One of the main reason for Brexit to happen is to deal with EU national in the UK. The decision for Remain or leave was divided among the parties and party members of Conservative and Labour. The Labour party failed to influence people to vote for Remain with EU and conservative party comprised people with mixed views but as a result people voted for leave EU. Author points out that Conservative party is made up of middle class and people who voted to leave EU were working class. Thus, the working-class vote made the decision for whole of the nation (Curtice: 2016: p. 7). Hobolt, Leeper and Tilley in Menon (2016: p. 9) puts it:

The negotiations between the British Government and the EU involve an array of complex policy questions. The most prominent so far has been the trade-off between the Government prioritizing preferential trade agreements with the EU or prioritizing control over EU immigration rates. But there are many other policy choices that relate to the "divorce bill", continuing EU budget contributions and access to EU funds, jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice, border controls with the Republic of Ireland and so on. These questions did not feature on the referendum ballot paper, nor are they issues that many people necessarily gave much thought to before the referendum. However, it is crucial for the Government that the outcome of the negotiations is perceived to be legitimate by the people. The main idea behind the establishment of EU was the integration of different countries together so that one can fulfil the content that lacks in another. Therefore, EU also achieved the monetary integration that is, the biggest financial integration. But the country which entered EU was notorious to adopt the single currency was Britain which pointed out that it wanted its financial issues to left outside the eurozone (Scuira: 2017: p. 111). Britain did not want to have its financial issues are being controlled by the 'European central Bank'.

The area of conflict occurred in the displeasing attitude of the European countries towards Britain. In addition, 60 percent of decisions in EU were not made by the MPs but by the European Parliament (consist of unelected bureaucrats). Furthermore, Britain also argues that hard rules were imposed on it by the European Union which led the lower population to start a free movement out of common sentiments about the unemployment and wage crises (Scuira: 2017: p. 112).

Brexit has led a certain shift in the EU and its member states. As EU has lost its one on of the biggest member state like France and Germany. After a look, it can be said that Brexit given France a way to make EU more of a French structured Union. Greece is no more scared to have Grexit after the results and effects of Brexit. Non-Eurozone members such as Sweden, Poland and Denmark after Brexit are trying to shape the eurozone policies.

This shows that EU has lost more than what Britain was about to lose after Brexit (Oliver: 2016: p. 1323-1324).

There is a dilemma that if UK leaves EU then he may no longer be part of European Economic Area (EEA) but if UK leaves EU and be member of EEA then its control over domestic market would not be constrained. However, even after the result the decision has come with a compromise. The winner and the loser both negotiate compromise on certain elements for the survival of both the party (Anon: 2016: p. 488). As Menon and Fowler (2016: R7) put it:

By local authority-level characteristics, the 'Leave' vote share was highest in areas where average levels of schooling were low, whereas all 20 of the 'most educated' areas in the UK voted 'Remain'. This fed through into similar patterns for occupational background: areas with large proportions of people in professional occupations registered strong 'Remain' votes, as did those with higher levels of median hourly pay.

Sovereignty

The above stated statement is the list of demands that government want from Brexit which are somewhat similar to the demands of the people but not exactly what people want like their concern is regarding sovereignty, trade arrangements and there should be no bill settlement. The way where government gets separated from the people's demand is over controlling and giving rights to the immigrants. It's not only their sovereignty but their democracy was all taken away by the EU as Michael Grove the justice secretary argues that the right to take critical decisions about the lives of the Britons was also hampered by being part of EU (Beddoes: 2016: p. 4). Thus, the main reason for people to vote for Leave EU is to take control back over the decision. The three factors for the sovereignty argument are-parliamentary supremacy

- European Law trumps the national law of the Britain
- Under the influence of EU Britain has signed 700 international treaties that impinges on its sovereignty

The argument does not end only on these factors; the reason Britain was highlighted in leaving EU was that it is Britain who do not have control over its parliament unlike Denmark, Sweden and Netherlands who are more accountable to the people by taking their own decision over their people without any interference or the influence of the EU.

The effects of post- Brexit are one thing that prevail in government argument which has left government to negotiate with the EU over economic and political matters in order to survive after separating from EU. The ground on which Britain considered that they are better off EU that Britain pays 20 pounds billion a year to Brussels after deducting what EU spend on UK. Secondly, jobs will not get affected after separating from EU, but Britain argues that this is non- sense as jobs depend on demand, wage levels and Labour laws than on membership with number of trades (Beddoes: 2016: p. 3). Thirdly, Nigel Farage pointed out that it is Britain who takes 20% of EU exports and gives more than that. Though these arguments are different on the grounds on which people voted such as sovereignty and immigration but these issues are important to be addressed. Apparently, the problems faced by Britain were put in one form by the Eurosceptic plutocrats in front of the people was the insecurity about the xenophobia that outsiders are hijacking their jobs, their place, their living (Scuira: 2017: p. 114). Arron Banks in his book pointed out that people of EU were asked to leave Britain after the result of Brexit was revealed. The very racist attitude was put forward by the Britons for the immigrants.

Nevertheless, some scholars argue that the concept of sovereignty has been misplaced by the word autonomy. All the external constraints and state conflicts due to lack of attainment of policy goals is not due to the loss of sovereignty but because the state has lost its autonomy. Cooperative interaction has become a policy goal for states and EU is one form of it. However, NATO is another form of it, but it is the dangerous to national sovereignty as it includes military forces, who are ultimate decision maker (Kostadinova: 2016: p. 138).

Britain lives with the idea of ultimate supreme power where its construction of the Europe as 'Other'. Britain was also concerned about the parliamentary sovereignty as well because due to the EU law Britain could not apply its own legal system (Ewing: 2017: p. 714). As Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson (2003: 54) put it:

European Union integration invokes and induces a continuous breaking up and renewal of existing power structures, thereby continuously subverting existing spatial economic orderings of property and belonging.

Migration leads to terrorism?

It cannot be ignored that one of the main reason for Brexit to happen was the issue of permissible boundaries that is, the boundaries became so liberal that Britain lost control over the immigration. The government especially the Prime Minister David Cameron in response to people's demand he promised to bring the net migration below the 100,000 in a year but it was hard to believe because currently it was around 362,000. The main concern that people (Britons) were for Brexit was the economic condition were get worse for them as people were getting unemployed and also the terrorism was surging. For instance, the attack in Brussels on 22nd March also led terrorism to enter Britain because of free movement of people. Also, in EU Britain is not registered on the Schengen passport which ultimately also means that it does not come under its migration protection (Beddoes: 2016: p. 6- 7). But it still cannot stop the Europe migration it wants have access to the single market of Europe like the above stated example of Norway. Beddoes (2016: p.7) puts it:

Most Brexiteers insist on tougher controls. They say heavy EU migration burdens taxpayers, drives up welfare spending, strains public services like health and education and aggravates the housing crisis. Some argue that migration steal jobs and reduces wages, especially for the lower paid. Those who favour some immigration often prefers an Australian-style points system that would let Britain cherry-pick the best and brightest.

The issue of migration and the EU membership was also separated. It was for UK in 1973 that it joined EU for migration from outside the region to increase within. The thing which mattered UK that UK Independence Party (UKIP) increased their vote to 3.8 million from one million votes. In order to deal with this problem, later, David Cameron, put a short-term program (calling for a referendum) for its party to confront the Euro- sceptic problem (Morgan and Patomaki: 2016: p. 99).

The week before the result was out the leave campaign only focused on immigration portraying it as a root cause of the Brexit (Goodwin and Heath: 2016: p. 324). It is highlighted by the UK that Brexit vote was in the support of the growing class inequality and wage workers who were facing discrimination. So, the vote was not only based on the class divide but also between the capitalist and anti- capitalist (Bailey: 2017: p. 333). Immigration control does not means making borders hard but to stop people Europe immigrants to enter without the visa (Jonathan: 2016:p. R16).

Safety hooks

David Cameron pointed various factors regarding the immigration, terrorism, finance, trade and national identity. But one more issue which still needed to be addressed was the issue of safety, security. The question that David Cameron put in front of its Cabinet Ministers led to look at the whole result of post- Brexit. This was the issue of Britain's safety. He pointed out that there will be rise of conflict after Britain will get separated from EU. In last couple of decades EU has increased its foreign and security policy and after the result Brexit will limit or moreover will diminish its role in world (Beddoes: 2016: p. 13). In addition, Europe has a role in intelligence co-operation. Infact, many British politicians believe that Britain was more secure and safe when it was part of EU.

However, it has been contradicted by the Britain on three grounds that for foreign security and policy it is NATO and EU cannot undermine it. For intelligence, they say that they have the support of five countries altogether as a 'five eyes' including America, New Zealand, Canada, Britain and Australia and post- Brexit will help to replicate the co-operation with EU and thirdly, EU is damaging and unreliable because it can rule in security cases for instance, migration (Beddoes: 2016: p. 13). Also, Brexit will increase the risk of EU because the military headquarters is long set in Britain away from any European country. All the five eye wants Britain to stay in EU because it helps them to align with the Europe and in turn allow EU to co-operate with them. Economist pointed out that if EU has made any decisions especially European Court of Justice (ECJ) ruling out Britain then it is not ECJ but can be Court of Human Rights which is not part of EU. In addition, to this it has geopolitical reason as well and that is EU's role in foreign policy has increased and has become the key instrument for West's security and defence, but after Brexit it EU will become weak because of the reason mentioned above which will ultimately make the West weak in terms of security.

Another problem is that the trust in EU has declined because of economic crises which seems by the Brexiteers as undemocratic, however, the problem of securitization and identity politics is not only confined with EU but it does include the reliable issue on EU which give rise to the external conflicts.

In such a revolutionary step of Britain how come US stay out of it. When it is evident that US share good relations with both with EU in which Britain being part of it and with Britain separately. US has played a major role in the Brexit decision indirectly according to Wyn Rees. The US have always faced the problem that whether to consider the EU as a partner in security and defence or as a problem holding a power contrary to US.

However, the author asserts, that the relationship with Britain is seen as tackling with that problem. As Rees (2017: p. 559) puts is:

As a leading defence and security actor within the EU, the UK has provided the United States with a means to influence and constrain the Union's activities. In turn, this has played into UK scepticism of the EU's continental and global security functions. It fostered a UK self-perception that it was more than just a European power.

After Brexit, the US argues that EU partners such Germany, Spain and many other countries are spending sufficiently on the defence and security issues. It is evident that Britain alongside France and Germany has contributed majorly on the defence and security system making European Union powerful to the contrary to US. The separation from EU does not mean that one cannot have access to the EU regulation. Switzerland, Israel got access to certain EU programmes and research scheme and have paid to get access to it (Cressey: 2016: p. 15).

Trade

Brexiters argue that trade will not be affected even after the leave vote. The factors that has been pointed out is that trade can be carried out on free- trade deal. Though it will affect in some way because EU dismantles both tariffs and non- tariff barriers involving various rules and regulations; as EU, single market is deeper than the free-trade barriers and it gets it strength on such grounds. This gave boost to the Britain export. Nevertheless, the supporters of leave Brexit campaign argued that countries can have access to the single market even by not being part of the EU if they agree all the rules set by EU, free movement of people from Europe and also contribute to EU budget like, in the case of the Norway (Beddoes: 2016: p. 6). Further, Britain has more access to the world market export and therefore, EU need Britain more than EU needs Britain, as it exports 45% of goods to Europe and import around 7% of goods. Even if no deal was made on a single market access then they will rely on the World Trade Organisation or will go for the free- trade deal like Canada as it will be more beneficial to them. Nevertheless, according to the economist the Brexit will definitely affect the inward investment of Britain on productivity of goods (Beck:2016: p. 26)

Britain companies could not possibly able to lobbying out the profit outside the economic bloc governed by EU due to harsh trade agreements; they did not have any direct control over the business (Scuirra: 2017: p. 113). According to Britain it is the eastern Europe migrants were one of the reason for leave vote as they are seen as the competitors to the scarce resources and employment available in the UK. So, Britain was contributing in EU budget and also in eastern Europe unemployment issue, which in turn was affecting the Britain's economy (Nolke: 2017:p. 231).

The loophole comes when big countries like India, America and China wants to make deal with the EU for trading in which Britain will be excluded after post- Brexit. Economist also asserts that for Canada it took seven years to make free- trade deal which is still not ratified and Britain has been given only two years to make a trade deal. In this position, the Britain market can get damaged. In addition, free trade does not mean freedom of trading with European countries but it is a trade which involve liberals and protectionist. Thus, for Britain the rules will be more worse than it has now if it agrees for free- trade deal (Beddoes: 2016: p. 6).

The example of Canada also shows that one regional parliament decision is enough to disrupt the relation with the trading partners. It is not only about Britain but the Union is also going to be reshaped by the Brexit vote. The concern to EU was that how Brexit will act as integration or a disintegration for the 27-member states which it consists (Oliver: 2017: p. 524). For EU, the most notable concern after Brexit is Britain withdrawal from the support for security and defence. Britain as a permanent UN member and as a one of the powerful international entity will have an impact on EU. "It is in the field of merchandise trade relations that the Union exhibits the highest degree of actor capability through a daily requirement to identify policy priorities and to formulate policy as a single unit" (Bretherton and Vogler: 2006: p. 67). Economists pointed out that EU is good in terms of trade laws and trade is ultimately good for the economy of the country. So, after leaving EU how Britain going to manage its trade with the global world? The answer is its going to be under the World Trade Organisation (WTO) trade regulations to maintain the cycle. Apparently, this going to affect its GDP. According to the Minford's model the Britain has removed all the manufacturing tariffs and under WTO it only has to pay the external tariffs. In order to protect the UK trade system there are multiple ideas are implied like to increase the tariffs on Chinese trade or to increase wage inequality. However, whatever the ideas are posed by the Britain decision makers the UK income per capita will fall by the 2.6% (Sampson, Dhingra, Ottaviano and Reenen: 2016: p. 2- 3).

The effect on business

The leave vote was a pro- Brexit campaign where the business people argued that business is equally divided. But the big majority was for the Remain Brexit vote. 80% was for Remain in the EU and only 5% did not want to stay in the EU. International Chamber of Commerce, Aerospace and defence association, Food and Drink Association and many more voted for Remain. Only handful of big companies wanted to leave EU.

Various European banks trying to impose the transactional tax on Britain also euro- zone has stopped clearing the euro transactions in London. Britain has successfully challenged this in court but however, this has further created the tension between the countries (Beddoes: 2016: p. 11).

George Osborne Chancellor, Member of Parliament pointed out that Britain will have its own rule book for the financial services and if any non- euro country felt that their interest in financial transactions was not protected then that country will be left with a choice whether to join EU or Britain. As Britain will not do collaborative business with EU even through a non- euro country. Another reason for not doing business with euro- zone countries is because European countries have multiple currencies and also many countries resent Britain for having more than half of its business transaction with Europe and therefore, many countries want to take it.

The tension arises with the heated decision for Britain that EU wants many non- euro countries to join euro for business, looking forward to make a euro- zone integration with the euro- zone Finance Minister to set up a common mutual budget and rules for the transaction, and making harder for euro- zone to non- euro countries to make it difficult for the Britain even to negotiate the terms of rules for having business. London is a financial centre for both EU and euro- zone countries. Financial uncertainties were growing in UK after Brexit, people were losing hope in business investment (Kierzenkowski, Pain, Rusticelli and Zwart: 2016: p.6).

Researcher such as Owen Worth points out that roots of Brexit can be found on the sand of free market. He takes the work of Karl Polanyi that “free market liberalism tends to generate the forces of its own demise” (Morgan and Patomaki: 2016: p. 100). Boris Kagarlitsky on the other hand agrees with Worth but it looks different reason for Brexit to be happen that because of ‘difference in class’. That is, as pointed out earlier that the vote for leave was mainly made by lower class and working-class population. He criticizes the neoliberal elites and media for misleading the population regarding to the concept of Brexit.

Whether good or bad the effects are always two- way round. The discussion has always been around the fall of Britain and the Brexit consequences on Britain but it cannot be ignored according to the researchers and economist that Brexit also going to have a profound impact on Europe and EU. The youth unemployment will rise and Greece will be back in crisis, the overall economic growth will become slow. Infact even the German politician Angela Merkel will be politically weakened. The EU will also be affected economically as its biggest economic supporter will exit the team. Britain is EU’s one of the largest military clout. As mentioned earlier the vice- versa will be there for EU that it will become less liberal and more protectionist and will also lost the balance of power between European countries.

The question of xenophobia among people arouses when the fear of migrants hijacking their employment thus, increasing the wage inequality and creating cultural alienation. It can be said that xenophobia being led by poverty. As Ramiah, Pham and Moosa (2017, p. 2508) put it:

It is too early to get a feel of the economic and financial effects of Brexit on the British economy, particularly because the country is still part of the European Union. However, it is possible to envisage the likely costs and benefits of Brexit. The potential costs are (1) possible tariffs on exports to the European Union; (2) the loss of access to the huge EU market; (3) the adverse effect on the City of London, which is typically viewed as a major pillar of the British economy (who needs manufacturing industry when we have the City) and (4) declining investment in reaction to uncertainty. On the other hand, the potential benefits are (1) avoidance of EU regulation; (2) savings on EU contributions; (3) the ability to strike new trade deals with non-EU countries and (4) the positive effects of skill-based migration policy

Agricultural export

EU take 62% of British agricultural export which in turns make the Britain’s 54% of British’s farmers income. But farmers still want to get separated from the EU. The mere assumptions have been that they want to get away because of sovereignty and national identity even by the fact that this going to make their lives harder. British government itself wants to make agricultural policies where they outlaw the agriculture for farms because of pesticides and look up for more greenery for environmental regulations than crops. By existing EU, Britain will get more control over their land and address issues about environmental concerns. In addition, to this many farmer feel that neither DEFRA nor Rural Payment Agency (RPA) is fit for them as politically powerful European counterparts gets good treatment than them (Beddoes: 2016: p. 13). Tariff Rate Quotas (TRQ’s) need to be put on some agricultural products such as sheep and lamb meat. UK will export these products and on other products UK does not have to pay any Tariffs (Jongeneel, Berkum and Vrolijk: 2016: p. 27).

Even after leave campaign farmers want to cut red tape and to increase subsidy. The farmers are the one who going to suffer the most from the Brexit. As they require the British born workers in farming. National Farmer Union (NFU) have prepared a report stating that the Brexit should affect the trading partnership

otherwise the farmers are going to face the great loss (Burnyeat: 2016: p. 15).

The survival of EU-UK division

It is false to assume that EU make decisions on which the government is unwilling to take any decisions for instance, Britain has taken 87% side on EU's decision. One of the spheres where Britain is somewhat different from EU in terms of policy is in the business sector. Britain as compared EU has liberal standards and least-regulated. Britain think- tank points out that there is no issue regarding to the employment, though Britain always had and has did play an important role in climate change and financial services which were affected before Brexit. But however, Britain is trying to make workers and unions think about the employment problem which is not even there in business. Another argument which is not being considered in this debate is that EU has rest on fewer new rules and also started to withdraw the older ones so that after Brexit Britain consider EU less competitive.

Scotland does not want to leave EU and its 75% vote was for backing Remain. It is said that EU will be most happy to welcome Scotland but the issue of leaving pound and adopting euro as its currency. Also, if Britain stops the free movement of people then this will create a tension with the borders of Scotland and England. Further, the majority of farming is done on the Northern Ireland (part of Britain) which ultimately depends on the EU subsidies. Ireland is more worried about the Brexit result as that leave it into dilemma that- Ireland is most net beneficial from the EU budget and secondly, Britain is the largest exporter to Ireland than to any other country. Britain argues, that people who voted to Remain even they did not want the European Union Power, in fact they were also in the favour of centralized power (Bourne: 2016: p, 358). Brexiteers argue that it is not a wise choice to make in terms of trade as Ireland will then be in a big trouble and will leave Ireland with only one choice that is, to separate Ireland from Northern Ireland.

This does not mean that Britain with Brexit will bring the years of violence. The 'Good Friday Agreement' is one such example as both Ireland and Britain signed the European Convention on Human Rights in 1988. Such Agreements are example of being together in unity. The people who voted to remain in EU were ready to stay in 'different' EU. The remain campaigners demanded that Britain should in EU while being part of European Monetary Union (EMU).

Change of governance

No one denies the fact that the leave vote denotes the misinterpretation of the meaning and the polarisation within the population which has created the repercussion among people's thinking. But what if this may also give a way to both EU and UK to change their form of governance. Kaufmann pointed out that the Brexit vote showed there exit the difference among who do not embrace multiculturalism or globalisation pointing out the 'attitudinal positioning' of the people (Kostadinova: 2017: p. 136).

The vote is seen as the unintended unpredictable decision rather than carefully analysed the process of the debate. As the international governance shapes the EU financial governance, likewise EU can also put its preferences on the international market (Moloney: 2016: p. 453). But however, the international affairs remain the main context of the UK government (Reid: 2017: p.4).

UK according to the economist wanted to leave EU, but did not want to exit the system completely. They might be wanted the Norwegian style of arrangements which by being separate from the EU they have access to the single market and free movement (Douglas- Scott: 2016: p. 1023).

What future Britain holds after Brexit?

David Cameron pointed out that after the vote for Brexit, the Britain will go straightforwardly for the two-year departure time according to the Article 50 of Lisbon Treaty and ask 27 EU countries what offers do they have to offer them obviously with the majority vote. There will also be a negotiation on the new trade deal with the unanimous vote of 27 EU countries including their national parliaments (Beddoes: 2016: p. 17). If both head failed to reach on any result then they will extent the two-year time and if it is still not done then Britain has to walk out with no deal at all. This argument shows that power still lies in the hand of EU but nevertheless with above stated debate Britain leaves in its fragile state as EU needs Britain more than the other way around. Therefore, Brexiteers are looking for an alternative through which both the parties can survive, in which they propose that they should make new trade laws and agree on it informally or "not to use the Article at all but instead repeal the 1972 European Communities Act that gives effect to EU laws, or pass a new act taking Britain out of the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice" (Beddoes: 2016: p. 17). But this would lead to a breaching of the EU law. So, the only friendly and legal way which is left is to work according to the Article 50 is to leave EU.

The EU 'Global Strategy' looked upon the international trade and finance, in which after the leave vote EU

also included the labour mobility. EU encompasses various international economic policy but however, it risks to be out of order from various ‘domestic political developments’ of EU countries (Blockmans: 2016: p. 182). The misconception around the notion that the countries will have more freedom if they are not constrained by Europe. But they miss the fact that EU makes “sovereignty” possibility in a highly connected world of technology, migration, and nonetheless, the global values. The international economic order prevails through global fair trade with the countries co-operating to function together in a global world. To maintain the global peace in terms of European Economic Area (EEA) and EU will maintain the relationship with the Britain.

It is predicted that the Leave vote however, will show continue in Britain’s crisis because of the misconception among people regarding the vote leave instead of pointing out the problem in the economic policy of UK. Jessop points out that it is always the privilege value the financial profit in which the use value is exploited leaving the shift in the meaning of the wealth and income which further generate ‘financial crises and de-industrialization’ which is lately, characterized by the economic, financial, migration, identity crises by Britain.

The debate of Brexit in future can be seen as the debate centred around the breakup from the globalisation in the context of economic and cultural dependence (Blagden: 2017: p. 1). The debate also centres around the notion that the concept of nationalism for vote for Brexit is mere an illusion, the generalization can be deducted from the concept of globalization. As no country in the world of technology and inter- dependence would turn its back on globalization to protect its nation- state. Nevertheless, can change its dependable partner. Therefore, through Brexit both Britain and EU has become open up to the new world. But this again becomes problem for UK as it will get separated from EU and might leave scotland in a condition to get separated from the UK. Thus, this can lead to internal division (Galbraith cited in Morgan and Patomaki: 2016: p. 102).

Nonetheless, Britain would have spoken as a reference point for the countries such as Denmark and Austria in the debates held in EU. According to German administrators the Brexit has disintegrated the EU internally through Brexit, for which EU has to focus more on enhancing and protecting eurozone through integration with other European countries. Therefore, other EU members pointed that this has led Britain to have informal and indirect relation with it. The fear of undercutting with the Britain led EU made them to have a special provisional relationship with them. Another reason for EU to have this informal relation is to avoid the social and political conflict and above that the financial conflict as mentioned above (Oliver: 2016:p.1324).

The effect on Scotland

As discussed above Scotland has always been on the edge of Britain. It has tried to overcome its poverty and the less population issue against the England. They have always tried to keep their culture away from getting inter- mixed with English culture. They never got assimilated with English- British culture which is somewhat prevalent in England. Scotland and England remained ethnically distinct. It can be said that, “remained a nation without a state” (Mackenzie: 2016: p. 578). The nationalism of Scotland demanding the independence within Europe; as an individual existing entity by being the part of a whole. The inclination towards British than the English was clearly pointed out on the referendum of the 26 July 2016. Where most of the majority votes for remain came from the Scotland. The statistics shows that 106 votes were for remain and only one vote was for leave.

No Scottish party has ever voted for Remain as the result were there in 2016. It is not about the desirability that Scotland wants to be part of EU rather it is independence that will be jeopardized by leaving EU. Furthermore, Scotland have a trading partnership with England so that by not getting support in return, the England will seize the economic deal with the Scotland, resulting in hard borders (Hackett: 2016: p.99).

According to Michael Keating further addition to the result of Brexit was that maximum devolved legislature was controlled by the EU when major work was done by the Britain. Due to the devolution act the EU controlled UK and also EU single market under the same roof with its own administrative authority. All the UK administrative decisions were taken under the framework of the EU. UK does not have frameworks in the field of environment, agriculture, so the maximum direction and coordination comes from the EU ministerial competence (Keating: 2017: p. 1). EU resides in the heart of UK as it provides the divided authority in the multinational identity state. Like in Scotland it supports certain party, Northern Ireland it helps in maintain cross border peace and cooperation. Thus, EU acts as an external affair which is important for Britain governance. In order words, it can be said that UK has multi layers of governance. Through Brexit UK has tried to decentralize the power between the nation and also tried to dysfunction the devolution power that EU holds. The EU served an important role in underpinning the UK’s own union. After Brexit, it will be much more difficult to hold that together (Keating: 2017: p. 3). The reason for such a support was that the Scotland benefits financially and politically in many ways.

The resent towards the English culture and their people is extremely strong. Scotland does not want to be

controlled or followed by the English orders. They have xenophobia regarding to their national place from English and Welsh people. Mackenzie argues that the remain vote shows that the Scotland integration towards EU and Britain will always be favored. It does not support the idea of England getting separated from EU as this will create the tensions between the border of states.

Another reason for Scotland to vote for remain was for the free movement of people (workers) from Scotland, EU-27 and other parts of the Europe. The only way for EU to keep UK incorporated with itself was binding the strict regulation regarding the access to the single market. However, it can be seen the result showed that it failed to shape or redefine the decision of UK.

Keating makes the point that Scotland alone gave 62% of votes for remain in EU because of its deal regarding the trade, movement of people but it is noteworthy that Scotland does majority of trade with Britain than with EU. Also, Northern Ireland share same ideology as EU, the leave result becomes threat to the Northern Ireland accessibility to those ideologies. And the remain decision create a difference in the internal thinking thus, giving a rise to a chaos internally. However, UK has tried not keep any 'hard borders' with the EU. Even after the leave vote UK will keep the liberal policies for the Irish and Britain borders. In addition, is trying to negotiate with the EU regarding the free movement of trade and in having liberal business policies. According to the Brexiteers, as the Brexit has put the border between the Ireland likewise it is going to put the hard border between the Ireland and the Britain no matter how easy and liberal relation UK tries to make.

On one hand, Irish and Scottish government do not want UK framework and on the other hand Welsh government wants UK framework for gaining control over the devolving legislature. As mentioned about the devolution the Scottish government inclined towards the EU as it has similar governing policies and therefore, UK thinkers feared that the reason for Scotland to vote for Remain so that it can have its own political devolution separate from the England (McHarg and Mitchell: 2017: p. 517).

World view on Brexit

"The EU is a product of a liberal international order that the USA has pursued since 1945" (Oliver: 2017: p. 526). US has always supported EU- UK relationship. On the contrary, EU has also stood as a challenger to US for trade and security purposes in the context of UN. US administrators were always optimistic about the UK relation with EU and has also encouraged UK to pursue its relationship with European states, ideally as this will help to nurture the 'UK- US relation' which will benefit each other and this also make little uncommitted to European Union. On the other side, US has also maintained stable relation with EU separately from UK. Ultimately this two-way transatlantic relation has created problems in balancing the edge of foreign, security and trade concerns as Britain had always been the leading proponent in these agendas (Oliver: 2017: p. 527) and Trump may fail in leading a subtle transition between UK and EU. However, USA support matters as it helps Europe in global trading and national security and maintain good transatlantic relation. Casarini and Musu points out that if US stands in the opposition to EU then it will become difficult to maintain the cooperation as no country in the world will be able to stand against US in security purposes.

This separation by Russia is seen as the weakness of EU to hold a member within its realm. Unlike, the EU sees it as 'post- modern' power on international affairs. Russia has stronger financial relations with EU than with the Britain. However, the reliability is temporary and therefore, any monetary or financial conflicts is of no interest of Russia. According to Russian administrates EU is ruined because of the eurozone and Schengen problems. It has also lost its religious, cultural, financial and hold over legal laws (Oliver: 2017: p. 529).

Critical analyses

In this essay, we have already encountered the benefits of the integration between the EU and UK. Keeping Brexit outside UK is extremely important for UK so that can have a reliable approach. With EU, it had support for 'political projects', were able to negotiate with the global world in terms of trade and no to forget to mention that Brexit however, includes more than the integration between the EU and UK. As Nissan, Galpin and Rosamond (2017, p.575) puts it:

The key analytical question emerging from this understanding of Brexit as a speech act is What kind of promise for the future does Brexit hold outside the UK, across the three domains at which we are looking?

Taking the Judith Butler's view on gender performance by applying it on the Brexit notion the scholars trying to point out that people actions are shaped according to the historical and cultural practices. Therefore, these scholars argue that the vote for Brexit is a discourse which itself is questionable. But in the performance nevertheless, there is an element of agency which make the actor to act in a transformative way. Thus, the performance can be redefined through a significance of an agency.

Britain has advocated the ideas and laws about climate change and environment concerns proposed by EU. It is seen that eastern Europe caused the problem which led Britain to vote for Brexit. Britain has advocated and opposed EU laws like any other member such as Germany and France out of national sentiments. Therefore, this should not only be centered around Britain as one of the reasons for Brexit (Oliver: 2017: p. 522).

UK after leaving the EU has disturbed the order of international cooperation and global dependence. Like Japan, who was concerned about the multilateralism where it was maintaining good relations with Europe for cooperation in maintaining world order. Similarly, China and US advocated UK to Remain in EU, but for US it was scripted as UK- EU integration will counter the US world power. On the contrary, the transatlantic relation is hampered by the Brexit. The transatlantic relation as mentioned earlier is a business agreement regarding the trade and investment between US and EU. US sees Brexit has disrupted the economic, legal and commercial flow between the EU and EU as Britain was the major contributor in net export in EU. European decision makers pointed out that Brexit has made EU deprived of what it is most prevalent for that is, free trade and international economy. It is not only US who is trying to resist the new rising order which is not fitting the global world of economic order but it also includes Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) countries. To sum up, it affects geopolitical every nation.

To draw out little benefit from the single market of EU is now seems to surge. But this possibility has been crossed out by the UK. As Nissen, Galpin and Rosamond (2017, p. 583) puts it:

envisages clear benefits of maintaining a North Atlantic liberal economic space, within which the jurisdictionally separate US, EU and post-Brexit UK economies would continue a relatively seamless integrative path. This version of the transatlantic economy is premised on long established practices that have shaped and naturalised the US-EU economic relationship into this particular conception.

According to Amanda Sy Director of African Growth Initiative at Brookings Institute asserts that Brexit will only result in reduction in bilateral trade and international development programs (Nissen, Galpin and Rosamond: 2017: p.580). Furthermore, Indian diplomats argued that UK- EU integration would come through as to improve the relationship with the UK in terms of human dimension especially in the context of visa. Such a statement from a commonwealth country subverted the argument from remain to leave as Brexit will help UK to control the migration issue as mentioned above. China, Turkey, Japan, India many other countries showed that if Britain remains in EU then it will benefit the world as somehow everyone is dependent on one or the other and these countries share the relation with the EU; and will be stronger with Britain being part of it.

The argument formulated with the belief system that Britain decision makers believe that it was better to leave than to stay in EU; will benefit more to Britain despite the fact these countries shared 'special relationship' with Britain as it ensured good relationship between China and European Union, advocated Turkish interest in the EU and have trade and financial relation with commonwealth countries. Only Brexit is considered as a way out for Britain to be truly global on the international stage.

Brexit has raised some intriguing paradoxes about the global economy. Brexit has talked about the discourses regarding the global economy and the geopolitical identities creating the division between the international and national spectrum. Nissen, Galpin and Rosamond point out that there is difference between the 'liberalism and economic nationalism'. Economic nationalism purports the idea of market economy without the government control on it. Apparently, Brexit is seen as a backlash to the global economy. In other words, withdrawal from the EU Britain is supporting economic nationalism. A step towards making Britain truly global according to the Britain thinkers. Even after Brexit Britain has maintained the content about the EU- 27 that it will remain united.

Some less developed countries of commonwealth countries have not strongly advocated that Brexit will only bring the negative effects to the world. As it cannot be denied that many of the commonwealth countries relied on EU to gain access to the Britain market. But the key players of commonwealth countries want to maintain their relation with the EU even after Brexit. Thus, through Brexit the economic terms are not only redefined but are also reimagined to implement the existing laws in the changing context of the global world made by the Brexit.

However, it is evident that in the global economic order Britain weighs a lot of importance and therefore EU has special provision to have an informal relationship with Britain in trade sector. EU, will not go to discard Britain from the obligations of economic policies with respect to the Union (Nissen, Galpin and Rosamond: 2017: p. 386).

Britain shared a weird relation with EU. It always supported EU's regulation of single market and followed laws directed by EU. Britain has advocated the ideas and laws about climate change and environment concerns proposed by EU. It is seen that eastern Europe caused the problem which led Britain to vote for Brexit. Britain has advocated and opposed EU laws like any other member such as Germany and France out of national sentiments.

Therefore, this should not only centred around Britain as one of the reason for Brexit (Oliver: 2017: p. 522).

2. Conclusion

This essay, looks at how people's view was shaped for Brexit vote in 2016. The result shows the influence of the negative effects of the EU on the issues such as immigration, economy, terrorism and national identity. "The Leave forces countered with dire warnings about how EU membership fuelled uncontrolled immigration, increasing terrorist threats, the loss of sovereignty and an accompanying erosion of democratic accountability" (Clarke, Godwin and Whiteley: 2016: p.24).

Immigration, terrorism and foreign affairs would be better off EU also personal finances and economy would be better off EU membership. EU membership supply needed labour and keep peace in Europe and it will not benefit British culture, erodes sovereignty and raise the chances of more terrorism. This shows that Boris Johnson and Nigel Farage had more influence over people to vote for leave EU.

EU single market is deeper than the free trade policy from Iceland to turkey all are part of it and in it of it Britain going to be part of it. However, about Norway trade deal with EU is that out of 100 it follows it 87 trade rules and also part of the 'European Economic Area (EEA)'. This gives Norway an easy access to the Europe's single market and same rules will be applied to Britain if it agrees to it and want access to the single market. Similarly, Switzerland have same bilateral deal with EU for the access of the single market (Beddoes: 2016: p. 20). With the fact that these countries have lower rate of unemployment than EU and still have its membership; then why not Britain? EU on its urge has kept this point that European countries outside EU will stay away from EU- Canada free trade Agreement and will be excluded from the 'Transatlantic Trade from America'. By looking at the example of Turkey and Canada that both of them fall outside EU and are also restricted the free movement of people and have no role to play in the financial services, are still enjoying the advantage of single market. This is the strong point and counter-argument which is being posed by the Brexiteers and Britain to have an access to the single market.

UK wanted to have integration as well as wanted to maintain its sovereignty. It wanted to dissolve the hegemonic power of the west Europe embedded in the inner core of the Union and making the integration with the integration with rest part of the world. The taboo for leaving the EU has been questioned. The debate and theories about the Brexit is small to study UK- EU relation. The problems posed by the economist about the eurozone and Schengen questions the political structure which claims to be strong and stable. Brexit can only be seen from two perspectives one from the EU viewpoint and another is from the world view of not forget to mention about how Brexit affects everyone's interest nationally and internationally (Oliver: 2017: p. 531).

We can see that Brexit for Britain does not only act as 'tectonic'. It serves a much larger view. Rather than being anti- globalized it also serves to construct other national identities and redefine the trade terms in both bilateral and multilateral economic organizations. On the global level, the Brexit is occurring as the performative of different revolutionary acts. But on the contrary, it also holds a more productive and a bright future which is not only getting confined to Britain but also to the rest of the world. After Brexit, Britain still holds the commitment towards the declaration for the trade laws and the economic order. It has taken a step to establish new era from the lens of economic nationalism. Through Brexit Britain has tried to keep its britishness and also questioned the discourse regarding the European identity. It is important to understand that the views for Brexit should not be constructed on the perspective of the world view but should base on the core argument of the cons and pros of the Brexit stating of how constructive and how destructive it is (Nissen, Galpin and Rosamond: 2017: p. 387).

References

1. Adler-Nissen, Rebecca; Galpin, Charlotte and Rosamond, Ben. 2017. Performing Brexit: How a post-Brexit world is imagined outside the UK. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. [Online]. 19(3), pp.573- 591. [Accessed on 23 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
2. Anderson, James; O'Dowd, Liam and Wilson, Thomas M. 2003. *New Borders for the Changing Europe: Cross Border Cooperative and Governance*. London: Frank Class Publisher, pp. 37- 58.
3. Anon. 2016. Lessons from Brexit. *Nature*. [Online]. 535(7613), p. 487- 489. [Accessed on 11 August 2017]. Available from: <http://sl4tb4rv5r.search.serialssolutions.com>
4. Bailey, David. 2017. Class struggle after Brexit. *Capital and Class*. [Online]. 41(2), p. 333- 372. [Accessed on 23 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0->

- journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK
5. Banks, Arron. 2016. *The Bad Boys of Brexit: Tales of Mischief, Mayhem and Guerrilla Warfare in the EU Referendum Campaign*. Great Britain: Biteback Publishing
 6. Barber, Stephen. 2017. *The Brexit Environment Demands that Deliberative Democracy Meets Inclusive Growth*. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*. [Online]. 32(3), p. 219- 239. [Accessed on 18 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 7. Beck, Martin. 2016. *Brexit and FDI*. *Economic Outlook*. [Online]. 40(2), p.26- 30. [Accessed on 19 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 8. Beddoes, Zanny M. 2016. *The Brexit Briefs Our Guide to Britain's EU Referendum*. [Online]. [Accessed on 7 August 2017]. Available from: <https://www.economist.com/sites/default/files/EconomistBrexitBriefs16.pdf>
 9. Blagden, David. 2017. *Britain and the world after Brexit*. *International Politics*. [Online]. 54(1), pp.1- 25. [Accessed on 23 August 2017]. Available from: <https://0-link-springer-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 10. Blockmans, Steven. 2016. *Brexit, Globalisation and the Future of the EU*. *Intereconomics*. [Online]. 51(4), pp.182-183. [Accessed on 21 August 2017]. Available from: <https://0-link-springer-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 11. Bongardt, Annette and Torres, Francisco. 2016. *The Political Economy of Brexit: Why Making It Easier to Leave the Club Could Improve the EU*. *Intereconomics*. [Online]. 51(4), p. 214-219. [Accessed on 26 August 2017]. Available from: <https://0-link-springer-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 12. Bourne, Ryan. 2016. *Why did the British Brexit? And What are the Implications for Classic Liberals?* *Economic Affairs*. [Online]. 36(3), p. 356- 363. [Accessed on 18 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.United Kingdom>
 13. Bretherton, Charlotte and Vogler, John. 2006. *The European Union as a Global Actor*. London: Routledge
 14. Burnyeat, Andrew. 2016. *The Trouble with Brexit: European Concerns about the UK Leaving the EU is Spreading*. [Online]. 81(4), p. 14- 16. [Accessed on 22 August 2017]. Available from: <http://sl4tb4rv5r.search.serialssolutions.com>
 15. Casarini, Nicola and Musu, Costanza. 2007. *European Foreign Policy in an Evolving International System*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3- 26.
 16. Clarke, Harold D; Goodwin, Matthew and Whiteley, Paul. 2016. *Why Britain Voted for Brexit: An Individual-Level Analysis of the 2016 Referendum Vote*. [Online]. [Accessed on 11 July 2017]. Available from: <https://blogs.kent.ac.United Kingdom/epop/files/2016/07/Clarke-Goodwin-and-Whiteley.pdf>
 17. Cowell, Richard. 2017. *Policy and Practice: The EU Referendum, Planning and the Environment: Where Now for the UK?* *Town Planning Review*. [Online]. 88(2), pp. 153. [Accessed on 13 July 2017]. Available from: <https://0-search-proquest-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 18. Cressey, Daniel. 2016. *Academics across Europe join 'Brexit' debate*. *Nature*. [Online]. 530(7588), p. 15. [Accessed on 26 August 2017]. Available from: <http://sl4tb4rv5r.search.serialssolutions.com>
 19. Curtice, John. 2016. *Brexit: Behind the Referendum*. *Political Insight*. [Online]. 7(2), pp. 4-7. [Accessed on 13 July 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 20. Curtice, John. 2017. *Why Leave Won the UK's EU Referendum*.
 21. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. [Online]. 55(S1), p. 19-37. [Accessed on 25 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 22. Delanty, Gerard and Kumar, Krishna. 1942. *The Sage Handbook of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications
 23. Douglas- Scott, Sionaidh. *Brexit, Article 50 and the Contested British Constitution*. *The Modern Law Review*. [Online]. 79(6), p. 1019-1040. [Accessed on 19 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
 24. Ewing, Keith. 2017. *Brexit and Parliamentary Sovereignty*. *The Modern Law Review*. [Online].

- 80(4), p. 711- 726. [Accessed on 24 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
25. Goodwin, Matthew J and Heath, Oliver. 2016. The 2016 Referendum, Brexit and the Left Behind: An Aggregate-level Analysis of the Result. *The Political Quarterly*. [Online]. 87(3), pp. 323- 332. [Accessed on 22 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
26. Gusterson, Hugh. 2017. From Brexit to Trump: Anthropology and the Rise of Nationalist Populism. *American Ethnologist*. [Online]. 44(2), pp. 209- 214. [Accessed on 12 July 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
27. Hackett, Paul. 2016. Building beyond Brexit: what Now? Housing, Care and Support. [Online]. 19(3/4), p. 97- 100. [Accessed on 19 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-www.emeraldinsight.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
28. Hobolt, Sara B; Leeper, Thomas J and Tilley James. 2017. Technical Report for “What ‘Brexit means Brexit’ Means to Citizens. [Online]. [Accessed on 20 August 2017]. Available from: https://s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/tjl-sharing/assets/Brexit_Means_Brexit_Technical_Report.pdf
29. Jongeneel, Roel; Berkum, Siemen and Vrolijk, Hans. 2016. Brexit: Breaking Away – Would it Pay? *EuroChoices*. [Online]. 15(2), p. 26-33. [Accessed on 18 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
30. Keating, Michael. 2017. Brexit and Devolution in the UK. *Politics and Governance*. [Online]. 5(2), pp. 1- 3. [Accessed on 26 August 2017]. Available from: <http://www.cogitatiopress.com>
31. Kierzenkowski, Rafal; Pain, Nigel; Rusticelli, Elena and Zwart, Sanne. 2016. The Economic Consequences of Brexit: A Taxing Decision. *OECD Economic Policy Papers*. [Online]. no.16. [Accessed on 24 August 2017]. Available from: <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org>
32. Koch, Insa. 2017. What’s in a Vote? Brexit Beyond Culture Wars. *American Ethnologist*. [Online]. 44(2), p. 225-230. [Accessed on 16 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
33. Kostadinova, Valentina. 2017. Brexit is Unlikely to Provide Answers to Governance Problems Under Globalisation. *Economic Affairs*. [Online]. 37(1), pp. 135- 140. [Accessed on 21 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
34. Mackenzie, John M. 2016. Brexit: The View from Scotland. *The Round Table*. [Online]. 105(5), pp. 577- 579. [Accessed on 25 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-www.tandfonline.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
35. Madood, Tariq. 1997. Labels won't stick: Tariq Madood says the trend in Britain towards cultural mixture doesn't mean an identity crisis. *The Guardian* (1959- 2003). [Online]. B6. [Accessed on 8 July 2017]. Available from: <https://0-search-proquest-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
36. McHarg, Aileen and Mitchell, James. 2017. Brexit and Scotland. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. [Online]. 19(3), pp. 512- 526. [Accessed on 22 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.United Kingdom>
37. Menon, Anand and Fowler, Brigid. 2016. Hard or Soft? The Politics of Brexit. *National Institute Economic Review*. [Online]. (238), p. R4- R12. [Accessed on 20 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.United Kingdom>
38. Menon, Anand and Salter, John- Paul. 2016. Brexit: Initial reflections. *International Affairs*. [Online]. 92(6), pp.1297- 1318. [Accessed on 25 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
39. Menon, Anand. 2016. EU Referendum: One Year On. [Online]. [Accessed on 7 August 2017]. Available from: <file:///C:/Users/lenovo/Downloads/One-year-on.pdf>
40. Moloney, Niamh. 2016. International Financial Governance, the EU, and Brexit: The ‘Agencification’ of EU Financial Governance and the Implications. *European Business Organization Law Review*. [Online]. 17(4), p. 451- 480. [Accessed on 23 August 2017]. Available from: <https://0-link-springer-com.wam.leeds.ac.United Kingdom>
41. Morgan, Jamie and Patomaki, Heikki. 2017. Special Forum on Brexit. *Globalizations*. [Online]. 14(1), pp. 99- 103. [Accessed on 20 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-www.tandfonline.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>

42. Nolke, Andreas. 2017. Brexit: Towards a New Global Phase of Organized Capitalism? Competition and Change. [Online]. 21(3) p. 230- 241. [Accessed on 21 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.United Kingdom>
43. Oliver, Tim. 2016. European and International Views of Brexit. Journal of European Public Policy. [Online]. 23(9), pp. 1321- 1328. [Accessed on 23 August 2017]. Available form: <http://0-www.tandfonline.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
44. Oliver, Tim. 2017. Never mind the Brexit? Britain, Europe, the world and Brexit. International Politics. [Online]. 54(4), pp. 519-532. [Accessed on 24 August 2017]. Available from: <https://0-link-springer-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
45. Portes, Jonathan. 2016. Immigration After Brexit. National Institute Economic Review. [Online]. 238(1), p. R13- R21. [Accessed on 17 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
46. Ramiah, Vikash; Phama, Huy N. A. and Moosa, Imad. 2017. The Sectoral Effects of Brexit on the British Economy: Early Evidence from the Reaction of the Stock Market. Applied Economics. [Online]. 49(26), p. 2508- 7. [Accessed on 24 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-www.tandfonline.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
47. Rees, Wyn. 2017. America, Brexit and the security of Europe. The British Journal of Politics and International Relations. [Online]. 19(3), pp. 558- 572. [Accessed on 21 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.United Kingdom>
48. Reid, Colin T. 2017. Brexit and Devolution Dynamics. Environmental Law Review. [Online]. 19(1), p.3-5. [Accessed on 25 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-journals.sagepub.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
49. Sampson, Thomas; Dhingra, Swati; Ottaviano, Gianmarco and Reenen, John V. 2016. Economists for Brexit: A Critique. [Online]. [Accessed on 16 August 2017]. Available from: <http://cep.lse.ac.UK/pubs/download/brexit06.pdf>
50. Sayer, Derek. 2017. White riot—Brexit, Trump, and Post-Factual Politics. Journal of Historical Sociology. [Online]. 30(1), p.92- 106. [Accessed on 16 August 2017]. Available from: <http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>
51. Scuirra, Leonardo. 2017. Brexit Beyond Borders: Beginning of the EU Collapse and Return to Nationalism. Journal of International Affairs. [Online]. 70(2), pp. 1- 17. [Accessed on 18 August 2017]. Available from: <https://0-search-proquest-com.wam.leeds.ac.UK>