



# **The rise of nationalism in the United Kingdom and its impact on globalisation: A critical analysis**

**RG Hugo**

 **orcid.org 0000-0002-2366-7612**

Mini-dissertation accepted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree *Master of Arts in Development and Management: Security Studies* at the North-West University

Supervisor: Dr BL Prinsloo

Graduation: May 2020

Student number: 12261270

*“We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.”*

**Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston**

*(1784 - 1865)*

British Prime Minister and British Foreign Minister

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ek dra hierdie verhandeling op aan my vrou, Elrise Hugo.

Sonder jou liefde, motivering, gebede en die laat aand koppies *Milo*, sou hierdie verhandeling net nog 'n droom gewees het.

- I would also like to express my gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Dr Barend Prinsloo for the enthusiasm and professionalism with which he presented his subjects. I am truly thankful for his optimistic guidance, wisdom and encouragement which motivated me to complete my research.
- To Tom Nelson (Oom Tom), for his patience and the subtle guidance he provided when proofreading the various draft chapters, thank you.
- Aan my ouers, Kobus (1958-2003) en Christa. Julle opvoeding, opofferinge, liefde en geloof het die fondament gelê waarop ek 'n toekoms kon bou. In besonder aan my ma, Christa. Dankie dat ma, as enkel ouer, vir my en Niel gedra het tot ons behoorlik op ons eie voete kon staan, en ons steeds elke dag aan die Here opdra. Ons is lief vir ma.
- Vir Janlu, Cara en Lienke. Dankie vir julle prentjies en briefies en dat julle party Saterdag langs my kom sit en 'swot' het. Julle bring lag en lig waar ookal julle gaan. Ek is lief vir julle.

Aan my Hemelse Vader, vir die vermoë om die navorsing te kon doen. Vir die talente waarmee Hy my geseën het en die geleentehede wat Hy op my pad gebring het.

*“Ek is tot alles in staat deur Hom wat my krag gee”*

*Fillipense 4:13*

**Soli Deo Gloria**

## **ABSTRACT**

Since the end of the Second World War, Britain has successfully contributed to building international institutions. Britain also played a key role in imposing liberal democratic governance across the globe and contributed to a safer, more democratic world. In the period following the end of the Cold War, Britain was one of the main exporters of neoliberalism and by extension, globalisation and the processes of globalisation. However, in June 2016, the new world order that replaced the bipolar world of the Cold War was shaken by the results of the UK's referendum. Fifty-two percent of the UK's electorate voted to leave the European Union (EU).

In this study it is argued that the decision by the British electorate to exit from the EU (Brexit) is mainly the result of rising nationalism and populism amongst citizens in the UK. On a theoretical level, the decision by the UK's electorate to leave the EU, indicates a move away from the neoliberal approach to international relations, towards the more neorealist approach, which is synonymous with nationalism, the nation state and self-determination.

Hence the theories of realism and liberalism are discussed providing the theoretical foundation for the question on whether nationalism is on the rise in the UK. The study also provides a historical background of Britain's interaction with the EU, culminating in the decision by Britain to leave the EU. The study concludes with an assessment on how the resurgence of nationalism will influence Britain's security and foreign policy in a globalised world.

### **Key Terms:**

Britain, Brexit, Nationalism, Globalisation, Realism, Neorealism, Liberalism, Neoliberalism, National Security, Human Security.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... II**
- ABSTRACT ..... III**
  
- CHAPTER 1 THE RISE OF NATIONALISM IN THE UNITED KINGDOM AND ITS  
IMPACT ON GLOBALISATION: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS ..... 1**
- 1.1 Introduction ..... 1**
- 1.2 Globalisation..... 1**
- 1.3 The rise of British nationalism..... 3**
- 1.4 Conflicting theories ..... 4**
- 1.5 Problem Statement ..... 6**
- 1.6 Research questions..... 7**
- 1.6.1 How are state security approaches related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism? ..... 7
- 1.6.2 How are human security approaches related to neoliberalism and ultimately globalisation? ..... 7
- 1.6.3 Are neorealism and state-centric nationalism on the rise in the UK, and if so, what are the main reasons? ..... 7
- 1.6.4 How can a balance be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK? ..... 7
- 1.7 Research objectives ..... 7**
- 1.7.1 To assess and summarise the state security approaches that are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism. .... 7
- 1.7.2 To analyse and appraise how human security approaches are related to neoliberalism and ultimately globalisation. .... 7

1.7.3	To assess and conclude whether neorealism and state security-centric nationalism are on the rise in the UK, and if so, to determine the main reasons.....	7
1.7.4	To consider and recommend how a balance can be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK. ....	7
<b>1.8</b>	<b>Central theoretical statement .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.9</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.9.1	Methodological approach.....	8
1.9.2	Data collection instruments.....	8
1.9.3	Strategy for data analysis .....	9
1.9.4	Ethical considerations.....	9
<b>1.10</b>	<b>Limitations of the study .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.11</b>	<b>Significance of the study .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.12</b>	<b>Layout of the chapters .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: NEOREALISM AND THE RELATION TO STATE-CENTRIC NATIONALISM AND STATE SECURITY APPROACHES .....</b>		<b>12</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Realism.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.2.1	Twentieth Century Classical Realism.....	14
2.2.2	Neorealism .....	15
<b>2.3</b>	<b>The Nation State .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Nationalism .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.5</b>	<b>State Security.....</b>	<b>20</b>

2.5.1	National Security Threats .....	23
<b>2.6</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3: LIBERALISM, NEOLIBERALISM AND THE RELATION TO GLOBALISATION AND HUMAN SECURITY .....</b>		<b>26</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Liberalism .....</b>	<b>27</b>
3.2.1	Classical Liberalism .....	27
3.2.2	Contemporary Liberalism.....	28
3.2.3	Neoliberalism.....	30
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Globalisation.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Human Security .....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.4.1	Human Development Report 1994.....	34
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Main differences between realism and liberalism .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4: BREXIT AND STATE-CENTRIC NATIONALISM (CASE STUDY) .....</b>		<b>40</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Britain and the EU: Historical Background.....</b>	<b>40</b>
4.2.1	The European Coal and Steel Community.....	41
4.2.2	The Treaty of Rome.....	44
4.2.3	The French Veto.....	45
4.2.4	The 1975 Referendum.....	47
4.2.5	The Thatcher era (1979 – 1990).....	48
4.2.6	The Maastricht Treaty.....	51

4.2.7	Tony Blair and ‘New Labour’ (1997-2010).....	53
<b>4.3</b>	<b>The Build-up to Brexit .....</b>	<b>56</b>
4.3.1	The Return of the Conservative Party .....	56
4.3.2	The 2016 Referendum (Brexit Vote) .....	59
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5: BRITISH NATIONALISM AND GLOBALISATION - STRIKING A BALANCE.....</b>		<b>64</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Britain and Globalisation: Historical Background.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>European Integration and British Nationalism .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Britain’s Security Strategy .....</b>	<b>68</b>
5.4.1	A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The National Security Strategy .....	68
5.4.2	Securing Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The Strategic Defence and Security Review.....	71
5.4.3	The National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence Review 2015: A secure and prosperous United Kingdom .....	73
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Theresa May and ‘Global Britain’ .....</b>	<b>74</b>
5.5.1	National Security Capability Review .....	75
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....</b>		<b>78</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Answering the research questions of the study.....</b>	<b>78</b>
6.2.1	Research Question 1: How are state security approaches related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism? .....	78

6.2.2	Research Question 2: How are human security approaches related to neoliberalism and ultimately globalisation? .....	79
6.2.3	Research Question 3: Are neorealism and state-centric nationalism on the rise in the UK, and if so, what are the main reasons? .....	79
6.2.4	Research Question 4: How can a balance be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK? .....	80
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>81</b>
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>84</b>

# CHAPTER 1 THE RISE OF NATIONALISM IN THE UNITED KINGDOM AND ITS IMPACT ON GLOBALISATION: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

## 1.1 Introduction

In June 1987, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, addressed the citizens of Germany's divided capital, Berlin. In his famous speech he said:

*“General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalisation: Come here to this gate! Mr Gorbachev, open this gate! Mr Gorbachev, tear down this wall” (Cambridge Editorial, 2006:200).*

On 9 November 1989, the Berlin wall fell and a new era dawned. The fall of the Berlin wall symbolised the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union. In this new world, the United States (US) was the only remaining superpower. For American foreign policy, this meant that the US was now in a position to dominate international relations and to set the agenda for a post-Cold War world, based on liberal democracy and market economics (Switzer, 2015:15).

The post-Cold War optimism and euphoria gradually developed into the idealism of a new global order, based on common values and human rights. The influence of neoliberal economics played a crucial role in the shaping of the new world order. The integration of national economies increased through the development of an international trading system, which is today called the global economy (Robinson, 1998:561).

## 1.2 Globalisation

The continued integration of political, social, economic and cultural relations across state borders can be summarised in one word: globalisation (Kacowicz, 1999:528). This definition is supported by Viotti and Kauppi (2001:280), who define globalisation as the continual increase of worldwide interactions in almost every human pursuit, ranging from the economic to the cultural spheres. Globalisation became the catchword of the 1990s, and liberal pluralists soon started to prescribe globalisation as the cure which would open up societies to democratic tendencies, reduce inequality and promote international harmony (Kacowicz, 1999:530). Greater access to information, newspapers, the internet and television increased public awareness on issues such as human rights, gender equality, labour relations and democracy (Dreher *et al.*, 2008).

Globalisation has also produced a wide range of benefits for international trade. The increased movement of goods and services has had a positive effect on economic growth, which in turn has

increased the living standards of many citizens. Globalisation has led to more efficient distribution systems, higher levels of consumption and greater prosperity throughout integrated areas/regions (Dreher *et al.*, 2008).

Heron (2008:85) argues that globalisation became the precondition for economic development policy and that there is little room for alternative theories on capitalist development. Heron (2008) further states that neoliberalism can be seen as the supporting ideology of globalisation, enforcing the significance of the free market and liberalisation.

The attempt to impose liberal democratic rule became the mantra of the United States and the United Kingdom (UK). The developed world moved towards a utopia where the absence of enemies dictated that large scale wars were unlikely, and it was no longer necessary to connect issues of national and global governance. An overarching Western grand strategy of a liberal, norm based global order gradually started to replace more realist assessment of the state and national interest (Jones & Smith, 2015). This world view was soon adopted by Western political elites, democratic governments and theorists. The Western model of civilisation was promoted as the ideal to which developing countries should aspire, in order to develop and prosper (Heron, 2008). The shift towards a single global structure was not only driven by Western powers, but many scholars agreed that globalisation has made it necessary to break with the nation-state approach which was inherited from the era of sovereignty (Clapham, 2002:775).

According to Robinson (1998:563), globalisation requires a shift from state based economies, predicated onto national interest to a global society, based on an integrated global economy. He argues that globalisation is global capitalism, which has replaced the nation state stage of capitalism. Clapham (2002:775) supports this argument. In his view, globalisation involves more than mere interconnectedness. It is a dynamic which brings into existence a new world order, from which no part of the world is excluded. He further argues that the idea of autonomous state sovereignty may be consigned to the past. In the same vein, Heywood (1997:103) states that due to increased external and internal pressures, the era of autonomous states is drawing to a close. The existence of international bodies such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organisation, amongst others, and the need to find international solutions to issues plaguing the world, are some of the pressures which force states to shift their focus to the globe rather than the state.

This was especially true for the UK during the period 1997-2010, when the ruling Labour Party implemented a foreign policy closely aligned to the concept of Good International Citizenship, a term which was first used by the Australian Foreign Minister, Gareth Evans (Gilmore, 2015:108). According to Pert (2011:96), Good International Citizenship includes compliance with

international law; support for multilateralism; willingness to assist with international tasks; morality; ethics; international good deeds and improving or raising international standards through leadership. In essence, a foreign policy based on Good International citizenship looks beyond the immediate national interest, to the values that guide and define the international community. According to Wheeler and Dunne (1998:848), Good International Citizenship departs from the traditional realist approach to foreign policy, because it rejects the assumption that national interest is always at odds with the promotion of human rights. This foreign policy was crafted as a response to an international environment where globalism is on the rise (Gilmore, 2015:108).

This new focus on the international environment as an element of the UK's foreign policy was highlighted by the speech of the then British Prime Minister, Tony Blair's Doctrine on the International Community. The speech sought to justify intervention, including military intervention, that has wider objectives than pure national interest. The doctrine aimed to address issues such as, amongst others, the oppression of civilian population and humanitarian crises (Blair, 2009:5). In the speech, the British Prime Minister affirmed the UK's commitment to establish and spread the values of liberty, human rights and an open society, sentiments which many viewed as the pillars of the UK's foreign policy under Blair (Gilmore, 2015:112).

According to Chandler (2003:300), the newly elected Labour Government's Defence Review of 1998 indicated that that resources allocated to foreign policy initiatives had very little relationship to any strategic threats faced by the UK. Hence, the Labour Government of the day had the space to pursue policy initiatives, seen to symbolise a clear projection of values. One of the first examples of implementing the "Blair Doctrine" occurred when the UK decided to actively intervene in the 1999 Kosovo war. The war in Kosovo did not have any direct or immediate threat to Britain's national security, nor was it determined by British geo-strategic concerns of international instability (Chandler, 2003:301). In the same vein, Daddow (2009:548) states that Britain's involvement in Kosovo could be seen as the expression of Prime Minister Blair's moral purpose articulated in Blair's Doctrine of the International Community.

Against this background, it is clear that the UK had an affinity for neoliberal capitalism (Martell, 2008:460), which Heron (2008:85) describes as the supporting ideology of globalisation. Over the last two decades, Britain was also one of the main exporters of neoliberalism and by extension, globalisation and the structures and processes of globalisation (Martell, 2008:458).

### **1.3 The rise of British nationalism**

However, in June 2016, the new world order that replaced the bipolar world of the Cold War was shaken by the results of the UK's referendum. Fifty-two percent of the UK's electorate voted to

leave the European Union (EU), despite experts' warnings of financial instability and economic misery. Matthijs (2017:85) describes the exit of Britain from the EU (Brexit) as the worst political crisis that the EU has ever faced. For the EU it means the loss of its largest military power, a nuclear power and one of the only two EU members with veto powers in the UN Security Council. Although the impact of Brexit on the EU will provide some interesting reading, the bigger question is why did fifty-two percent of the UK's electorate vote to leave the EU?

Bachmann and Sidaway (2016:48) argue that Brexit is mainly the result of rising nationalism and populism amongst citizens in the UK, largely driven by the perceived loss of control over their own political system and economic wellbeing. This view is supported by Tombs (2016:23), who states that most of the people who voted to leave the EU think that their voices will more likely be heard in a national democracy than in an international trading block.

Tombs (2016:24) further argues that one of the probable causes of the Brexit vote is the fact that the EU is perceived to drain power and legitimacy away from national governments, but is incapable of effectively exercising this power. Similarly, Bachmann and Sidaway (2016:48) identify one of the reasons for Brexit as the attachment to national democracy and the perceived loss of control. "Take back control" was a key slogan of the leave campaign.

The concerns about the "drain of power and legitimacy from national government" as mentioned by Tombs (2016:24), and the "perceived loss of control", as described by Bachmann and Sidaway (2016:24), can also be interpreted as the perceived loss of national self-determination. National self-determination is defined by Baradat (1999:50) as the right of national groups to organise their own nation states. Baradat (1999:59) further maintains that nationalism is the ideology of the modern nation state. This sentiment is shared by Greenfeld (2011:5), who states that the future of the nation state depends on the future of nationalism. This argument is supported by Flemmen and Savage (2017:262), who state that a major underpinning of contemporary nationalism is that it is perceived as a legitimate way in which anti-establishment sentiment can be manifested. The perceived rise of nationalism is described by Lind (2016:21) as the "Revenge of the nation state". Lind (2016:21) argued that the rising Euroskepticism, Scotland's possible secession from the United Kingdom, and the UK's exit from the EU, amongst others, are proof that the new liberal idea of post nationalism is an illusion. Lind (2016:21) furthermore contends that instead of being an "outmoded relic of the past", nationalism is flourishing.

#### **1.4 Conflicting theories**

From the discussions above, the tension between globalisation and the nation state cannot be ignored. On the one hand, there is a school of thought which argues that the era of the nation

state is drawing to a close (Heywood, 1997:103), that global capitalism has replaced the nation state stage of capitalism (Clapham, 2002:775) and that the idea of autonomous state sovereignty may be consigned to the past (Robinson, 1998:563).

On the other hand, authors such as Lind (2016:16) and Greenfeld (2011:9) suggest that the nation state is thriving and that there is no better form of organising society. This view is also supported by Wahl (2017:158), who states that in spite of globalisation, and European integration, the nation state remains the dominant form of organising society, worldwide and especially within the EU.

The apparent friction between the concept of globalisation and the concept of the nation state also spills over into political theories. This is reflected by Heron (2008:85), who states that neoliberalism is the supporting theory of globalisation, and by Baradat (1999:59), who asserts that nationalism is on the rise in the modern nation state. Hence is clear that there is friction between the concepts of globalisation and the nation state, where the theory of neoliberalism is in conflict with the ideas of nationalism. The fact that there is friction between the theory of neoliberalism, and the ideas of nationalism, also manifests itself in the relation between the theory of neoliberalism and neorealism.

Walt (1998:30) states that through the lens of the neorealist theory, the international system consists of competing powers, each seeking to survive, and because the system has no central authority to protect states, each state has to survive on its own. Similarly, Krause and Williams (1996:240) argue that nationalism should be understood in the context of the historical development of armies, and the necessity for states to be able to raise armies in order to survive. In other words, nationalism is caused by the pressures of the international system, where states compete for survival. Hence, it can be argued, that when international relations are viewed through the lens of neorealism, states will be inclined to nationalism or nationalistic behaviour as a survival method.

This apparent conflict subsequently spills over to the academic field, pitting theoretical approaches of security studies against each other. In this specific case of nationalism and globalisation, the theoretical approaches involved are neorealism and neoliberalism. This strenuous relationship is aptly described by Chatterjee (2003:130), who states that neorealists do not rule out the prospects of cooperation between states. Similarly, neoliberals who are much more optimistic about interstate cooperation do not deny the assumption of anarchy and the international system being primarily a self-help system.

*“The realist–neoliberal controversy revolves around the issue of cooperation and conflict amongst states, the extent and range of cooperation, the impact of institutions on state*

*motivation and behaviour, the nature and consequences of anarchy, the priority of state goals, the intentions and capabilities, and the vital issue of absolute and relative gains*" (Chatterjee, 2003:130).

The "realist-neoliberal controversy" (Chatterjee, 2003:130) can also be detected when dealing with the concept of security. According to Buur *et al.* (2007:11), the concept of security has undergone various changes, resulting in a broadening of the concept to include referents other than states. It is precisely the inclusion of referent objects other than the state into the concept of security which contributes to the "realist-neoliberal controversy". The neorealist approach sees the competition between states as the hallmark of international politics, in which the state is the most important player, and the security of the state is paramount. This is in contrast to the neoliberal approach to security, where there is a stronger focus on the security of groups and individuals (human security) (Viotti & Kauppi, 2001).

According to Buur *et al.* (2007:11), by using the notion of "human security", security has been transformed to such an extent that a number of human needs have been included, and are now indispensable for the survival of the individual. Thus, unlike the traditional, neorealist approach to security, which has a strong focus on state security, the more neoliberal approach to security (human security) focuses on the safety of people rather than states (Buur *et al.*, 2007:11).

## **1.5 Problem Statement**

From the information above, a shift in the UK's politics/policies can be detected. For the period following the end of the Cold War, the UK was one of the main exporters of neoliberalism, and by extension, globalisation and the structures and processes of globalisation (Martell, 2008:458). The decision by the people to exit the EU on the other hand is described as nationalistic (Bachmann & Sidaway, 2016:23) and a matter of patriotism (Tombs, 2016:23), which further contributes to the rising nationalist temperature.

It is thus clear that the decision of the UK's citizens to leave the EU indicates a move away from the neoliberal approach towards the more neorealist approach, which is synonymous with nationalism, the nation state and self-determination.

It is against this background that this study will attempt to analyse whether nationalism is on the rise in the UK, and what the impact of the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will be on globalisation and international cooperation. This will allow us to determine the main problem under investigation: "*Will the resurgence of nationalism in the UK result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation?*"

## **1.6 Research questions**

Flowing from the above, a number of secondary questions can be formulated:

- 1.6.1 How are state security approaches related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism?
- 1.6.2 How are human security approaches related to neoliberalism and ultimately globalisation?
- 1.6.3 Are neorealism and state-centric nationalism on the rise in the UK, and if so, what are the main reasons?
- 1.6.4 How can a balance be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK?

## **1.7 Research objectives**

- 1.7.1 To assess and summarise the state security approaches that are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism.
- 1.7.2 To analyse and appraise how human security approaches are related to neoliberalism and ultimately globalisation.
- 1.7.3 To assess and conclude whether neorealism and state security-centric nationalism are on the rise in the UK, and if so, to determine the main reasons.
- 1.7.4 To consider and recommend how a balance can be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK.

## **1.8 Central theoretical statement**

The UK has over the past thirty years been ascribing to neoliberal pluralism. The UK is also described as one of the main exporters of neoliberal pluralism, mainly through globalisation (Heron, 2008:85). The UK's exit from the EU and the apparent resurgence of nationalism in the UK is indicative of a move away from neoliberalism towards neorealism. This apparent shift in theoretical approach towards international relations and security is described by Chatterjee (2003:130) as the "realist-neoliberal controversy", pitting two different approaches (neorealism and neoliberalism) against each other. As was stated earlier, the apparent friction between the concept of globalisation and the concept of the nation state also spills over into political theories: neoliberalism is the supporting theory of globalisation and nationalism is on the rise in the modern nation state supported by the theory of neorealism. Hence, on a theoretical level, this study will

contribute to the discussion on the tension between neorealism and neoliberalism as theoretical approaches to international relations and security, with specific focus on how the apparent change in the theoretical approach will impact the future of the UK's security (state and human) and international relations.

## **1.9 Methodology**

### **1.9.1 Methodological approach**

This study primarily made use of a qualitative research approach. The qualitative research approach is described by Coetzee (2001:41) as a research method which attempts to explain or express characteristics, values and events, in terms of concepts, rather than figures and numbers. Therefore qualitative research will make use of arguments and is assessed on the quality of arguments. This definition is supported by Landrum and Garza (2015:200), who define qualitative research as a research method which makes descriptive knowledge claims about meaning, using descriptive data and expressing findings in linguistic narratives. Bryman (2012:116) shares this view by stating that qualitative research involves an in-depth understanding of human behaviour and the reasons which govern human behaviour. In other words, qualitative research relies on the reasons behind the various aspects of behaviour (Bryman, 2012:116).

### **1.9.2 Data collection instruments**

Data collection was primarily based on the evaluation and interpretation of relevant literature. The leading sources of data were documents, mainly in the form of textbooks, academic journals, official documents deriving from governments and news articles. The research were also based on primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include amongst others, policy documents from the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, reports of the UK Parliament, as well as official speeches by heads of state and senior government officials.

Secondary sources such as books and academic journals were used for the theoretical framework, as well as matters relating to realism, pluralism, neoliberalism, nationalism and globalisation. The case study will also rely on primary and secondary sources.

Additionally, the following databases were consulted for more information on the topic:

- Catalogue of books: Ferdinand Postma Library (Potchefstroom Campus);
- EBSCO Host;
- Google Scholar;

- JSTOR;
- LexisNexis;
- Science Direct.

### **1.9.3 Strategy for data analysis**

Data analysis, in a qualitative study, is aimed at describing and contextualising events and occurrences through the use of qualitative logic, in order to interpret, understand, explain and predict future events and developments. The main objective of data analysis is therefore to transform raw input data into value added output information in the form of explanations and/or predictions, which will provide a better understanding and insight into the subject matter under consideration (Cloete, 2007:514).

For the purpose of this study, the data analysis strategy firstly included data familiarisation. This step will focused on the reading and evaluation of the available data. The second step were to identify a thematic framework. The thematic framework was derived from the problem statement and research objectives (Cloete, 2007:515). Thirdly, data was organised and categorised into particular themes, in order to reduce data to manageable understandable text, which will simplify the interpretation of the data in relation the relevant theories applicable to the study. The final step in the strategy was to interpret the collected data.

### **1.9.4 Ethical considerations**

Since this study primarily made use of the qualitative research approach, data analysis, description and comparison were utilised. No questionnaires were distributed an no study groups or interviews were. Therefore the study had no impact on the privacy or wellbeing of individuals. The only ethical consideration which applied was that the research should be done in an honest and objective manner in line with the ethical prescripts of the North-West University.

### **1.10 Limitations of the study**

The issues analysed in this study are contemporary, and currently there are a variety of voices and views in the public domain trying to make sense of the apparent rise of nationalism in the world. The fact that the topic is so current means that there is not a lot of scientific work done on the current developments in international relations. This might be a slight challenge when scientific sources relating to the subject are sought. However, there are vast amounts of literature on the theoretical aspects of the study, and the actuality of the theme is a challenge that can be overcome by effective data reduction and by maintaining a narrow focus on the primary research question.

### **1.11 Significance of the study**

The study on the rise of nationalism in the UK is applicable to a wider international phenomenon, where there are signs that countries are gradually moving away from internationalism or globalisation towards nationalism. The election of Donald Trump in the United States, the decision by Britain to leave the EU and the results of the elections in France in April 2017, support this argument. Hence this study addressed some pertinent issues with which the world is grappling today. The study is current and deals with contemporary issues. The current issue of the resurgence of nationalism will play an important role in how states interact with each other in the future, and it is important to start thinking about how international relations will be conducted in the future.

### **1.12 Layout of the chapters**

#### **Chapter 1: Introduction**

The first chapter will serve as an introduction and will outline the objectives, structure and research problems which will be addressed in this study.

#### **Chapter 2: Neorealism and the Relation to State-Centric Nationalism and State Security Approaches**

Chapter 2 will discuss the theoretical approach of realism and its manifestation in international relations, in order to provide a theoretical departure point for the concepts of nationalism, the nation state and state security. This will be done to address the main objective of this chapter which is to assess how the state security approaches are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism. This chapter will therefore form the first part of the analysis on whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation.

#### **Chapter 3: Liberalism, Neoliberalism and the Relation to Globalisation and Human Security**

Chapter 3 will analyse the concept of liberalism and how the theoretical approach of liberalism is manifested in international relations. The chapter will also explore the relation between liberalism, neoliberalism, globalisation and human security. This chapter will therefore form the second part

of the analysis on whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation.

#### **Chapter 4: Brexit and State-Centric Nationalism (Case Study)**

Chapter 4 will provide a case study of the UK's decision to leave the European Union. The case study will provide a background/historical context to the build-up to the 2016 referendum and will also assess the possible reasons which led to the pro Brexit referendum results. The aim of the case study will be to assess whether state-centric nationalism and neorealism are on the rise in the UK and what the reasons for the phenomenon may be.

#### **Chapter 5: British Nationalism and Globalisation: striking a balance**

The purpose of Chapter 5 will be to assess the effect that rising nationalism in Britain may have on globalisation and whether it will be possible to find a balance between nationalism, which is closely related to neorealism, and globalisation, which is synonymous with liberalism and neoliberalism. Chapter 5 will also attempt to establish whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation.

#### **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

The final chapter will serve as a summary of the study. The assumptions formulated in the introduction will be tested against the findings in the study.

## CHAPTER 2: NEOREALISM AND THE RELATION TO STATE-CENTRIC NATIONALISM AND STATE SECURITY APPROACHES

### 2.1 Introduction

The decision by Britain to leave the EU following the 2016 referendum sent shockwaves throughout the world and provided new impetus to the debate on the friction between globalisation and the nation state. Bachmann and Sidaway (2016:48) argue that Brexit is mainly the result of rising nationalism and populism amongst citizens in the UK, mainly driven by the perceived loss of control over their own political system and economic wellbeing. The decision to leave the EU therefore seems to be in conflict with what Jones and Smith (2015:934) describe as an overarching Western grand strategy of a liberal, norm based global order, which gradually started to replace a more realist assessment of the state and national interest.

This friction between the apparent rising nationalism and liberal norm based global order clearly spills over into the academic field, pitting theoretical approaches of international relations and security studies, namely realism and liberalism, against each other. Korab-Karpowicz (2010:1) identifies realism as one of the theories in international relations and describes it as a view of international politics that stresses the competitive and conflictual side of international relations. Korab-Karpowicz (2010:1) goes further by stating that realism is usually contrasted with idealism or liberalism, which tends to emphasise cooperation. Similarly, Mowle (2003:561) stated that liberal and realist theories of international behaviour present significantly different versions of how states interact with one another. This view is echoed by Chatterjee (2003:130), who stated that:

*“The realist–neoliberal controversy revolves around the issue of cooperation and conflict amongst states, the extent and range of cooperation, the impact of institutions on state motivation and behaviour, the nature and consequences of anarchy, the priority of state goals, the intentions and capabilities, and the vital issue of absolute and relative gains.”*

Walt (1998:30) also argued that the study of international affairs can be described as the protracted competition between realist and liberal traditions. In the same vein, Morgenthau *et al.* (2006:3) state that the history of political theory can be described as a contest between two schools of thought (realism and liberalism) that differ fundamentally in their conceptions of human nature.

This chapter will thus discuss the theoretical approach of realism and its manifestation in international relations, in order to provide a theoretical departure point for the concepts of nationalism, the nation state and state security. This will be done to address the main objective of this chapter, which is to assess how the state security approaches are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism. This chapter will therefore form the first part of the analysis on whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation.

## **2.2 Realism**

According to Viotti and Kauppi (2001:21), realism is a school of thought that can be traced back thousands of years. Similarly, Elman (2008:17) states that the proponents of realism argue that realist thinking extends well before the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, and often suggest that current theories are the incarnations of an extended intellectual tradition. Authors such as Forde (1995), Doyle (1990) and Korab-Karpowicz (2010) argue that the Athenian general and historian Thucydides (born in 472 BC) can be seen as the father of the realist school of thought. According to Korab-Karpowicz (2010:3), Thucydides' writings reflect on human nature and how self-interest takes priority over morality, and how independent states can only survive when they are powerful. Similarly, Doyle (1990:226) stated that according to Thucydides, interstate relations always existed in a condition where war was always eminent and military preparedness and military superiority were the only deterrents for war.

According to Viotti and Kauppi (2001:53), the Italian diplomat, Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) can also be seen as one of the founding fathers or main advocates of political realism. Machiavelli believed that politics was a means to pursue and enhance the internal and external security of the state, and unless security is achieved, all other goals are pointless. Machiavelli further argued that the best defence is being well armed and having good allies, and that assessment of power and security should be done from a realist perspective of "what is" and not an idealist perspective of "what should be". In the same vein Korab-Karpowicz (2010:4) stated that the political theory advanced by Machiavelli is a radical type of political realism which denies the relevance of morality in politics and claims that all means are justified in the pursuit of state power.

The 17<sup>th</sup> Century philosopher, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) is also renowned for his contribution to the realist school of thought. According to Jackson and Jackson (1997:19), Hobbes had a very pessimistic view of human nature, and was a staunch supporter of an absolute government based on a social contract which would bind citizens under a sovereign who would protect them from their own selfishness. Most relevant to the realist traditions is Hobbes's view of human nature. He

argued that without a central governing authority, an anarchic state of nature would exist where violence and war would be in the order of the day (Viotti & Kauppi, 2001:55).

According to Hobbes, the struggle for power lies at the heart of human nature and can also be applied to the international system, where states, in absence of a central governing authority would seek to acquire more power in order to dominate other states and ensure their own security and independence. Hence actors (states) in the international system would be prone to tension and the possibility of war (Korab-Karpowicz, 2010:5).

Against this background it can be argued that Thucydides, Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes provided the foundations for the realist school of thought. The next section will briefly discuss how realism developed and manifested itself as a political theory in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

### **2.2.1 Twentieth Century Classical Realism**

According to Williams (2008:16), the concept of realism can be subdivided into different variations. The two most distinctive variations are classical realism and neorealism. Elman (2008:17) stated that the work by Hans Morgenthau, "*Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*", became the undisputed standard bearer for political realism in the era following the second world war. This view is supported by Snyder (2004:54) and Walt (1998:31), who also identify Morgenthau as one of the founding theorists of classical realism.

The realist school of thought according to Morgenthau *et al.* (2006:3) believes that the world is shaped by forces inherent to human nature, and to improve the world, one must work with these forces, and not against them. Morgenthau *et al.* (2006:3) further state that the world consists of opposing interests characterised by conflict, where moral principles can never be fully realised and should rather be managed by balancing the competing interests and settlements of conflicts. The realist school of thought envisages a system of checks and balances as a universal principle for all pluralist societies. Such a system appeals to historical precedent rather than abstract principles and aims at the realisation of the lesser evil rather than that of the absolute good (Morgenthau *et al.*, 2006:3).

Political realism according to Morgenthau *et al.* (2006:4) is based on six principles. The first principle states that politics is governed by objective laws, with its roots in human nature. The second principle is based on the assumption that statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined in terms of power. The third principle assumes that interest defined in terms of power is universally valid but not cast in stone, and is dependent on the political and cultural context within which foreign policy is formulated and may include anything that establishes and maintains political control. The fourth principle states that political realism is aware of the moral significance

of political action and the tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action. The fourth principle also states that realism maintains that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract universal formulation, but that they must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place. The fifth principle maintains that political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe. According to this principle, it is the concept of interest, defined in terms of power that prevents excess and political folly. The sixth and final principle of Morgenthau's principles of political realism assumes that political realism maintains the autonomy of the political sphere, and specifically focusses on how policy affects the power of a nation (interest). The sixth principle further states that political realism does not ignore the existence and influence of theories outside the political sphere, but that political realism is superior in the sphere of politics.

According to Cristol (2009:239), Morgenthau's six principles emphasise power over morality. Similarly, Waltz (1979:31) states that classical realists such as Morgenthau believed that states, like human beings, had an innate desire to dominate others, which led them to fight wars. This argument is supported by Elman (2008:17), who concluded that political realism as advocated by Morgenthau has its origins in the flawed nature of humanity and the constant desire for more power. In other words, classical realism is directly linked to human nature and self-interest, a trait often displayed by aggressive statesmen and domestic political groups pursuing self-serving expansionist foreign policies.

### **2.2.2 Neorealism**

The second variant of realism as identified by Elman (2008:18) is neorealism. According to Williams (2008:18), Walt (1998:31), Snyder (2004:53) and Korab-Karpowicz (2010:11), Kenneth Waltz is one of the leading theorists advancing the neorealist theory.

The major difference between the classical realist theory advanced by Morgenthau and the neorealist theory advanced by Waltz is that Waltz ignored human nature and focussed on the effects of the international system (Walt, 1998:31). Similarly, Korab-Karpowicz (2010:11) states that Waltz, in his efforts to develop a theory of international relations, avoided any philosophical discussions of human nature and rather focussed on the international system and the structure of the international system in which states operate, and which constrains the behaviour of states.

According to Waltz (1990:30), the main difference between traditional realism as advocated by Morgenthau, and neorealism, is the idea that international politics can be described as a system with a precisely defined structure. Waltz (1979:79) describes the international system as

composed of a structure and of interacting units, where the structure is a system wide component which makes it possible to think of the system as a whole. Waltz (1979:88) further defines the international structure by its organisation or the way it is ordered. He states that unlike domestic systems which are centralised and hierarchic, the international system is decentralised and anarchic or without government. According to Waltz, anarchy is the ordering principle of the international system, and the units in the international system are states which compete for survival (Korab-Karpowicz, 2010:11). Chatterjee (2003:123) illustrates the anarchic international system propagated by Waltz as a self-help system where states are defensive actors, primarily concerned with their own security, in order to survive in the anarchic system. Similarly, Korab-Karpowicz (2010:11) compares the international system propagated by Waltz to firms in a domestic economy who all have the same fundamental interest: to survive. In his own words, Waltz (1979:111) describes the behaviour of units (states) in an anarchic system as follows:

*“To achieve their objectives and maintain their security, units in a condition of anarchy—be they people, corporations, states, or whatever—must rely on the means they can generate and the arrangements they can make for themselves. Self-help is necessarily the principle of action in an anarchic order. A self-help situation is one of high risk-of bankruptcy in the economic realm and of war in a world of free states.”*

Hence, in contrast to a classical realist like Morgenthau, who sees the accumulation of power by states as both a means and an end, neorealists believe that the fundamental interest of states is security (Korab-Karpowicz, 2010). This is in line with the argument by Waltz (1990:36) who stated that in crucial situations, the ultimate concern of states is not for power, but for security. Neorealists thus view power as a useful tool to be used in attempts to secure the state, rather than as an end in itself.

The fact that neorealism is primarily concerned with the survival and security of the state also has an influence on the way that states interact with each other in the international system. According to neorealism, states are concerned with their own security and survival, and in an international system consisting of competing units, advantages to one unit might be seen as threats to another. It is for this reason that the structure of international politics limits the cooperation between states. According to neorealism, states are cautious to become too dependent on each other, and although an increase in trade and cooperation amongst states might improve the wellbeing of the world, it would increase the vulnerability of states due to their dependence on other states (Waltz, 1979:106). Waltz (1979:107) further elaborates on the interdependence of states by stating that:

*“States do not willingly place themselves in situations of increased dependence. In a self-help system, considerations of security subordinate economic gain to political interest.”*

Therefore according to Tarzi (2004:124), neorealism dictates that states will contribute to the establishment of international regimes if it is in their interest, and will also comply with the rules of international regimes if it serves their interest and enhances its security. This approach is supported by Chatterjee (2003:128), who stated that neorealism predicts that states will, instead of cooperating with each other to maximise individual benefits, be more interested to increase their own share and preserve their initial advantage.

From the information above it is clear that neorealism is a political theory concerned with the survival and security of the state. Neorealism moves away from attributing state behaviour to individual leaders or human nature, and explains state behaviour in terms of the international structure that emerges from the ways in which states relate to each other in an anarchic system. What realism and neorealism do have in common is the fact that both theories are concomitant with the nation state and the survival and security of the nation state. Hence for both realist and neorealist, the referent object of security will always be the state. Against this background, the next section will briefly discuss the concept of the nation state as the identified referent object of security by both realist and neorealist theorists.

### **2.3 The Nation State**

According to Fielder (2018:215), the concept of the nation state originated from the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, where the nation state was instituted as the primary political unit in the world order. The treaty further necessitated that states recognise each other as independent and sovereign and that the territorial integrity of states be respected.

Jackson and Jackson (1997:34) define a state as a political unit within a specific territory, with a permanent population and a form of government. Similarly, Viotti and Kauppi (2001:16) define a state as a geographical entity governed by a central authority whose leaders claim to represent all persons within its territory. According to Baradat (1999:57), the state evolved as a way of organising society in order to maximise the exploitation and distribution of resources which became limited when humans evolved from a nomadic way of life to subsistence farming. Baradat (1999:51) further contends that the laws and governments that were created within the states were used to define, protect and transfer property. Similarly, Jackson and Jackson (1997:35) state that a sovereign state wields power by maintaining order within its borders, is able to tax its citizens, and is also recognised by the international community as having the right to run its own affairs free from interference by other states and governments.

A second concept that arises when defining the state as a concept is the nation state. Scholars such as Jackson and Jackson (1997:35), Heywood (1997:27) and Viotti and Kauppi (2001:411)

deem the term nation state to be problematic in the sense that the term nation and the term state are sometimes used interchangeably without distinction. Hence the scholars are clear that a state is a legal concept that refers to a population administered by a government on a given territory with a claim to sovereignty recognised by other sovereign states. A nation on the other hand exists when there is a union of people based on similarities and linguistic patterns, ethnic relationships, cultural heritage and geographic proximity (Baradat, 1999:47). Subsequently, when a nation of people manages to create a state of their own, the nation state is born. Heywood (1997:117) argues that for liberals and most socialists, the nation state is largely fashioned out of civic loyalties and allegiances among the people residing in the specified territory. For the purpose of this research the definitions of a nation state provided by Heywood (1997:117) and Baradat (1999:50) will be used.

The importance of the nation state is described by Baradat (1999:50) as follows:

*“The nation state has become the principle form of political organisation among modern people. Indeed, in political terms, part of the definition of a modern society is that it is organised into a nation state. The term nation symbolised the unity of the people, the term state politicised the union. In this century, national self-determination (the right of national groups to organise their own nation states) has become one of the most universally accepted...”*

The statement by Baradat (1999:50) is supported by Wahl (2017:158), who stated that the nation state remains the dominant form of organising society, despite efforts of regional integration and globalisation. Similarly, Goldman (2002:286) states that nation states are the most important actors for understanding international relations. It is thus clear that the nation state is a cardinal part of international relations and world politics. From the statement by Wahl (2017:158), it is also evident that there is a certain degree of tension between what was defined as globalisation, and what has been defined as the nation state. The tension between globalisation and the nation state is also reflected on by Lind (2016:21), who refers to the apparent rise of nationalism as the “Revenge of the nation state”. It is thus clear that there is a close relation between nationalism and the nation state. The next section will briefly discuss the concept of nationalism and its relation to the nation state.

## **2.4 Nationalism**

According to Haas (1986:707), the concept of nationalism is usually described in academic circles as fuzzy, or diverse. This is supported by Freedman (1998:748), who in the introduction of his essay: *“Is nationalism a Distinct Ideology?”* stated that the categorisation of nationalism as an

ideology is a matter of confusion in contemporary political analysis. Similarly Fielder (2018:214) stated that there are many definitions of nationalism, while Audi (2009:366) stated that nationalist views fall on a spectrum from minimal to extreme and there are many different versions of the term. Although it is accepted that the concept of nationalism is not easy to define, this section will provide a broad set of definitions for the term of nationalism, in order to create a workable concept that can be applied to the problem statement and relevant research questions.

Jackson and Jackson (1997:36) define nationalism as the collective action of a politically conscious group or nation in pursuit of increased territorial autonomy and sovereignty. These authors maintain that nationalism has been used to justify economic expansionism, protectionism and imperialism. As an ideology, nationalism has been employed to promote supremacy of nations or people, as well as justification for the emancipation from colonial rule and other forms of oppression and opposition to self-determination. Jackson and Jackson (1997:36) further state that nationalism sometimes enjoys a higher sense of allegiance than religion, class, tribe or other social group.

Viotti and Kauppi (2001:413) define nationalism as a devotion to the interest of one's nation, usually to the exclusion of other competing identities. They contend that nationalism is the result of the mobilisation of common identity for political purposes. In the same vein, Dekker *et al.* (2003) attribute the emergence of nationalism to political socialisation, stating that when the contents of political socialisation includes aspects such as a common origin, a pure nation, the maintenance or establishment of sovereignty, groups that fall outside the nationalist definition might be forced to leave, which may end international cooperation between groups outside the nationalist definition and the promoters of the nationalist ideas.

Baradat (1999:47) not only defines nationalism as an ideology, but goes further by stating that nationalism is the most powerful political idea of the past several hundred years. Similarly, Wimmer (2019:3) stated that almost all modern political ideologies were shaped by nationalism and that nationalism has provided the political foundation for institutions such as democracy and the welfare state. Baradat (1999:47) argues that nationalism calls on people to identify with the interest of their national group, in order to support the creation of a state and to support that interest.

Accordingly, nationalism is perceived as a vehicle to improve the wellbeing of citizens and to attain a certain level of national self-determination. This argument is supported by Wimmer (2019:6) who stated that through nationalism, the power of the modern state was channelled to improve the lives of its citizens. Baradat (1999:59) further stated that the emotional attachment to nationalism is so strong because it provides individuals with a sense of identity and extends their

identity to something greater than the self. Hence nationalism gives individuals a platform through which they can define themselves and identify themselves with national self-interest. Baradat (1999:59) concludes by stating that nationalism is the ideology of the modern nation state and the theoretical basis for the organisation of sovereign states, each claiming sovereignty and striving towards self-determination.

From the definitions above it is clear that nationalism can be seen as a political tool, used to promote the interest of a specific group or nation, including sovereignty and self-determination. It is also argued that nationalism is the supporting ideology of the nation state (Baradat, 1999:59). This argument is supported by Greenfeld (2011:5), who states that the future of the modern nation state is dependent on nationalism. Hence it can be argued that they strive for self-determination. The interest of a specific group or nation is the key aspect of the nationalist ideology which manifests itself in the nation state. Fielder (2018:214) argued that nationalism centres around the idea that humanity is naturally divided into nations that have specific characteristics, such as a shared language, culture, values, religion, race or ethnicity, and mostly an emotional or physical attachment to a certain geographic area. Fielder (2018:215) also argued that key to the idea of nationalism is the fact that the nation should be self-governed, politically sovereign and as independent as possible. The emphasis on state sovereignty and independence is one of the key considerations when dealing with the security of the state. The next section will briefly discuss the concept of state security.

## **2.5 State Security**

According to Morris (2012:121), achieving national security is the central goal of every nation state. Morris (2012:121) defines national security as a state's ability to use economic, military, political, diplomatic and judicial measures to overcome domestic and international threats. Viotti and Kauppi (2001:14) describe security as the basic survival, welfare and protection of the state. Liotta (2002:475) goes further by stating that national security is synonymous with state-centric security, the focus of national security is the state, and that sovereignty and territorial integrity are usually the identified risks flowing from security threats in the form of other states and non-state actors. In the same vein, Newman (2001:240) defines national security as the imperative of defending territory against, and deterring external military threats, while Buzan (1983:36) identifies the state as the referent object of the term national security. Hence, for the purpose of this chapter, the term national security will automatically refer to the state as the referent object of security.

The challenge in securing the state as the referent object, according to Buzan (1983:36) is the fact that the state and the concept of the state is in itself a multi-faceted phenomenon, due to the

fact that the state is composed of individuals bound together into a collective political unit. In order to explain or simplify the concept of the state, Buzan (1983:40) developed a model, describing the state as a unit made up of three components. The first component of the state is the idea of the state, which establishes the state's authority in the minds of the people. The second is the physical base of the state, consisting of territory and population, while the third component of Buzan's model is institutional expression of the state, defined as governing institutions that control the physical base.

According to Buzan (1983:50), organising ideologies can be seen as the most obvious type of higher idea of the state. Ideologies such as democracy, communism or the identification with general principles like Christianity or Islam, can serve as the idea of the state and will be closely connected to the state's institutional structure. The idea of the state can also be strengthened by a sense of national purpose like racial preservation or national culture. As long as these ideas are widely held by the population, this component of the state will remain strong. The argument by Buzan (1983:50) that organising ideologies can be seen as the most obvious type of higher idea of the state, can also be linked to the argument by Baradat (1999:59), who stated that nationalism is the ideology or higher idea of the nation state. By linking these two arguments, it is possible to argue that nationalism can be described as the idea of the state, which is one of the components of the state. In other words, nationalism can be seen as an integral component of the state.

The institutions of the state refer to the entire machinery of the government, including the legislative, administrative and judicial bodies, laws, procedures and norms. Buzan (1983:56) argued that the institutions of state are much more tangible than the idea of the state as an object of security. Given that the institutions of states are physical objects, they are more vulnerable to physical threats than ideas. Buzan (1983) argued that institutions of states can be uprooted and destroyed much easier than ideas which are more abstract and ambiguous.

The final component of the state according to the model developed by Buzan (1983) is the physical base of the state. According to Buzan (1983:62), the physical base of the state comprises of the population and territory, including all of the wealth within the borders of the state. Buzan (1983:62) argued that the physical base of the state is the most concrete of the 3 components, hence it is also easier to describe or secure as a referent object of security, because threats to physical objects are more direct and obvious in terms of seizures and damage than threats directed at more amorphous and ambiguous components such as ideas and institutions.

The model provided by (Buzan, 1983) attempts to break down the state as referent object of security, thereby providing a slightly narrower definition to national security, a concept that Baldwin (1997:12) described as dangerously ambiguous. Defining the state by dividing it into

components, the referent object also becomes easier to define, and threats to the referent object become easier to identify. Therefore a threat to any of the three components described by Buzan (1983) can be perceived as a threat to national security. Buzan (1983:53) therefore concluded that:

*“The multi-layered nature of the state opens it to threats on many levels, particularly vulnerabilities depending on the unique structure and circumstance of the state concerned. This diversity of states as referent objects of security underpins the argument about the impossibility of devising a useful general definition for national security.”*

The “impossibility” of devising a useful general definition for national security is also articulated by Wilson (2015:374), who stated that the concept of security has been notoriously difficult to pin down, and instead of improving the concept of national security, deferent versions of security have emerged and flourished. The difficulty to provide an authoritative definition for national security is also reflected on by Krause and Williams (1996:230), who state that the neorealist focus on safeguarding the core values of the state from military threats emanating from outside its borders is no longer adequate as a means of what is to be secured, from what threats and by what means.

Although Krause and Williams (1996:230) acknowledge that a definition for security and national security is no longer adequate to the current challenges of international politics, they specifically link the state-centric security or national security to neorealism. Newman (2001:240) stated that international security has traditionally been defined as military defence of territory within a context of an anarchic state system whose main characteristic is the constant competition for security among states. This theory of an anarchic system where states are in competition falls squarely into the theory of neorealism advocated by scholars such as Waltz (1979).

In an analysis of international relations, shortly after the Second World War, Wolfers (1952:481) makes the same point by stating that realists are inclined to insist that the foreign policy they advocate for should be dictated by the national interest, and more specifically by national security interest. Klarevas (2004:20) summarises realism by stating that realism is focussed on national security, selfishly in pursuit of national interest, in a world where the primary agents of international politics are nation states. Similarly, Ritchie (2011:357) stated that in the neorealist tradition, security has been conceived as property of states, defined in terms of military power, maintained for the purpose of safeguarding the sovereign territory and institutions of the state from external attacks and coercion, while maximising its autonomy and influence. It can therefore be concluded that national security/state security is based on the theoretical approach of political

realism, which is mainly concerned with the threats emanating from the competition between states in an anarchic system.

According to Leffler (1990:143), a national security approach acknowledges that power plays a key role in the behaviour of nations and the functioning of an international system. Leffler (1990:143) maintains that a nation's power depends on its political stability, social cohesion, economic productivity as well as its troops, tanks, planes, ships and nuclear warheads. Leffler (1990:144) further stated that threats to national security and the assessment of these threats should be the starting point for any policy makers tasked with developing national security strategies. Similarly Buzan (1983:73) stated that in order to make sense of national security as a policy problem, the threats and vulnerabilities impacting on the referent object need to be understood. Therefore the next section will briefly discuss the threats to national security as seen from a realist perspective.

### **2.5.1 National Security Threats**

According to Buzan (1983:75), military threats are accorded the highest priority among national security concerns. This is mainly due to the fact that military action can threaten all the components (idea of the state; physical base of the state; state institutions) of the state and destroy centuries of accomplishments in the field of politics, art and all human activities. In essence, the most extreme form of military threat is the threat of invasion and occupation aimed at obliterating the state.

The elimination of the state by military means is obviously the most extreme form of military threat that any state can face. However, Buzan (1983:76) distinguishes between the different levels of military threats by describing the spectrum of military threats ranging from direct threats like invasion, to indirect threats like threats to shipping lanes, or threats to allies or strategically placed territories. Although the level of military threats can vary, it is the use of or threat of force that compels states to prioritise military threats and elevate them above other threats to national security.

Buzan (1983:76) stated that the use of force implies a breach of normal peaceful relations, crossing the line which separates the normal relations of political, economic and social sectors from the less restrained competition of war. If the use of force implies a breach of peaceful relation and defines the threat in terms of a military threat, then terrorism can also be grouped into the category of military threats. However, Gotowicki (1997:1) states that terrorism is not fundamentally a military problem, but rather a political, social and economic problem, and a military approach to terrorism can only be part of the solution in dealing with terrorism. Although

terrorism and its definition and reaction to terrorism does not fall into the scope of this research, it is important not to ignore it as a threat to national security, especially in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

The second threat to state security identified by Buzan (1983:77) is a political threat and relates to the institutional expression of the state and the idea of the state that forms two of the three components of the state. According to Buzan (1983:76), a state is essentially a political entity and political threats are just as dangerous to the state as military threats. Buzan (1983) argues that political threats originate from the “great battle of ideas” or the competition between ideologies, which is the underlying justification for the international anarchy described by realists such as Waltz (1979). Similar to military threats, political threats can be classified into different threat levels ranging from competition or competing ideologies such as communism and capitalism, to lower level threats such as social and cultural differences and religious differences. All these aspects might have an impact on the idea of the state, and subsequently national security. The difficulty in dealing with threats of a political nature is that they are much more complex than military threats (Buzan, 1983:77).

The third threat to state security, according to Buzan (1983:79), is an economic threat. Although economic threats are focused strictly on the economy of the target state and do not directly threaten other units of the state in the same way that military and political threats may harm the state, economic threats might have secondary political and military consequences for the state. It is therefore hard to distinguish the dangers of normal economic competition from economic threats to national security. Despite the secondary nature of economic threats, Buzan (1983:80) highlights two economic threats that could have direct consequences for national security.

The first economic threat involves the traditional link between economic factors and military capability. Buzan (1983:80) argued that a country’s military capability is dependent on its economic performance, basically stating that a country’s economy is the mechanism responsible for funding any military expenses. However, a direct economic threat to a country will be when strategic minerals/materials for military purposes must be obtained from outside the country, then threats to the supply chain might be considered as a national security threat. For example, if Country A needs to import steel to build ships for its fleet, and the supply routes are blocked or the exporting country no longer wants to trade with Country A, then threats to the supply of steel might be classified as a national security threat.

The second economic threat is not as closely linked to military capability, but has more to do with the domestic stability of countries. According to Buzan (1983:80), the second economic threat to national security is when states rely on international trade to sustain their national welfare or socio-economic projects. Hence a country’s social development plans are funded by the income

received from international trade. Should there be an interruption in the established trade patterns, the country's economic growth will slow down and socio-economic programmes and projects will need to be reduced or cancelled, which might lead the general population to become unhappy with the political status quo and might lead to political instability within the country, which the state might perceive as a threat to national security.

## **2.6 Conclusion**

The first section of this chapter briefly discussed the historical roots of the realist school of thought. From the discussion it is clear that the realist approach to the relations between states can be traced back to the time of Thucydides, and was further developed by figures like Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes. Although the theory of political realism has developed over the past two thousand years, one aspect that has remained unchanged is the fact that traditional realism, the classical realist and the neorealist all identify the referent object of security as the state. Hence the state security approach can be directly linked to the theory of neorealism.

When analysing the concept of nationalism, it is also clear that nationalism can be defined as the ideology of the nation state or the idea of the state, which according to Buzan (1983) forms a crucial component of the state itself. Hence, if nationalism is a crucial component of the state, and the realist theory identifies the state as the referent object of the state, then it can be deduced that state security approaches are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism.

Therefore the apparent rise of nationalism in the UK, and the decision by the UK to leave the EU, could be attributed to a departure from a liberal approach to international relations toward a neorealist approach motivated by state security concerns. However, to ascertain whether the decision by Britain to leave the EU is indeed a departure from a liberal approach to international relations, it will be necessary to discuss the concept of liberalism and its manifestation in international relations. Thus the next chapter will form the second part of the analysis on whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK is the result of a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation. This will be done by analysing the concept of liberalism and how the theoretical approach of liberalism is manifested in international relations. The chapter will also explore the relation between liberalism, globalisation and human security.

## CHAPTER 3: LIBERALISM, NEOLIBERALISM AND THE RELATION TO GLOBALISATION AND HUMAN SECURITY

### 3.1 Introduction

In Chapter 2, political realism and the relation between neorealism, state-centric nationalism and state security were discussed. The theoretical approach of realism thus formed the first part of the analysis on whether resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation. According to Morgenthau *et al.* (2006:39), realism is contested by the liberal school of thought which believes in a rational and moral political order, derived from universal, abstract principles that assume the essential goodness in infinite malleability of human nature. Liberal theory blames failures of the international social order on the lack of knowledge and understanding, outdated social institutions and the immorality of individual groups. According to liberalism, education, reform and the sporadic use of force can remedy the shortcomings plaguing international politics. The argument by Morgenthau *et al.* (2006:3) is supported by Walt (1998:32), who argues that the main challenge to political realism originated from the broad family of liberal theories.

According to Jones and Smith (2015:933), the attempt to impose liberal democratic rule became a key element of British foreign policy following the end of the Cold War. Similarly, Martell (2008:458) argued that, over the last two decades, Britain became one of the main exporters of neoliberalism and by extension, globalisation and the structures and processes of globalisation. This argument is supported by Gilmore (2015:108), who stated that Britain's Labour Party implemented a foreign policy closely aligned to the concept of Good International Citizenship, a term which was first used by the Australian Foreign Minister, Gareth Evans. According to Wheeler and Dunne (1998:848), Good International Citizenship departs from the traditional realist approach to foreign policy because it rejects the assumption that national interest is always at odds with the promotion of human rights. Hence British foreign policy, at least in the period from 1997 to 2010, was based on liberty, human rights and an open society (Gilmore, 2015:112).

Against this background, it can be argued that Britain's foreign policy in the era following the Cold War was aligned to a more liberal approach to international relations and Brexit might indicate a shift towards a more realist approach. Therefore as the second part of the analysis, this chapter will analyse the concept of liberalism and how the theoretical approach of liberalism is manifested in international relations. The chapter will also explore the relation between liberalism, neoliberalism, globalisation and human security.

## **3.2 Liberalism**

### **3.2.1 Classical Liberalism**

Liberalism and liberal theory gradually developed over the last 300 years. According to Heywood (1997:41), the collapse of feudalism and the growth of the free market and capitalism were the main reasons for the evolution of liberalism and liberal theory. One of the most influential advocates of early liberalism was the political philosopher, John Locke (1632-1704). According to Locke, all humans have the right to life, liberty and property, as well as the option to form their own government that will protect and preserve these basic rights. Locke also argues that individuals are entitled to overthrow the government if it fails to fulfil its function of providing protection of their rights (Jackson & Jackson, 1997:155). Similarly Viotti and Kauppi (2001:453) state that Locke believed that humans have natural rights to life, liberty and property, which they only surrender to the state as part of a social contract. Hence, according to Locke, one of the primary functions of government is to guarantee certain civil rights.

Another important contributor to the development of liberal thought was Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Rousseau believed that political authority derives from the citizenry and individuals must be able to create their own laws. He also argued that the state should be an expression of man's moral purpose. In other words, through a social contract power is given to the state by its citizens in order to promote the welfare and freedom of its citizens (Blanchet, 2002:17). According to Viotti and Kauppi (2001:453), Rousseau was also a great advocate for equality and argued that property among individuals was one of the sources of inequality. In terms of international relations Rousseau argued that states are constantly monitoring each other and adjusting their power in order to be prepared for conflict or as a method of avoiding conflict (Navari, 2008:31). Rousseau thus proposed that a variety of federations will limit the frequency of wars (Blanchet, 2002:19).

Navari (2008:30) maintains that the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) also made a valuable contribution to the liberal school of thought. Kant was a strong advocate for republican government. According to Kant, a republican government based on constitutional rule where even the leaders are subordinate to the law is the only legitimate form of government. Kant also argued that republican states are less prone to conflict than other forms of state, due to their accountability to the citizenry (Navari, 2008:31). Similarly, Viotti and Kauppi (2001:149) state that according to Kant, the best way to ensure progress toward peace was to encourage the growth of republics, because republics through their constitutional checks and balances would be less inclined towards conflict. Kant was also of the opinion that a federation of republics (a group of countries that share the same republican values) would be more inclined toward peace and would also be more likely to behave in accordance with international laws than countries that have

different forms of government, such as monarchies and empires. Kant further argued that it is the duty of the republican state to export their internal liberalism to the international environment by working towards international relations regulated by law (Viotti & Kauppi, 2001:57). According to Navari (2008:31), Kant believed that peace was the natural orientation for republican states and the spreading of republican states would automatically lead to the promotion of peace among states.

Phelan and Dawes (2018:4) as well as Jackson and Jackson (1997:156) identify the British philosopher John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) as another expositor of liberal theory. According to Jackson and Jackson (1997:156), Mill argued that the only justification for restricting the freedom of individuals should be to prevent harm to others. Mill was a strong advocate for minimal state intervention in human activities and believed that the state should not restrain individual actions that do not negatively affect others. Mill also strongly advocated for freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of choice (Phelan & Dawes, 2018:3). According to Heywood (1997:44), Mill was of the opinion that democracies had the potential to promote and improve societies, by prompting the development of individuals. In other words, the democracy advocated by Mills not only promoted limited state intervention, but also advocated for a more socially focused democracy (social democracy) that is linked to personal development of individuals.

The work of Locke, Rousseau, Kant and Mill, amongst others, provided the foundation for modern liberal thought. They were the first proponents of limited state involvement, and constitutional limits to state power and respect for individual freedoms (Roland, 2006:426). According to these classical liberals, the limiting of government powers was a recipe for domestic and international peace. Classical liberalism can thus be defined as a school of thought committed to the ideals of equality, liberty, individuality and rationality (Bellamy, 2015:26).

Against this background, the next section will briefly discuss the more contemporary approaches to the liberal theory.

### **3.2.2 Contemporary Liberalism**

According to Walt (1998:32), the principal challenge to realism came from a broad family of liberal theories. The fact that Walt (1998:32) described the liberal challenge to realism as a broad family of liberal theories, highlights the fact that liberalism, in contrast to realism, does not adhere to a narrow set of principles in the same way as realism. In the same vein, Lynch (2009:48) stated that liberals rarely define themselves against core principles to define their paradigm. Larmore (1990:339) also stated that the liberal school of thought is marked by disputes among its advocates as well as disagreements with its adversaries. Larmore (1990:339) goes even further

by stating that one of the central disputes among liberal theorists is how liberal theory should be distinguished from rival theories.

Therefore in an effort to condense liberal thought to a more practical political or international relations theory, contemporary scholars argued that liberal thought can be subdivided into various components or “strands”.

In an attempt to develop a framework for non-utopian liberal theory of international relations, Moravcsik (1992:1) identified four strands of classical liberal thought that have found their way into contemporary liberalism. The first strand according to Moravcsik (1992:1) is republican liberalism, and it denotes that liberal democracies tend to be more pacific than other forms of government. The second strand identified by Moravcsik (1992:1) holds that the unequal distribution of power, inequality or “deep social cleavages” creates incentives for international conflict. The third strand of liberal thought identified by Moravcsik (1992:1) is commercial liberalism. This strand of liberalism argues that economic interdependence creates incentives for peace and cooperation. The fourth and final strand of liberal thought, according to Moravcsik (1992:1) is regulatory liberalism, which claims that international law and institutions promote or increase international cooperation and reduce international conflict.

In line with Moravcsik (1992), Walt (1998:32) identified three strands of liberal thought, the first being the fact that economic interdependence would discourage states from using force against each other in fear of negatively affecting their own economic growth and prosperity. The second strand according to Walt (1998:32), stated that the spread of democracy is the key to world peace, largely based on the assumption that democratic states are more peaceful than other forms of government. The third and final strand of liberalism according to Walt (1998:32) holds the view that international institutions could assist or compel states to cooperate and thereby reduce the chances of international conflict and increase international cooperation.

Echoing the argument by Walt (1998:32), Navari (2008) also identified three strands of liberalism, namely commercial liberalism, the democratic peace thesis and neoliberal institutionalism. In the case of commercial liberalism, according to Navari (2008:43), the underlying motivation is economic benefit, but the integration of economies could be seen as a “peace producer” due to the fact that harm to a state’s economy that is closely linked to the economies of other states might have a detrimental effect on the prosperity of all the other partner states. The democratic peace thesis also referred to by Navari (2008) as republican liberalism promotes that liberal states do not fight wars against other liberal states and that democratisation of states could decrease or limit the potential for conflict among states. Finally, Navari (2008:39) identifies neoliberal institutionalism as another strand of the liberal theory. Neoliberal institutionalism, according to

Navari (2008:39), concentrates on the role of international institutions in mitigating conflict. According to Navari (2008:40), neoliberal institutionalists hold the view that international actors should promote institutionalism as a way of promoting international stability, which would be in the collective interest of all role players (states).

In addition to the strands of liberalism identified by contemporary scholars and liberal theorists, the term neoliberalism became a prominent political-economic philosophy that gained prominence during the 1970's. The next section will briefly discuss neoliberalism as an additional school of thought (meta theory) originating from contemporary liberal theories.

### **3.2.3 Neoliberalism**

McCarthy and Prudham (2004:276) state that despite the fact that neoliberalism is a familiar term, defining it is not a straightforward task. According to McCarthy and Prudham (2004:276), this is because neoliberalism is made up of a range of ideological commitments and institutional practices. Kendall (2003:3) also describes the concept of neoliberalism as a rather hackneyed and imprecise term in sociology and in many other cognate disciplines. Acknowledging this challenge, this section will briefly attempt to provide a definition for the term neoliberalism.

Lynch (2009:50) uses the term neoliberalism to describe liberal international relations theories since 1970 because they chronologically followed the liberal thinkers of the past 200 years. Lynch (2009:50) stated that neoliberal theorists are united in their belief that international institutions can limit the propensity for war, emanating from competing state interests. Lynch (2009:50) also stated that neoliberal theorists believe that democracies seem to avoid wars, a theory that is in line with the democratic peace thesis within the liberal tradition. Tarzi (2004:120) argued that one of the cardinal foundations of neoliberalism is the view that an international system, with rules and institutions, mitigates against conflict and affects relations among states in such a way that it pushes the international system toward pluralism and diversity. Neoliberalism advocates that transnational contacts and coalitions have transformed national attitudes and the definition of national interest (Tarzi, 2004:120).

However, neoliberalism is also closely associated with global economy. De Vogli (2011:313) described neoliberalism as an economic doctrine based on the view that governments should limit their interference with market forces and protect property rights and corporate freedom. The economic link is also articulated by Heron (2008:89), who summarised neoliberalism as a theory which endorses the market as the ultimate force of the world economy and the key instrument through which social problems can now be solved. Neoliberalism also dictates a reduced influence by the state in terms of policy and an increased influence by international institutions.

Heron (2008:89) further stated that neoliberalism focuses on trade and economic growth as a prerequisite for development.

Peck and Tickell (2007:28) provide an overarching definition that links political and economic values to neoliberalism by defining neoliberalism as a distinctive political-economic philosophy, dedicated to the extension of the free market form of government rule across all spheres of social life. In terms of international relations, Peck and Tickell (2007:28) argue that neoliberalism gained prominence after the election of Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom and Ronald Reagan in the United States during the 1970's. Between these two world powers, momentous steps were taken to construct a capital-centric order, removing the obstacles to financially orientated accumulation and the establishment of international institutions.

According to Schmidt (1996:71), neoliberalism dictated that economic changes in line with the neoliberal approach possess the capacity to overpower longstanding historical characteristics, and realign them to conform to the desired policy objectives. Schmidt (1996:71) further stated that according to neoliberalism, the stability of society resides in subordinating societies and politics to the neoliberal prescripts of economic reforms, aimed towards free market systems, neoliberal institutionalism (international institutions), liberalisations and democratisation. Schmidt (1996:71) also argues that: *“Neoliberalism has evolved into a new orthodoxy appropriate to rapid contemporary globalisation.”*

The definition of neoliberalism provided by Heron (2008:89), similar to that of Schmidt (1996:71), links neoliberalism directly to globalisation. According to Heron (2008:89), neoliberalism is the ideology that promotes its own brand of capitalism restructuring, which can be described as globalisation. Accordingly, neoliberalism works through specific institutions and regimes that have significant power and control over the way in which globalisation is directed. Finally, Heron (2008:89) stated that neoliberalism is the supporting ideology of globalisation. It can thus be argued that globalisation can be described as the product or one of the products of neoliberalism. Therefore the next section will briefly analyse globalisation as a concept and its relation to neoliberalism.

### **3.3 Globalisation**

Kacowicz (1999:528) stated that globalisation is basically the short form for a cluster of related changes in various fields, including the economic, ideological, technological and cultural fields. The economic changes resulting from globalisation include amongst others, the spatial reorganisations of production, the rise in transnational organisations or multinational organisations/companies, the spread of financial markets and increased transfers of populations.

Ideologically, changes include investment and trade liberalisation, deregulation, privatisation and the adoption of political democracy in the institutional realm. Işksal (2003:143) explains globalisation in three ways. Firstly, by stating that globalisation is a process of integrating the world economy, which cannot be controlled by states. Secondly, by stating that globalisation is an evolutionary political process associated with the spread of democracy and human rights, and thirdly, that globalisation is a technological and social revolution, driving the increased communication and interaction between nations and cultures.

From the definitions above it is clear that there is a direct link between globalisation and neoliberalism. However, although subtle, there is also another aspect that needs to be noted. Apart from the main concepts such as integration, liberalisation and the spread of democracy and human rights and international institutionalism, globalisation also has a definite effect on the sovereignty of states and traditional nation states. Signs of the effect can be detected in the definition by Işksal (2003:143) which states that globalisation is a process of integrating the world economy which cannot be controlled by the state. Kacowicz (1999:528) also subtly points to the effect of globalisation on the state by stating that:

*“Globalisation can be defined as the intensification of economic, political, social and cultural relations across borders. In this sense, it involves more than the geographical extension of range of phenomena and issues. It implies not only a significant intensification of global connectedness, but also a consciousness of that intensification, with a concomitant diminution in the significance of territorial boundaries.”*

In a less subtle description, Robinson (1998:563) stated that globalisation denotes transition from national societies to a transnational or global society predicted on a global economy. The tension between globalisation and the state is also described by Clapham (2002:775), who stated that globalisation is a complex process of creating a single global structure which challenges and undermines the role that was historically played by states. He goes further by stating that the mythology of unfettered state sovereignty can be consigned to the past. This sentiment is echoed by Heron (2008:89), who stated that neoliberalism dictates a reduced influence by the state in terms of policy, and an increase in influence by international institutions. It is thus clear that there is a certain level of tension between the process of globalisation and the sovereignty claimed by states, similar to the tension between nationalism and neoliberalism.

Apart from the fact that neoliberalism and globalisation might pose a certain level of conflict with concepts such as the nation state and nationalism, the definition of Işksal (2003:143), stating that globalisation is an evolutionary political process associated with the spread of democracy and human rights, draws a direct line between the human security approach, neoliberalism and

globalisation paradigms. Similarly, the definition of liberalism provided by Britannica (2019) states that according to modern liberalism, the main functions of governments should be to remove obstacles that prevent individuals from fully realising their potential. Such obstacles, according to Britannica (2019), include amongst others, issues such as poverty, disease and discrimination. Richmond (2006:76) also argued that human security is a liberal concept due to the fact that human security primarily focusses on the individual, in the same way that liberal concepts such as democratisation, the rule of law, human rights, free trade, globalised markets and neoliberal economic development are based on the welfare, rights and prosperity of the individual.

Against this background, the next section will briefly discuss the concept of human security and its relation to liberalism, neoliberalism and globalisation.

### **3.4 Human Security**

In Chapter 2 the link between realism and national security was established. When analysing liberalism, it is clear that the security approach advocated by liberalists is very different from the security approach advocated by realists. According to Williams (2008:5), security is most commonly associated with the alleviation of threats linked to the survival of a particular referent object. Williams (2008:7) highlights the importance of identifying the referent object of security, by stating that without a referent object there can be no threats and no discussion of security because the concept of security is meaningless without something to secure.

Hence the identification of the referent object of security can be seen as the foundation of any discussion relating to security. It is also the identification of the referent object of security, or the question: "Whose Security?" with which policy makers and academics in the field of international relations and security studies are grappling. Similarly, Wilson (2015:374) argued that the identification of the referent object of security and how to best achieve the security of the referent object are questions at the heart of the debates on the theory and practice of international relations. Wilson (2015:374) argued that the end of the Cold War and the lack of superpower conflict, together with the intensification of globalisation, have forced a shift in the meaning of security from a state-centric, military focussed notion to a much wider concept, incorporating transnational issues and new levels of analysis beyond the state.

According to Williams (2008:6), it is possible to identify two prevalent philosophies of security. The first describes security in terms of power and the accumulation of power, and the relation between the power and security. The second philosophy is concerned with justice and the provision of human rights. The two approaches to security are also articulated by Thomas and Tow (2002:177), who state that the end of the Cold War generated a major re-evaluation of

approaches to security. The first approach, termed state security or national security, was historically understood in terms of threats to state sovereignty and territory. The second approach, termed human security, gained prominence following the Cold War and had a much broader focus, which included concerns such as access to food, environmental issues and the economic welfare of populations. According to Thomas and Tow (2002:178), the term human security has been developed as an idea that can be contrasted with state security and directs attention to an emerging and wider spectrum of security issues. Similarly, Fakiolas (2011:369) stated that the concept of human security presents a shift in security studies, which goes beyond the traditional state-centric national security and draws attention to human lives.

According to Chandler (2008:427) and Matlary (2008:135), the term human security gained prominence when it was used in the *1994 Human Development Report* of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) which radically challenged the traditional approach to security.

#### **3.4.1 Human Development Report 1994**

Chapter 2 of the 1994 UNDP report, entitled “*New dimensions of human security*” provided the foundation for the concept of human security and the migration from a realist, state centred approach to security. The second paragraph of the chapter summarises the necessity for a move from a realist state security approach to a post-Cold War human security approach as follows:

*“The concept of security has for far too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interest in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of a nuclear holocaust. It has been related more to nation states than to people. The superpowers were locked in an ideological struggle – fighting a cold war all over the world. The developing nations, having won their independence only recently, were sensitive to any real or perceived threats to their fragile national identities. Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives. For many of them, security symbolises protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime social conflict, political oppression and environmental hazards”* (UNDP, 1994:22).

The UNDP (1994:23) define the term human security as twofold, firstly as safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression, and secondly as protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life. According to this definition, such threats exist at all levels of national income and development. The UNDP (1994:24) further argue that in addition to the definition, human security is basically composed of two major components: freedom from fear and freedom from want, but historically more emphasis was placed on the freedom from fear than

on the freedom from want. Thus the necessity developed after the Cold War to move away from the narrow concept of national security to an all-encompassing concept of human security. Thus the UNDP (1994:24) advocated that the concept of security must change in two ways. Firstly, from an exclusive stress on territorial security to a much greater stress on people's security, and secondly from security through armaments to security through sustainable development.

The UNDP (1994:24) subsequently categorised the various threats to human security into seven main categories:

- Economic Security
- Food Security
- Health Security
- Environmental Security
- Personal Security
- Community Security
- Political Security

According to McDonald (2002:278), the *1994 Human Development Report* sought to redefine security in order to "institutionalise" threats at the individual level in the practice of security, moving away from the traditional, realist approach to security. McDonald (2002:278) further argues that the *1994 Human Development Report* provided a new paradigm where human security could be seen as central to issues of humanitarianism in the international system, reconceptualising security to include issues such as humanitarian intervention, human rights, refugee movements, structural economic inequality and environmental change in the security debate.

Similarly, Paris (2001:90) stated that the UNDP's 1994 definition of human security remains the most widely cited and most authoritative formulation of the term. However, despite recognising the UNDP's 1994 definition of human security as the most authoritative and widely cited formulation of the term, Paris (2001:88) argued that it remains unclear whether the concept of human security can serve as a practical guide for academic research and governmental policy makers. His critique of the 1994 UNDP definition is that the scope of the definition is so vast that: "*Virtually any kind of unexpected or irregular discomfort could conceivably constitute a threat to human security.*"

Even when taking into account the seven main categories which are supposed to provide a narrower focus for the broad term of human security, Paris (2001:90) argued that the list of threats to human security is so broad that it is difficult to assess what is excluded from the list or from the term human security. Newman (2001:243) shares this concern by stating that the basic concept

of human security has raised an extremely wide variety of issues and the proliferation of issues (threats) related to human security threatens to undermine the meaningfulness of the concept. Fakiolas (2011:370) is also of the opinion that the term human security lacks clear definitional and practical grounding.

Although acknowledging the important role that the development of the term human security played in providing impetus to a neglected dimension of security, the broad conceptualisation of human security rendered it to be ineffective in practice. Similarly, Martin and Owen (2010:213) state that even within the United Nations (UN), the concept of human security is somewhat problematic, mainly due to the ambiguity surrounding the concept and practices of development and human security, the lack of a clear distinction between human rights and security, and the conceptual overstretch of the UN's use of human security. Despite the challenges relating to the definition of human security and the usefulness of the concept as a policy making tool, the evolution of the term human security in the era following the Cold War did have a major impact on debates about security.

According to McDonald (2002:279), when analysing the different definitions of human security, it becomes clear that although policy makers and academics are not agreeing on a singular definition, and complain that the definition provided by the UNDP is too broad, a few basic elements are shared across the board. Firstly, it is agreed that human security necessitates a shift away from the state as a referent object of security towards the individual, redefining threats as threats to the quality of life of individuals instead of threats to the state. Secondly, human security recognises the role of non-state actors as agents for the attainment of security. Thirdly, human security includes the elevation of issues of human rights and economic inequality, and finally human security proponents recognise the importance of orientating the security debate away from the traditional realist conceptions and practices of security that are exclusively focussed on armed conflict.

McDonald (2002:279) is supported by Fakiolas (2011:269), who stated that among policy makers and academics, human security usually involves three forms of agenda. Firstly, the advancement of human rights and democracy and the enhancement of the wellbeing of individuals and communities within states. Secondly, the ambition to establish a human security organisational system of global governance, and finally, to develop policy that does not perpetuate traditional power relations with a narrow realist motivation.

From the paragraphs above it is clear that there is mutual agreement among policy makers and academics that human security at the most basic level requires a shift from the realist state centred approach to security towards an individual based approach to security. Human security

also advocates for the protection and advancement of human rights and for the inclusion of non-state actors in the security debate, even going as far as advocating for a system of global governance responsible for human security. When considering the definitions on liberalism and neoliberalism, it can be argued that a human security approach has several parallels with liberalism and neoliberalism and might even be seen as a product of a liberal approach to security.

When comparing realism and neorealism and the focus on the state as the referent object of security as discussed in Chapter 2 to liberalism and neoliberalism and the subsequent focus on the individual and human security, it is clear that the two theories, when applied in international relations and security studies, lead to very different outcomes and state behaviour. Therefore, the next section will briefly summarise the main differences between realism and liberalism.

### **3.5 Main differences between realism and liberalism**

According to Walt (1998:28), the main theoretical propositions of realism is the fact that self-interested states constantly compete for power or security. In contrast, in the case of liberalism, the concern for power and security is overridden by a desire for prosperity and a commitment to liberal values directed by political and economic considerations. Walt (1998:38) also differentiated between the main instruments that are used by implementing the different paradigms. Realism, according to Walt (1998:38) mainly depends on economic and military power, whereas liberalism makes use of instruments such as international institutions, economic exchanges and the promotion of democracy.

Lynch (2009:48) further differentiates between liberalism and realism by stating that liberalism does not view states as autonomous entities, but rather amalgamations of people with different preferences that are reflected in the different forms of government. Lynch (2009:48) also stated that for liberals, international relations evolve and improve, as opposed to realists, who see international relations as static and prone to conflict. In the same vein, Snyder (2004:56) argued that liberals foresee a slow but notable movement away from the anarchic world envisioned by realists, mainly due to international ties formed by trade and the spreading of democratic norms. Snyder (2004:59) further states that the foundation of realist thought is based on the assumption that self-interested states compete for power and security while liberalist thought believes that the spreading of democracy, global economic ties and the support and development of global international organisations will strengthen world peace.

According to realism, the main actors in international relations are states, which behave similarly, regardless of their style of government. Liberalism argues that the main actors in international relations are states, international institutions and commercial interests. Finally, Snyder (2004:59)

stated that realism and liberalism also depend on different instruments to navigate the world of international politics. Realism depends on military power and state diplomacy, where liberalism depends on international institutions and global commerce. The way in which realists and liberalists interact and cooperate in the international arena is also different. According to Chatterjee (2003:130), neorealists do not rule out the prospects of cooperation between states, but are much more pessimistic about cooperation among states, and would usually pursue cooperation when it is in the interest of the state. This is different from the liberal approach to cooperation which is willing to sacrifice short term gains for long term stability.

The differences between the realism and liberalism are also clear when dealing with the concept of security. According to Buur *et al.* (2007:11), the concept of security has undergone various changes, resulting in a broadening of the concept to include referents other than states. It is precisely the inclusion of referent objects other than the state into the concept of security which contributes to the “realist-neoliberal controversy”. The neorealist approach sees the competition between states as the hallmark of international politics, in which the state is the most important player, and the security of the state is paramount. This is in contrast to the neoliberal approach to security, where there is a stronger focus on the security of groups and individuals (human security) (Viotti & Kauppi, 2001). According to Buur *et al.* (2007:11), by using the notion of “human security”, security has been transformed to such an extent that a number of human needs have been included, and are now indispensable for the survival of the individual. Thus, unlike the traditional, neorealist approach to security, which has a strong focus on state security, the more neoliberal approach to security (human security) focusses on the safety of people rather than states (Buur *et al.*, 2007:11).

### **3.6 Conclusion**

The purpose of this chapter was to analyse liberalism as a political theory and to discuss the development of liberal thought over the past 300 years. From the discussion it is clear that liberalism or the liberal school of thought made a significant contribution to the political systems and international institutions. Human rights, democracy, freedom and the rights of individuals are the product of liberal thought and play a crucial role in the way in which individuals, states and international institutions approach issues relating to development, security and international relations. This chapter also explained the link between liberalism, globalisation and human security, and briefly discussed how these approaches impact on states. Most importantly, this chapter discussed the main differences between realism and liberalism and how these two conflicting theories manifest themselves in international relations. Hence Chapters 2 and 3 provided the theoretical foundations for realism and liberalism and their manifestation in international relations.

This chapter also mentioned that the UK was once seen as one of the main advocates or exporters of neoliberalism, globalisation, human rights and democracy. The decision to leave the EU could be seen as a departure from these principles. Thus this chapter formed the second part of the analysis on whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK is the result of a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation.

Against this background, the next chapter will provide a case study of the UK's decision to leave the European Union. The study will provide a background/historical context to the build-up to the 2016 referendum and will also assess the possible reasons which led to the pro Brexit referendum results.

## **CHAPTER 4: BREXIT AND STATE-CENTRIC NATIONALISM (CASE STUDY)**

### **4.1 Introduction**

In Chapter 2 of this study, political realism and the relation between neorealism, state-centric nationalism and state security were discussed. Chapter 3 then formed the second part of the analysis, where the concepts of liberalism and neoliberalism and the relation between these concepts and globalisation and human security were discussed. The main differences between realism and liberalism were also analysed in Chapter 3, highlighting the tension between these two approaches to international relations. The purpose of Chapters 2 and 3 therefore provided the theoretical foundation for both realism and liberalism.

According to Sampson (2017:163), Brexit, as the act of Britain exiting the European Union became known, marked a drastic departure from the trend of growing economic and cultural globalisation, as well as increasing political integration (liberalism) that were associated with the period following the Second World War. Similarly, Mölder (2018) argued that the nationalist trend that developed in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century was accompanied by anti-liberal views and opposition to liberal institutionalism in foreign policy, contrary to the foreign policies that shaped the international system in the era following the Second World War.

Using the theoretical foundation provided in Chapter 2 and 3, this chapter (Chapter 4) will provide a case study of the UK's decision to leave the European Union. The case study will provide a background/historical context to the build-up to the 2016 referendum, and will also assess the possible reasons which led to the pro Brexit referendum results. The aim of the case study will be to assess whether state-centric nationalism and neorealism are on the rise in the UK and what the reasons for the phenomenon might be.

### **4.2 Britain and the EU: Historical Background**

When the Second World War ended in 1945, the international balance of power was drastically altered. Europe, the centre of global politics prior to the war, was transformed and only constituted a component in a new balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union (Kenealy, 2016:1). Different from the rest of Europe, Britain regarded itself as the victor of the War and was determined to remain a "global power of the first rank" in the new global order. Acknowledging Britain's position following the end of the Second World War, this section will briefly discuss Britain's interaction with its European neighbours, covering the period from the

establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community to the decision by British citizens to leave the European Union.

#### 4.2.1 The European Coal and Steel Community

The European Union (EU) has its origin in the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) that was established in 1952 and originally consisted of six members: Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg the Netherlands and West Germany. According to Biscontinini (2018:1), the reasons behind the establishment of the ECSC were twofold. The first reason was economic, as Europe was starting to rebuild following the disastrous effects of the Second World War, and hard borders and high tariffs between the European nations would have hampered economic recovery. The second reason was more political. Although binding the coal and steel industries of the six countries together made sound economic sense, it also meant that if the steel and coal industries of specifically France and West Germany were pulled into a union, then the weapon making capabilities of erstwhile enemies would be united, preventing them from turning against each other. This argument is supported by Reynolds (2017:34), who states that using the coal and steel industries as a starting point for European integration was ideal, firstly because coal and steel were vital for industrial growth and development of the war torn Europe, and secondly, because coal and steel were the backbone of the defence industry and for waging war. Hence, Reynolds (2017:34) states that: "Surrendering national control over these critical assets could enhance prosperity and peace." Similarly, Smith (1992) states that according to the French diplomat, Jean Monnet, who is also referred to as the godfather of the European Community, locking European economies together would serve a double purpose. Firstly, it would make war between Germany and France impossible due to their dependency on each other, and secondly, it would lead to the emergence of a more powerful Western Europe.

The establishment of the ECSC was a stepping stone to the 1957 Treaty of Rome which further integrated the European member states by establishing the European Economic Community (EEC). The EEC was a common market and customs union between Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy and West Germany (Reynolds, 2017:33). According to Burgess and Edwards (1988:369), the Belgian Foreign Minister, Paul Henry Spaak, approached British officials in May 1955 with a proposal for further European integration. This proposal contained Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg's position on European integration and was to be discussed by all six members of the ECSC at a meeting of foreign ministers held in Messina, Sicily in June 1955 (Messina Conference). The plan was to gain Britain's support and participation in the project to further European integration.

However, the establishment of the ECSC and the subsequent Messina Conference which led to further integration of Western Europe was not met with enthusiasm by Britain. According to Spaak (1963:612), Britain deliberately refused to take part in the establishment of the ECSC and did not actively participate in the Messina Conference. Britain's reluctance to participate in the further integration of Western Europe was motivated by several factors. Britain's imperial history and the outcome of the Second World War had a definite impact on Britain's world view. In 1945 Britain still had the largest empire in the world and its national interest was global. According to Troitiño (2014:119), Britain was the victor of the Second World War and the only Western European country that actively participated in the defeat of Nazi Germany. This view is supported by Reynolds (2017:34), who stated that the defeat of Nazi Germany was achieved not by continental Europeans, but by an alliance between Britain and the United States of America (USA). The fact that Britain was the only Western European country undefeated by the Nazi Germany strengthened the belief that British sovereignty (Reynolds, 2017:34) and nationalism (Troitiño, 2014:119) were key factors in winning the Second World War. The effect of the WW2 victory on Britain's world view is aptly summarised by Spaak (1963:612) who wrote that:

*“For a long time – for too long – Britain refused to accept the idea of a united Europe. Its hesitations and procrastinations are regrettable, but the reasons are understandable: a great country which has just won a great war is naturally reluctant to acknowledge that it must radically alter its age-old tradition. The mere fact of victory works against the effort of adjustment.”*

It is thus clear that Britain still saw itself as a world power, a view that was strengthened by the outcome of WW2. Hence British foreign policy mainly remained the same in the period following WW2, and the chances were very slim that a victorious Britain would consider surrendering any national powers to a higher authority such as the ECSC (Reynolds, 2017:34). Britain's foreign policy in the immediate period following WW2 was based on the Churchillian doctrine of Britain located in three interlocking circles, the first and most important circle being Britain's relationship with the USA, the second circle being Britain's relation with the Commonwealth, and thirdly and least importantly, Britain's relationship with Europe (Burgess & Edwards, 1988). Following this foreign policy doctrine, Britain did not consider itself as part of Europe, but rather as a separate but closely related ally and friend to a United Europe (Reynolds, 2017). Thus although Britain welcomed European integration, especially the mending of relations between Germany and France, Britain did not consider itself as part of a United Europe.

According to Burgess and Edwards (1988:399), the British position toward further European integration was to assist with their integration but not to be integrated themselves. In October 1955, the British Government finalised a report which articulated its position on the outcomes of

the Messina Conference and the participation of Britain in the further integration of Western Europe. The political considerations articulated in the report are summarised by Burgess and Edwards (1988:399) stating that:

*“Above all, membership of an ‘inward looking’ trading block would detract from the sum total of Britain’s international prestige. Ultimately, membership was considered ‘detrimental’ to the United Kingdom’s political connection with the rest of the commonwealth. It offered no clear and definite prospect of political benefits of other external relations that would make up for this.”*

Britain’s approach to the further integration of Europe is also illustrated by Wallace (1973:29), who states that in the immediate period following WW2, British policy makers were focussed on “the classic concerns of ‘high policy’” which mainly dealt with issues of status and security, pursued through diplomacy. According to Wallace (1973:29), British policy aims of security and status received priority, despite the pressing concerns of economic recovery and welfare. The strong focus on British sovereignty in relation to military, economic and political issues was also the main obstacle for Britain joining the ECSC, because, according to Britain, relinquishing powers to a higher multilateral body would be incompatible with the “maintenance” of Britain’s parliamentary sovereignty.

Reynolds (2017:34) argued that in addition to Britain’s foreign policy, which did not favour further integration, the British Government was also sceptical of whether the European countries would be able to successfully implement their plans to further European integration. From a British perspective, it was highly unlikely that the ECSC and subsequent EEC would materialise. Thus the British position was that Britain should remain outside Europe in order to remain a worthwhile ally to the US, in case Europe collapsed. This pessimism by Britain was also articulated by Burgess and Edwards (1988:394), who state that the British Government of the time considered the project of European integration as foredoomed and destined to fail. This sentiment is also mentioned by Smith (1992:162) and May (2013:31), who state that the general feeling among British government officials and politicians was that nothing would come of the European attempt at further integration of Western Europe. However the move towards greater European integration gained momentum among the members of the ECSC, culminating in the Treaty of Rome.

#### 4.2.2 The Treaty of Rome

Despite British pessimism regarding the success of European integration and Britain's absence in the process, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy and West Germany moved ahead with purpose, and in March 1957 the Treaty of Rome was signed (Smith, 1992:162). The Treaty of Rome created the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). The member states made rapid progress in removing trade barriers in order to form a common market, and also agreed on a Common Agricultural Policy (Venter, 2004:56). According to Spaak (1963:612), the achievements of the newly created organisation were "as swift as it was sensational".

The speed and efficiency with which the newly formed EEC removed trade barriers and moved towards their goal of establishing a common market caught the British establishment off guard. By the end of the 1950's it was clear that the Commonwealth, Britain's second most important priority in terms of foreign policy, offered very few opportunities for the expansion of British trade. The policy makers in Whitehall were also beginning to see signs that the Sterling Area was becoming a liability (May, 2013). By 1960, foreign direct investment and economic growth of the EEC were outperforming Britain's economy and it became clear that Britain was lagging behind its continental neighbours (Kenealy, 2016:2). According to Smith (1992:162), British casualness toward the ECSC and the subsequent EEC turned to regret and trepidation. The same sentiment is articulated by Reynolds (2017:35), who stated that British complacency and even arrogance towards the European project were by then coming back to haunt Britain. Apart from the economic dynamics of the day, there was also some serious political consideration to be taken into account. Not only was the EEC experiencing better economic prospects than Britain, but there was also a strong possibility that the increasing political power of the EEC would mean that Britain could be side-lined in terms of the regional balance of power and would cease to be able to make any claims of being a world power (Reynolds, 2017:35). Britain slowly came to the realisation that with its own economic and political decline, the EEC was becoming the political centre of gravity in Europe, as well as the centre of US attention. Therefore in order to maintain political influence, Britain was left with no choice but to apply for membership of the EEC (Cooper, 2012:1193).

In July 1961, Britain applied for full membership of the EEC. This decision marked an unexpected and drastic break in British foreign policy in the era following WW2. Prior to the decision to apply for membership of the EEC, British foreign policy preferred intergovernmental cooperation and was opposed to the 'supranational' integration associated with the EEC (Steinnes, 1998:61). According to Wallace (1973:45), one of the main motives behind the decision to apply for membership of the EEC was the recognition by Britain that it could no longer maintain an independent world role, and that the EEC could provide Britain with a new platform to play a

leading role in world politics. This argument was also shared by Northedge (1970:44), who stated that Britain was not in favour of the EEC and did not really believe in its purpose, but joined the EEC in order to take economic advantage of the larger European market, in order to restore its position as a leading world power. Similarly, Steinnes (1998:62) argued that Britain's decision to join the EEC was based on its ambitions to maintain its status as a world power and to serve as a counter balance to an evolving Franco-German Alliance.

Therefore due to its post-war arrogance and complacency (Reynolds, 2017:35), Britain was driven towards the decision to join the EEC. Northedge (1970:40) describes British policy making of the time as follows:

*“One consequence of this psychological inertia has been a most characteristic behaviour pattern of Britain since the Second World War: the tendency to be driven towards decisions and policies not because they are the most desirable, or least undesirable, options currently available, but because other options have ceased to be available.”*

Spaak (1963:612) also reflects on Britain's position at the time by stating that:

*“... the British Empire was falling apart and both economic and political relations among the Commonwealth countries were becoming less important. The hour of agonising re-appraisal was drawing near. It struck in 1961.”*

In October 1961, Britain declared that it was ready to accept the principles of the Treaty of Rome and negotiations to join the EEC began under the leadership of Edward Heath (Wallace, 2013:1). Britain did however articulate the challenges it faced in joining the EEC. These challenges were: the existing ties with the Commonwealth, British agriculture and British interest in the European Free Trade Area (EFTA). Despite the challenges mentioned by Britain, the six members of the EEC accepted the challenges facing Britain and agreed to start negotiation, bearing these challenges in mind (Spaak, 1963:612).

#### **4.2.3 The French Veto**

Britain subsequently worked towards realigning its Commonwealth relations to join the EEC, and negotiations for membership started in 1961. However, the process was derailed in January 1963 by the opening of negotiations by the six member states when the French President, Charles de Gaulle, made it clear that he would veto Britain's application (Smith, 1992:164). Ironically, Britain initially refused to join the EEC because of 'high policy' considerations of status and security, and by 1963 it was France who vetoed the British application, a decision, it could be argued, also

motivated by 'high policy' considerations of status and security. According to Reynolds (2017:35), President de Gaulle was a fierce nationalist and wanted to use the European project to the advantage of France, and keeping Britain out of the EEC served that purpose. This view is echoed by Pinder (1985:45), who stated that President de Gaulle used the EEC as a tool for his nationalist foreign policy.

According to Smith (1992:164), the reasons for President De Gaulle's veto were motivated by his view that Britain was an insular maritime power with multiple international trade and political links. Similarly Steinnes (1998:67) translated President de Gaulle's views by stating that de Gaulle believed that Britain's geographical position as an island and Britain's Commonwealth network meant that Britain would naturally look outwards across the oceans, and would not see the European Common Market in the same way as the French would do. According to Smith (1992:164), President de Gaulle was extremely sceptical of Britain's relations with the US and feared that Britain would be an "American Trojan Horse" inside the EC. Thus in order for the French to accept the British application, Britain had to choose between her special relationship with the US and her commitment to the Commonwealth on the one hand, and her membership of the EEC on the other (Steinnes, 1998:67).

The fact that Britain's relations with the US and the Commonwealth were the two most important pillars of British foreign policy made it clear that admission to the EEC would definitely not happen as long as de Gaulle was the President of France. According to May (2013:36), when Britain announced its intention to launch its second application to join the EEC, there was no doubt that Britain's application would not succeed while President de Gaulle was still in power. Similarly, Smith (1992:164) stated that Britain realised that there was no way of bypassing the French Veto and it was only when President de Gaulle's successor came to power that Britain's application progressed. On 02 May, 1967 Britain submitted its second application to the EEC, which was again vetoed by President de Gaulle on 27 November 1967 (Wallace, 2013:532). However, in April 1969 President de Gaulle resigned and as anticipated, Britain reactivated the second application that was submitted in 1967. By December 1969, the EEC agreed to open negotiations, to start in June 1970 (May, 2013:36). In the same year, Britain was also scheduled to hold General Elections. The Conservative Party won the 1970 General Election with an outright majority (330 seats) and Edward Heath became Prime Minister on 19 June 1970 (Wallace, 2013:532). Between 1970 and 1972 Britain, Denmark, Ireland and Norway successfully negotiated the accession to the EEC (Wallace, 1973:532), and on 01 January 1973, 15 years after the establishment of the EEC and two failed applications later, Britain finally became a member of the EEC (Reynolds, 2017:35).

#### 4.2.4 The 1975 Referendum

The fact that Britain finally became a member of the EEC in 1973 did not mean that Britain's political elite was now united in their support for European integration. In Britain, domestic politics played an increasingly important role in Britain's policy towards the EEC. Alternatively, it can be argued that the EEC and European integration became an increasingly pertinent issue in Britain's domestic politics. This argument is supported by Daddow (2013:210) who stated that:

*"In British political life the reputation of many an individual and indeed party has been forged and shredded on the question of the most appropriate form for Britain's relations with the European Union."*

A prime example of this phenomenon is described by Evans (2018:128), who recalls the Labour Party's defeat in 1970, which meant that negotiations for joining the EEC were led by the governing Conservative Party. Hence, the EEC and European integration became an election issue for the 1974 elections. In February 1974 Britain held a General Election and due to the inconclusive results, a minority administration under the leadership of the Labour Party was established (Evans, 2018:128). The governing Labour Government then started a process of renegotiation.

According to Glencross (2015:26), the governing Labour Party was concerned that the EEC rules imposed too many costs and constraints on the British budget, and that the public should have a greater say on Britain's future, in relation to European integration. Williams (1995:7) reflects on the renegotiation attempts by the governing Labour Party as an attempt to prove that it cared more about the national interest of the British people than the previous Conservative Party, which negotiated Britain's entrance into the EEC. Hence, the Labour Party not only renegotiated some of the terms, but also called for a referendum in an attempt to resolve the long standing debate on Britain's entry into the EEC (Eichenberg & Dalton, 1993:508).

According to Gliddon (2017:92), the referendum served as a pragmatic tool for the Labour Party for two reasons. Firstly, to unite the Labour Party and secondly, to demonstrate Britain's commitment to and continued membership of the EEC. Gliddon (2017:92) further argued that the pro-Europeans within the Labour Party were of the opinion that continued EEC membership would maximise Britain's economic opportunities and political influence.

The date for the referendum was set for 05 June 1975, and Britain was asked to vote on the question: "Do you think the UK should stay inside the European Community?" (Wallace, 2013:533). On the day, 64.5% of the British electorate participated in the referendum and the final results indicated a majority win (67.2%) for the remain camp, while 32.8% of the votes were in

favour of Britain leaving the EEC (Wallace, 2013:533). According to Gliddon (2017:91), the results of the referendum temporarily diffused the ongoing debates about EEC membership and created the appearance that the government of the day now had the public's consent for remaining inside the EEC. However, according to Goodwin and Milazzo (2015:2), the results indicated that support for Britain's participation in the EEC was "wide but did not run deep". In other words, although the referendum was an indication that Britain wanted to remain inside the EEC, there was no indication that they wanted deeper integration, and the vote was rather an indication that the electorate preferred the status quo. Similarly, Vines (2015:539) argued that the election results reflected acceptance, rather than support, and the idea that Britain could lose its national identity and become an offshore island of Europe was still a possibility in the minds of the electorate (Vines, 2015:539).

#### **4.2.5 The Thatcher era (1979 – 1990)**

Apart from the referendum on Britain's membership of the EEC, the year 1975 was also the year that Margaret Thatcher became the leader of the Conservative Party (Fontana & Parsons, 2015:93). According to Evans (2009:101), the elevation of Margaret Thatcher to the leadership of the Conservative Party signalled a significant change in the Conservative Party, which saw the party's centre of gravity shift further to the right of the political spectrum.

According to Fontana and Parsons (2015:90), Britain's opinion, and particularly the opinion within the Conservative Party in the 1970's, of Europe and European integration, were shaped by the interaction of four political traditions. Firstly, the perception that Britain is a distinctly global power and not European, secondly, that the British Government is built on parliamentary sovereignty that rejects federal or shared power, thirdly, that Britain traditionally viewed itself as pragmatic, rather than utopian, and finally, that the British people traditionally saw themselves as distinctively liberal. Thus the political environment in which Thatcher rose to power was shaped by the traditions described by Fontana and Parsons (2015:90).

In the same vein, Daddow (2013:212) refers to the Eurosceptic tradition in Britain. Euroscepticism according to Brown *et al.* (2018), refers to a group of people who are sceptical of the European Union and European integration. Ray (2019) defines Euroscepticism as a political doctrine that advocates disengagement from the European Union (EU). Daddow (2013:212) argues that the Eurosceptic tradition was popularised by Margaret Thatcher, and similarly, Fontana and Parsons (2015:89) argue that the British Euroscepticism was strengthened under the premiership of Margaret Thatcher. Daddow (2013) maintains that the 'Eurosceptic' tradition is rooted in Britain's national identity that geographically and psychologically separates Britain from Europe. Daddow (2013:214) further states that a realist appreciation of international relations, together with

Britain's national identity and history and with their liberal ideals or strong connection to liberalism, all played an important role in shaping the Eurosceptic views that not only shaped Thatcher's own political views, but were later closely associated with Margaret Thatcher.

It is against the background of an evolving Eurosceptic tradition that the Conservative Party under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher won the 1979 General Election with a 43 seat majority and Thatcher became Britain's first female Prime Minister (Southerland, 2018). The Thatcher Government replaced the Labour Government that was responsible for the renegotiation of budget contributions to the EEC as well as the 1975 referendum. According to Wallace (1997:678), the newly elected Conservative Government inherited the incomplete results of accession negotiations, which crucially left issues relating to Britain's financial contributions towards the EEC unresolved. Hence the first five years of Prime Minister Thatcher's term in office were, on the European front, dominated by the budget problem. According to Eichenberg and Dalton (1993:513), the issues relating to the EEC budget and Britain's contributions were prominent in Prime Minister Thatcher's 'acrimonious' relation with the EEC, and her insistence on a rebate and permanent budget readjustments was one of the most critical issues for the EEC at the time. At the 1979 European Council, Prime Minister Thatcher famously asked for her 'money back'. According to Wallace (2013:541), the budget issues were only resolved at the Fontainebleau European Council of 1984. Wallace (1997:679) argues that Prime Minister Thatcher's stance on the reimbursement reinforced the adversarial character of negotiations between Britain and the EEC, which again manifested the British tradition of us (Britain) and them (Europe). Despite the obstacles presented by Britain, the EEC, as in the past, moved ahead with its plans for further integration of Europe. In 1981, Greece joined the EEC, marking the continued widening of European integration (Dinan, 1994:14; Wallace, 2013:533).

The next major development for the 'deeper' integration of the EEC, came in the form of the Single European Act (SEA) of 1986. According to Dinan (1994:11), the SEA increased the Community's institutional capacities and functional scope and committed member states to the establishment of a free, single market without any trade barriers, with the aim of creating a single European market by 1992. Dinan (1994:11) further states that the SEA was a landmark in the Community's history because it incorporated the most important revisions to date of the Treaty of Rome. According to Daddow (2013:217), the SEA was one of the most integrationist treaties in recent times.

Surprisingly, Britain signed up to the treaty. The position in Whitehall was that the institutional reforms were helpful in promoting the new liberalisation agenda. According to Daddow (2013:220), Prime Minister Thatcher's approach to Europe was one driven by political realism, attempting to secure and promote Britain's interest in trade and financial terms. For Prime Minister

Thatcher the financial infringements were justifiable, as long as political intrusions did not follow. However, according to Fontana and Parsons (2015:95), Britain's ratification to the SEA caused a 'dilemma' for Britain's technocrats and politicians. On the one hand, the SEA meant greater liberalisation of trade and served as a technical instrument to further promote British interest. On the other hand, the SEA was seen as a move towards federalism, of which Prime Minister Thatcher was extremely sceptical. The dilemma thus presented itself because, although Britain was a main exporter of neoliberal policies, especially under Prime Minister Thatcher (Martell, 2008:458), the continued European integration was now beginning to affect British sovereignty and by implication, British liberty. This is reflected in Prime Minister Thatcher's famous Bruges speech of 1988. According to Fontana and Parsons (2015:95), Prime Minister Thatcher's Bruges speech had a nationalist, populist, anti-institutional focus that outweighed her commitment to neoliberalism and also broke away from the pragmatic economic reasoning of some of her own cabinet members.

The following extract from her Bruges speech indicates her attitude toward European integration at the time:

*"... My first guiding principle is this: willing and active cooperation between independent sovereign states is the best way to build a successful European Community.*

*To try to suppress nationhood and concentrate power at the centre of a European conglomerate would be highly damaging and would jeopardise the objectives we seek to achieve.*

*Europe will be stronger precisely because it has France as France, Spain as Spain, Britain as Britain, each with its own customs, traditions and identity. It would be folly to try to fit them into some sort of identikit European personality.*

*Some of the founding fathers of the Community thought that the United States of America might be its model.*

*But the whole history of America is quite different from Europe.*

*People went there to get away from the intolerance and constraints of life in Europe.*

*They sought liberty and opportunity; and their strong sense of purpose has, over two centuries, helped to create a new unity and pride in being American, just as our pride lies in being British or Belgian or Dutch or German.*

*I am the first to say that on many great issues the countries of Europe should try to speak with a single voice.*

*I want to see us work more closely on the things we can do better together than alone.*

*Europe is stronger when we do so, whether it be in trade, in defence or in our relations with the rest of the world.*

*But working more closely together does not require power to be centralised in Brussels or decisions to be taken by an appointed bureaucracy.*

*Indeed, it is ironic that just when those countries such as the Soviet Union, which have tried to run everything from the centre, are learning that success depends on dispersing power and decisions away from the centre, there are some in the Community who seem to want to move in the opposite direction.*

***We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain, only to see them re-imposed at a European level with a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels.***

*Certainly we want to see Europe more united and with a greater sense of common purpose.*

*But it must be in a way which preserves the different traditions, parliamentary powers and sense of national pride in one's own country; for these have been the source of Europe's vitality through the centuries..." (Thatcher, 1988).*

According to Daddow (2013:218), Prime Minister Thatcher's Bruges speech was a catalytic moment for Euroscepticism and the Eurosceptic traditions in Britain, and moved Euroscepticism from a sideshow to the centre stage of the political landscape. Similarly, Kidd (2018:39) states that the 1988 Bruges speech was a crucial turning point for the Conservative Party's relationship with Europe. However, despite the fact that Prime Minister Thatcher lit the fuse for what was to become a more energised Euroscepticism, the European integration process continued and Thatcher was voted out by her own party in an internal election, partly due to the stance she took on European integration (Wallace, 1997:681). The iron lady officially resigned as Prime Minister on 22 November 1990 and was replaced by John Major, who promised to put the UK at the heart of Europe (Wallace, 2013:535).

#### **4.2.6 The Maastricht Treaty**

Despite the internal politics within Britain's Conservative Party and the resignation of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in November 1990, the EEC was still moving ahead with plans for further integration. The end of the Cold War in 1989 and the opening of Eastern Europe made the EEC a symbol of political and economic stability, and European leaders agreed that the time was ripe to move towards greater economic, monetary and political unity (Venter, 2004:58). According to Baun (1995:606), the fall of the Berlin Wall meant that the EEC, if effectively unified, could be a powerful competitor of the United States in an emerging multipolar world. Another motivation for further integration was that the reunification of Germany provided the EEC with a once in a lifetime opportunity to include a united Germany in the community (Baun, 1995:619; Dinan,

1994:10) Building on the foundation of the SEA, EEC member states thus moved ahead with negotiations on monetary and political union, which culminated in the Maastricht Treaty.

The Maastricht Treaty, also known as the Treaty of the European Union, was signed on 07 February 1992. The treaty introduced a range of new areas of cooperation between the governments of the member states, including areas relating to defence, justice and home affairs (Venter, 2004:58). According to Goldstein (1992:117), the Maastricht Treaty took the next step towards creating a far reaching economic and political union that might one day become the United States of Europe.

The Maastricht Treaty committed member states to, amongst others, establishing a common currency by 1999, aiming to harmonise the foreign policy interest of the 12 member states by establishing a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), providing a framework for a common defence policy, as well as establishing policy objectives to regulate public health, education and the environmental issues (Goldstein, 1992:119; Hussain, 2017:19). According to Venter (2004:58), the Maastricht Treaty was the biggest overhaul of the EU since the establishment of the EEC. Goldstein (1992:119) maintains that the principal intent of the Maastricht Treaty was to construct a federal union and to transfer portions of national power to the European Commission's centralised agencies.

On the other side of the English Channel, Britain's new Prime Minister, John Major was in charge of Britain's negotiations towards the completion of the Maastricht Treaty. In typical British fashion, Britain was opposed to some of the provisions in the treaty and Prime Minister Major was able to successfully negotiate an opt out protocol that provided Britain with the right to opt out of the social chapter and to decide at a later stage whether to join the single European currency (Smith, 1992:155). Prime Minister Major's success in negotiating special terms for Britain probably contributed to the re-election of the Conservative Party with Major as Prime Minister in April 1992. However, despite the concessions that Prime Minister Major successfully negotiated, in December 1991 the procedure of parliamentary ratification within the British Parliament on 20 May 1993 ignited a long running rebellion within Prime Minister Major's Conservative Party (Berrington & Hague, 1998:45). According to Wallace (1997:683), arguments within the Conservative Party brought the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty close to failure due to the resistance of a powerful Eurosceptic faction in British conservative politics. The resistance toward the Maastricht Treaty was compounded by the events of 16 September 1992, when market turbulence and lack of support from its European partners caused the Pound to lose significant value and Britain was forced to withdraw the Pound Sterling from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) (Wallace, 1997:681). The 16<sup>th</sup> September 1992 became known as Black Wednesday (Wallace, 2013:535), and according to Wallace (1997:681), was one of the worst

days in office for any British Government. Kidd (2018:39) contends that the idea of a Tory Brexit was born on Black Wednesday, 16 September 1992.

According to Wallace (1997:683), Maastricht was a turning point for Prime Minister Major and his efforts to stabilise the government's European policy. Berrington and Hague (1998:67) argue that Europe remained a source of deep conflict and continuing embarrassment for the government under Prime Minister Major. Due to the pressure from Eurosceptics within the Conservative Party, a range of concessions were made in favour of the Eurosceptic faction. By 1994, positions within the Conservative Party hardened, and it was clear that the fragile unity within the Conservative Party depended upon Prime Minister Major opposing any substantial progress towards further European integration (Williams, 1995:5). By 1996, in the run up to the General Election as well as the upcoming Intergovernmental Conference to discuss further European integration, Prime Minister Major, like Harold Wilson in 1974, promised to turn the European issue over to the electorate, signalling the failure of the Conservative Party to reach a unanimous decision. For the conservatives, Prime Minister Thatcher's prophesy that further increases in European authority i.e. deeper integration might be intolerable proved to be true (Fontana & Parsons, 2015:90).

#### **4.2.7 Tony Blair and 'New Labour' (1997-2010)**

The majority of the British electorate did not share the Conservative Party's Euroscepticism (Fontana & Parsons, 2015). In the May 1997 General Election, the Labour Party under the leadership of Tony Blair won an historic 419 parliamentary seats, while the Conservatives were left with 165 seats, marking the end of 18 years of Conservative Party Government in Britain (Evans *et al.*, 1998:65). According to Bulmer (2008:597), the newly elected Labour Government were looking for a more constructive European policy, contrasting the policies of the Conservative Party of John Major. Mullen and Burkitt (2003:322) agree, by stating that the election of New Labour marked a drastic change in Britain's relationship with the EU, which openly pursued a pro-European agenda.

Bulmer (2008:600) states that the Labour Government was committed to the rapid completion of the single market and the enlargement of the European Community was high on its list of priorities. The Labour Government also acceded to the Social Chapter of the Maastricht Treaty from which the Conservative Government under Prime Minister Major opted out. According to Menon and Salter (2016:1302), Prime Minister Blair was mindful of the risk that the European question posed to the incumbent Labour Party, hence under his leadership a policy of constructive engagement was followed, while downplaying the importance of the EU in the national public arena. Bulmer (2008:498) labels this policy as 'utilitarian supranationalism' which basically means that on the one hand the Labour Government was able to pursue the national interest by exploiting

opportunities offered by the EU, ranging from issues relating to economic competitiveness to security and defence policy. On the other hand, the Labour Government was successful in depoliticising the European integration issue at home, taking into account the British public's "lukewarm" attitude towards European integration. This policy was also made possible by the absence of intra-party divisions that were experienced by the Conservative Party under Major (Bulmer, 2008:598). Similarly, Menon and Salter (2016:1302) state that the Labour Party's EU strategy was premised on the belief that issues relating to the EU could be handled at an elite level, which did not affect the average voter.

In addition to following an openly pro-European policy, the Labour Government was also committed to a foreign policy called 'Doctrine of the International Community', later known as the Blair Doctrine. The doctrine aimed to address issues such as, amongst others, the oppression of civilian population and humanitarian crises (Blair, 2009:5). According to this policy, Prime Minister Blair wanted to change the world by spreading democracy, freedom and human rights. Mölder (2018:157) agrees, by stating that Prime Minister Blair was of the opinion that violations against human rights should justify external interference and involvement of military forces in order to pursue humanitarian objectives. According to Mölder (2018:157), it was the Blair Doctrine that allowed Britain to intervene in the 1999 Kosovo crisis. Kennedy-Pipe and Vickers (2007:205) maintain that it was also in pursuit of this policy that Prime Minister Blair decided to join the US in invading Iraq in 2003.

In hindsight, the decision to join the US in invading Iraq proved to be a step too far for Prime Minister Blair and his liberal foreign policy approach. According to Kennedy-Pipe and Vickers (2007:2016), Prime Minister Blair's decision to support the US invasion resulted in widespread and growing erosion of trust in the Labour Party and Blair in particular. The performance of the Labour Party in the 2005 General Election, where they won the election with a significantly reduced majority, could also be directly attributed to the decision to send British troops to Iraq (Bulmer 2008:604). According to Mölder (2018:165), the Labour Party only won the 2005 elections due to the good performance of the British economy.

Kennedy-Pipe and Vickers (2007:205) argue that in his decision to join the US military action in Iraq, Prime Minister Blair underestimated the effect that his decision had on domestic politics and also the threat to domestic security that emanated as a result of British military action in Iraq. Kennedy-Pipe and Vickers (2007:205) maintain that the threat that emanated from the UK's involvement in Iraq manifested itself in the form of home grown suicide bombers opposed to Britain's involvement in Iraq. In support of this argument, Hasan (2010:27) stated that MI5 warned the British cabinet ministers that the war with Iraq would increase the terrorist risk in the UK.

Hence the terror attack in London on 07 July 2005, in which 56 people were killed (Hasan, 2010:27), was seen by many as a direct result of the decision by Prime Minister Blair to join the US led invasion in Iraq.

Reflecting on the various terror attacks that took place since the 9/11 attacks in the US, Mölder (2018:162) argued that when the international system becomes unstable, as it did during the attack on the World Trade Centre in 2001 or the London bombings in 2005, people tend to value national security guarantees over economic and social benefits, and national values will be preferred to universal values. Therefore Mölder (2018:162) attribute the rise of nationalism to insecurity. This argument is supported by Kaldor (2004:168), who stated that nationalism is bred in conditions of insecurity and violence. Hence it is possible to link the British nationalism that was prevalent in the immediate era following the Second World War to the recent rise of nationalism that Mölder (2018:162) argued is a result of the insecurity. In both cases violence and insecurity provided a breeding ground for nationalism.

In addition to the apparent rise of nationalism in Britain, brought on as a result of increased insecurity, following the involvement of Britain in the Iraq invasion and subsequent terror attacks in London, the Labour Party was concerned that public trust in its leader, Prime Minister Tony Blair was diminishing, and he was no longer an electoral asset (Bulmer, 2008:604). Thus in September 2006, Prime Minister Blair announced the he would step down within twelve months. In June 2007, Gordon Brown succeeded Blair as Britain's Prime Minister. According to Bulmer (2008:605), the British Government under Prime Minister Brown continued with the same policy of 'utilitarian supranationalism' that was used under the Blair leadership. However, with a significantly reduced majority in Parliament, Brown was constrained in terms of foreign policy, and Britain's European policy became a pertinent domestic political issue.

The arrival of the 2008-2009 economic recession created the perfect storm for the Labour Party under the leadership of Prime Minister Brown. According to Menon and Salter (2016:1304), the economic collapse of parts of the EU served as confirmation to the Eurosceptic Conservatives within the British establishment that the EU had a negative effect on Britain's economy. Similarly Mölder (2018) argued that the 2008-2009 global economic recession strengthened the trend of Euroscepticism and protectionist attitudes within the British society. Combined with increasing nationalist and security orientated views as well as a struggling British economy, the Labour Party was facing an uphill battle.

### **4.3 The Build-up to Brexit**

According to Kidd (2018:39), the idea of a Tory (Conservative Party) Brexit was born on Black Wednesday, 16 September 1992. This argument is supported by Bachmann and Sidaway (2016:49) who argue that the Euroscepticism that germinated and grew under Thatcher in the 1980's spiralled out of control in the 1990's. The establishment of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in 1993 further supports this claim (Menon & Salter, 2016:1303; Wallace, 2013:535). In the same vein, Fontana and Parsons (2015:97) state that the early 1990's saw the emergence of populist right wing politicians carrying the banner of Thatcherism. 'Thatcher's children', as these politicians became known, won several seats in the 1992 election and quickly joined the Eurosceptic voices in Britain's Parliament. According to Fontana and Parsons (2015:97), among the 63 new conservative MP's that were elected in 1992 were a small group that later became the "leading edge of a generation for whom conservatism meant following in Thatcher's footsteps".

Kidd (2018:35) argues that the current Conservative Party still considers itself Thatcherite and has become increasingly reckless in its pursuit of a hard Brexit driven by a phalanx of conservative nationalists. Hence, when the British electorate grew tired of the Labour Party in 2010, the only alternative bore the face of Margaret Thatcher. Unlike the Labour Party, who successfully depoliticised the issue of European integration on the domestic level, the Conservative Party made the EU and EU integration a key election issue. According to Menon and Salter (2016:1303), David Cameron, in order to secure his election as Conservative Party Leader, pledged to pull the Conservative Party out of the European People's Party in the European Parliament, and allied the Conservatives with a new grouping of right-wing Eurosceptic parties. Hence, the Conservative Party that competed in the 2010 elections was dominated by Eurosceptical MPs, whose views were widely accepted in the mainstream electorate (Fontana & Parsons, 2015:100).

#### **4.3.1 The Return of the Conservative Party**

On Thursday 06 May 2010, Britons went to the polls to cast their vote in the General Election. The election produced a hung parliament, compelling the Conservative Party to form a coalition with the Liberal Democrats (Wallace, 2013:539). According to Quinn *et al.* (2011:295), the May 2010 elections produced the first hung parliament since February 1974 and resulted in the first peacetime coalition government since the 1930's. Although the Conservative Party received the most votes, it needed support from other parties to command a majority. Therefore the Conservative Party entered into a coalition with the Liberal Democrats to form a government. The issue of European integration played a key role in the coalition negotiations. According to Menon

and Salter (2016:1303), the coalition agreement signed with the Liberal Democrats guaranteed that there would be no more transfers of sovereign powers to the EU until the next election. Based on this agreement, David Cameron, leader of the Conservative Party subsequently became Britain's Prime Minister. The return of the Conservative Party to power in 2010 after thirteen years of Labour rule marked an important turning point in British politics.

Considering that the Conservative Party, which came to power in 2010, aligned itself closely with Thatcherism (Kidd, 2018:35), this also meant that the party would associate itself with the political traditions to which Margaret Thatcher ascribed. According to Fontana and Parsons (2015:90), the Conservative Party under Margaret Thatcher saw Britain as a distinctly global power and not a European one. The Conservative Party was also emphatic that Britain is built on the foundation of parliamentary sovereignty that rejects federal power. The Conservative Party was also closely associated with a pragmatic (realist) approach to politics rather than a utopian view. Similarly, Daddow (2013:214) stated that a realist appreciation of international relations together with Britain's national identity and history and their liberal ideals or strong connection to liberalism all played an important role in shaping the Eurosceptic views that not only shaped Thatcher's own political views, but were later closely associated with Margaret Thatcher. It is thus clear that with the Conservative Party back in power, Britain was bound to return to a Thatcherite approach to international relations based on realism and state-centric nationalism. With its affinity for realism and state-centric nationalism, the Conservative Party leadership that came to power in 2010 was also in a position to use the failures of the outgoing Labour Government to support its increasingly Eurosceptic agenda (Bachmann & Sidaway, 2016:49).

When David Cameron became Prime Minister, Britain was struggling to deal with the effects of the 2008-2009 financial crisis, forcing the coalition government to introduce austerity measures, in order to reduce Britain's deficit (Quinn *et al.*, 2011:302). In addition, the Conservative Government was also dealing with an immigration 'crisis' which according to the newly elected coalition government was "out of control" (Gower, 2015:3). According to the newly elected Home Secretary, Ms Theresa May, between 1997 and 2010 (this is the period when the Labour Party was in government) more than 2.2 million people migrated to Britain, putting enormous strain on public services (Gower, 2015:3). Robinson (2013:1) stated that public perception hardened around the view that the British society was paying a heavy price for the increased flow of migrants.

Corbett (2016:14) argued that the expansion of the EU in 2004 contributed to the increasing migration to Britain, which resulted in increased competition for low skilled, low pay and insecure job opportunities in Britain. This argument is supported by Mölder (2018:169), who stated that the Euro-zone crisis together with increased migration from poorer European countries were two of

the cornerstones of the growing Euroscepticism within the British society. In the same vein, Menon and Salter (2016:1306) state that the increasing emphasis on migration, particularly the fact that European migrants were able to claim state support, increased pressure on Prime Minister Cameron to decisively deal with the EU question. Hence Prime Minister Cameron, under pressure from Eurosceptic Conservative Party members, amplified by the strenuous financial position of older, blue collar, lower skilled Britons, as well as competition from the populist right wing UKIP, committed to hold an in/out referendum if the Conservative Party secured a majority in the 2015 general election (Corbett, 2016:18; Hobolt, 2016:1261). According to Goodwin and Ford (2017:7), the rise of UKIP played an important role in Prime Minister Cameron's decision to commit to holding a referendum on Britain's continued membership of the EU.

UKIP, founded in 1993, shortly after Black Wednesday, was a single issue Eurosceptic Party, focused entirely on Britain's withdrawal from the EU. Despite not gaining much traction since its establishment in 1993, UKIP gained prominence after the 2010 General Election that resulted in the coalition government between the Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats. By 2012 polls suggested that UKIP outperformed the Liberal Democrats as Britain's third most popular party. According to Goodwin and Ford (2017:7), UKIP's support came mainly from older white social conservatives, with lower levels of education, who were fiercely opposed to immigration and EU membership. Most of these supporters had voted for the Conservative Party in the past but gradually became dissatisfied with Britain's two main political parties.

According to O'Reilly *et al.* (2017:808), Prime Minister Cameron triggered the Brexit referendum as a means to contain the right wing margins of the Conservative Party and to stem the rising tide of the growing right wing UKIP. Thus the Conservative Party's outright majority in the General Election of May 2015 could be attributed to Prime Minister Cameron's referendum promise (Menon & Salter, 2016:1304). O'Reilly *et al.* (2017:808) argue that the promise of a Brexit referendum was most probably part of an anticipated coalition agreement with the conservative right. The fact that the Conservative Party won the May elections with an outright majority meant that the initial promise was now part of the Conservative Party's manifesto pledge.

One of Prime Minister David Cameron's first actions as the newly elected Prime Minister was to negotiate a new settlement for Britain in Europe (Hobolt, 2016:1216). On 20 February 2016, Prime Minister Cameron finalised a deal with the 27 leaders of the EU. The deal included the concession that Britain would not be bound to the term 'ever closer union' in any of the treaties, and that Britain would be granted the power to limit the in-work benefits of EU migrants. The deal also provided a guarantee that non Euro states would not have to fund Euro bailouts, and should be reimbursed if EU funds were used to support the Euro (Hobolt, 2016:1261; Menon & Salter, 2016:1306). Although Prime Minister Cameron was able to secure significant concessions from

his European counterparts, the deal did not receive the anticipated welcome from the British public, the media or even some members of Prime Minister Cameron's own Conservative Party (Hobolt, 2016:1261).

#### 4.3.2 The 2016 Referendum (Brexit Vote)

Shortly after Prime Minister Cameron returned from Brussels, where he negotiated the new deal, he announced his intention to hold a referendum on European membership on 23 June 2016 (Menon & Salter, 2016:1307). The announcement of a referendum marked the beginning the referendum campaigns which divided Britain into a Remain camp and a Leave camp. According to Goodwin and Ford (2017:9), the Remain and Leave campaigns focussed on different issues, reflecting the profiles and priorities of their supporters. The Remain campaign firmly focussed on the economic risks that the UK would face by leaving the EU. On the other hand, the Leave campaign focussed mainly on issues relating to migration, the threat that the EU posed to Britain's sovereignty and the need to redirect contributions to the EU back to the British people and national welfare services. Similarly, Hobolt (2016:1262) stated that, from the outset, the battle lines between the Leave and Remain campaigns reflected the competing issues of immigration versus the economy.

In April 2016, Britain's electoral commission nominated the "Vote Leave" group as the official campaign in favour of leaving the EU. The Vote Leave campaign recruited support from senior Conservative Cabinet Members and Members of Parliament (MPs). Among the Vote Leave campaign's champions was Boris Johnson (Former London Mayor and popular MP politician). On the other side, the "Britain Stronger In Europe" were nominated as the official campaign for the Remain campaign (Goodwin & Ford, 2017:9).

On 23 June, the British people went to the polls to cast their vote in what was to become one of the most historic referendums in British history. On 24 June 2016 a sense of shock and disbelief rocked Britain and capitals around Europe, if not the world, when it became clear that 51.9% of British voters had cast their vote in favour of leaving the EU (Hobolt, 2016:1259). Thus the Leave campaign, whose main focus for the referendum was on issues relating to migration, threats to national sovereignty and the social welfare of the British people was successful, and Britain was on her way out of the EU.

Analysing the results of the Brexit Referendum provides an interesting picture of the divisions within the British electorate. According to Goodwin and Heath (2016:326), referendum results indicated that the percentage of voters who voted to leave the EU were much higher in areas with lower levels of education, while the Leave campaign received less votes in areas consisting of

citizens with higher levels of education. In the same vein, Goodwin and Heath (2016:326) found that there is also a clear correlation between the age profile of electoral districts and the results of the referendum. According to their research, Goodwin and Heath (2016:326) found that in areas with a younger population, more people voted to remain, while in areas with older populations (65 and above) more people voted for the Leave campaign. These findings are also supported by Nouvellet (2017:31), who found that the two youngest age classes (18-29 and 30-49) were most likely to vote to remain. Hence Goodwin and Heath (2016:326) conclude that both education levels and age composition of the different voting districts had a direct influence on residents' propensity to vote to leave.

The findings by Goodwin and Heath (2016) are supported by Hobolt (2016:1269), who predicted that:

*"...those who have benefited from increased international cooperation and trade – the better educated, the young and well off – are less likely to vote for leave compared to those who were 'left behind' – the low skilled, the old and the poor."*

Similarly O'Reilly *et al.* (2017:829) state that the referendum results can be described as the competition between 'cosmopolitans and locals'. Cosmopolitans are described as educated, skilled, comfortable with other cultures, travel widely and have a global frame of reference. Locals on the other hand are described as poorly educated people, who don't travel and are uncomfortable with different races and cultures. The 'locals' also tend to have a national or even regional frame of reference. The 'cosmopolitan vs. locals' description is also visible in the geographic voting patterns. According to Goodwin and Ford (2017:10), voting districts with large numbers of pensioners, with a history of voting for UKIP, voted to leave. University towns, London, Northern Ireland and Scotland, (areas with a younger demographic composition and higher education levels) voted to remain.

O'Reilly *et al.* (2017:830) describe the section of the British electorate who voted for Britain to leave as follows:

*"The local leavers are also a diverse amalgam, running from the remnants of the industrial working class through the empire-lamenting nationalist and hard left opponents of global capital. They may also be collectively lumped together by remainers as backward-looking and xenophobic. What is particularly striking is that the leaders of this group tend to be ardent global free-marketeters whose objection to the EU is that it is not global enough and overly attached to employment rights and environmental standards. In this way the leavers*

*are reminiscent of the Thatcherite coalition of the 1980's in contradictorily combining elements of nationalist traditionalism with economic globalisation."*

From the analysis of the referendum results, it is clear that nationalist, far right/conservative parties like UKIP and the Thatcherite component of the incumbent Conservative Party were successful in mobilising the older and working class citizens to support their "nationalist traditionalism". Increased insecurity, poverty and unemployment, immigration and the perceived loss of sovereignty were the main drivers behind the rising nationalism among those left behind by the liberal agenda of the previous Labour regime. The Conservative Party, influenced by other populist right wing parties like UKIP, was effective in harnessing the resurgence of nationalism to put Britain back on a Thatcherite, Eurosceptic trajectory, dominated by a neorealist approach to international relations.

#### **4.4 Conclusion**

From the historical background it is clear that Britain, since the establishment of the ECSC, was never fully committed to the project of European integration (Spaak, 1963:612) and only joined the EEC when it served British interests (Northedge, 1970:44). Similarly Daddow (2013:220) argues that under the leadership of Prime Minister Thatcher, Britain's approach to Europe was driven by political realism, attempting to secure and promote Britain's interest in trade and financial terms. Under Prime Minister Tony Blair and 'New Labour', Britain followed a more constructive approach toward the EU which Bulmer (2008:498) labels as 'utilitarian supranationalism' which basically means that the Blair Government was able to pursue the national interest by exploiting opportunities offered by the EU. In the same vein, Prime Minister Cameron negotiated a special deal with the EU after his election in 2015, mainly to serve British national interest with regard to migration and financial contributions.

Therefore from the historical background it is clear that regardless of the political party in charge of British foreign policy, Britain's national interest has always been the primary priority for any British government, and membership of multilateral organisations has always been used to advance Britain's interest in the world. It is thus evident that despite differences in policy, with the primary focus on Britain's interest, all British governments to date have shown an affection or preference for a neorealist approach toward international relations.

Similarly, British nationalism runs wider and deeper than the current upsurge in nationalist sentiments. According to Corbett (2016:12), British nationalism is grounded on the myths of the British Empire and the impact of the Second World War on the national consciousness. This argument is supported by Troitiño (2014:119) and Reynolds (2017:34), who stated that British

nationalism and sovereignty were key factors that contributed to Britain's victory in the Second World War. Hence, nationalism and sovereignty are part of the British psyche and these two factors also guided British foreign policy over centuries.

However, although nationalism has always been part of the British psyche, the build-up to Brexit and the decision by the British electorate to leave the EU, clearly indicate that nationalism is on the rise in the United Kingdom. This argument is supported by Mölder (2018:153), who stated that nationalist movements became stronger in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Similarly, Fielder (2018:217) stated that Brexit may be the most visible example of the rise of nationalism in Europe and that this wave of nationalism centres around far right "ethno-nationalists" who advocate for the interest of specific ethnic groups.

The reasons for the rise of nationalism that led to Brexit can be attributed to a variety of factors. The first factor that contributed to the rise of nationalism culminating in Brexit was increased insecurity (Mölder, 2018:162). The 2005 terror attacks had a severe effect on the psyche of the average British citizen. The use of violence/force that was associated with the 2005 terror attack also had significant repercussions for national security because it implied that the British Government was now faced with a national security issue (Buzan, 1983:76). The presence of violence and insecurity that was experienced by Britain therefore provided fertile soil for nationalism to germinate and grow (Kaldor, 2004:168).

The second factor that contributed to the rise of nationalism in the UK was the global economic recession of 2008-2009 and the economic hardships that were experienced by British citizens as a result of the recession (Quinn et al., 2011:302). The third factor was the increased migration. The final factor that contributed to the rise of nationalism in the UK was the perceived loss of sovereignty and the perception that the power of national governments was transferred to unelected technocrats in the EU.

The reasons for the rise of nationalism are aptly summarised by Wahl (2017:159) who stated that:

*"...when people are marginalised and underprivileged, if respect and dignity is refused to them, if their social status is threatened, nationalism is one way to compensate for that, in particular in the absence of an emancipatory alternative."*

It is exactly these feelings of marginalisation, and the threat to social status, which stoked the fire of nationalism in Britain and gave rise to populist right wing parties such as UKIP. The Conservative Party also used the resurgence of nationalism to further their neorealist agenda, opposing the liberal approach to international relations under the previous Labour Government. Snyder (2019:54) captures the essence of the modern nationalists by stating that:

*“Today’s nationalists decry the “globalist” liberalism of international institutions. They attack liberal elites as sell-outs who care more about foreigners than their fellow citizens.”*

Comparing this description with the messages of the Leave campaign, it is difficult not to label supporters of the Leave campaign as nationalist. It is also difficult to deny that nationalism did indeed experience a revival in the United Kingdom.

Against this background, it is clear that nationalism is on the rise in the UK and that the UK is departing from a liberal approach to international relations toward a neorealist approach, with a stronger focus on national security. In order to explore the effect of rising nationalism and neorealism in the UK, the next chapter will provide an analysis on the effects that rising nationalism and neorealism might have on globalisation and human security. The next chapter will also explore whether Britain will be able to find a balance between nationalism and globalisation.

## **CHAPTER 5: BRITISH NATIONALISM AND GLOBALISATION - STRIKING A BALANCE**

### **5.1 Introduction**

In Chapter 4, it was established that state-centric nationalism and realism are on the rise in the UK. The emergence of right wing nationalist parties, combined with an incumbent Conservative Party committed to Thatcherism, played a key role in altering Britain's course away from the neoliberal approach, towards the more neorealist approach, which is synonymous with nationalism, the nation state and self-determination.

By effectively exploiting issues such as immigration, economic decline, increased insecurity, the perceived loss of sovereignty and the perception that power of national governments was transferred to unelected technocrats in the EU, the conservative right were able to mobilise the British electorate, to support the decision to leave the EU. The rise of nationalism in Britain and the decision to leave the EU also indicated a departure from a more liberal approach to foreign policy, to a foreign policy closer aligned to neorealism.

Given this background and acknowledging that nationalism is on the rise in the United Kingdom, the focus of this chapter will be to assess the effect that rising nationalism in Britain may have on Britain's foreign policy and by extension globalisation. This chapter will also assess whether it will be possible for Britain to find a balance between nationalism, which is closely related to neorealism, and globalisation, which are synonymous with liberalism and neoliberalism. This chapter will also attempt to establish whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation.

In attempting to answer these questions, the chapter will firstly look at Britain's historic relation with globalisation and how Britain dealt with the issue/phenomenon of globalisation.

### **5.2 Britain and Globalisation: Historical Background**

According to Martell (2008:453), Britain's imperial power laid the basis for an early form of economic, political and cultural globalisation. Between 1920 and 1930, the British Empire encompassed a fifth of the world's population and a quarter of the world's landmass, excluding colonies such as the US, which were already independent by that time. Despite the presence of other imperial powers like France, Portugal and Spain, the global spread and influence of the British Empire were unmatched. Through its empire Britain established global relations in order

to exploit raw materials, source new products and develop new markets. On the political front Britain established political networks and projected its military power globally in order to maintain its influence and control.

In order to support its economic and political endeavours, Britain also developed communications and transport systems (naval power, navigation and under water cable systems) that formed the foundation for the modern day communication systems. Bearing these developments in mind (economic, political and technological), Martell (2008:453) argued that although the term globalisation only became prominent in the international relations lexicon in the 1990's (Kacowicz, 1999:528), it is clear that the phenomenon of globalisation was already present during Britain's imperial period. Similarly, Thomas and Thompson (2014:142) state that empires can be seen as a central feature of the modern globalised world. According to Thomas and Thompson (2014:145), the imperial authorities in Britain deliberately encouraged their inhabitants to harness their colonial relations to promote relations and develop a sense of global Britishness in order to promote wider economic and cultural interests. In binding together British communities from all over the British Empire, Britain developed a transnational sense of Britishness which significantly reduced the cultural, informational and political barriers to migration, trade and finance within the empire.

Similarly, Martell (2008:453) stated that capitalist pressures were the main reason for Britain's imperial expansion, providing a definite link between capitalism and imperialism. This argument is also supported by Robinson (1998:563), who stated that globalisation at its core is the result of a centuries-long process of the spread of capitalist production and the displacement of pre-capitalist relations. It can therefore be concluded that capitalism is the golden thread that links imperialism with globalisation. Hence, acknowledging Britain's imperial past, it is impossible to separate Britain from globalisation. This relation between Britain and globalisation is aptly described by Martell (2008:452) who stated that Britain is a very globalised and globalising country, and is both an exporter and importer of globalising structures and processes. This affinity to globalisation can largely be attributed to Britain's imperial past, the openness of the British economy and Britain's global political involvements and openness to global cultures. It is against this background that Martell (2008:450) concludes that globalisation takes a very different form in the UK when compared to other countries.

This uniqueness is also reflected in the way Britain dealt with the new global order that was established following the Second World War. According to Wallace (1973:30), the post war international system required greater focus on issues related to wealth, welfare and economic, industrial and technological progress. Acknowledging the new challenges that faced the world, and determined to remain a global player (Troitiño, 2014:119), Britain, in partnership with the

United States, was at the forefront of establishing a network of international organisations such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), which later became the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), as well as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) (Wallace, 1973:30).

Interesting though is the fact that Britain refused to join the more 'close-knit' ECSC that was established shortly after the Second World War (Wallace, 1973:30). As mentioned in Chapter 4, Britain only applied for membership of the EEC in 1961. The decision to join the EEC was motivated primarily in order to take economic advantage of the larger European market and to restore Britain's position as a leading world power (Northedge, 1970:44; Steinnes, 1998:62). In a similar situation, Britain decided to ratify the 1986 Single European Act (SEA) which is described by Daddow (2013:217) as one of the most integrationist treaties in recent times. According to Fontana and Parsons (2015:95), Britain ratified the treaty because the SEA meant greater liberalisation of trade and served as a technical instrument to further promote British interest.

From the information above it is clear that Britain has always been a key player in the new world order that was established following the Second World War. It is also clear that Britain has played an important role in the way globalisation and the structures of globalisation were implemented and exported. Considering the work of Martell (2008) and Thomas and Thompson (2014), it can be argued that globalisation as a product of neoliberalism is, just like nationalism, inherently part of the British political culture and world view. It is also clear that Britain has used international organisations and multilateral fora to promote both globalisation and Britain's national interest. The examples of EEC membership and ratification of the SEA support this argument. It can therefore also be argued that since the end of the Second World War, Britain was able to maintain a balance between nationalism and globalisation by exporting globalisation and the structures of globalisation in order to further promote Britain's national interest.

This argument is supported by Glencross and McCourt (2018:586), who state that for more than 50 years, Britain's main political parties (the Labour and Conservative Parties) agreed that European Union Membership had strategic value for Britain's foreign policy and that European integration served as an important tool for Britain to promote its economic and political influence. However, the longstanding consensus over EU membership started to unravel when the Conservative Party won an outright majority in the 2015 General Elections. According to Menon and Salter (2016:1304), the then Prime Minister, David Cameron's referendum pledge was a critical factor that contributed to the majority victory of the Conservative Party. One of Cameron's first actions as the newly elected Prime Minister was to negotiate a new settlement for Britain in

Europe (Hobolt, 2016:1261). On 20 February 2016 Cameron finalised a deal with the 27 leaders from the EU. The deal included the concession that the UK would not be bound to the term ‘ever closer union’ in any future treaties.

### **5.3 European Integration and British Nationalism**

The concession that was negotiated by Prime Minister Cameron in 2016 was not the first attempt by Britain to limit the constraints of European integration. According to Glencross and McCourt (2018:582), successive UK governments, often alone in their attempts, sought to negotiate a special dispensation for Britain. These concessions were mostly sought to limit further integration. Among the examples of resistance toward further European integration is the Bruges Speech by Margaret Thatcher (Chapter 4), which according to Fontana and Parsons (2015:95), had a nationalist, populist, anti-institutional focus that outweighed her commitment to neoliberalism and also broke away from the pragmatic economic reasoning of some of her own cabinet members. Similarly, when negotiating the Maastricht Treaty in 1991, the then Prime Minister, John Major successfully negotiated an opt out protocol that provided Britain with the right to opt out of the social chapter and to decide at a later stage whether to join the single European currency (Smith, 1992:155).

Considering Britain’s opposition towards further integration, an impression might be created that Britain’s nationalist and populist, anti-institutionalist stance (Fontana & Parsons, 2015:95) and the rise of nationalism under Conservative Prime Ministers David Cameron (11 May 2010 – 13 July 2016), Theresa May (13 July 2016 – 24 July 2019) and Boris Johnson (24 July 2019 – present), might outweigh Britain’s commitment to neoliberalism, which according to Heron (2008), can be seen as the supporting ideology of globalisation. This position by Britain, where it is perceived to be at a fork in the road, having to choose between nationalism/neorealism and liberalism/globalisation is described by Chatterjee (2003:130) as follows:

*“The realist–neoliberal controversy revolves around the issue of cooperation and conflict amongst states, the extent and range of cooperation, the impact of institutions on state motivation and behaviour, the nature and consequences of anarchy, the priority of state goals, the intentions and capabilities, and the vital issue of absolute and relative gains”* (Chatterjee, 2003:130).

When considering the statement by Chatterjee (2003:130) it is clear that the main contention between the neorealist-neoliberal approach is the level or “extent and range” of cooperation. Considering that Britain decided to leave the EU might thus be seen as an indication that Britain is choosing the path of state-centric nationalism based on the principles of neorealism. Should

this be the case, will it mean that Britain will reconsider all areas of cooperation with other countries as well as international organisations and institutions? The next section will briefly analyse Britain's strategy, specifically towards security, in order to assess whether the current rise of nationalism would mean that Britain would follow a purely state-centric realist approach towards security.

#### **5.4 Britain's Security Strategy**

After taking office in 2010, the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government under the premiership of the Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron initiated a major review of Britain's defence and security policy. According to Ritchie (2011:356), the aim of the review was to amongst others, determine the global role that Britain wanted to play, the relevant role of the armed forces and the resources that should be allocated to them. According to Rees (2011:32), the coalition government under Prime Minister Cameron, argued that:

*"...the moral and ethical dimensions of foreign and defence policy that had been trumpeted so loudly under New Labour's Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, in 1997, would be less to the fore; pragmatic and economic interest would in future play a larger role."*

However, despite the clear indication that the Conservative-led British Government would now be moving away from the "moral and ethical dimensions" of foreign policy, as propagated by New Labour, the British Government was still determined to remain a player on the international stage, with an internationalist outlook (Rees, 2011:32). It is against this background that the National Security Strategy (NSS) and the Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR) were developed. The next sections will briefly discuss the NSS and the SDSR.

##### **5.4.1 A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The National Security Strategy**

According to the NSS, a strategy for national security must as a point of departure identify the role Britain wants to play in the world. The NSS further states that in a world that is changing very quickly, Britain's interest remains constant. In defining Britain's national interest, the NSS states that Britain's national interest requires it to stand up for values such as the rule of law, democracy, free speech, tolerance and human rights (HM Government, 2010b:4).

In the introduction of the NSS the strategic approach of the NSS is defined as follows:

*"The UK is well placed to benefit from the world of the future. The National Security Strategy of the United Kingdom is: to use all our national capabilities to build Britain's prosperity, extend our nation's influence in the world and to strengthen our security"* (HM Government, 2010b:4).

In order to effectively implement the strategy, the NSS identifies collective security as one of the critical building blocks. According to the NSS, the UK benefits from a wide set of alliances. Among these alliances, Britain's relationship with the US is regarded as essential to Britain's security and prosperity. The NSS also states that Britain is able to, through its alliances with NATO and the EU, share its security needs and gain collective security benefits (HM Government, 2010b:15).

The NSS also describes Britain's role in the world as "distinctive" and states that Britain will continue to play an active role in shaping global change. Interestingly, the NSS allocates a whole chapter to describe Britain's "distinctive role".

In the chapter, labelled "Britain's Distinctive Role", the NSS states that:

*"Britain is at the heart of many global networks, has an outward looking disposition and is both a geographical and virtual centre of global activity. Our location and time zone position us as a link between the economic centres of Asia and America, as well as forming part of the European Single Market"* (HM Government, 2010b:21).

The NSS further emphasises Britain's 'distinctive role' by stating that Britain has a global reach disproportionate to its size, and that Britain serves as a base for the international flows of people, communications and services. The NSS also views the English language as a strategic asset which gives Britain the ability to share ideas and build networks around the world. However, while acknowledging Britain's 'distinctive' role in the world and the strategic value that comes with this role, the NSS recognises that Britain's openness and deep and outward looking posture, together with its "deep engagement with the world" means that Britain is also particularly vulnerable to international events (HM Government, 2010b:22).

Acknowledging this vulnerability, the NSS identifies two strategic objectives. The first is ensuring a secure and resilient UK. Ensuring a secure and resilient UK, according to the NSS, entails the protection of Britain's citizens, economy, infrastructure and way of life from major threats. The second strategic objective is the shaping of a stable world. According to the NSS, shaping a stable world would require Britain to reduce the likelihood of risks affecting Britain and its overseas/international interests. This would be done by applying all Britain's power and influence to shape the global environment and tackle potential risks at source (HM Government, 2010b:22).

In order to tackle these risks at source, the NSS includes a National Security Risk Assessment (NSRA). The purpose of the NSRA is to assess and prioritise all major areas of national security risk. In concluding the NSRA, Britain's National Security Council (NSC) identified 15 generic priority risks and outlined them into three tiers. The first tier dealt with risks that were considered

to have the largest impact as well as the highest likelihood. These risks are (HM Government, 2010b:27):

- International terrorism affecting the UK and its interests.
- Hostile attacks upon UK cyberspace.
- A major accident or national hazard.
- An international military crisis between states that could draw in the UK and its allies.

The second tier risks identified by the NSRA were deemed the second highest risk level and included risks considering impact and likelihood. The risks that were included in this category are (HM Government, 2010b:27):

- A chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear attack on the UK or its overseas territories.
- A major instability, insurgency or civil war (outside Britain) that could create an environment for terrorists to exploit and threaten Britain's security (such as the war in Syria).
- The increase of organised crime in the UK.
- Disruption to the UK's satellite infrastructure, which is responsible for the provision of information and intelligence.

The third and final tier of risks identified by the NSRA are risks that could have a serious effect on Britain's national security, but both the likelihood and impact are considered to be minimal. The risks identified in this tier are (HM Government, 2010b:27):

- A large scale conventional military attack on the UK by another state.
- A significant increase in the level of terrorists, organised criminals, illegal immigrants and illegal goods attempting to enter the UK.
- Disruption to the UK's oil and gas supplies.
- A nuclear disaster emanating from a civil nuclear installation.
- An attack on any NATO or EU member.
- An attack on any UK overseas territory.
- Disruption of international supply lines.

In order to reach the objectives articulated in the NSS and to address the risks identified by the NSRA, the British Government developed the Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR) which aims to set out the ways and means necessary to achieve the objectives set by the NSS. The next section will briefly discuss the SDSR.

#### 5.4.2 **Securing Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The Strategic Defence and Security Review**

The foreword of the SDSR, delivered by the then Prime Minister, David Cameron stated that:

*“Our country has always had global responsibilities and global ambitions. We have a proud history of standing up for the values we believe in and we should have no less ambition for our country in the decades to come. But we need to be more thoughtful, more strategic and more coordinated in the way we advance our interest and protect our national security”* (HM Government, 2010a:3).

The SDSR then, in order to address the objectives articulated by the NSS, stipulates eight security tasks and planning guidelines, which provide guidance on what the UK’s security and defence agencies should do in order to address the risks identified by the NSRA. These tasks are (HM Government, 2010a:12):

- To monitor national risks and opportunities.
- To tackle the root causes of instability.
- To exert influence to exploit opportunities and manage risks.
- To enforce domestic law and strengthen international norms to help tackle those who threaten the UK and its national interest.
- To protect the UK and its national interest, domestically and internationally, through increased border security and focus on physical and electronic threats.
- To help resolve conflicts and contribute to stability in support of the UK’s national interest.
- To provide resilience for the UK by being prepared for all kinds of emergency.
- To work with alliances and partnerships to generate stronger responses to security risks.

In terms of the UK’s security cooperation with bilateral and multilateral partners, two of the identified security tasks focus specifically on cooperation. The first is the task that stipulates that the UK should exert its influence to exploit opportunities to manage risks. According to the SDSR, the British Government will perform this task by using, amongst others, its Diplomatic Service in order to support its activities as a permanent member of the United National Security Council (UNSC) and leading member of NATO and the EU. The task will also require the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to employ its global network in order to safeguard Britain’s interests and security (HM Government, 2010a:11). The second task that has specific emphasis on cooperation, stipulates that the UK work in alliances and partnerships wherever possible, to generate stronger responses to security risks. In order to deliver on this task, the SDSR identifies collective security through NATO as the basis for the UK’s territorial defence and the stability of

the European neighbourhood. This task also stipulates that an 'outward-facing' EU is required in order to promote security and prosperity. The SDSR further states that the UK requires its contribution to international military coalitions to focus on areas of comparative national advantage valued by key allies, especially the US (HM Government, 2010a:11).

The SDSR dedicates an entire chapter to the discussion of 'Alliances and partnerships'. According to this chapter, the SDSR states that alliances and partnerships will remain a fundamental part of the UK's approach to defence and security. According to the SDSR (HM Government, 2010a:61):

*“The UK enjoys a central position in key multilateral institutions such as the UN Security Council and the international financial institutions and is a leading member of the European Union, NATO, G8, G20 and the Commonwealth. We make significant contributions to international organisations such as the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and implementation bodies such as the International Atomic Energy Agency. We also support regional organisations such as the African Union and the Association of South East Asians Nations.”*

From the information above, it is clear that both the NSS and the SDSR acknowledged the importance of cooperation with bilateral partners and multilateral international institutions, and that Britain is in a position to use its membership of these organisations to further promote and protect its national interest. According to Wilson (2015:381), the international system in the way that it is currently configured confers substantial privileges and preferential status to Britain, mainly because the British Government played an integral role in the establishment of the “rules based international system” that was created following the Second World War. Wilson (2015:381) argues that among the privileges Britain enjoys due to its historical role as a key player in the Post WW2 world are a permanent seat on the UNSC, legal recognition of the UK's nuclear arsenal under the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty, and longstanding membership of key institutions such as NATO, the EU, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, as well as the G7 and G8 groupings. Hence, according to Wilson (2015:381), it will be in Britain's interest to maintain and preserve the current international system for as long as possible.

However, it is important to note that the NSS and SDSR were drafted by a coalition government, following the 2010 General Election and both documents were scheduled to be reviewed every five years. Therefore the next review of the NSS and SDSR were conducted by a Conservative Party Government, who won the 2015 General Election with an outright majority (Menon & Salter, 2016:1304). The next section will briefly discuss the outcomes of the review as published in the National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence Review 2015.

### 5.4.3 The National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence Review 2015: A secure and prosperous United Kingdom

In the opening paragraph of the introduction of the 2015 National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence Review, Prime Minister David Cameron, who won the 2015 General Election with an outright majority for the Conservative Party, stated that Britain's national security depends on its economic security. Hence in order for the NSS to be effective, Britain needs a strong economy (HM Government, 2015:5). Slightly different than the 2010 NSS, the 2015 Review immediately introduced the issue of the British economy. However, the vision articulated in the 2015 Review remains essentially the same as the vision for the 2010 NSS. The 2015 Review's vision statement reads as follows:

*“Our vision is for a secure and prosperous United Kingdom, with global reach and influence. Everything we do in the UK and around the world is driven by our determination to protect our people and our values, and ensure that our country prospers” (HM Government, 2015:9).*

In order to achieve this vision, the 2015 Review sets out three national security objectives. Objective One is to “protect our people”, Objective Two to “project our global influence” and Objective Three to “promote our prosperity”. Similar to the 2010 NSS, the 2015 Review emphasises Britain's role in the world, stating that the UK plays a strong, positive role in the world by projecting its power, influence and values in order to shape a secure and prosperous future (HM Government, 2015:13). The review also highlights Britain's commitment to the rules based international order by stating that:

*“The rules-based international order is founded on relationships between states and through international institutions, with shared rules and agreements on behaviour. It has enabled economic integration and security cooperation to expand, to the benefit of people around the world. It has done much to encourage predictable behaviour by states and the non-violent management of disputes, and has led states to develop political and economic arrangements at home which favour open markets, the rule of law, participation and accountability. The UK has consistently championed this framework” (HM Government, 2015:20).*

The 2015 Review also dedicated an entire chapter to Britain's global influence, which emphasises the importance of strong alliances and partnerships. According to the 2015 Review, Britain's security and stability are dependent on its strong Euro Atlantic partnership, including NATO. The Review goes further by stating that Britain will deepen its security, defence and intelligence

relationships, particularly focusing on cooperation with the US, France and Germany (HM Government, 2015:50). Regarding Britain's relation with the EU, the 2015 Review states that Britain will continue to foster closer cooperation between the EU and other institutions, primarily NATO, in order to support Britain's national priorities to improve Euro-Atlantic security. The view articulated in the 2015 Review is that a secure and prosperous Europe is essential for a secure and prosperous Britain (HM Government, 2015:53). Interestingly, the 2015 Review also mentions that Britain is in the process of negotiating with the EU, to effect reforms that will make the EU more competitive, flexible and democratically accountable. According to the 2015 Review, these reforms would make the EU a stronger partner for economies around the world that would like to invest. The Review concludes the section dealing with the EU by stating that Britain is planning for a referendum on EU membership by the end of 2017 (HM Government, 2015:53).

As envisaged by the 2015 Review, the referendum did take place and on 23 June 2016, 52% of the British electorate voted in favour of Britain leaving the EU. According to Wiersma (2016:85), the referendum results were perceived as a setback for the then Conservative Prime Minister, David Cameron, who campaigned for Britain to remain in the EU. Due to this defeat, Cameron stepped down as Prime Minister and was succeeded by Conservative PM Theresa May. PM May was given the responsibility of organising an orderly Brexit.

### **5.5 Theresa May and 'Global Britain'**

In February 2017, the Conservative-led British Government under the Premiership of Theresa May decided to trigger Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty, which officially started the process for Britain to leave the EU (Wiersma, 2016:85). According to Chalmers (2017:2), the decision by Prime Minister May to trigger Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty indicated May's commitment to restore full national control over issues such as economic regulation and migration. This argument is supported by Goodwin and Ford (2017:13), who argue that during the early months of her premiership, Prime Minister May attempted to reorient the Conservative Party toward traditional social conservatism and the English nationalism in order to unite Leave voters to support the Conservative Party.

Soon after triggering Article 50, Prime Minister May called for a General Election to be held in June 2017. According to Hobolt (2018:40), May called for the 2017 General Election in order to strengthen the Conservative Party Government's hand in the Brexit negotiations. However May's strategy did not pay off and the Conservative Party was forced to form a coalition with the small, ultra-conservative, right wing Northern Irish Party and the Democratic Unionist Party in order to remain in government (Hobolt, 2018:40).

Despite the disappointing election results, May forged ahead with leading Britain out of Brexit. With the fresh mandate she received from the 2017 snap-election, Prime Minister May decided to reconfigure expectations about Britain's foreign policy by creating the idea of a Global Britain (Glencross & McCourt, 2018:582). According to Glencross and McCourt (2018:586), Prime Minister May saw Brexit and the subsequent realignment of Britain's foreign policy as an opportunity to build a truly global Britain, re-establishing Britain as a "great global trading nation". Glencross and McCourt (2018:585) further argue that the Conservative Government under Prime Minister May was of the view that Brexit would unlock Britain's untapped potential, because without the restraints of European integration, Britain would be able to shape decisions across the globe and also contribute to a safer world by promoting Britain's values and interests in every part of the world. This view is echoed by Chalmers (2017:3), who states that the repatriations of power from the EU to the UK would provide Britain with new opportunities. Without the yoke of EU rules and regulations, Britain would be able to craft a national approach to foreign policy which would allow, for example, the use of sanctions and trade concessions as a policy instrument without consulting EU courts and authorities.

It is thus clear that Brexit marked an interruption in British foreign policy and created new expectations surrounding Britain's role in the world (Glencross & McCourt, 2018:583). According to (Lawson, 2018), Brexit and other changes in the international security environment also prompted the Conservative Government under the leadership of Prime Minister May to initiate the National Security Capability Review (NSCR).

### **5.5.1 National Security Capability Review**

According to Lawson (2018:3), the NSCR that was initiated after the 2017 General Election, was based on the assumption that the framework contained in the National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence Review (SDSR 2015) remained valid. This is also reflected in the 2018 NSCR which states that Britain's NSC concluded that the national security objectives identified by the SDSR 2015 should continue to frame Britain's approach to national security (HM Government, 2018:3). Hence according to the NSCR, Britain's national security objectives remained as follows (HM Government, 2018:9):

- "Protect our people
- Project our global influence
- Promote our prosperity."

One major difference between the NSCR and the SDSR 2015 is the fact that the NSCR was developed after Britain made the decision to leave the EU, and Prime Minister May decided to reconfigure Britain's foreign policy in order to reflect Britain's post Brexit posture and promote her

vision of a “Global Britain” (Glencross & McCourt, 2018:582). Therefore the NSCR explicitly states that:

*“While the UK has chosen to leave the EU, we are unconditionally committed to European Security and defence and want to work closely with our European Partners to keep all our citizens and our continent secure”* (HM Government, 2018:5).

Similar to the 2010 NSS, SDSR and the SDSR 2015, the 2018 NSCR dedicates an entire section focussing on Britain’s role in the world. The section entitled “Our Global Britain vision and values” describes Britain as a global free trading nation with one of the most open and connected societies in the world. The section further articulates that Britain has the world’s sixth largest economy and the most globalised economy in the G20 group. The NSCR further emphasises that Britain is an open outward looking European country, who champions the rules based international system (HM Government, 2018:7). The section further elaborates on Britain’s relationship with its allies such as the US, NATO and the EU as partners, and highlights the importance of cooperation in the field of security.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

When considering the content of the 2010 NSS and SDSR, as well as the SDSR 2015 and the NSCR, it is clear that when the Conservative Party came to power in 2010 there was a definite shift in Britain’s foreign and defence policies. The statement by Prime Minister Cameron in 2010, namely that: “the moral and ethical dimensions of foreign policy” would be deemed less important and that Britain would embark on a pragmatic (realist) foreign policy with a stronger focus on economic interest (Rees, 2011:32), provided a clear signal that Britain was officially moving away from the liberal “ethical and moral” foreign and defence policy that was initially advocated by New Labour under PM Tony Blair. This view is supported by Wiersma (2016:87) who states that Britain’s post Brexit posture showed signs of a movement away from value driven, rules-based international cooperation, to a more transactional approach to foreign affairs. Similarly, Chalmers (2017:9) states that Brexit is likely to deepen the trend towards a security policy focussed on the national interest. Such a shift, according to Chalmers (2017:9), will see Britain embark on a foreign and security policy that is fundamentally different from the moral and ethical internationalism advocated by Tony Blair and New Labour.

Analysing Britain’s NSS and related documents also shows that there is a clear focus on national security and national interest, which clearly indicates that Britain is moving away from a more liberal approach to security. Acknowledging that national security identifies the state as the referent object of security (Liotta, 2002:475), it can be concluded that Britain’s security policy, at

least since the 2010 elections, has had a strong focus on national security. It is therefore safe to conclude that the resurgence of nationalism in the UK has resulted in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation. The fact that the term “human security’ is not mentioned in any of the security strategies published by the British Government since 2010 further proves this point.

However, although the resurgence of nationalism in the UK has resulted in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation, the rise of British nationalism does not mean that Britain will not be part of the globalised world and globalisation. To the contrary, the NSS and documents that flowed from the NSS makes it clear that Britain is planning to continue to play a key role on the international stage. It is also clear that Britain will remain both an importer and exporter of the processes and structures of globalisation. Importantly this will be done on British terms in order to promote British interest. It is thus clear that by leaving the EU and escaping from the constraints of integration, Britain is attempting to maintain the balance between nationalism and globalisation, by exploiting the benefits of globalisation to serve its national interests.

## **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION**

### **6.1 Introduction**

In the period following the end of the Cold War, Britain was one of the main exporters of neoliberalism and by extension, globalisation and the processes of globalisation. Acknowledging Britain's integral role in the process of globalisation, as well as its role in establishing international organisations, the decision by the British electorate to leave the EU indicated a drastic change in British foreign policy. This change in Britain's foreign policy gave rise to the question of whether nationalism is on the rise in Britain and whether the resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that will diminish the human security approach associated with globalisation. In an attempt to answer this question, four secondary research questions were formulated. Each of these research questions were discussed in Chapters 2 to 5. In order to conclude this dissertation, the following section will provide a brief conclusion of each research question as provided in each of the respective chapters. This chapter will conclude after careful integration and interpretation of the all the arguments and relevant theories to answer the primary research question: *"Will the resurgence of nationalism in the UK result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation?"*

### **6.2 Answering the research questions of the study**

#### **6.2.1 Research Question 1: How are state security approaches related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism?**

The first research question was assessed and explored in Chapter 2 of the dissertation. It therefore addressed the question of how state security approaches are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism. This was done by a providing a brief overview of the origins of realist thought and reflecting on classical realism and neorealism. Chapter 2 concluded that both realism and neorealism are theories primarily concerned with the survival and security of the state. Hence according to realism and neorealism, the referent object of security is identified as the state. In Chapter 2, nationalism is linked to the state by arguing that it can be defined as the ideology of the nation state, or even the higher idea of the nation state, thus forming a critical component of the state. The different components that constitute the state were also analysed and it was concluded that nationalism is a critical component of the state. In the final paragraphs of Chapter 2, it was argued that nationalism is a crucial component of the state, and the realist theory identifies the state as the referent object of the state. Therefore, it can be deduced that state security approaches are related to neorealism and state-centric nationalism.

### **6.2.2 Research Question 2: How are human security approaches related to neoliberalism and ultimately globalisation?**

The second research question: “How are human security approaches related to neoliberalism and globalisation?” was addressed in Chapter 3. This was done because liberalism provided an alternative and opposing view to realism and neorealism. In order to explore the tension between realism and liberalism, Chapter 3 provided a brief overview of liberal theory by analysing the origins of liberal thought ranging from classical liberalism to contemporary liberalism and neoliberalism. The link between liberalism, neoliberalism and globalisation were also established, by stating that neoliberalism promotes its own brand of capitalist restructuring, described as globalisation.

The concept of globalisation, and the impact that globalisation may have on the state, were also discussed in Chapter 3. The chapter concluded that globalisation might pose a certain level of conflict with concepts such as the nation state and nationalism. In the final part of Chapter 3, liberalism was linked to human security by stating that human security is a liberal concept, due to the fact that human security is primarily focussed on the individual. Chapter 3 concluded that liberalism prioritises the rights of individuals. Thus when dealing with issues of security, the referent object of security, according to the liberal school of thought, is the individual. This is in direct contrast with realism, where the referent object of security is the state. Against this background, the concept of human security and its manifestations in international relations and security were discussed. The chapter concluded by highlighting the main differences between realism and liberalism.

### **6.2.3 Research Question 3: Are neorealism and state-centric nationalism on the rise in the UK, and if so, what are the main reasons?**

The objective of the third research question was to assess and conclude whether neorealism and state security-centric nationalism are on the rise in the UK, and if so, to determine the main reasons for this. This was done based on the theoretical foundation established in Chapters 2 and 3 which linked the theoretical approaches of realism and liberalism to the concepts of nationalism, globalisation, national security and human security. Chapter 4 therefore provided a case study on Britain’s decision to leave the EU.

The case study provided a background/historical context to the build-up to the 2016 referendum, and also assessed the possible reasons which led to the pro Brexit referendum results. Through an historical overview, it was established that nationalism has always been part of Britain’s psyche. However, events such as the 2005 London bombings, the global economic recession of

2008, the influx of foreign migrants, together with a perception that the power of national governments was transferred to unelected technocrats in the EU, resulted in the rise of nationalism in the UK.

The nationalist temperature was further raised by an increasingly Eurosceptic Conservative Party with an affinity for Thatcherism. In order to stay in power, the Conservative Party was forced to appease small, populist, right wing parties like UKIP, and even enter into a coalition with the ultra-conservative, right wing Northern Irish Party and the Democratic Unionist Party (Hobolt, 2018:40).

It was concluded in Chapter 4 that increased insecurity, poverty and unemployment, immigration and the perceived loss of sovereignty were the main drivers behind the rising nationalism among those left behind by the liberal agenda of the previous Labour regime. The Conservative Party influenced by other populist right wing parties like UKIP, was effective in harnessing the resurgence of nationalism to put Britain back on a Thatcherite, Eurosceptic trajectory, dominated by a neorealist approach to international relations.

#### **6.2.4 Research Question 4: How can a balance be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK?**

The aim of the fourth research question was to determine how a balance can be found between rising state-centric nationalism and maintaining the principles of globalisation in the UK. This research question was addressed in Chapter 5. Chapter 5 analysed the historical relation between Britain and globalisation, reflecting on Britain's imperial history. The dynamics and interaction between British nationalism and European integration were also discussed. This was followed by an overview of Britain's national security strategy. The conclusion drawn at the end of Chapter 5 states that the rise of nationalism in the UK resulted in a state security approach that diminished the human security approach associated with globalisation. It was also argued that Britain is planning to continue to play a key role on the international stage and that Britain will remain both an importer and exporter of the processes and structures of globalisation. In addition, it was argued that Britain will attempt to remain a key player on the international stage and will continue to protect and enhance its national interest through striking a balance between nationalism and globalisation. The chapter concluded by stating that Brexit could be an opportunity for the British Government to maintain a balance between nationalism and globalisation, by casting off the yoke of EU integration in an attempt to craft a global role for Britain.

### 6.3 Conclusion

On answering the question on whether “The resurgence of nationalism in the UK will result in a state security approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation?” it could be deduced that nationalism experienced a revival in the UK. It was also concluded that the resurgence of nationalism in the UK was a result of increased insecurity, poverty and unemployment, immigration and the perceived loss of sovereignty. Exploited by an increasing Thatcherite Conservative Party, and populist right wing parties like UKIP, the resurgence of nationalism also found its way into the policies of the governing Conservative Party, which resulted in a nationalistic, state security-centric approach that diminishes the human security approach associated with globalisation. It is also the resurgence of nationalism that influenced the British electorate to leave the EU.

The decision by Britain to leave the EU provided a unique opportunity to evaluate the interaction between the two theories of realism and liberalism, especially considering Britain’s imperial history and its role in shaping the world order following the Second World War. Evaluating Britain’s history, it seems that Britain has always opted for a pragmatic approach towards foreign policy, primarily focussed on advancing Britain’s national interest.

When Britain joined the EEC, it was to advance Britain’s national interest. The EEC provided a larger market for British products. At the time the EEC also provided a platform to play a leading role in world politics. However, continued integration and movement toward an ‘ever closer union’ of the EEC and subsequent EU, have always proved to be a challenge for Britain. Margaret Thatcher’s Bruges Speech in 1988 brilliantly captures Britain’s position towards the European Community. The speech also captures the dilemma between realism and liberalism. In her famous speech she stated:

*“We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain, only to see them re-imposed at a European level with a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels” (Thatcher, 1988).*

From her statement it is clear that Thatcher closely associated Britain with liberalism, individual freedom and reduced state interference. Hence liberalism was employed in defence of British sovereignty, opposing the ‘ever closer union’ envisaged by the European Community. However, Britain remained committed to cooperation with the EU, in order to advance its national interest, which falls in the domain of neorealism. According to Tarzi (2004:124), neorealism dictates that states will contribute to the establishment of international regimes if it is in their interest, and will

also comply with the rules of international regimes if it serves their interest and enhances their security.

It is thus clear that Britain has since the end of the Second World War successfully contributed to building international institutions. Britain also played a key role in imposing liberal democratic governance across the globe. Although the liberal foreign policy approach by Britain definitely contributed to a safer, more democratic world, it can be argued that the main objective of British foreign policy has always been to promote Britain's national interest. The focus on national interest, as argued in Chapter 3, is synonymous with a neorealist approach to international relations. Hence it can be argued that Britain has over the past 70 years effectively used liberalism to support its neorealist approach to international relations.

However, in the build-up to the 2010 General Elections, events such as the 2005 London bombings, the global economic recession of 2008, the influx of foreign migrants and the perceived loss of sovereignty served as useful election tools for the Conservative Party. These tools provided the Conservative Party with the necessary ammunition to attack the Labour Party's liberal foreign policy approach.

Considering that the Conservative Party of 2010 was dominated by Eurosceptic Thatcherites (Kidd, 2018:35), Britain was bound to break with its liberal approach to foreign policy when the Conservative Party returned to power following the 2010 General Election. According to Rees (2011:32), the first signs of Britain's departure from a more liberal approach to international relations occurred when Prime Minister David Cameron stated in November 2010:

*“...that the moral and ethical dimensions of foreign and defence policy that had been trumpeted so loudly by New Labour's Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, in 1997, would be less to the fore; pragmatic and economic interests would in future play a larger role.”*

An assessment of the subsequent National Security Strategies that were developed by the Conservative Party Government following the 2010 General Election supports this argument. Authors such as Wiersma (2016:87) and Chalmers (2017:9) argue that Britain's post Brexit stance indicated a movement away from “value driven, rules based” international cooperation to a more transactional approach to international relations. Chalmers (2017:9) also argues that Brexit is likely to deepen the trend towards a security policy focussed on national interest. This trend towards a security policy focussed on Britain's national interest marks a clear break from the ethical internationalism advocated by the Labour Government under Prime Minister Tony Blair.

It is thus clear that when the Conservative Party came into power in 2010, its national security and foreign policies were heavily influenced by the resurgence of nationalism among the British

electorate. Influenced by other populist right wing parties like UKIP, the Conservative Party was effective in harnessing the resurgence of nationalism to put Britain back on a Thatcherite, Eurosceptic trajectory, dominated by a neorealist approach to international relations. The return to nationalist traditionalism also meant that Britain's security and foreign policy would be primarily focussed on national interest and state security.

The renewed focus on national interest and state security by the Conservative Party Government also meant that the human security approach that is usually associated with globalisation would be drastically diminished. The Conservative Party's stance on immigration is a clear example of the diminishing role that human security will play in the foreign and security policies of the British Government under the leadership of the Conservative Party.

Hence, while the Conservative Party remains in power, Britain is likely to follow a Thatcherite approach to international relations, combining elements of nationalist traditionalism with economic globalisation (O'Reilly *et al.*, 2017:830). Under the leadership of the Conservative Party Government, Britain is likely to focus its foreign and security policies on its national interest and state security, moving away from the human security approach associated with globalisation.

From this study it is clear that Brexit is primarily a Conservative Party project (Kidd, 2018:39), driven by nationalist traditionalism. However, considering the fact that the majority of the British electorate aged under 49 (Goodwin & Heath, 2016:326; Nouvellet, 2017:31) were in support of Britain remaining in the EU, this could mean that Brexit, and Britain's return to realism and state-centric nationalism, might be short lived. The recent return to state-centric nationalism could perhaps just be the last kicks of a dying Thatcherite horse.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Audi, R. 2009. Nationalism, Patriotism, and Cosmopolitanism in an Age of Globalization. *Journal of Ethics: An International Philosophical Review*, 13(4):365-381.
- Bachmann, V. & Sidaway, J.D. 2016. Critical review: Brexit geopolitics. *Geoforum*, 77:47-50.
- Baldwin, D.A. 1997. The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*, 23(1):5-26.
- Baradat, L.P. 1999. Political ideologies : their origins and impact: Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice Hall, c1999. 7th ed.
- Baun, M.J. 1995. The Maastricht Treaty as High Politics: Germany, France, and European Integration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 110(4):605-624.
- Bellamy, R. 2015. Liberalism: Political Doctrine and Impact on Social Science. (In Wright, J.D., ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)*. Oxford: Elsevier. p. 26-31).
- Berrington, H. & Hague, R. 1998. Europe, Thatcherism and traditionalism: Opinion, rebellion and the Maastricht treaty in the backbench conservative party, 1992–1994. *West European Politics*, 21(1):44-71.
- Biscontini, T.J. 2018. European Union (EU). *Salem Press Encyclopedia*: Salem Press.
- Blair, T. 2009. Doctrine of the international community: Ten years later. *Yale J. Int'l Aff.*, 4:5.
- Blanchet, G. 2002. Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Contribution to International Relations Theory. *Glendon Journal of International Studies*, 2.
- Britannica. 2019. Liberalism. *Britannica Academic*. <https://academic-eb-com.nwulib.nwu.ac.za/levels/collegiate/article/liberalism/117288> Date of access: 5 March 2019.
- Brown, G.W., McLean, I. & McMillan, A. 2018. Eurosceptic. <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199670840.001.0001/acref-9780199670840-e-1654> Date of access: 01 January 2018.
- Bryman, A. 2012. Social research methods: Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2012. 4th ed.
- Bulmer, S. 2008. New Labour, New European Policy? Blair, Brown and Utilitarian Supranationalism1. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 61(4):597-620.

- Burgess, S. & Edwards, G. 1988. The Six plus One: British policy-making and the question of European economic integration, 1955. *International Affairs*, 64(3):393.
- Buur, L., Jensen, S. & Stepputat, F. 2007. The security-development nexus. [electronic resource] : expressions of sovereignty and securitization in Southern Africa: Uppsala : Nordiska Afrikainstitutet ; Cape Town : HSRC, 2007.
- Buzan, B. 1983. People, States & Fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era: Ecpr Press.
- Cambridge Editorial. 2006. Speeches that changed the world : the stories and transcripts of the moments that made history. [New ed. ?]. London : Quercus.
- Chalmers, M. 2017. UK foreign and security policy after Brexit.  
[https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/201701\\_bp\\_uk\\_foreign\\_and\\_security\\_policy\\_after\\_brexit\\_v4.pdf](https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/201701_bp_uk_foreign_and_security_policy_after_brexit_v4.pdf)  
 Date of access: 03 July 2019.
- Chandler, D. 2003. Rhetoric without responsibility: the attraction of 'ethical' foreign policy. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5(3):295-316.
- Chandler, D. 2008. Review essay: human security: the dog that didn't bark. *Security Dialogue*, 39(4):427-438.
- Chatterjee, S. 2003. Neo-realism, Neo-liberalism and Security. *International Studies*, 40(2):125-144.
- Clapham, C. 2002. The Challenge to the State in a Globalized World. *Development & Change*, 33(5):775.
- Cloete, F. 2007. Data analysis in qualitative public administration and management research. *Journal of Public Administration*(6):512.
- Coetzee, C.J. 2001. Public Management and Governamnce: Methodology (Study Guide). Potchefstroom: Pu vir CHO.
- Cooper, R. 2012. Britain and Europe. *International Affairs*, 88(6):1191-1203.
- Corbett, S. 2016. The Social Consequences of Brexit for the UK and Europe. *International Journal of Social Quality*, 6(1):11-31.

- Cristol, J. 2009. Morgenthau vs. Morgenthau? "The Six Principles of Political Realism" in Context. *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 31(4):238-244.
- Daddow, O. 2009. 'Tony's War'? Blair, Kosovo and the Interventionist Impulse in British Foreign Policy. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 85(3):547-560.
- Daddow, O. 2013. Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 15(2):210-227.
- De Vogli, R. 2011. Neoliberal globalisation and health in a time of economic crisis. *Social Theory & Health*, 9(4):311-325.
- Dinan, D. 1994. The European Community, 1978-93. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 531:10-24.
- Doyle, M.W.J.R.O.I.S. 1990. Thucydidean Realism. 16(3):223-237.
- Dreher, A., Gaston, N. & Martens, W.J.M. 2008. Measuring globalisation. [electronic resource] : gauging its consequences: New York : Springer, 2008. 1st ed.
- Eichenberg, R.C. & Dalton, R.J. 1993. Europeans and the European Community: The Dynamics of Public Support for European Integration. *International Organization*, 47(4):507-534.
- Elman, C. 2008. Realism. (In Williams, P., ed. Security Studies: and introduction. Oxon: Routledge. p. 15-28).
- Evans, A. 2018. Planning for Brexit: the Case of the 1975 Referendum. *Political Quarterly*, 89(1):127-133.
- Evans, G., Curtice, J. & Norris, P. 1998. New labour, new tactical voting? The causes and consequences of tactical voting in the 1997 general election. *British Elections & Parties Review*, 8(1):65-79.
- Evans, S. 2009. The Not So Odd Couple: Margaret Thatcher and One Nation Conservatism. *Contemporary British History*, 23(1):101-121.
- Fakiolas, E.T. 2011. Human and national security: a relation of contradiction or commonality? *Journal of Southeast European & Black Sea Studies*, 11(4):369-384.

- Fielder, L. 2018. Is Nationalism the Most Serious Challenge to Human Rights? Warnings from BREXIT and Lessons from History. *Texas International Law Journal*, 53(2):211-237.
- Flemmen, M. & Savage, M. 2017. The politics of nationalism and white racism in the UK. *British Journal of Sociology*, 68(Suppl 1):S233-S264.
- Fontana, C. & Parsons, C. 2015. 'One Woman's Prejudice': Did Margaret Thatcher Cause Britain's Anti-Europeanism? *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53(1):89-105.
- Forde, S. 1995. International Realism and the Science of Politics: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Neorealism. *International Studies Quarterly*, 39(2):141-160.
- Freedon, M. 1998. Is nationalism a distinct ideology? *Political Studies*, 46(4):748.
- Gilmore, J. 2015. Still a 'Force for Good'? Good International Citizenship in British Foreign and Security Policy. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 17(1):106-129.
- Glencross, A. 2015. Looking Back to Look Forward: 40 Years of Referendum Debate in Britain. *Political Insight*, 6(1):25-27.
- Glencross, A. & McCourt, D. 2018. Living Up to a New Role in the World: The Challenges of "Global Britain". *Orbis*, 62(4):582-597.
- Gliddon, P.M. 2017. The Labour government and the battle for public opinion in the 1975 referendum on the European Community. *Contemporary British History*, 31(1):91-113.
- Goldmann, K. 2002. Internationalisation and the nation-state: Four issues and three non-issues. *European Journal of Political Research*, 41(3):N.
- Goldstein, W. 1992. EUROPE AFTER MAASTRICHT. *Foreign Affairs*, 71(5):117.
- Goodwin, M. & Milazzo, C. 2015. Britain, the European union and the referendum: What drives euroscepticism. *Chatham House*:6.
- Goodwin, M.J. & Ford, R. 2017. Britain after Brexit: A nation divided. *Journal of Democracy*, 28(1):17-30.
- Goodwin, M.J. & Heath, O. 2016. The 2016 Referendum, Brexit and the Left Behind: An Aggregate-level Analysis of the Result. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(3):323-332.
- Gotowicki, S.H. 1997. Confronting Terrorism: New War Form or Mission Impossible? *Military Review*, 77(3):61.

- Her Majesty's Government. 2010a. Securing Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The Strategic Defence and Security Review. <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/> Date of access: 03 July 2019.
- Her Majesty's Government. 2010b. A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The National Security Strategy. <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/> Date of access: 03 July 2019.
- Her Majesty's Government. 2015. National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015: A Secure and Prosperous United Kingdom. [www.gov.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.gov.uk/government/publications) Date of access: 03 July 2019.
- Her Majesty's Government. 2018. National Security Capability Review. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-security-capability-review-nscr> Date of access: 03 July 2019.
- Gower, M. 2015. Immigration and asylum: changes made by the Coalition Government 2010–2015. *House of Commons Library: Standard Note SN/HA/5829.26(05)*. <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN05829#fullreport> Date of access: 30 June 2019.
- Greenfeld, L. 2011. The Globalization of Nationalism and the Future of the Nation–State. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 24(1-2):5-9.
- Haas, E.B. 1986. What is nationalism and why should we study it? *International Organization*, 40(3):707-744.
- Hasan, M. 2010. The bulletproof case against Blair. *New Statesman*, 139(4986):24-28.
- Heron, T. 2008. Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency(Issue):85.
- Heywood, A. 1997. *Politics*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, England : Macmillan.
- Hobolt, S.B. 2016. The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9):1259-1277.
- Hobolt, S.B. 2018. Brexit and the 2017 UK General Election. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56(S1):39-50.
- Hussain, M. 2017. *The European Union : on the verge of global political leadership*: Singapore : Palgrave Macmillan, [2017].

- Işksal, H. 2003. Security, Globalisation, and Problems within the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership in the post Cold War Era. *Journal of Economic & Social Research*, 5(1):139-152.
- Jackson, R.J. & Jackson, D. 1997. A comparative introduction to political science: Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice Hall, c1997.
- Jones, D.M. & Smith, M.L.R. 2015. Return to reason: reviving political realism in western foreign policy. *International Affairs*, 91(5):933-952.
- Kacowicz, A.M. 1999. Regionalization, Globalization, and Nationalism: Convergent, Divergent, or Overlapping? *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*. 24(Issue):527.
- Kaldor, M. 2004. Nationalism and Globalisation. *Nations & Nationalism*, 10(1/2):161-177.
- Kendall, G.P. 2003. From liberalism to neoliberalism.
- Kenealy, D. 2016. How Did We Get Here? A Brief History of Britain's Membership of the EU. *Britain's Decision Facts and Impartial Analysis for the EU referendum on 23 June 2016*:12-16.
- Kennedy-Pipe, C. & Vickers, R. 2007. 'Blowback' for Britain?: Blair, Bush, and the War in Iraq. *Review of International Studies*, 33(2):205-221.
- Kidd, C. 2018. The great moving right show. *New Statesman*, 147(5438):34-39.
- Klarevas, L. 2004. Political Realism. *Harvard International Review*, 26(3):18.
- Korab-Karpowicz, W.J. 2010. Political realism in international relations. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/realism-intl-relations> Date of access: 06 February 2019.
- Krause, K. & Williams, M.C. 1996. Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40(2):229-254.
- Landrum, B. & Garza, G. 2015. Mending fences: Defining the domains and approaches of quantitative and qualitative research. *Qualitative Psychology*, 2(2):199-209.
- Larmore, C. 1990. Political Liberalism. *Political Theory*, 18(3):339-360.
- Lawson, E. 2018. The UK National Security Capability Review and The Fusion Doctrine. <https://rusi.org/commentary/uk-national-security-capability-review-and-fusion-doctrine> Date of access: 03 July 2019.

- Leffler, M.P. 1990. National Security. *The Journal of American History*, 77(1):143-152.
- Lind, M. 2016. Revenge of the Nation-State. *National Interest*(146):18.
- Liotta, P.H. 2002. Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, 33(4):473-488.
- Lynch, T.J. 2009. Liberalism and neoliberalism. *New Directions in US Foreign Policy*. Routledge. p. 62-75).
- Martell, L. 2008. Britain and Globalization. *Globalizations*, 5(3):449-466.
- Martin, M. & Owen, T. 2010. The second generation of human security: lessons from the UN and EU experience. *International Affairs*, 86(1):211-224.
- Matlary, J.H. 2008. Much Ado about Little: The EU and Human Security. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 84(1):131-143.
- Matthijs, M. 2017. Europe After Brexit. *Foreign Affairs*, 96(1):85.
- May, A. 2013. The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945–73. *The Round Table*, 102(1):29-39.
- McCarthy, J. & Prudham, S. 2004. Neoliberal nature and the nature of neoliberalism. *Geoforum*, 35(3):275-283.
- McDonald, M. 2002. Human security and the construction of security. *Global Society*, 16(3):277-295.
- Menon, A. & Salter, J.-P. 2016. Brexit: initial reflections. *International Affairs*, 92(6):1297-1318.
- Mölder, H. 2018. *British Approach to the European Union: From Tony Blair to David Cameron. Brexit*. Springer. p. 153-173).
- Moravcsik, A. 1992. *Liberalism and international relations theory*: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University Cambridge, MA.
- Morgenthau, H.J., Thompson, K.W. & Clinton, W.D. 2006. *Politics among nations : the struggle for power and peace*. 7th ed. /. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Morris, T. 2012. Achieving national security: comparing four state security models. *Police Practice & Research*, 13(2):121-137.

- Mowle, T.S. 2003. Worldviews in Foreign Policy: Realism, Liberalism, and External Conflict. *Political Psychology*, 24(3):561-592.
- Mullen, A. & Burkitt, B. 2003. European Integration and the Battle for British Hearts and Minds: New Labour and the Euro. *The Political Quarterly*, 74(3):322-336.
- Navari, C. 2008. Liberalism. (In Williams, P., ed. *Security Studies: an introduction*. Routledge. p. 29-43).
- Newman, E. 2001. Human security and constructivism. *International studies perspectives*, 2(3):239-251.
- Northedge, F.S. 1970. Britain As a Second-Rank Power. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 46(1):37-47.
- Nouvellet, P. 2017. Age matters in the UK's Brexit referendum. *Significance*, 14(4):30-33.
- O'Reilly, J., Froud, J., Johal, S., Williams, K., Warhurst, C., Morgan, G., Grey, C., Wood, G., Wright, M., Boyer, R., Frerichs, S., Sankari, S., Rona-Tas, A. & Le Galès, P. 2017. Brexit: understanding the socio-economic origins and consequences. *Socio-Economic Review*, 14(4):807-854.
- Paris, R. 2001. Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security*, 26(2):87-102.
- Peck, J. & Tickell, A. 2007. Conceptualizing neoliberalism, thinking Thatcherism. *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*, 26:50.
- Pert, A. 2011. The Good International Citizenship of the Rudd Government. *Australian Year Book of International Law*, 30:93-145.
- Phelan, S. & Dawes, S. 2018. Liberalism and Neoliberalism. <http://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-176> Date of access: 26 February 2018.
- Pinder, J. 1985. European Community and Nation-State: A Case for a Neo-Federalism? *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 62(1):41-54.
- Quinn, T., Bara, J. & Bartle, J. 2011. The UK Coalition Agreement of 2010: Who Won? *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 21(2):295-312.

- Ray, M. 2019. Euroskepticism. *Britannica Academic*. <https://academic-eb-com.nwulib.nwu.ac.za/levels/collegiate/article/Euroskepticism/605114> Date of access: 28 May 2019.
- Rees, W. 2011. Britain and the Wider World. *Defense & Security Analysis*, 27(1):31-41.
- Reynolds, D. 2017. Twilight of the postwar era. *New Statesman*, 146(5368):32-37.
- Richmond, O.P. 2006. Human Security and the Liberal Peace: Tensions and Contradictions. *Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*(Issue 2):75.
- Ritchie, N. 2011. Rethinking security: a critical analysis of the Strategic Defence and Security Review. *International Affairs*, 87(2):355-376.
- Robinson, D. 2013. Migration policy under the coalition government. *People Place and Policy Online*, 7(2):73-81.
- Robinson, W.I. 1998. Beyond Nation-State Paradigms: Globalization, Sociology, and the Challenge of Transnational Studies. *Sociological Forum*, 13(4):561.
- Roland, P. 2006. Bringing the Leviathan Back In: Classical versus Contemporary Studies of the Liberal Peace. *International Studies Review*, 8(3):425.
- Sampson, T. 2017. Brexit: The Economics of International Disintegration. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(4):163-184.
- Schmidt, A. 1996. Globalization, Neoliberal Ideology, and National Identity: The Historical Uncertainties of NAFTA. *Caribbean Studies*(1):67.
- Smith, G. 1992. BRITAIN IN THE NEW EUROPE. *Foreign Affairs*, 71(4):155-170.
- Snyder. 2004. One World, Rival Theories. *Foreign Policy*(145):53.
- Snyder, J. 2019. The Broken Bargain: How Nationalism Came Back. *Foreign Affairs*, 98(2):54-60.
- Southerland, J.E. 2018. Margaret Thatcher. *Salem Press Biographical Encyclopedia*. <https://nwulib.nwu.ac.za/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ers&AN=90669674&site=eds-live> Date of access: 29 May 2019.
- Spaak, P.H. 1963. Hold Fast. *Foreign Affairs*, 41(4):611.

- Steinnes, K. 1998. The European Challenge: Britain's EEC Application in 1961. *Contemporary European History*, 7(1):61-79.
- Switzer, T. 2015. THE END OF THE EVIL EMPIRE THE AGE OF THE AMERICAN ATLAS. *Institute of Public Affairs Review*, 67(1):14.
- Tarzi, S.M. 2004. Neorealism, neoliberalism and the international system. *International Studies*, 41(1):115-128.
- Thatcher, M. 1988. Speech to the College of Europe.  
<https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332> Date of access: 03 June 2019.
- Thomas, M. & Thompson, A. 2014. Empire and Globalisation: from 'High Imperialism' to Decolonisation. *The International History Review*, 36(1):142-170.
- Thomas, N. & Tow, W.T. 2002. The utility of human security: sovereignty and humanitarian intervention. *Security Dialogue*, 33(2):177-192.
- Tombs, R. 2016. The English revolt. (cover story). *New Statesman*, 145(5324):22.
- Troitiño, D.R. 2014. The British Position towards European Integration: A Different Economic and Political Approach. *Baltic Journal of European Studies*(1):119.
- UNDP. 1994. Human development report 1994. (978-0-19-509170-00-19-509170-1).
- Venter, D.J. 2004. The European Union and South Africa. Northcliff, South Africa: Richard Havenga.
- Vines, E. 2015. A Common Appeal: Anglo-British Nationalism and Opposition to Europe, 1970–1975. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 61(4):530-545.
- Viotti, P.R. & Kauppi, M.V. 2001. International relations and world politics : security, economy, identity. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ : Prentice Hall.
- Wahl, P. 2017. Between Eurotopia and Nationalism: A Third Way for the Future of the EU. *Globalizations*, 14(1):157-163.
- Wallace, H. 1997. At Odds with Europe. *Political Studies*, 45(4):677-688.
- Wallace, H. 2013. The UK: 40 Years of EU membership. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 8(4).

- Wallace, W. 1973. British external relations and the European Community: The changing context of foreign policy-making. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 12(1):28.
- Walt, S.M. 1998. International relations: one world, many theories. *Foreign Policy*:29-46.
- Waltz, K.N. 1979. Theory of international politics: Reading, Mass. : Addison-Wesley, c1979.
- Waltz, K.N. 1990. Realist thought and neorealist theory. *Journal of International Affairs*, 44(1):21.
- Wheeler, N.J. & Dunne, T. 1998. Good International Citizenship: A Third Way for British Foreign Policy. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 74(4):847-870.
- Wiersma, J.M. 2016. Brexit and the Future of European Security and Defence Cooperation. *Security and Human Rights*(Issue 1-2):85.
- Williams, P. 2008. Security studies : an introduction: London ; New York : Routledge, 2008.
- Williams, S. 1995. Britain in the European Union: A way forward. *Political Quarterly*, 66(1):5.
- Wilson, P. 2015. Three Emerging Security Challenges for the UK. *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations*, 29(3):373-389.
- Wimmer, A. 2019. Why Nationalism Works and Why it isn't going away.  
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2019-02-12/why-nationalism-works> Date of access: 14 February 2019.
- Wolfers, A. 1952. "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(4):481-502.