

UDC 327(410:4-627EU)  
Bibliid 0543-3657, 68 (2017)  
Vol. LXVIII, No. 1168, pp. 86–101  
Original Scientific Paper

## **THE UK AT A CROSSROADS: RE-PUZZLING OVER THE FUNCTIONING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN EUROPE AND GLOBALISATION AFTER BREXIT**

Ivan DUJIĆ<sup>1</sup>

*Abstract:* This paper deals with the status of the United Kingdom (UK) in the unstable European international relations following the referendum on the European Union (EU). It also deals with the UK's capability to survive in spite of being transformed into a country of four nations. It seems that the devolution process in the UK, analysed at the beginning of this paper, does not create an obstacle to the UK's independent acting in globalisation. The advocacy of a new vision of the UK's global presence in world politics after leaving the EU requires full and responsible implementation of such idea by the UK Government. Actually, due to its global presence in the evolution of international relations, the UK endeavours to be a state capable of redefining its reason of state, independently from one of the EU members. Therefore, the UK could be an independent actor in international relations that promotes globalisation in the name of the new vision for a 'Global Britain'. In order to achieve this vision, the author points out that gender equality is a priority, particularly in pursuing the policy of integrated management of human and natural resources. To that end, the importance of gender roles is emphasised. All discussion is in favour of the focus of the paper: the re-puzzling over the functioning of international relations in Europe and globalisation after Brexit.

*Key words:* the UK, the EU, Brexit, European international relations, globalisation, gender equality, gender roles.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In the postmodern era, characterised by the need to digitise services, every state tends to regain and retain control over its space. In other words, states do not want

---

<sup>1</sup> Ivan Dujić, PhD, Research Fellow, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade. E-mail: ivan@diplomacy.bg.ac.rs

to be engulfed by uncontrolled migration flow in intra- and inter-state integration processes. Thus, the states' wish to be constantly re-spatialised can be justified by their intention to redefine their primordial role in the international arena.

The position of states in the international arena depends on the changes in international relations as well as the relations within the state. As for the UK, its internal relationships attract the attention of international scientific and the wider community because of a significant degree of decentralisation which did not enable the UK to transform from a unitary into a federal state. As opposed to some states that have undergone the process of internal transformation during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the UK did not become a federal state.

The literature on this subject indicates that the UK came to be made up as 'a union of four nations' (Minto et al., 2016, p. 186). As one of the western European countries, the UK is undergoing a period of constitutional change. Instead of being transformed from a unitary into a federal state, the UK is a state in which the UK's devolved administrations operate.

Some scholars like Cox (2016), Blunkett, Flinders and Prosser (2016), Tomaney (2016) hold that the UK is going through a period of rapid constitutional change characterised by devolution of some powers to the UK's devolved administrations. Such change entailed a higher level of autonomy for England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales with respect to the decision-making process in London. Before, during and after the 2016 EU referendum and Brexit, the citizens of the four UK administrative units did not share the common views on the further status of their country in the EU.

Instead of retaining a strictly unitary system, the UK undergoes the process which is moving ahead, particularly in England as the largest administrative unit. Cox (2016, p. 569) indicates that England, unlike Ireland, Scotland and Wales, is implementing devolution, for example, in the field of 'health and social care services' as a part of the policies of giving broader powers to the administrative units that operate in accordance with the established and retained administrative division in the UK.

Devolution in the UK before and during Brexit is a process that is characterised by the aspiration towards having the UK as a state within which all decisions, especially political ones, will not be made exclusively in London. In addition to its endeavour to diminish substantially the role of Westminster in political decision-making in favour of the greater influence of Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales in determining the future destiny of the UK, the process of devolution significantly affects the possibility that the regions of England might develop and nourish political identity which will be manifested by permanent or periodical holding of the Assembly or Parliament. As Blunkett, Flinders and Prosser note, it is about a

‘[...] new territorial settlement in the UK, and one that devolved power not just to the constituent nations but also to the English regions [...]’ (2016, p. 555).

The importance of devolved power is reflected in the redistribution of power within the state in order to retain the transfer of powers to Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales as the UK’s constituent nations. These nations have the right to participate in creating the UK internal policies without undermining its long ago developed subjectivity, in the complex new forms of international relations and globalisation. When it comes to the negotiations between the UK and the EU, it means that ‘[...] devolved nations (...) make a coordinated approach to the UK government (...), but their involvement (is) limited.’ (Minto et al., 2016, p. 183).

By gaining wider powers, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, as devolved nations, redefine the UK in a way that it becomes more democratic in making and implementing its internal political decisions. However, democratism in making such decisions, which is dependent upon devolved powers of the UK administrative units, rests on ‘[...] the degree to which devolved systems are accompanied by fiscal mechanisms of territorial redistribution.’ (Tomaney, 2016, p. 548). Fiscal mechanisms of the territorial redistribution within the UK mean that the process of decentralisation operates in favour of the gradual redefinition of the UK through democratisation in making political, economic and other decisions.

Pursuing fiscal policy, following the 2016 EU referendum and Brexit, at the level of the UK devolved nations enables England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales to ease the implementation of, among others, health and social care policy. The implementation of such policy disencumbers the UK government, in the sense that those nations implement much faster the health and social care measures. The existence of National Health Service (NHS) in these systems is very convincing evidence that it is about a very high degree of decentralisation in the UK, not only in terms of implementation of health and social care policy, but also the provision of greater independence of the devolved powers in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales in relation to the central power in London.

Although in literature the term ‘Brexit’ is more often used to refer to Great Britain’s exit from the EU, O’Leary is more precise in arguing that the term ‘Ukexit’ is more appropriate because it is not only about Great Britain’s exit but also Northern Ireland’s exit from the EU. O’Leary also points out that the 2016 EU referendum and, accordingly, the UK’s future status in the trade bloc, was held not only in England, Scotland and Wales, i.e. Great Britain, but also in Northern Ireland (2016, pp. 518-519). In this article, the term ‘Brexit’ will be used from a historical standpoint in the realm of foreign and security policy that Britain has pursued in the era of its unification with Ireland in 1801.

There is an increasing UK’s tendency to recover its political influence both in Europe and worldwide during and after Brexit. To understand the relationship

between the UK, as an independent country and the EU as a complex bloc made up of 27 members, one should proceed from the speech of the UK Prime Minister Theresa May, delivered in Westminster, when she announced the triggering Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union, stating that she wants to see the UK as a country with its duty to survive and

[...] emerge from th(e) period of (administrative and constitutional) change stronger, fairer, more united and more outward-looking than ever before. I want us to be a secure, prosperous, tolerant country – a magnet for international talent and a home to the pioneers and innovators who will shape the world ahead.' (The UK Government, 2017).

The text below shows that the UK's withdrawal from the EU is founded on the following fact: globalisation as a long-term process and international relations are not only based on the efficient functioning of the EU in the process of European integration, but also on the capabilities of states as main actors of international relations, to regain full control over their restricted territories. With respect to the way the UK perceives itself, it is obvious that the UK's withdrawal is the outcome of an inherited discourse on the UK's being an independent actor of international relations. The UK government's goal is to re-implement the principle of non-interference into European affairs in relation to the EU, on the basis of the aforementioned discourse and the importance of gender equality for the integrated management of human and natural resources.

### **BREXIT AS A TOOL FOR THE LATEST RE-PUZZLE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN EUROPE AND GLOBALISATION**

The unification of England and Scotland began in 1603 with the arrival of the Stewart dynasty and creation of a personal union, and ended in 1707 with the creation of a real union between the two countries. It was verified by the Union with Scotland Act 1706 passed by the Parliament of England, and the Union with England Act 1707 passed by the Parliament of Scotland (Act of Union with England 1707; Act of Union with Scotland 1706). This led not only to the creation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain as a single state but also to the continuation of the foreign policy based on the balance of power. Kissinger explicitly states that William III endeavoured to develop a doctrine of the balance of power in the England's, later the UK's foreign policy with a view to curbing France's and Germany's power for the sake of full independence of the UK as an actor in international relations (1994, p. 71).

The creation of the UK, thanks to a real union between England and Scotland under the name 'Great Britain', coincided with the heyday of France's power

expressed in its tendency to become the dominant power among European states. At the time when the Kingdom of Ireland became part of the UK by the Act of Union in 1801, France was a dominant power in Europe for a brief period of time. The uniting of Great Britain and Ireland in a separate economic and political union resulted from the tendency to foster closer relationship between the Kingdom of Ireland and Great Britain '[...] in order to promote and secure the essential interests of Great Britain and Ireland, and to consolidate the strength, power, and resources of the British Empire [...]' (Act of Union with Ireland 1800, p. 1).

The promotion and protection of the UK's and Ireland's fundamental interests during the period 1801-1921 – when The Anglo-Irish Treaty was signed immediately after a large chunk of Ireland gained the independence from the UK – pertained to the establishment and further keeping the colonies in certain parts of the world. This is particularly important because of the maintenance of the balance of power in relation to France and other world powers that had a subordinate status to the UK. Apart from having a global influence, the UK had, owing to its economic and political power manifested through its overseas colonies, a great contribution to '[...] the heyday of European imperialism which lasted from the mid-19th century to 1918 as a fourth wave of globalization. It was driven by bulk trade, involved voluntary trans-oceanic mass migration [...]' (Therborn, 2000, p. 161).

The phenomenon of trans-oceanic mass migration occurred during the period 1850-1918 and marked the fourth wave of globalisation, thus shaping the future of international relations. One can notice that during this period the UK was a centre of mass emigration to Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States. In his research on the ocean shipping, North points to the fact that '[...] from the mid-seventeenth century onward productivity rose at a significant rate, which accelerated still more during the first half of the nineteenth century.' (1968, p. 954). It was accompanied by population growth since the eighteenth century.

The UK population growth in the eighteenth century, on the one hand, led to trans-oceanic mass migration and redistribution of human resources to the UK's former colonies, which resulted in the formation of new communities, societies and states. As Castles indirectly put, mass migration in the colonised areas contributed to the understanding of the '[...] processes of community formation leading to social and cultural change [...]' in the UK's former colonies (2002, p. 1144). During a period of population growth, the UK tended to spread its cultural, economic, and political influence that entailed subsequent changes in the demographic structure and concentration of capital in the UK's cities.

The increasing size of the UK population, due to a high birth rate and natural increase, and trans-oceanic mass migration, worked to the advantage of a covert manifestation of the country's vision to gain and retain its status as 'the workshop of the world' in international relations. The long-term outcome of trans-oceanic

mass migration was reflected in the change of the demographic landscape of the UK's cities rooted in the creation of modern UK economy that justified the effects of the First Industrial Revolution. Therefore, the trans-oceanic mass migration, on the other hand, contributed to globalisation and multi-culturalisation of the cities which, according to Sassen, became '[...] strategic sites for cultural and institutional changes.' (2013, p. 212).

Drawing on the fact that some cities serve as strategic sites for cultural and institutional changes, the UK, in leaving the EU, is likely to have not only citizens from the EU members but also the ancestors from its former colonies. Castles points to the considerable importance of migration and hence its symptoms that are manifested in migration flows, i.e. migratory movements which '[...] develop their own dynamics and cannot easily be stopped.' (2002, p. 1150). In the case of the EU, migration flows mean the free movement of capital, goods, ideas, labour force, knowledge and technology in Europe, partially including the UK as a formal EU's member state.

Is there a clear UK's tendency to regain, owing to migration flows, its sovereignty in spite of being legally obliged to the EU? By taking steps towards its disengagement from the EU's bilateral agreements and treaties, the UK Government, following the 2016 EU referendum, took a negative stance on the UK's future in the EU. Actually, it is the independent exploitation of human and natural resources that may be used as an argument in favour of the UK's independence in conducting economic and trade policy for the sake of optimising its status in the international arena.

The discussion about the importance of partially constraining the human and natural resources within the UK presumes the creation of new policy relying on a balance between the relationship of the UK with Europe and the wider world. The supporting argument that such balance already exists could be found in Theresa May's speech on the occasion of triggering the Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty, where she stated that Great Britain, as a greater part of the UK, must be '[...] a truly Global Britain – the best friend and neighbour to our European partners, but a country that reaches beyond the borders of Europe too. A country that goes out into the world to build relationships with old friends and new allies alike.' (The UK Government, 2017).

The opinion expressed in the idea of building Great Britain as a 'Global Britain' is grounded on a policy of the UK's full participation in world politics. This claim relies on the traditional standpoint of the UK's global presence in the international arena. By analysing and comparing the two UK's referendums on the EU memberships held in 1975 and 2016, Saunders (2016, p. 319) notes that the UK still is highly sensitive to its relationship with the EU's members across the Continent, particularly in the political, economic, and security realm.

In the security realm, the UK is developing and maintaining its national security programme which is based on the co-operation and partnership with the EU members. In this regard, there are established relations between France and the UK in defence and foreign policy. As Whitman indicates, the UK is, together with France, '[...] one of the European Union's two most powerful and ambitious states when it comes to foreign and defence policies.' (2016, p. 254).

The UK is still regarded by many scholars as a remarkable state because of its positive stand on sustainable development of the common European defence and foreign policy. Over the last 20 years, the UK played a crucial and inevitable role in maintaining the co-operation among the EU members relating to the creation of common defence and foreign policy. In order to achieve this policy, the UK has to face the fact that the EU is an incomplete political entity in terms of state with its economic, legal and political systems.

In the further explanation of the EU's shortcomings, one must consider the complex and multifaceted international relationships among European states. In *stricto sensu*, states are regarded as entities that have the capability to produce and sustain specific types of power in order to implement the ideas of European integration and solidarity. However, Adler-Nissen (2016, p. 242) points to that the UK '[...] does not commit fully to the ideas of European integration and solidarity [...]' due to its awareness that the continental part of the EU failed to become a single entity in international relations.

Instead of being fully integrated into a single economic and political system, the EU members operate independently on the implementation of common political decisions within the trade bloc. The status of the UK in the EU reflects not only the UK's position as an outsider in the domain of the EU's economy, defence and security, but also a tendency of the state to behave as an independent actor in the international relations of European states. Acting as an independent political entity, the UK intends to re-orientate the future process of international relations in Europe by enforcing the trade bloc to be accustomed to operate both economically and politically without the UK.

The UK's decision to leave the EU will imply the conduct of an independent foreign policy and creation of defence policy in favour of regaining the control and supremacy over the UK's human and natural resources. According to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) statistics for 2016, in 2015 the UK was ranked as '[...] the fifth biggest importer of goods, with imports amounting to US\$ 626 billion, representing 4 per cent of world imports.' (WTO, 2016, p. 44). With meagre and limited resources, the UK tends to survive as one of the largest importers in the world and an independent proponent of globalisation, which is rooted in the UK's isolationism of the nineteenth century.

What is the common denominator of the UK's isolationism of the nineteenth century and Brexit in international relations and globalisation? The UK's tendency to exempt its political decision-making process from the EU collective decision-making process is firmly grounded in the UK's incapability to fully comprehend, from an economic standpoint, its leading position and role as the EU's proponent of interstate perpetual peace. Prior to an explanation of a possible link between the UK isolationism and Brexit, one should bear in mind that globalisation was a long UK-led process during the period from 1801 to 1945, so the international relations were driven by the UK's dominance during that period.

The discussion about the structure of international relations in the context of gender role is crucial for permanent consideration and understanding of economic growth. Since economic growth is one of the main postulates of the sustainable development and survival of a state, a question is raised over the role of men and women in maintaining the economic growth. In an in-depth analysis of the heteronormative heterosexuality in the context of global political economy (GPE) and broader economic relations among actors of international relations, Griffin points to

'[...] (t)he unspoken assertion of (hetero)normative heterosexuality in (the World) Bank discourse as essential to economic growth predicates heterosexuality as essential to productive economic behaviour, circumscribing appropriate life narratives or social identities accordingly.' (2007, p. 232).

The idea of economic growth in the context of gender roles covertly advocated by the World Bank and other domestic and international economic institutions and organisations is underpinned by strengthening men and women's roles in society. An abstract concept of heteronormative heterosexuality is based on behaviour, relationships, and previously defined female and male roles which are socially accepted. Viewed from the aspect of economic, political, and social science, female and male roles seek to be fully regarded as a starting point for consideration not only the gender roles in society but also the male dominance deriving from masculine power.

Griffin's latest research in relation to male and female gender roles gives rise to the ongoing consideration of the relationships among economy, heteronormative heterosexuality and masculinity, indicating that the male domination, established long ago, still exists irrespective of a strong and generally accepted discourse on gender equality. This research may be supervened to the fact that '[...] (hegemonic) masculinity is constituted as reason, order, and control, masculine domination is reproduced through conceptual systems that privilege male entitlement – to authority, power, property, nature.' (Spike Peterson, 1999, p. 40). The majority of societies and states are grounded on the hegemonic masculinity and gender



hierarchy with a tendency to use the discourse on gender equality to achieve a long-run economic growth, particularly in the UK after its departure from the EU.

In Theresa May's address to the House of Commons, as she triggered Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), she said that '[...] the UK needs to increase significantly its trade with the fastest growing export markets in the world.' (The UK Government, 2017). This statement relies on the presumption of a long-run economic growth in the UK as an actor in international relations, especially if the functioning of the UK outside the EU is taken into account. Viewed as a long-term goal, the UK economic growth is feasible if, in addition to gender equality, there are still socially defined gender roles, regardless of the fact that the UK is regarded as a postmodern state.

One of the reasons behind the UK's acting as a postmodern state lies in its long ago developed citizenship, whose survival and further evolution rely on

'[...] liberal democratic theory (that) has constructed and worked with a set of antagonistic universalising categories of male and female and has attributed to the particular characteristics to men and women in ways which shape their experiences as citizens.' (Arnot, 1997, p. 281).

Owing to individual experience, men and women, as the citizens of a state, are meritorious for defining and continual advancing of the UK as a postmodern state, whereas they rely on liberal democracy and its theory. One can say that members of both genders participate in the redefinition of the UK as an internationally recognised actor in international relations, independently of the fact that this state is leaving the EU. Also, both genders are granted the right to determine in a referendum the destiny of the UK administrative units, as it is the case with Northern Ireland – it is stipulated by the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement (Article 1, par. a and c) – and with Scotland of 2014, where Scottish independence relative to the rest of the UK was decided by its citizens.

May socially defined gender roles within a state be still considered in the context of international relations in Europe and globalisation? Taking into account that gender is considered as a socially devised concept, Weber, citing Spike Peterson through Jones, explains that gender implies '[...] subjective identities *through which we see and know the world*, and (...) *the world is pervasively shaped by gendered meanings*.' (2005, p. 89). Male and female roles define all characteristics of a state as an organisation which contributes functioning and further development of international relations and globalisation.

The UK's withdrawal from the EU is a result of an attempt by the majority, who opt for quitting the European Union, to save their state from losing subjective identity in relation to other members. Nevertheless, the majority will not have only to regard the EU as one of the actors of international relations, but also to face unavoidably a great problem of how to either improve or maintain the position of

UK among the states which achieved a very high level of human development. According to the 2016 Human Development Report, the UK is ranked 16<sup>th</sup> (UNDP, 2016, p. 200).

The UK could take a chance to stay among the states with very high human development provided it keeps its position as a state having success in achieving economic freedoms. In respect of the fact that the UK has achieved great success in the field of economic freedoms from the years of Margaret Thatcher's reign to 2013, the state ranks fifth in the last four years on the list of the world's largest economies (The Heritage Foundation, 2017, p. 294). In addition to a high ranking among world economies, the UK is also ranked among the states with the stable internal order (Messner, 2017).

The majority's decision on the UK leaving the EU not only carried a great risk of losing a good position in the aforementioned indicators but also became the cornerstone for understanding the international relations in Europe which depend on the states as the most important actors. In other words, the international relations in Europe after the UK's withdrawal from the EU may depend on state policies generally pursued by men. Though the contemporary international relations in Europe are marked by integration processes, men are still key actors in defining state policies which is explained by the fact that they '[...] may contest one another for power in terms of positioning not only along and within the various levels of power available in the horizontal stratification, but also across levels in the vertical formation of the hierarchy.' (Buchbinder, 2013, p. 72).

A claim that men in a mutual contest pursue state policies is underpinned by the fact that the relations within a state are masculinised and, accordingly, they continuously tend to expand in order to be part of international relations. This fact is supported by Spike Peterson's research on gender identities that firmly draw on a premise that they are not '[...] essentially derived but historically specific to patriarchal relations; they are *social constructions*.' (1990, p. 322). Whereas patriarchal relations in society and state endeavour to involve gender identities in such a way that they represent parts of social constructions, the international relations in Europe are based on the strengthening of the discourse on gender equality, that, in turn, keeps stimulating gender identities also at the level of relations among states.

Do gender identities contribute to the UK's withdrawal from the EU by placing greater emphasis on a well-known fact that the state is the only one that is authorised to mother all these identities? The UK's tendency to become an independent actor in international relations with respect to the EU embraces the state's grand vision of reviving, through gender identities, its ancient role of a bystander of all kinds of events, in particular economic ones, in Continental Europe. This will be feasible if the UK integrates within its borders gender identities as its own human resources for the sake of integrated management of natural resources and definition of

independent policies in the favour of the UK's reason of state (*raison d'État*), without involving in its counterpart of the EU members.

As an independent actor with respect to the EU, the UK endeavours to see itself not only as a state with a defined reason of state but also as an important factor in global relationships. From the standpoint of international relations in Europe, the UK has never seen itself as a European state in terms of its full involvement into European affairs. Irrespective of the age of global interdependence, for the UK, as an independent actor in international relations, Continental Europe has always been '[...] an amorphous mass which is just "over there".' (Eyal, 2016, p. 141).

The states' success to re-spatialise its space is based on the hoary doctrine of reason of state that relies on the state as a territorialised political unit on the global power stage. In addition, the state's economic milieu on the international stage presumes the state's capability to control and maintain its autonomous financial system. It is presumed that the evidence supporting this claim may be found in the fact that the state has its monetary system and that it needs to monetise government bonds and debts into money in order to support the financialisation of the continuous domestic and international relationships.

The scarcity of human and natural resources, particularly the latter ones, encourages interconnection between states in order to grasp capital flows and stimulate openness towards integration of the resources. The possible outcome of states' interconnection is the establishment of an integrated international trade and disintegrated national production. This raises a question of whether the integration of international trade and disintegration of national production have been masculinised.

Integrated natural resources management will be more facilitated if gender equality in the UK, after its withdrawal from the EU, still remains a key factor where men and women participate in a continual exploitation of the movement of capital with the aim of achieving economic gains. Given that both men and women are, due to a powerful discourse on gender equality, not only involved in achieving economic gains from the movement of capital but also organised in social groups striving for gender equality. The importance of this equality is obvious since it

'[...] occurs where women and men do the same things and do not overtly stress their biological features (so that) gender differentiation does not exist. But gender equality also occurs where there is a clear gender differentiation and where the fields of activities are segregated according to gender. And finally there is gender equality in groups with higher gender differentiation and at the same time more co-operation between the genders in relation to different fields of activity.' (Godenzi, 2000, p. 36).

But, whereas Godenzi points to the potential benefits of gender equalities in a society and state, Beasley notes, while discussing hegemonic masculinity, that it is men rather than women who are deserving of the creation and further maintenance of the discourse on globalisation that establishes the relationship between genders in the context of '[...] an analysis of the contested and shifting nature of gender identity at the global as well as the local level, to highlight the ways in which different hegemonic masculinities are negotiated, and even resisted.' (2008, p. 99). The nature of gender identity is not only the quotation stated above but it is also a pivot on which the future process of globalisation after the UK's withdrawal from the EU will depend.

Future development of international relations followed by the globalisation assumes radically different comprehension of gender equality where a greater emphasis is laid on '[...] focused characterization of hegemonic masculinity as concerned with a political ideal or discourse, as an enabling mode of representation, which mobilizes institutions and practices.' (Elias and Beasley, 2009, p. 288). When it comes to the UK's withdrawal from the EU, mobilisation of institutions and practices will seek in the long term a strong obligation and responsibility to have gender relationships regulated in the UK and its devolved administrations, and international relations in Europe still developed on the basis of gender relationships.

Re-puzzling over international relations, particularly in Europe does not only depend on the relationships that will be established between the UK and the EU in the coming years. It is a fact that international relations are not the same as domestic ones. They are grounded on the establishment and maintenance of quasi-order among the actors of international relations. The UK's withdrawal from the EU is taken as evidence that there exists an illusion of order in international relations, although the terms to end a state's membership in the EU are set forth in Article 50 of the TEU.

In addition to being viewed as economic, political, technological, and cultural relationships among the actors of international relations, the international relations among states as well as among international organisations may also be viewed as a result of the relationship between genders. In this respect, the UK's departure from the EU should be likewise viewed as a result of the relationship between genders, which is responsible for the integration of human resources. As a result, the UK will have a chance to integrate its natural resources not only on its own territory but also on the territories of former British colonies.

Re-puzzling over international relations towards putting a greater emphasis on the states as independent actors of the relations entails viewing globalisation as a phenomenon depending on the state. The same holds true for the UK. As one of the most influential states in Europe, the UK endeavours to resume a role of an observer of all events in Europe in particular as a guarantor of security in Continental Europe.

## CONCLUSION

The loss of the status of colonial power does not prevent the UK from achieving its goal to become again an independent actor of international relations, particularly in Europe. The UK's endeavour to achieve this, due to its withdrawal from the EU, does not necessarily mean that its importance in international relations should be denied because it is always possible to count on the UK's positive role in the re-arrangement of international relations. Further, the UK's survival in international relations will depend likewise on the UK's long-term objective to put its human resources into action, thus remaining a key participant in this sphere.

The result of putting the UK's human resources into action is an additional capability of the state to maintain the integrated management of natural resources, which as regards the UK means not only the integration of its natural resources but also the readiness to place the natural resources outside the UK under the control of its companies. The UK's exit from the EU poses a great challenge to the state, due to its tendency to act as an independent actor in international relations, as well as to restore the old meaning of globalisation that contains such state's tendency. In relation to the EU, the UK is a state with meagre human and natural resources, but which are, thanks to its companies' operation, likely to be integrated with those from the UK's former colonies.

When the question of the UK's departure from the EU was raised as a possibility at the beginning of the migrant crisis, it was hard to imagine the UK, as the strongest economy in Europe, leaving the trade bloc. The UK's departure and Brexit's coming to fruition could result in resurrecting the idea of state sovereignty and reason of the state in international relations in Europe, which would have a positive impact on further progress towards globalisation. Whereas the EU count on its human and natural resources across the territory of 27 members, the UK relies on its own human resources required to be completely integrated to secure the UK's survival as an independent state in international relations. As such, it could redirect globalisation in favour of independent states.

The integration of human resources in contemporary international relations is not possible without gender equality. Although this form of equality is strongly supported by the EU, the UK may also achieve such equality thanks to its full-fledged liberal theory on citizenship, particularly if you bear in mind that there are other forms of equality. Furthermore, gender equality might be important to fostering social discourse on permanent gender roles associated with its biological role.

When social roles of men and women in a state are raised to the level of international relations, then the social discourse transforms into a global discourse. Thanks to their social dimension, the complex international relations between states or international organisations become more comprehensive, whereas globalisation

that most often displays its economic, political and cultural dimensions, tends to include a social dimension as well.

## REFERENCES

- Adler-Nissen, R. (2016). The Vocal Euro-outsider: The UK in a Two-speed Europe. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(2), 238-246.
- Arnot, M. (1997). 'Gendered Citizenry': New Feminist Perspectives on Education and Citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(3), 275-295.
- Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking Hegemonic Masculinity in a Globalizing World. *Men and Masculinities*, 11(1), 86-103, doi: 10.1177/1097184X08315102.
- Blunkett, D., Flinders, M. & Prosser, B. (2016). Devolution, Evolution, Revolution ... Democracy? What's Really Happening to English Local Governance?. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(4), 553-564.
- Buchbinder, D. (2013). Regarding patriarchy. *Studying Men and Masculinities* (pp. 65-96). New York: Routledge.
- Castles, S. (2002). Migration und Community Formation under Conditions of Globalization. *International Migration View*, 36(4), 1143-1168.
- Cox, E. (2016). Devolution in England—Is the Genie out of the Lamp?. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(4), 565-571.
- Elias, J. & Beasley, C. (2009). Hegemonic Masculinity and Globalization: 'Transnational Business Masculinities' and Beyond. *Globalizations*, 6(2), 281–296.
- Eyal, J. (2016). Reinvesting in Europe in the Wake of the British Departure?. *Horizons (Journal of International Relations and Sustainable Development)*, 8, 140-155.
- Godenzi, A. (2000). Determinants of culture: men and economic power. In Ingeborg Breines, Robert Connell & Ingrid Eide (Eds.), *Male roles, Masculinities and violence: A culture of peace perspective* (pp. 35-52). Paris: the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Griffin, P. (2007). Sexing the Economy in a Neo-liberal World Order: Neo-liberal Discourse and the (Re)Production of Heteronormative Heterosexuality. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9(2), 220–238, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-856x.2007.00280.x.
- Kissinger, A. H. (1994). From Universality to Equilibrium: Richelieu, William of Orange, and Pitt. *Diplomacy* (pp.56-77). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Messner, J.J. (2017). Fragile States Index 2017: Factionalization and Group Grievance Fuel Rise in Instability. The Fund for Peace. Retrieved from <http://fundforpeace.org/fsi/2017/05/14/fsi-2017-factionalization-and-group-grievance-fuel-rise-in-instability/>.

- Minto, R., Hunt, J., Keating, M. & McGowan, L. (2016). A Changing UK in a Changing Europe: The UK State between European Union and Devolution. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(2), 179-186.
- North, C.D. (1968). Sources of Productivity Change in Ocean Shipping, 1600-1850. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(5), 953-970.
- O’Leary, B. (2016). The Dalriada Document: Towards a Multinational Compromise that Respects Democratic Diversity in the United Kingdom. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(4), 518-533.
- Peterson, V.S. (1999). Sexing Political Identities/Nationalism as Heterosexism. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1(1), 34–65.
- Peterson, V.S. (1990). Whose Rights? A Critique of the “Givens” in Human Rights Discourse. *Alternatives*, 15(3), 303-344.
- Sassen, S. (2013). Does the City Have Speech? *Public Culture*, 25(2), 209-221, doi: 10.1215/08992363-2020557.
- Saunders, R. (2016). A Tale of Two Referendums: 1975 and 2016. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(3), 318-322.
- The Government of Ireland, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFA). (1985). The Anglo-Irish Agreement. The Government of Ireland. Retrieved from <https://www.dfa.ie/media/dfa/alldfawebstemedial/ourrolesandpolicies/northernireland-Anglo-Irish-Agreement-1985-1.pdf>.
- The UK Government. (2017, March 29). Prime Minister’s Commons statement on triggering Article 50 (Oral statement to Parliament). Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prime-ministers-commons-statement-on-triggering-article-50>.
- The UK Legislation. Act of Union (Ireland) 1800. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aip/Geo3/40/38/contents>.
- The UK Legislation. Union with England Act 1707. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1707/7/contents>.
- The UK Legislation. Union with Scotland Act 1706. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Ann/6/11>.
- Therborn, G. (2000). Globalizations: Dimensions, Historical Waves, Regional Effects, Normative Governance. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 151-179.
- The Heritage Foundation. (2017). Index of Economic Freedom. In Miller, T. & Kim, B.A. (Eds.), Washington: The Heritage Foundation.
- Tomaney, J. (2016). Limits of Devolution: Localism, Economics and Post-democracy. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(4), 546-552.

- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2016). Statistical Annex. *The 2016 Human Development Report: Human Development for Everyone*. New York: The United Nations Development Programme.
- Weber, C. (2005). Gender: is gender a variable? (Fatal Attraction). *International Relations Theory* (pp. 81-102). New York: Routledge.
- Whitman, G.R. (2016). The UK and EU Foreign and Security Policy: An Optional Extra. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(2), 254-261.
- World Trade Organization (WTO). (2016). Trading patterns: Global and regional perspectives. *World Trade Statistical Review 2016* (pp. 42-51). Genève: The World Trade Organization.

Ivan DUJIĆ

**UJEDINJENO KRALJEVSTVO NA RASKRSNICI:  
NOVA DILEMA U POGLEDU FUNKCIONISANJA MEĐUNARODNIH  
ODNOSA U EVROPI I GLOBALIZACIJE NAKON BREGZITA**

*Apstrakt:* Ovaj rad se bavi statusom Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva (UK) u nestabilnim međunarodnim odnosima u Evropi nakon referenduma o izlasku iz Evropske unije (EU). U radu se takođe razmatra sposobnost UK da dalje funkcioniše uprkos njegovoj transformaciji u državu koju čine četiri države. Izgleda da proces prenosa ovlašćenja (devolucije) u UK, koji se analizira na početku rada, ne predstavlja prepreku za nezavisno delovanje UK u globalizaciji. Zastupanje nove ideje o globalnom prisustvu UK u svetskoj politici nakon izlaska iz EU traži potpuno i odgovorno sprovođenje te ideje od strane Vlade UK. Naime, zahvaljujući globalnom prisustvu u razvoju međunarodnih odnosa, UK nastoji da bude država koja je sposobna da redefiniše svoj državni razlog nezavisno od država članica EU. Shodno tome, UK bi moglo da bude nezavisan subjekt u međunarodnim odnosima koji promoviše globalizaciju u ime nove vizije o „globalnoj Britaniji”. Da bi se ostvarila ova vizija, autor ukazuje na polnu ravnopravnost kao prioritet, posebno u vođenju politike integrisanog upravljanja ljudskim i prirodnim resursima. U tom smislu stavlja se naglasak na ulogu polova. Čitava diskusija se odvija u korist fokusa ovoga rada – nova dilema u pogledu funkcionisanja međunarodnih odnosa u Evropi, i globalizacije nakon Bregzita.

*Cljučne reči:* UK, EU, Bregzit, međunarodni odnosi u Evropi, globalizacija, polna ravnopravnost, uloga među polovima.

Received: 21.08.2017

Revised: 26.09.2017

Accepted: 05.10.2017