

Economic Analysis of Law Review

The Main Causes Of BREXIT And Possible Consequences For The Future Of The Europe Union.

Yong Wang¹
University of Ohio

Wilson Almeida²
Universidade Católica de Brasília

Yuri Ribeiro de Oliveira³
Universidade Católica de Brasília

RESUMO

Este artigo pretende analisar, sem o objetivo de esgotar o tema - o que encontra-se apenas em seu início - uma reflexão sobre o conjunto de fatores que desencadeou o Reino Unido se separar do resto da União Européia, que foi denominado como BREXIT, através de uma votação que ocorreu entre os países membros do Reino Unido-Reino Unido (Escócia, Inglaterra, Irlanda do Norte, País de Gales) para obter a vontade da maioria de sua população. Historicamente, a união da região com o bloco sempre foi algo cercado de controvérsia, uma vez que sempre esteve com uma série de exceções aos padrões vinculativos para outros membros, no que parecia ser um arranjo bem adaptado aos interesses britânicos. Dada a relevância do Reino Unido para o bloco e vice-versa, é extremamente importante identificar o que o resultado do recente referendo sobre separação pode significar. Como as implicações são dadas em todos os segmentos de atividade e afetam diretamente toda a sociedade em todo o mundo com qualquer relação direta ou indireta com as partes interessadas, a opção aqui adotada é restringir a análise às questões comerciais. Dado que o tema é tão recente, foi de grande importância a análise de artigos escritos por jornalistas e especialistas na União Européia, uma vez que a bibliografia de grandes estudiosos sobre o assunto ainda está em fase embrionária.

Palavras-Chaves : Reino Unido, União Européia, Comércio, BREXIT, Efeitos.

ABSTRACT

This article aims to provide, without the goal to exhaust the matter - which is only in its beginning - a reflection on the set of factors that triggered the UK will to separate from the rest of the European Union, which had the mark called BREXIT, consistent in a vote that took place between the United Kingdom member countries (Scotland, England, Northern Ireland, Wales) in order to get the will of the majority of its population. Historically, the union of the region with the block was something surrounded by controversy since it always was with a number of exceptions to the binding standards for other members, in what appeared to be an arrangement well suited to British interests. Given the relevance of the United Kingdom to the block and vice-versa, it is exceedingly important to identify what the outcome of the recent referendum on separation may mean. Because the implications are given over all segments of activity and directly affect the entire society worldwide with any direct or indirect relationship with the stakeholders, the option here is to restrict the analysis to trade issues. Given the theme is so recent, it was of great importance the analysis of articles written by journalists and experts in the European Union since the bibliography of great scholars about the matter still is in an embryonic stage.

Keywords: United Kingdom. European Union. Commerce. BREXIT. Effects.

R:17/04/2017 A:30/04/2017 P: 01/08/2018

¹ E-mail: wangy@ohio.edu

² E-mail: 88walmeida@gmail.com

³ E-mail: yroliveira@hotmail.com

1. Introdução

Economists like Diane Coyle, professor of economics at Manchester University, agrees that trade is the main channel through which the economic cost of BREXIT will be realized. Several studies have tried to estimate the implications of the referendum for the United Kingdom and other countries and the conclusion is that the negative effects will be global and will be manifested mainly by trade. Concerns can be didactically divided into two categories: firstly, the direct effects of the UK move away from the single European market, which today accounts for almost half of the exports due to the gigantic size of the market with 513 million consumers and 21 million small and medium-sized enterprises; second, the indirect effects related to the implications of trade policies, which can be divided into three:

1. By withdrawing from the single market of the European Union, the United Kingdom can't be a party to free trade agreements of the bloc, which give privileged access to many important markets. There will be a need to replace these conventions with their own arrangements with other nations and initial difficulties to trigger negotiations because they can no longer guarantee offers that give access to the common market, that is, in practice there will be economic and political weakening;

2. There will be a competitive disadvantage for UK companies at first, since several parallel negotiation processes will have to be set up, with substantial use of time and resources;

3. The United Kingdom has no autonomous trade policy since it became a member of the European Economic Community, when it came under the exclusive competence of the EU, thus, although BREXIT reintroduces a return to the more primitive concept of national sovereignty, in the current context of the market this may imply a greater risk. The post-referendum government is exposed to major protectionist pressures that have special interests in the background.

Economic research has shown that migration facilitates foreign trade and new empirical evidence indicates that firms that hire immigrants can increase their external transactions. In this way, as immigration control is one of the key points of the pro-BREXIT campaign, it is important to analyze the influence of this point on the economy.

Aside from these negative aspects, when leaving the single market, Britain avoid having to contribute to the EU budget, it is free of the need to agree to regulations from Brussels

on internal matters and is open to deal about the circulation of people in its territory in a way that is most advantageous.

This article will examine whether or not the negative economic effect, derived from the adverse trade conditions that are imposed, would be underestimated, the costs of exit, how will be affected the transactions with the main trading partners of the UK, how the migration limit affects the economy and what are the options to circumvent the immediate decline in British economic indicators, all without forgetting the proper historical contextualization of what may have led to the current state of things, consistent of a break with a model that apparently was working.

1. European Construction

The constant addition of new members to the common market - enlargement policy - and the relentless usurpation of jurisdiction over a myriad of domestic affairs - policy of deepening - are the two key factors for achieving the result shown in the British polls after the recent popular consultation.

This process of "legal usurpation" has taken place through bureaucratic decrees and treaties with hidden intentions, which many of the affected citizens have only real knowledge after a long time of their ratification. In this sense it's included:

1. Treaty of Rome (1957), whose fundamental objective was the creation of a supranational entity with its own personality - European Economic Community (EEC) - aiming to form a Common Market. To that, all kinds of Community barriers should be removed and an external agenda established for the formation of the common market over a transitional period of 12 years, where several objectives should be achieved: defense of intra-community competition, adoption of a common commercial policy against third parties, adoption of common policies in the agriculture and transport sectors, the coordination of economic policies, the approximation of national legislation, the creation of a social fund to improve the standard of workers living, the establishment of a European Investment Bank to facilitate the expansion the Community and so on;

2. European Communities Act (1972), provides for internal legal enforcement of the accession of the United Kingdom to the European Union, giving precedence to European law in the British courts;

3. The Single European Act (1986) enshrined the free movement of goods, services and persons;

4. Schengen Agreement abolished many of the internal borders of the European Union allowing free passport movement in most of the block. Only six of the twenty-eight member states are outside this zone: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Ireland, Romania and the United Kingdom. This agreement had its name coming from the city of Schengen, Luxembourg, where the agreement was signed in 1985. Its entry into force occurred in 1995;

5. The Maastricht Treaty, also known as the "Treaty on European Union", was responsible for the creation of the European Union and was signed in Maastricht, the Netherlands, on February 7, 1992 by 12 Member States, reflecting their respective intentions in the Creation of a common economic and monetary union. It was aimed at unifying policies of defense, currency and citizenship among all members. It entered into force on November 1, 1993 with the creation of the bloc and since then has been amended by numerous other treaties;

6. Treaty of Amsterdam endorsed by the European Council and signed on October 2, 1997 by the fifteen member countries of the European Union. It entered into force on May 1, 1999 after ratification by all Member States. Its main objectives were to modify certain rules of the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties establishing the European Communities (Paris and Rome) and certain acts related to them, and did not replaced previous ones, merely supplemented them. It was harshly criticized, mainly because of its democratic deficit arising from the lack of transparency in the discussions that preceded it. In addition, there have been numerous shortcomings to its reforms: it did not prepare the bloc for its potential growth; it was a very timid move towards a political union, and important areas such as police and judicial cooperation and common foreign and security policy have been left in the background;

7. Treaty of Nice adopted in December 2000 and signed in February 2001, three and a half years after the signing of the Treaty of Amsterdam. It aimed to prepare the institutions of the European Community to work with the representatives of the ten new Member States. It deals basically with four institutional issues: the replacement of unanimity to qualified majority voting in decision-making processes, enhanced cooperation between some members, the weighting of votes in the Council and the size and composition of the Commission;

8. Treaty of Lisbon, document drawn up by the members of the European Union aiming to reform and amend certain legislative features. It came to light after six years of debate and was concluded in 2007, with the signature of most European countries, and came into force from 2009. It is controversial, as it grants greater power to the bloc to the detriment

of the sovereignty of the National States. Its main objective is to strengthen the European Parliament and the national parliaments, which can take joint action as long as they are agreed by a majority of the members. In this way, the functioning of the European Council takes place through the adoption of decisions by the favorable vote of at least 55% of national parliaments representing 65% of the population. There was also been an increase in the political power of the citizens of the bloc who can intervene and request political-bureaucratic changes if they organize themselves into groups of more than one million citizens, thus recognized. As for leaving the Union, what could not happen before, is possible if there is internal approval and notice of one year, without necessary justification before the others in the group. The European Parliament recognizes decision-making power over social and sovereign issues, such as: control over immigration/emigration policy, issues related to the internal security of countries and terrorist attacks, integration of legislation, stipulation of programs for sustainability and so on. Various posts are created, including one of the leadership of the European Council with powers to chair and direct sessions of any kind and ensure institutional functioning.

The EU-UK relationship has been historically difficult. In the 1960s French President Charles de Gaulle objected to British membership, then, being out of the front, the United Kingdom joined the European Union in 1973 and in 1975 held a referendum on his entry, at which time more than two-thirds of voters opted to remain. Despite this, many citizens later complained and presented resistance to integration claiming that what was then a trade association evolved into something else, an expanded linkage where powerful institutions such as the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice Have been able to achieve aspects of private life by diluting British sovereignty.

Because of the importance and political-economic-military magnitude of Britain in the context of which it is inserted, Continental Europe has bent to keep it in the bloc and thus has allowed it to evade monetary union and fiscal rules, do not be part of the Schengen border control reduction zone, its contributions to the common budget are reduced and it is practically exempt from all integration measures which do not relate directly to the Common Market. In addition, the EU adjusted its rules on the free movement of labor to ease the British populist labor free movement and the European Central Bank and other economic regulators allowed London to be the financial center of the euro zone.

Hence comes the doubt about what else they might want. For this questioning that the study of the historical context of the integration is important, since the answer finds roots in the beginnings of the adhesion. The United Kingdom has always opposed further integration

and movement towards fiscal and political union, which limits the possibility for the European Union to strengthen its institutional framework. At the same time, it has always been rigid and vigilant in its attempt to preserve and improve the single market for goods and services and a strong advocate for market-based reforms. This has led to a twofold approach to the way the continent is viewed: one group of countries is pursuing an ever closer integration and another contingent is mainly interested in maintaining the free movement of goods and services such as UK, some Nordic countries and others.

2. The decision of the British people and its possible consequences

BREXIT is an abbreviation for "British exit" and refers to the June 23, 2016 referendum in which British citizens voted to leave the European Union. The outcome of the vote led to the following immediate effects: global market turmoil causing the pound to fall to its lowest level in decades and the then Prime Minister David Cameron, who supported the UK's stay, resigned in July 13.

The European Union insists that if a country wants to have access to its markets, it must accept the whole body of the *acquis communautaire*, ie the whole range of EU legal acts, judicial decisions and bureaucratic regulations which, to a large extent, have nothing to do with free trade and serve only to affirm supranational governance and subversion of national sovereignty from its traditional purpose, touching issues ranging from banalities like models of uniforms of sports teams to the legal codification of culture, education and immigration policy. With the UK voting to leave the European Union, its citizens have chosen to get rid of more than 13,000 common acts, norms and regulations, but on the other hand, they want to continue economic relations with the continent.

According to proponents of staying in the bloc, leaving the EU will open up uncertainty for UK-based businesses that may decide to leave, change some of their activities or at least open a subsidiary in the Union. The reaction of financial markets is difficult to predict but experts like Sarah Hewin says it will include a weakening of the pound against the euro, as well as a decline in the euro and currency-denominated assets. According to these, the crisis of 2008, as in other countries, has caused a profound inequality in Britain, and in this sense, those who voted in favor of BREXIT would be clamoring for a change of economic model and channeling their frustration opposing the permanence of their country in the Union.

Proponents of exit believe that there will be two main benefits: the UK will be able to control migration more effectively and will be able to get rid of too intrusive legislation and

regulation, especially with regard to financial services. Moreover, the defense of sovereignty is prominent in the discourse, although some believe that nothing would change much and negotiations with the bloc would continue in a peaceful and prosperous way, because the British participation already happened with mitigation of the applicability of many of the rules common.

There is now an opportunity for companies to identify the areas in which repeal of common legislation may reduce their costs. With the change of relationship and trade relations with the rest of the world, there will also be great international opportunities as well as threats, and commercial analysts should be able to identify these divergent points. While some argue that the relevant trade balances between the UK and third countries, as much specific may be less advantageous to the British than those agreed with the EU with its 28 countries; others, understand that with manumission, one can be able to go beyond what the bloc as a whole could offer in terms of global levels of liberalization and the focus should be on trade with former Union partners and with major nations around the world, especially the United States and the BRICS (especially China and India) and the possible existence of good reasons for London guarantee the European Union do not reside in the area of trade and investment.

With this result, Europeans are expected to move forward with integration, as they will be free from a member who has always had serious misgivings about the bloc's existence. If the exit is not stormy and detrimental to the interests of those who are leaving - which could foster the tendency for some regions with a breakaway bias also to come out, weakening the common market until it takes in a few years its irrelevance - it's waited a great cohesion in some fields. The first area has to do with the integration of the capital markets and a fight between Paris and Frankfurt can be foreseen to assume the space vacated by London as financial capital of Europe. The second area is cultural: Europe is replete with relics of the past that need preserving and often costing beyond the possibilities of local governments. Given the importance of culture for attracting tourists and their significant repercussions among small European countries, a common and beneficial regulation for all is expected. The third area is transport and, on this point, it is noted that there are still unnecessary border difficulties, caused by different road and rail systems, in stark contrast to the United States, for example.

3. Production and Trade Scenarios

International trade has grown considerably in recent decades, and by 2014, according to the World Bank, the value of exports of goods and services between the different countries

around the world was ten times that of 1970. In addition, by an analysis of the gross domestic product (GDP) it is easy to see that economies have become more interdependent and linked to foreign trade in general, which opening doubled over the same period. Similarly follows the UK economy.

The adoption of more open trade policies is a good explanation of why trade has made GDP grow so significantly in recent decades, in addition to contributing to technological advances and decrease transport costs. In this scenario, natural geographical barriers lose much of their importance and many companies feel tempted to market with foreign markets.

Despite this, only a small part of the companies have entered the international market and one of the explanations is the change in the scenario of trade and production. According to HATZIGEORGIU and LODEFALK (2016):

The fragmentation of supply chains, companies' division of different aspects of production between countries, together with the increasing role of services in the economy, are two trends that have altered the framework of current trade policy. Fragmentation implies that goods and services are often traded within corporations or production networks, which implies that trade barriers no longer impede merely the final link of trade transactions, but rather the whole process from production to delivery. Progress towards global value change is blurring the distinction between exports and imports.

In addition, developed nations increasingly classify themselves as service economies because of the growing global importance of services and industrialization, which is true especially for the UK economy where almost 80 percent of GDP is in the tertiary sector, something much above of the European average. Trust/risk, norms/regulations have become more significant factors in the commercial context, and such barriers dominate what conventionally had higher operating costs and these obstacles to informal trade greatly affect the British.

There is a risk that with the exit of the bloc, the United Kingdom will not be able to maintain access to the third-country market at the current level. In addition, it will be excluded from existing agreements and deprived of future global agreements that the European Union is negotiating with several strategic countries around the world, such as Japan and the United States. Regardless of being able to negotiate new free trade agreements, this is a fact that depends on some external factors. Because of the relevance of the American market and fraternal ties between nations, this would be the natural bilateral agreement to be sought and, according to studies by the Center for Economic Policy Research in London, a potential Transatlantic Partnership for Investments and Commerce, could increase the United King-

dom's GDP over a period of 10 years at an estimated value of 0.14 to 0.35 per cent. However, the president of the United States, at the time of the outcome of the referendum, has made repeated declarations through his diplomatic corps that the British can not expect any special treatment and will be behind "queuing" with the exit of the EU.

With BREXIT, UK companies will not overcome a competitive disadvantage of restricting access to the market quickly enough to avoid losses, since current trade agreements have a great complexity and scope to be relevant. As internationalization today represents more than one country producing goods nationally and refer others for exhibition and sale, contemporary trade agreements follow the increase in the heterogeneity of the global economy, so that production is fragmented and divided between national borders into global chains of value with companies combining manufacturing and buying and selling services, which contributes to the increase in the level of knowledge and experience required to succeed in finalizing trade agreements that provide real market access for firms. This series of complications elucidates why the current average time for the EU to seal a new trade agreement is seven years, despite the large number of specialist staff and wide range of resources available in many Member States.

Trade negotiations, like any other, have to do with compromise and, to be more relevant, should be premised on a level playing field between the parties involved. The European bloc is the world's second largest economy in terms of purchasing power, ahead of the United States and just behind China. Its population is 513 million people, which would make it the third most populous "nation" in the world, losing only to India and China. Even with the favorable outcome to BREXIT, the European Union is still among the three largest economies, but the United Kingdom loses its capacity to boost the influence of one of the world's most powerful economies and must rely only on its own greatness, which will mean fall in some positions in its GDP. Thus, the common market is more likely to reach trade agreements with third countries than the British acting on its own account, since there will be a natural reduction in Britain's political and trade influence because it is outside a multilateral trading system of such magnitude.

In a scenario where EU trade policy has exclusive competence, there is a limitation on the influence of special national interests, which are the lobby of companies and sectors seeking protection from what they call "unfair foreign competition", since there is a Series of anti-dumping measures. With BREXIT, it is natural for protectionist pressures to rise and the position that will be adopted by the national administration is uncertain as governments tend to

find more plausibility in national interests than in foreign ones. This trend is even more worrying given that, during the referendum campaign, the problems of the British steel industry - for instance - found external factors as culprits.

4. The impact of migration on British

Both trade and migration are central elements of globalization and, therefore, have gained relevance over time. Thus, the United Kingdom is a perfect example of a globalized economy as it is very open to such issues, so that it is one of the most important countries of migration in the world, either to leave or, mainly, to input of different peoples. About twelve percent of the total population, eight million people, is made up of foreigners, which is above the average of neighboring countries. On the other hand, it is estimated that 5.5 million Britons live in other nations, especially Australia, the United States, Canada and scattered throughout the EU where Spain stands out as the second largest set of citizens outside the United Kingdom. Almost a third of Britons living abroad are looking for countries in the bloc, and of the 30 most popular destinations 11 are with a contingent of 5.1 million people.

In a period of rapid growth in the United Kingdom, between 1970 and 2010, the grouping of international migrants living in the UK as a share of the total population doubled and thus came the question: what contribution have they made to this development?

According to neoclassical theories of international trade, trade and migration are substitutes, but they may be complementary. Since migrants have a good understanding of the culture, politics, language, and other characteristics important to the business of their home countries, they end up facilitating the access to networks that provide opportunities to stimulate trade with their former homelands which is true in this particular case, due to the dependence on trade and the large mass of immigrants and emigrants.

According to scholars of the field and the countless research that has done over the years, there are three main channels through which migration influences the decisions of companies for export and import through lower commercial costs (HATZIGEORGIOU; LODEFALK, 2016):

1. Migrants can reduce business costs and increase trade through extensive domestic information about their home countries and have a good ability to communicate in foreign languages, as well as helping companies to adapt their products and marketing for the particularities of each location and at different times;

2. Have contacts and access to social and business networks in their homeland, which helps to promote trust between buyers and sellers from different countries and facilitate the execution and drafting of contracts limiting opportunistic behavior;

3. Can affect trade through their personal preferences and search for products from their home country.

These three biases emphasize that both emigration and immigration have the potential to increase a country's foreign trade. The correlation between migration and trade is stronger in exchanges with different countries, where there are weak institutions and when there's differentiated products. According to studies (GENC et al., 2012), a ten percent increase in a country's immigrant grouping is associated with a 1 to 2 percent increase in foreign trade.

Most research points to a statistically significant relationship between migration and trade. The BREXIT could disturb the market due to changes in the bloc and the commercial policy conditions and, above all, the tightening of migration that was one of the points defended in the referendum by those who cried out.

5. Brexit and future of globalization

The global political, economic, social and psychological tremors of the vote by the BREXIT may reverberate for many years to come. Despite the magnitude, there was a great distance from US media coverage - except financial pages - which largely ignored coverage of the referendum until the last moments before the vote. According to the publication THE NEW AMERICAN (2016), the few who reported this matter echoed the "Fear Project" campaign against the exit, which was supported by former British Prime Minister David Cameron, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, President Barack Obama, the billionaire investor George Soros, the International Monetary Fund, the global banking system, the globalist political elites of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal British Institute of International Affairs. According to the representatives of this project, with the exit, the local economy would go into shock, jobs and pensions would evaporate, global markets would collapse and more a whole apocalyptic scenario worthy of Hollywood overproductions.

The message that has been passed is of great importance as it represents the first major setback in the European project since the Union was launched as the Community of Coal and Steel in 1951, as well as being a major blow to the "New World Order", a globalist scheme of world governance, of which the European Union is one of the forerunners and model for similar regional agreements.

In the nearly seven decades since the launch of the integration project, this ideal was for an organization of six Member States - West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg - with supranational authority on coal and steel production, until change to a common market - the European Economic Community - to come to what is now known today as the European Union. Each one of these stages involved a gradual transfer of powers and attributions from sovereign nations to a centralized bureaucracy based in Brussels, Belgium, and in each of these steps the leaderships hold the same promise: they assure to their citizens that this cohesion takes place for development and will always be guarantee the essential characteristics of national sovereignty and national independence governed by the principles of transparency and accountability. Indeed, the opposite is true: corrupt elites in Brussels are constantly enriched at the expense of usurping an increasing share of power by using these means to coerce and bribe politicians and national constituencies to provide a perpetuation of this acquired status.

Among the numerous topics in which the European Union has usurped internal legal powers - fisheries policies, agricultural subsidies, over-regulation, tax issues, criminal justice, defense, social policies and so on. - the issue of migration and refugees has been of major concern to the British citizen, and therefore of major importance in the recent referendum. The awakening occurred with the migratory crisis with the apex from 2015 and the permanence in those rails was seen as a dangerous tendency that would mean a national and cultural suicide. Despite the non-adherence to the Schengen Agreement, the United Kingdom has seen EU Member States absorb impotent the entry of 1.5 million refugees, predominantly Muslim, only in 2015, which makes it difficult to restrict their borders while tied to the bloc (THE NEW AMERICAN, 2016).

Following the spreading of the referendum, seen as a rejection of Britain's ruling elite - today there is a widening gap between rulers and governed - some dissonant voices still come up with the idea of continuing repeating the voting until voters reach the "correct" result, the permanence in the EU with an ever closer union, much to the liking of globalists, according to which voters chose to weaken the economy, reduce their international position and create enormous uncertainty in the name of abstract concepts of independence and sovereignty.

Some members of the Council on Foreign Affairs, the Royal Institute for International Affairs, the Brookings Institution, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberg Group, the World Economic Forum, the Aspen Institute, among other powerful globalist organizations, insist that it is possible, desirable and essential to ignore and reverse the results of the refer-

endum. Some, to this end, adopt a belligerent stance, as seen in the example below, while others, a softer and conciliatory touch, aimed at different audiences, but united by the same purpose.

According to James Taub (2016), a notorious defender of globalist interests and a great representative of the smug way they approach the issue, "it is time for the elites to rise up against the ignorant masses". And keeps going:

It is necessary to say that people are deluded and that the task of leadership is to un-delude them. Is that "elitist"? Maybe it is; maybe we have become so inclined to celebrate the authenticity of all personal conviction that it is now elitist to believe in reason, expertise, and the lessons of history.

Elites are moving to sabotage BREXIT using a primer they have worked on in the past. The first artifice, as already denounced and promoted by many influential figures, is the request for a new voting. For those who do not believe in this possibility, revisiting history, one can observe the example of what happened when Danish voters rejected the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and ended up being forced to vote again the following year after a campaign full of threats, promises and endless advertisements; in 2005, French and Dutch voters rejected the EU Constitution, however, the globalists renamed it as "Treaty of Lisbon" in an attempt to make it more palatable; in 2008, Ireland held a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty that had been rejected, only to be voted again in the following year.

One of the issues of greatest concern to British citizens was Theresa May's parliamentary choice to replace Cameron as Prime Minister and Conservative Party leader. She was a controversial secretary for migration/refugee issues and campaigned against BREXIT. Although she has assured that she will honor the electorate's desire and will use her post to negotiate a better relationship with skeptics about the bloc, her immediate predecessors made similar promises before shifting sides and joining to the "eurofederalists".

6. Conclusion

The EU exit process will not begin until the UK itself notifies the European institutions of its decision to abandon the project and invokes Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty. The founding members and senior officials at the service of the bloc have been clear: there will be no informal discussions and the exit process must proceed as soon as possible. In addition, a priori, access to the single market, as is desirable - an integration only in the economic field -

can not be maintained if the four freedoms of circulation are not accepted: goods, capital, services and persons. The case of the UK should be exemplary so that there is no fostering of separatist trends that exist in some areas of Europe, so it is hoped that a tough stance will be maintained, although the European Union has been very accommodating to the United Kingdom to sustain its permanence for so long, removing the need for its participation in important treaties, due to its high political, financial and military stature in the context in which it is inserted.

In general, the outcome of the referendum makes the UK less attractive, effective and powerful in terms of trade policy, as well as broad protectionist tendencies, which could jeopardize market access for British companies vis-à-vis companies from other countries Of the European Union, especially the markets that are part of the new type of modern, more comprehensive trade agreement, such as South Korea and Canada, as well as politically and economically powerful nations such as the United States and Japan.

The BREXIT was an important point off the bend in search of genuine representative government backed by a real sovereignty and opposed to a plutocratic form of government. Its immediate effects have proved to be bad, as was to be expected, however, given the magnitude of this decision, any assessment should consider a longer time span.

The Kingdom today is no longer as united as before, and there is a real threat that Scotland and Northern Ireland, who have largely opted to remain in the bloc, want to withdraw from Britain to remain under European influence. For this to not happen, this new take-over of British course must prove viable in a much shorter period of time than expected.

What is certain is that, with British unity remaining with its members as they currently are or not, the battle faced by the United Kingdom will have as its main adversaries the European Union, globalist elites and its attempt to implement the "New World Order " and the challenge of trade experts to prospect for trade arrangements of sufficient importance and greatness to the blow can be as small as possible and to enable, in the medium and long term, the sustainable growth of this emerging free nation.

7. References

BBC NEWS. **Schengen: controversial EU free movement deal explained**, London (UK), Apr. 2016. Available in: <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-13194723>>. Accessed on: Oct. 18, 2016.

CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC POLICY RESEARCH - CEPR. **Estimating the Economic Impact on the UK of a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) Agreement between the European Union and the United States**, London (UK), Mar. 2013. Available in:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/198115/bis-13-869-economic-impact-on-uk-of-tranatlantic-trade-and-investment-partnership-between-eu-and-us.pdf>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.

CUMMING, Douglas J.; ZAHRA, Shaker A.. **International Business and entrepreneurship implications of BREXIT**. *British Journal of Management*, forthcoming, London (UK), July 2016.

Available in: <<http://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=966127081000029118123090006005021108040064059016095049073103079078118023090094010075023058099106014008005096106123127075007107059000075062031064108099072025025093060015001112107102096014126113115099076073108030001118108118077087024123090125123022&EXT=pdf>>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.

DENTON, John W. H.. **Protectionism on the rise as trade growth slows**. *Mondaq Business Briefing*, London (UK), n. 2016, Feb. 2016. Available in: <<http://app.vlex.com/>>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

EL TIEMPO. **Reducen Previsión de Crecimiento de UE**, Miami (USA), July 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

EUROSTAT. **Foreign-born population by country of birth**, Luxembourg City (LUX), May 2015. Available in: <<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tps00178>>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.

FALLAH, Robert. **Potencial implications of BREXIT**. *Mondaq Business Briefing*, London (UK), n. 2016, Feb. 2016. Available in: <<http://app.vlex.com/>>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

FOGT, Howard. **BREXIT – what, when and why?**. *Mondaq Business Briefing*, London (UK), n. 2016, Feb. 2016. Available in: <<http://app.vlex.com/>>. Accessed on: Set. 29, 2016.

FOREIGN POLICY. **It's Time for the Elites to Rise Up Against the Ignorant Masses**, Washington (USA), June 2016. Available in: <<http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/06/28/its-time-for-the-elites-to-rise-up-against-ignorant-masses-trump-2016-brexit/>>. Accessed on: Oct. 18, 2016.

GENC, Murat; GHEASI, Masood; NIJKAMP, Peter; POOT, Jacques. **The impact of immigration on international trade: a meta-analysis**, London (UK), Nov. 2011. Available in: <http://www.norface-migration.org/publ_uploads/NDP_20_11.pdf>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.

HATZIGEORGIOU, Andreas; LODEFALK, Magnus. **The BREXIT trade disruption revisited**. *Journal of International Law and Trade Policy*, Saskatoon (CAN), vol. 17, n. 01, June 2016. Available in: <<http://law.usask.ca/documents/estey-journal/Hatzigeorgiou-Lodefalk17-11ay.pdf>>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.

KIERZENKOWSKI, Rafal; PAIN, Niger; RUSTICELLI, Elena; ZWART, Sanne. **The Economic Consequences of BREXIT: A Taxing Decision**. *OECD Economic Policy Paper*, Paris (FRA), n. 16, Apr. 2016. Available in: <<http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/5jm0lsvdkf6k.pdf?expires=1475245017&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=96C68E48F717ADDE5A41E71CD3410249>>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.

MONDAQ BUSINESS BRIEFING. **BREXIT: a guide to what happens next**, London (UK), n. 2016, Feb. 2016. Available in: <<http://app.vlex.com/>>. Accessed on: Oct. 18, 2016.

MONDAQ BUSINESS BRIEFING. **Webinar: the decision to leave the eu - what next?**, London (UK), n. 2016, Feb. 2016. Available in: <<http://app.vlex.com/>>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

NEW ZEALAND INTERNATIONAL REVIEW. **Brexit: a long march: Rita Ricketts reflects on the recent British vote in favour of leaving the European Union**, Wellington (NZL), vol. 41, n. 05, Sept. 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Oct. 18, 2016.

O GLOBO. **BC monitora BREXIT e diz que adotará medidas se necessário**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), June 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

O GLOBO. **BREXIT estimula clima xenófobo no Reino Unido**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), June 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

O GLOBO. **BREXIT gera incertezas na economia global, diz FMI**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), July 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

O GLOBO. **BREXIT pode fazer brasil sofrer choque pelo mercado**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), June 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

O GLOBO. **Ilan diz que BREXIT é um risco relevante para a economia brasileira**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), June 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

O GLOBO. **Para aplicar na bolsa, agora é preciso levar BREXIT em conta**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), July 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

O GLOBO. **Perguntas e respostas: o que muda no panorama europeu pós-BREXIT**, Rio de Janeiro (BRA), June 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

PBWORKS. **The Treaty of Amsterdam**, San Mateo (USA), Dec. 2008. Available in: <<http://testpolitics.pbworks.com/w/page/20734325/The%20Treaty%20of%20Amsterdam>>. Accessed on: Oct. 18, 2016.

RATLIFF, John. **BREXIT - major upheaval and change**. *Mondaq Business Briefing*, London (UK), n. 2016, Feb. 2016. Available in: <<http://app.vlex.com/>>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

REFORMA. **BREXIT: síntoma de una crisis mayor**, Ciudad de México (MEX), jul. 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY. **BREXIT: the unintended consequences**, Washington (USA), mar. 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Aug. 22, 2016.

THE NEW AMERICAN. **BREXIT: rejecting the globalism**, Washington (USA), ago. 2016. Available in: <app.vlex.com/>. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2016.