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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the influence that immigration, particularly EU immigration played on Britain’s decision to vote leave in the 2016 referendum, and impending withdraw from the European Union. This was done by contextualizing how the United Kingdom adopted a continental immigration policy via the EU, and how this gradually changed in the last 20 years. Findings show that EU immigration into the United Kingdom had consistently and exponentially risen during this period, which had left a large segment of the British population feeling like they needed to show their sentiments towards this, and subsequently voting Leave in the referendum. Secondly, this study thoroughly examines how the Brexit campaign, including the methods used by both the Leave and Remain camps – analyzing the discourse, main points of debate and the critical use of immigration by both sides during the campaign, and how this subsequently shaped the opinion of British voters and the referendum results. Findings show that broadcast media and printmedia specifically had a huge role to play in the referendum and its outcome. Lastly, this study looked at how Brexit has shaped emerging trends in Europe regarding immigration and the rise of far-right politics, and the dangers that this can pose to the future of the Europe Union. It is evident that there has been a notable rise in far-right politics in Europe, whereby, far-right parties use Brexit as an example to follow to ‘reclaim’ their country back from the European Union.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The world is undergoing a rapid and unprecedented change both from an economic perspective as well as from a fluid international power-balance structure. Regional integration is becoming the new face of globalization, as more and more states around the world create or join already existing economic blocks such as the European Union (EU), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and several blocks in Africa such as the East African Community (EAC) and others (Hearn, 2017). The more the world has increased in both cultural and economic integration, the more stable the planet has become with the end of the Cold War ushering in a period of relative stability around the world (Wiener, 2017). It was under this backdrop of increasing interconnectivity that when the news of the United Kingdom (UK) pursued to exit the EU under the banner of “BREXIT” caught the whole world by surprise. The EU has the second largest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the world after the United States of America, enjoys a high standard of living for its citizens and it is by far the most prosperous trading block in the world (Oliver, 2017). Several countries around the world strive to have favorable trade tariffs with the EU with some aspiring to become members. This leaves many asking questions and pondering why the UK would want to leave such a mutually beneficial organization. This paper thus seeks to understand EU immigration’s influence behind the UK’s sudden departure from the European Union at a time when regional integration was increasingly becoming popular among states throughout every corner of the world.
1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The founding of modern day United Kingdom has its origins at the beginning of the 1700s. It was the 1707 Acts of Union which had formally merged together the kingdoms of England and Scotland and had then adopted the formal name of the Kingdom of Great Britain (Breen, 2006). Although the two kingdoms of England and Scotland had united to become one entity it was Acts of Union of 1800 that had incorporated Ireland into the kingdom, thereby forming the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Kingdom of Ireland. However, the people of Ireland had deep seated grievances against the British and had launched a bloody insurgency to attain independence and form their own state as early as the union between Great Britain and the Ireland had been formed in 1801 (TeVelde, 2011). Relative stability brought by the unification of the British Isles had granted the country the chance to become an economic, as well a military superpower in the world with the famous English phrase summing it up, “The sun doesn’t set on the British Empire” (Ferguson, 2004).

Pitts (2005) argues that Britain for the most part of its history had been an empire that had colonies for many years and had not itself been a colony since the demise of the Roman Empire. From the perspective of empires, power is the ultimate goal of any empire, to attain as much power and exercise it over its rivalries and subjugates. Davies (2000) explains that power once attained by nations is extremely corrosive; it gives a false sense of superiority to those in charge and plants the seeds of resentment and inequality in the subjugated. This is illustrated by Crouch (2017) with his elaborate explanation of the pitfalls of European
colonialism primarily in Africa where the scramble for the continents’ resources had led to the creation of artificial borders and laid the foundations for a conflict-ridden future.

Colley (1994) argues that before World War 1 erupted, Britain was the world’s superpower but it had also become the envy of most of Europe’s dominant powers such as the Germans, French and Russian spheres of influence. This heightened sense of fear of the “other” had sparked a satirical revolution among London’s elites who enjoyed seeing satirical drawings which fed their stereotyping of a savage Russian, a lazy Frenchman and an untrustworthy German (Armitage, 2000). These same sentiments were evidently held across all European states who viewed the British in the same regard. This was hastened predominately by the rise of Germany as a challenger to British imperialism and continental dominance. Increasing imperial ambitions and growing calls of nationalism and national pride by European powers, combined with ever growing suspicion amongst each other, and the formation of alliances and counter alliances were a ticking time bomb waiting to be ignited and ignite it did with severe repercussions after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand (Smith, 2003).

Keating (2009) explains that the flames of World War 1 were never truly extinguished with the victory of the allied powers but rather that the flames of xenophobia, racism, ethnocentrism and ultra-nationalism had merely been suppressed.

The period after the first Great War was expected to bring peace to Europe and cease all hostilities across the continent and their respective colonies, however, Schnapper (2002) notes that German ambitions of regaining their lost pride and coming to terms with their humiliating defeat still lingered in the minds of its elites. The rise of Germany as a global power coincided with the decline of the British Empire, which was battling insurgencies across all its colonies in East Asia, the Indian sub-continent and in large parts of Africa.
Indigenous populations were determined to get rid of the colonial powers that had plundered their resources and exploited their people.

Moreover, the rise of the Third Reich in Germany and the emergence of Mussolini in Fascist Italy pointed to a clear sense of twisted nationalism across the continent. Nazism and Fascism fundamentally exist by alienating all those who do not “belong” to society. In the case Hitler’s Germany, it was Jews and other minorities in whom were deemed as undesirables by the Nazis and propagated to the German people as being a norm (Breen, 2006). It was this deeply misguided interpretation of nationalism among many other factors that lead to the Second World War. Crouch (2017) notes that man has always been susceptible to stereotypes and ignorance and that elites in society be they kings, emperors or modern-day politicians have an uncanny ability to manipulate the masses to carry out outrageous acts of violence against what they deem to be undesirable or ‘the outsider’.

The decline of the Soviet Union and the era of western dominance had been predicted by various international relations scholars as ushering a new dawn of peace and prosperity given that the threat of annihilation had now gone away (Greener, 2009). Globalization was touted as being the lasting solution to wars and conflicts around the world and in particular among western powers. The idea was simple, to have the economies of the western world become intertwined and connected such that war was simply too costly to be waged by one single country since it would be the first to suffer economically.

Mitchell (2009) explains that the founding of the European Coal and Steel Commission was aimed at bringing together the main coal and steel making industries of Europe together. For the UK the European project was always viewed with a lot of skepticism, and its politicians
did not see the need to be part of a French and German led organization. This Anglo-Franco rivalry was proven clear in 1961 when France vetoed the UK’s bid to join the then European Economic Community despite it later join the group in 1973 (Ferguson, 2004). Since its membership was accepted in to the EU the UK has always sought to have one foot in and one foot out of the door according to Weiner (2017), because the leadership in London was not ready to full comply with some of the EU’s rules for example the joining the Euro zone.

Another aspect of British resentment towards the EU was its Schengen agreement which was signed in 1985 in Luxembourg which essentially calls for the abolishment of passport-controlled migration among member states. The UK viewed this as giving up part of its sovereignty to the EU because it could no longer control its borders without colliding with the EU with regards to its immigration policies. A significant number of the UK’s population and in particular its older generation felt the EU was ‘consuming’ their country and that it was losing its identity arguing that Brussels controlled immigration, economic policy, trade and to a certain extent even the country’s foreign policy (Crouch, 2017).

Decades later the long-standing grievances the UK held against the EU would reach a critical point when Prime Minister David Cameron lead the country on its membership in the EU through a simple Leave or Stay referendum. In 2012 the PM went to Brussels to renegotiate some of the terms of Britain’s membership to the EU, at the core of his negotiation was the protection of the single market for Non-Eurozone countries, reduction of bureaucracy in business, exempting Britain from "ever-closer union", and restricting EU immigration (Susen, 2017). Prime Minister Cameron himself a staunch advocate of the UK staying in the EU was as Hearn (2017) puts, “facing more pressure from the conservatives in his party and the growing resentment of EU migrants among the British public”. In particular, was the
influx of Polish nationals into the UK, under the freedom of movement act in the EU charter which calls on members to allow for the unrestricted movement of EU citizens in all EU member states. Oliver (2017) notes that the combination of a sluggish economy recovering from the financial crash of 2008 and the steady rise in unemployment levels meant that the few jobs available in the country were being taken up by non-British citizens to the dissatisfaction of many voters.

Furthermore, growing concerns of sovereignty and in particular the European Union’s infringement of the United Kingdom’s sovereignty was a driving factor in calls for Brexit. Mitropolitski (2014) explains that the EU has several laws which its member states are to adhere to and uphold which in some cases means that European laws outstrip national laws. Brexit has been one of the most unpredictable events of the past decade with talk of the UK leaving the EU being held as very unlikely by many political analysts.

1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The vote to exit of the EU by the UK has somewhat proven that national interest is determined by states themselves. Growing discontent and a lack of belief in the EU have started to make other member states question their membership contrasted with what powers they are giving up to the organization. The rise of nationalist and anti-immigration groups in Greece and France are also starting to putting pressure on the EU’s existence with more and more far right parties being elected to public office which are questioning not only the sustainability of the EU but also its place in this modern age of increasing state nationalism (Calhoun, 2017).
Despite various academic studies having been done on factors that influenced Britain’s decision to withdraw from the European Union such as Porters (2016), Delanty (2017), Favell (2017), Peters (2017) and Van Reenen (2016), these works have not adequately looked at the role played by the EU immigration policy in influencing the referendum. However, the studies done on EU immigration and its role in influencing the decision to vote ‘leave’ by scholars such as Sampson (2017), (Ottaviano, Peri & Wright, 2016) and Favell (2017) have looked at the role of immigration through an economic perspective, predominantly discussing the Eurozone crisis caused by Eastern European States weakening the EU financial system. However, they do not sufficiently discuss EU Migration Policy and the role of migration from a socio-cultural aspect, where resentment of foreigners could’ve played a role in the referendum. Even though studies carried out on Nationalism and Britain’s withdrawal from the EU by authors such as O’Toole (2016), Rachman (2017) and Williamson (2017), they do not form any links and connections between the two variables. These studies do not clearly address the role of generational and ideological differences that exists in some segments of the society and their influence in the decision to vote leave. Understanding how EU immigration shaped the outcome of the decision is not clearly and adequately highlighted in these studies. This study thus seeks to identify, analyze and explain how EU Immigration may have pushed the United Kingdom to vote leave and withdraw from the European Union.

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to assess EU immigration’s influence on Britain’s decision to vote ‘leave’ in the referendum of 2016, and withdraw from the European Union, herein referred to as Brexit. This study will be guided by the following objectives:
1. To examine how EU immigration into the United Kingdom has changed in the last 20 years.
2. To investigate whether EU immigration influenced the British people’s decision to ‘vote leave’.
3. To assess whether Brexit has had an effect on EU immigration in EU member states.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study will be answering the following questions:

1. How has EU Immigration into the United Kingdom changed in the last 20 years?
2. Did EU immigration influence the decision to vote leave?
3. Has Brexit had an effect on EU immigration in EU member states?

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The rise of far-right parties and leaders who have hardline-stance on immigration have disappointed and shocked many who expected regional integration to strengthen around the world. The world is undergoing a tense and unpredictable change at the moment and new faces are emerging in the international system riding high on the wave of nationalism and anti-immigration with the promise of restoring their countries glorious past.

With the rise of UKIP in the UK and the National Front in France, which both advocate for their respective countries to leave the EU provides a compelling reason to assess the factors that may push a country to leave a supranational entity such as the EU. The rise of such political parties and leaders thus makes assessing Brexit that more relevant given the rapidly
changing nature of the international system from being globalized and integrated, to a more isolationist approach being favored by states across the world. The study aims to contribute to the pool of knowledge regarding regional disintegration and the impact it has on the international socio-economic and political system. The study also aims at providing policy makers and the academic community at large on the significance of Britain`s decision to withdraw its membership from the EU.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this study is limited to looking at Brexit, EU immigration in the United Kingdom, Europe and the European Union. However, this study shall be looking at the common characteristics around the world that is shared with the United Kingdom and the European Union. The study shall draw similarities and differences when it is suitable and when elaborating on some arguments made for the purpose of presenting a contextual, well-rounded research study based on the information collected. The study shall be focusing on why Brexit occurred, using immigration into the United Kingdom as the focal point to address the objectives of the study.

1.6 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

The rest of the chapters will be analyzed as follows. Chapter one presents the general background, objectives of the research and key concepts of this study. Chapter two will be a detailed literature review of previous works done regarding the research topic. Chapter three will look at the methodological approach taken by the study which will involve the collection and presentation of data in a systematic manner. Chapter four will be a thorough analysis of findings for the study objectives in regards to how EU Immigration influenced Britain’s
decision to vote leave and withdrawal from the EU. Chapter five will be a summary of the data findings and recommendations on further areas of study in the future with regard to the research topic.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

There have been a number of publications regarding immigration in Britain, and due to the recent events of Brexit more contemporary works are available which discuss and highlight the history of immigration into the United Kingdom. Ian R.G. Spencer’s publication: British immigration Since 1939 is one of the commonly discussed books, as it encompasses the contemporary history of immigration in Britain starting from pre-world war, Spencer addresses not only the different forms of immigration which Britain experienced during that period, but most importantly the manner in which the state and the British people reacted to this change, while also critically discussing the policies adopted by the government during this time. For a more historical approach regarding immigration in Britain literature works such as Panayi are most acknowledged, a balanced yet realistic description of not only immigration since the 1800’s but also the changes in public attitude towards immigration and also the experience of Britain at the time through the eyes of the immigrants themselves. More contemporary works discussing the link between immigration and Brexit are also widely used in this thesis such as Harold et al, Why Britain Voted to Leave the European Union which discusses not only the different factors that drove the vote, but also an unbiased description and explanation on why immigration played the role it did. Other similar works which will be studied and used are those of Ben Ryan, Alasdair Palmar and David Wood whose thesis revolve around the future approach Britain should adopt towards immigration post Brexit and the timeline which this should happen within.
Keating (2009) in his writings raises significant doubts as to whether Britain was ever fully on board with the idea of European economic, social and partial political integration since the inception of the European project. From the onset there were serious grievances Britain had against the EU and its predecessor the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (ECC) ranging from political to economic disagreements. Calhoun (2017) notes that the idea of Brexit had been in the minds of many prior to the referendum being held citing the 1975 referendum on whether the UK should continue being part of the then European Community. The results of that referendum were a staggering 62.7% voted for the UK to stay in the European Community which laid the foundations for anti-European sentiments in the country (Abbas 2007).

Brexit has been one of the most unpredictable events of the past decade with talk of the UK leaving the EU being held as very unlikely by many political analysts. Weiner (2017) points out the pitfalls of being in the EU despite its numerous benefits although he argues that it is in states nature to revert to their own innate own interests. This exit of the UK has somewhat proved his point that national interest is determined by states themselves. Growing discontent and a lack of belief in the EU have started to make other member states question their membership contrasted with what powers they are giving up to the organization. The rise of nationalist groups in Greece and France are also starting to putting pressure on the EU’s existence with more and more far right parties being elected to public office which are questioning not only the sustainability of the EU but also its place in this modern age of state nationalism (Calhoun, 2017).
2.2 RESURGENCE OF NATIONALISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

2.2.1 ECONOMIC DIMENSION

Economic inequality has been every country’s Achilles heel and a rallying point for the masses to cause revolutions throughout history (Bulmer & Solomon, 2009). Economic decline in the past decade particularly in the west has left many skeptical about globalization with jobs being lost at an unprecedented number. In the US for example Hearn (2017) notes that most big companies have moved their production facilities to Mexico and China due to low costs of production and long-term profitability. The exodus of large home-grown companies has spread across the world and in particular in Europe with unemployment starting to gradually rise. The UK for example according to an online survey has lost close to 150,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector with key firms increasingly choosing oversees to maximize profits (Newstatesman, 2016).

2.2.2 SOCIO-POLITICAL ASPECT

Growing resentment about political inclusivity, dwindling wages of the middle and low-income classes has significantly led to a mass rejection of the post-cold war international order globally. Morphet (2013) makes the argument that worsening economic fortunes of most white middle income class has culminated in the total distrust of the political elites with regards to safe guarding national interests. Critics of a globalized and economically interconnected world such as Delanty (2008) point to the financial crisis of 2008 which almost destroyed the financial structures of the world causing economies to shrink and millions to become homeless and unemployed throughout the world. Delantys’ sentiments are also echoed by Slapin(2011) who claims that
the pitfalls of a connected world economically were highlighted by the 2008 crisis as well as the emergence of transnational terrorist groups. The liberalization of the world immigration policies for example is by far the main arguments of anti-integration supporters who argue that relaxed borders such as the Schengen agreement hampers the ability of individual states to regulate their borders, an integrated EU poses more dangers to them as compared to before and during the cold war (Esposito, Welch & Campbell, 2013).

2.3 FAR RIGHT PARTIES IN EUROPE

The dawn of the 21st century has seen the fundamental existence of the EU challenged by anti-integration proponents who argue their individual nations are losing their sovereignty to the organization. The combination of failing states in the Middle East and elsewhere leading to the exodus of millions of refugees combined with poor economic growth and growing sense of national, religious and cultural identity has shaken the organization to its core. The rise of far-right nationalist populist groups with distinct anti-EU rhetoric and their surprise success in gaining electoral seats in governments has caused alarm in Brussels the heart of the EU parliament (De Haas, 2008).

2.4 LEAVE CAMPAIGN

From the onset those advocating for the UK to withdraw from the EU presented their arguments in a more emotional manner rather than a fact-based approach. Porters (2016) notes that the UK withdrawing from the EU was presented to the average citizen as a simple issue summarized by a Yes or No option while this was the furthest from the reality. The complexity of the issue was presented by the Remain camp as an economical phenomenon
wrapped in a shroud of economic and financial jargon, while the Leave camp utilized and played on people’s frustrations and fears propagating a message based on the politics of fear. By far what stood out in the campaign of both camps on the referendum was the use of provocative language and imagery. Both sides relied on billboards with their respective messages and far the most factually incorrect billboards were used by the Leave camp. Van Reenen (2016) notes that the argument that Britain sends an average of 350 million pounds weekly to the EU was grossly exaggerated pushing people to increasingly view the EU in a negative light. Perhaps what illustrates the use of uncanny imagery was the picture behind chief Leave advocate Nigel Farage at a press conference showing a line of refugees in Greece with the title “Breaking Point”.

Despite standing on the extreme side of the spectrum regarding Britain’s future on Brexit, both the Leave and Remain camps ultimately relied on a single factor: Fear. The Remain camp propagated the unknown pitfalls and the irrevocable damage that will be done to the economy should the UK leave the EU (Ottaviano, Peri & Wright, 2017). As for the Leave camp the politics of fear was their single rallying point, the fear of unchecked immigration, the fear of being dominated by the EU, the fear of losing their national and culture, the fear of an overburden social NHS and welfare system. Sampson (2017) noted that when people do not have sufficient information or lack and in-depth understanding of something they tend to be easily swayed by the side that feeds into their prejudices and stereotyping thereby voting with an irrational justification.
Central to this use of fear is the Leave camp`s arguments on immigration for instance which it claims has ruined the UK. Peters (2017) points out those allegations of unchecked and uncontrolled boarders are unfounded arguing that the UK is not part of the Schengen area and therefore has control of those who enter its boarders. Critics of the UK`s boarder policy make the argument that the immigrants that propagated the Leave camp to success are not non-Europeans but rather immigrants from EU member states such as Poland (Porters, 2016). These immigrants the Leave camp argued cause unemployed since they compete with British citizens with the jobs available within the UK causing a significant increase in the number of unemployed people which put a strain on the countries welfare system. Delanty (2017) explains that with the onset of automation and increased online jobs have led to increasing loss of jobs not only in the UK but also across the world, combined with the relocation of factories to China and India due to cheap labour have all led to an increase in unemployment and rise in the number of European migrants coming to Britain.

2.5 IMMIGRATION

An ever-expanding EU the Leave campaign argue continues to put significant pressure on the UK through the EU`s freedom of movement among its members (Van Reenen, 2016). The Leave campaign argue that since the global economic crisis of 2008 more and more people from former Eastern European countries are coming into the UK and taking low skill jobs meant for unskilled Britons. Porters (2016) collaborates that since the financial crises and the joining of the Eurozone by former Soviet States such as Romania have played a role in the weakening and leading to the eventual cause of the Eurozone Crisis.

Throughout the campaign the Leave camp based the core of their justifications of leaving the EU based on what they term as unregulated European migration policies. Nigel Farage head
of the Leave campaign is on record saying that the UK government has no control over what kind of people enter the country, and for those that enter they are unskilled workers who do not add any significant value to the economy arguing instead they are a burden to the social welfare system (Ottaviano, Peri & Wright, 2016). Sampson (2017) explains that increasing numbers of unemployment in the UK combined with a growing resentment of foreign workers formed a perfect cocktail of a voting public that wanted to make their voice heard by those political elites in London and elsewhere who overwhelmingly benefit from the EU at their expense.

However not all those who voted for Brexit because of immigration are vehemently opposed to migration rather they want a better efficient and effective immigration policy. Some of these supporters include current Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn who want an immigration policy based on skills such as the systems used by Australia, and Canada which is based on a point system ranging from language to technical skills allowing for more highly skilled immigrants to come thereby fostering innovation and economic growth (Centre for European Reforms, 2016).

Lastly the European migrant crisis has also been a focal point for the Leave campaign with millions of migrants escaping conflicts in the Middle East and Africa come to Europe. The civil wars in Libya and most recently Syria have unleashed a wave of thousands of people trying to reach the shores of Europe from Libya and Turkey. The Leave camp advocates argue that the Schengen agreement allows refugees to move freely in Europe and a good number of those refugees want to come to the UK through France and Germany. Sampson (2017) points out that the unrest in the Middle East, the refuge crisis and the rise of terror
groups such as ISIL and their attacks throughout Europe pose a serious security threat to the National security of the UK.

2.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study will use several theories in International Relations to effectively examine the role of nationalism in the 21st century. To understand and explain the influence of nationalism in modern political systems this study will use three theories ground firmly in the realm of international relations which are: Nationalism, and Realism.

2.6.1 NATIONALISM

Nationalism is a political ideology that is centered on the concept of the nation state. Nationalism combines the ideological tenets of the state and it revolves around the identity of people in relation to their national identity. Nationalisms infuses the political and social structures of individuals together with an overarching obligation to the state and its territory (Hage, 2000). Nationalism has had an immeasurable impact on human civilization dating back to the earliest known record of mass human settlements up to the modern day. Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his book The Social contract of 1762 points to the pitfalls of nationalism arguing that political nationalism can be fuelled to lead to wars among nations. He points to the brittle nature of national identification markers in Europe which at the time were based on religious and ethnic markers which can be used to turn people against each other. The devastation of both world wars can be directly or indirectly linked to a twisted sense of civic as well as ethnic nationalism in all corners of the European continent. The rise of multiculturalism, deeper economic interdependence and cultural tolerance in Europe was the cornerstone of the EU with greater interaction between peoples being argued was the most
effective way of reducing wars among nations. However, this ever-growing economic interdependence had its fair share of critics who saw greater economic and political integration as eroding their individual national identity, with this growing group of people beginning to identify as anti-globalists and economic nationalists.

From the lenses of nationalism, the outcome of the British referendum can be understood from one distinct feature: the central role of the state. The core tenet of nationalism is the identity individuals derive from belonging to a state, with ever increasing union in the EU eroding British national identity. Increasing interconnectedness among EU member has led to immigration of EU nationals across border with the aim trying to create a supranational identity of European outside the context of its geographical parameters. The rejection of this shedding of their individual identity combine with the gradual increase in the political muscle by Brussels seems to have clashed with the British people who were not willing to lose their national identity.

2.6.2 REALISM
Realism is a theory in international relations that portrays the international system as anarchic, chaotic, and dominated by states acquiring military power, and plagued by interstate conflict and rivalry. Realism provides an insight into how power dynamics shape state to state interaction and the indispensable role of national interests in determining state behavior in the international system. The 21st century international system will more than likely continue to be anarchic, occupied by states possessing military capabilities, and distinguished by inter-state power competition (Waltz, 1979). For realists the state is the Centre piece and the only actor in the international system. From the perspective of realism the growth of nationalism can be explained by two factors. Firstly the competition and deep mistrust among states in the pursuit of their interests leads them to conflicts and wars. The
second factor is that states are driven by gains and in particular zero sum gains whereby one state benefits and the other does not. According Mearsheimer (1994) it is this selfish nature of states that fails to allow cooperation to take place among states with regards to the pursuit of their own national interest. From this understanding it can be said that Britain’s exit from the EU was a mere manifestation of the UK’s desire to pursue its own interest without regard for the collective interests of the EU. Similarly the growing calls for withdrawal from the EU by other critics of the organization, is the erosion of national identities of countries. Mitropolitski (2014) notes that for a nation state to be recognized internationally it must fulfill three key requirements, firstly it must have a defined territory which the EU has, it must have a population that it exercises control over and it must have a clear set of laws that govern it. The EU meets all the above requirements which means it can technically become a state should its members agree, this would strip member states of their respective national identities. This thus clashes the realist belief that the state is the only actor in the international system and that supranational organizations such as the EU are merely tools for states to achieve their own interests.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

This research used a qualitative and quantitative approach to answers the research questions of the study. The study chose a mixed method design due to its ability to be able to collect data and also because of the nature of the study which revolves around assessing how immigration influenced Brexit. A case study approach was utilized by the study because as Kuper, Lingard, & Levinson (2012) explain, the key advantage of this approach is that it involves using multiple scholarly sources and techniques in the data collection process. It allows the researcher to determine what evidence to gather and what analysis techniques to use to answer the research questions. The study took a holistic approach to the concepts of immigration and nationalism to better understand the Brexit phenomenon. This study used extensive secondary sources of information from books, scholarly works, articles, journals, government publications and reports to effectively and efficiently analyze the research questions of the study. It also used non-written materials such as video interviews, radio programs and documentaries.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION

The researcher planned to collect both primary and secondary data, however, primary data was not collected for reasons explained in the limitations of the study. Secondary data was collected in the form of extensively reviewing books, journals, newspapers, conference proceedings, Government and Non-governmental reports, scholarly works, articles, relevant websites and magazines to acquire secondary data used in the study. The study also used a desktop research method which ensures up to date data is collected throughout the whole duration in which the study will being conducted. The researcher organized the data
collected in a clear, logical and systematic manner so as to answer all the research questions of the study in a consistent and logical manner.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected throughout the study was organized and analyzed in logical manner. During this phase of the research the data collected was presented in chronological order due to vast amounts of information relating to the topic such that the analysis and interpretation of the data is clear and concise. The researcher analyzed data through content analysis for both qualitative and quantitative data. Content analysis is a form of analysis that consists of an examination of what can be counted in text of any form text, media or publication.

The content analysis was carried out for the period of 4 weeks, that is 9th June 2016 to 7th July 2017, 2 weeks before the referendum and 2 weeks after. Of all the numerous available outlets, the researcher decided to assess two leading newspapers endorsing both sides of the referendum, therefore a total of four newspapers. The Sun and the Daily Express, endorsed the leave position of the referendum, whereby the Times and the Guardian were leaning towards the remain camp during this period.

3.4 ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

Research carried out in the field social sciences are dynamic and fluid given that they try to understand the nature of human being. The outcome of Brexit is one that may bring out a sense of bias, given the nature of the research, the researcher has gone to extreme lengths to certify that the information contained in the study will be verifiable and free from any bias. During data collection, the researcher ensured no manipulation, alteration or fabrication of data took place.
3.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The researcher intended to supplement this study by carrying out primary data collection for this thesis, with a targeted population sample of two EU Law scholars, and two International Relations experts in the University of Westminster in Central London, England. The data collection approach for this sample was in the form of key informant interviews. This would allow the researcher to gain targeted information from a group of specialized individuals in the field of British and EU immigration. The researcher exchanged emails with the aforementioned experts and agreed to meet them on a specified date to meet and to carry out these interviews. Upon travelling to the United Kingdom to carry out these interviews, it was very unfortunate for the researcher that none of the four experts were available to meet due to reasons being they were occupied with carrying out the final summer exams in their respective universities.

The researcher, therefore, made optimum use of secondary data available on web sources, published books and journals, video and radio interviews, as well as the analysis of nationwide surveys already carried out by BSR (Brexit Survey Results), YouGov UK, NatCen Social Research, and BSA (British Social Attitudes). These surveys were carried out by public and private institutions that spent millions of pounds to gauge and measure the British public’s opinion on the referendum, Brexit and immigration.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis assessed the influence that immigration played on Britain’s decision to withdraw from the European Union. This was done by contextualizing Britain’s immigration policy and the decision to join the European Union, the adoption of a continental immigration policy. This thesis also assessed the different institutions within the union which regard immigration, while also analyzing the different treaties and agreements over the history of the union post world was which have drawn up the current legislations regarding immigration. In addition, this study assessed the free movement of people in the Schengen area and the effect it has had on net migration in Britain, and the different approaches which the British governments have employed as a result of this. Furthermore, the Brexit campaign including the methods used by both the Leave and Remain camps, analyzing the discourse, main points of debate and the critical use of immigration by both sides during the campaign. Moreover, this thesis also assessed the impact of immigration on British society by looking at the role it has played in social and public services. The study also discussed the role played by UKIP and its party leader at the time, the reasons behind their rise in popularity, their electoral success and how immigration was used by them to not only gain unprecedented electoral success but also in the Brexit campaigns. Lastly, this thesis looked at common trends in Europe regarding immigration and a rise of far-right politics, and the dangers that this can pose to a future Europe.

4.2 EU MIGRATION POLICY

 Immigration is most commonly defined as the international movement of people into a country or territory of which they are not natives or residents and do not possess citizenship
in order to permanently settle there as naturalized citizens or find employment both on a temporary or permanent basis. Immigration has been occurring throughout the existence of humanity and by some immigration is part of natural law, as it is the belief by a number of libertarians that immigration is part of human behavior and that an individual who is sovereign has a right to move and relocate without permission or influence from the state (Napolitano, 2013). The right to move or travel is therefore viewed by some to be the right of an individual and a right that cannot be interfered with by the state, despite this states and governments around the world view immigration to be a concern of the state hence why different countries employ their own immigration laws and restrictions which reflect the interest of the country in question (Napolitano, 2013).

The UK has experienced different levels and different forms of immigration throughout its history. The origin of these immigrants has greatly varied and reflects its monarchial regimes and its imperial history. During the sixteenth century initial form of migration begun as England became a trading power but this was very minimal and the UK at the time was still very homogenous. As the British empire became more involved in the slave trade, more and more Africans began to go to Britain and by the seventeenth century there was a recognized African community in Britain. Despite the expulsion of Jews from Britain in 1290 by the eighteenth century a significant number of Jews migrated to Britain from Russia and Eastern Europe, Jewish migrants went to Britain in numbers and the Aliens Act in 1905 was implemented as a way to curb this. Britain also experienced small numbers of commonwealth migration pre-world war, majority of immigrants came from Canada, Australia and South Africa and were in most cases descendants of British citizens living in colonies. Post-World War 2 the number of commonwealth immigrants substantially increased, this was due to The
British Nationality Act of 1948 which granted the right to live and work in Britain to people from former colonies, immigration was restricted later in 1962 to Commonwealth countries and a yearly quota was applied. During the above periods immigration was not large scale and was very manageable for Britain, most inflows were of a small case and only lasted for short periods of time and did not affect demographics substantially as compared to is cultural and economic which was in the large part viewed as beneficial. Between the period of second world war and the 1990’s immigration grew slowly and steadily with a slight decline in the 1960’s. The big increase in net immigration happened in the late 1990’s and was unprecedented in Britain due to the adoption of EU legislation regarding immigration and movement of people (Green, n.d.).

4.3 SCHENGEN AGREEMENT

Within the European Union freedom of movement of EU nationals amongst member states is described as the cornerstone of Union citizenship which was established in 1992 through the Treaty of Maastricht, under the implementation of this directive citizens of European Union member states have a right to move and live freely within EU member states (Marzocchi, 2018). The idea of free movement within the EU has been gradual and has been ratified a number of times, initially it was described to be a European Economic Community (EEC) which referred to the movement of workers and facilitated establishment of companies and businesses through EU tax reforms and regulations for European businesses and enterprises, through the Maastricht treaty the concept of EU citizenship was then extended to all member states, this was further confirmed through the Lisbon Treaty which addressed areas of freedom, justice and also security for EU citizens equally in all member states (Marzocchi, 2018).
The above is referred to as the Schengen Area, this Schengen Area compromises the member states of the union which have unilaterally agreed to abolish all forms of border controls and passport checks within member state borders in order to facilitate the freedom of movement of European citizens. The area is named as Schengen after the agreements which were signed in June of 1990 and implemented into practice in 1995. The main scopes of the Schengen area are the abolition of borders for all people within the area, facilitate travel as European Citizens only need a basic of identification such as a driving license in order to travel within Europe, a common single visa policy even for non-European citizens which is applicable to the whole Schengen area (Schmid-Drüner, 2018). Another important scope of the Schengen area is to enhance police co-operation and judicial effectiveness, under the Schengen area police between member states have higher levels of co-operations and also have a right to pursue and detain criminals or fugitives in the territory of another member state, extradition has also been simplified and police forces are able to extradite criminals or fugitives at a much quicker rate.

Despite the introduction of the Schengen area, there has been a lot of scrutiny by member states into his effectiveness as it has posed a lot of various challenges and problems for a number of countries especially since the recent migrant crisis which Europe has been faced with over the last five years. The member states in the Schengen area especially since September of 2005 had been receiving a high volume of new arrivals both amongst each other and also by non-European citizens, this prompted a number of states to stop abiding by European regulation regarding immigration and saw a few states introduce checks in their borders to curb this high volume of new arrivals. The Schengen area has also shown difficulties by member states to curb out terrorism and insecurity, this is because of the ease
of entry between states which do not have internal border checks and was evident by the increase of terrorist attacks which was experienced in some member states such as France, Germany and Belgium (Guild, 2013). This outlined a correlation between high levels of immigration between member states and also at an international level.

The Schengen area was a manner to transform the European Union into an area where freedom and mobility is genuine and accessible to all citizens. The rights of indefinite residence therefore are granted to a variety of people including, students, employees and also self-employed individuals even after their employment is terminated or finished and most importantly also for families of individuals who are currently residents. In order to facilitate the above a number of regulations have been passed by the European Union which simplify the rights and obligations of member state citizens (Marzocchi, 2018). This was done in a number of ways, for a stay of less than three months in a member state the only requirement needed by a European citizen is a valid form of identification. For any stay of over three months an EU citizen or his family must have the necessary financial resources to reside in that country and possess any basic form of health insurance which depends on the specifications set by the member state in question which the European citizen wants to reside in, this is done without any formal issue of a residence permit, some member states require the Eu national to register themselves with the necessary authorities in the country in question. The right of permanent resident is also granted to a European citizen after an uninterrupted five-year residence and this is also applicable to the individual’s family and this right of permanent residence is granted without any condition (Marzocchi, 2018).
4.4 A COMMON EUROPEAN ASYLUM SYSTEM

Asylum in the European Union gains its origins from the Convention Relating to the Status of refugees in 1951, which has its basis in the 14\textsuperscript{th} article of the Universal Declaration of Human rights. After the implementation of the Schengen agreement and the cancellation of passport checks and internal borders which was then incorporated into the European Union’s legislative framework through the Amsterdam Treaty, the European Union introduced CEAS (Common European Asylum System) (Boswell, 2008). This was done to standardize the manner in which member states and signatories address asylum seekers. Refugees which enter the European Union have to follow laws which are placed by the CEAS. These laws are both meant to protect the status of the refuge in question, and also to regulate the manner in which member states deal with refugees. Due to the laws set out by CEAS European Union member states are not allowed to send back a refugee back to their country of origin if they face any form of insecurity or persecution, and member states must offer protection to those who have been granted refugee status under international law. Once individuals and their families arrive in any member states and seek refugee status it is the CEAS that assess the individual and their families and determines whether they are eligible for refugee status, and if granted refugee status then go under international protection. Different member states adopt different ways to deal with refugees due to the different laws which they practice and because of this some countries are found to be more appealing to refugees than others. Some member states have lenient laws towards refugees and accept the majority of applicants while other countries have more stringent laws and accept only a small fraction of refugee applications (EUCOM, 2018). In cases where application of a refuge is denied the Dublin Regulation approved by the European Union allows a state to return the applicant to their
first point of entry, this is done to provide an incentive to countries which have borders with non-member states to practice more stringent and effective border controls. This has been argued by many to be an unethical practice and an example of this is an intervention made by the UNHCR (United Nations High Commission for Refugees) in 2008 asking the European Union not to return Iraqi refugees to Greece. The number of accepted asylum applicants varies amongst member states, in 2002 for example the United Kingdom accepted over 14000 asylum applicants while countries like Greece and Spain accepted less than 1000 (Boswell, 2008).

The regulation set out by the European Union under the CEAS have been met by widespread controversy especially due to the migrant crisis which faced western Europe and also high levels of fraud regarding refugee status and the individuals it regards therefore a number of member states have changed their legal framework and adopted a more rigid and restrictive form of legislation in order to tackle this problem. The UK Border Act in 2007 is an example of this. This was a piece of legislation passed by the UK’s government in order to address the issues of immigration and asylum. Through this act the UK introduced mandatory biometric screening of immigrants coming from outside the European Union and also granted more powers to immigration and border control and the home secretary. The other main provision of this act include the deportation of foreign nationals if imprisoned for over a year or if imprisoned for specific criminal offences, the increase powers to immigration officers to carry out duties normally carried out solely by police such as detention, granting of entry, search of individuals and seizure of goods and also increase regulations and reporting of immigrants which have already been granted residence such as scheduled registrations and residing in specific addresses (n.d, 2009). The UK government also made it easier to deport
foreign nationals living in Britain after a number of high-profile incidents such as the murder of a police man in Bradford in 2005 by a foreigner which not only created public outcry but also showed the necessity for tougher immigration laws.

4.5 SMUGGLING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The issue of human trafficking and smuggling of migrants has been regarded as one of the main reason for the anti-immigrant sentiment which has been experienced not only in the United Kingdom but also in the rest of the European Union as of recent. According to Europol trafficking of migrants has become one of the profitable forms of crime in Europe and it is controlled by organized groups of crime both within Europe and countries where migrants and refugees leave from in order to come into Europe such as Libya. According to Europol people trafficking has increased so dramatically that it is now as profitable as the illegal drug market to organized criminal groups (Bulman, 2017). Economic issues and conflict in the Middle East and in Africa have seen a large wave of people trying to cross into Europe, in 2016 it was reported that there were over half a million illegal crossings into Europe from outside Europe, and the majority of these illegal crossings into the EU were done across specific routes and were managed and overseen by criminal networks. There are a number of actions taken by member states which were affected by this, the United Kingdom in response closed to the Dubs scheme despite condemnation by a lot of organizations and charities, this ended a scheme that offered safe passage to minors entering the UK and was done in order to reduce the number of people coming in and also as a form to curb fraud as a number of individuals claimed to be minors just in order to benefit from this scheme and gain refugee status in the UK (Harvey, 2000).
Migrant smuggling does not only affect the member states in the EU but also affects the migrants themselves who are mostly coerced by these criminal organizations and victimized. It is a crime which runs hand in hand with abuse of human rights and in a number of cases death. According to the office of Migration and Home affairs organized criminal groups which profit of migrant smuggling are also linked to human trafficking, terrorism and money laundering and is a threat to European security (EC, 2017). The European commission in 2015 presented the EU action plan against migrant smuggling and started taking steps to resolve the issue. The main course of action includes improved police and justice response, the increase sharing of intel and information amongst member states and stronger cooperation with the countries outside of the European Union that a large number of migrants used to cross into Europe, especially in North Africa and Western Africa.

Another action taken by the European Union in order to curb immigration and regulate numbers of people coming into Europe from outside the Schengen Area is the establishment of Frontex Agency. This agency was formed in 2005 after the EU went from 15 to 25-member states when the countries in the eastern bloc were included and joined the union. The mandate of the Frontex agency was to control and regulate the European Unions external borders and help member states who have these external borders with non-European Union states control their borders. The Frontex agency also has jurisdiction to carry out special operations and support countries in the Union who do not have the resources or capability to control their borders and stop both criminal activities and illegal immigration (Schumacher, 2018). The budget and size of the agency and its operational capacity has been increased constantly by the European Union over the years, highlighting the risk that high levels of immigration pose to the European Union, the increase in budget and size of the agency was
also in response to high levels of immigration from people in North Africa and the Middle East. Later on, in 2016 the Frontex agency was restructured to be the European Border and Coastal Guard Agency. One of the major reasons for this change in the agency was Italy and Greece.

These two countries were suffering from unprecedented immigration from North Africa and the rest of the world due to their southern coast and were being used by refugees and illegal migrants as the initial point of arrival and subsequently the ‘gateway’ into mainland Europe (Paravicini & Herszenhorn, 2018). Because of the Dublin Agreement, refugees must be processed in the first European nation that they arrive in, this meant countries like Greece and Italy were assuming the biggest burden of the refugee and migrant crisis, which put extra pressure on already struggling economies. Over half a million refugees have landed on Italian shores in the last few year and has strained not only local Italian communities who are directly affected but also the Italian public in general who in the large part oppose this (Barlai, Fähnrich, Griessler, Rhomberg & Filzmaier, 2017). Italy has also been a public critic of other countries like France and Spain who have refused to open their ports and deal with boats and ships carrying these refugees and migrants. The agency work is mostly concentrated on the Mediterranean coasts as this area is the one that has seen the biggest influx of illegal immigration and asylum seekers and has in the recent years seen many deaths of people trying to undertake those extremely dangerous crossings. The agency has also been focusing as of recently in patrols of the Adriatic Sea in order to curb the drug trade affecting a number of European states.

4.6 EU IMMIGRATION INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM
The United Kingdom has experienced different levels of immigration since its membership to the European Union, both from within the European Union and also from outside the European as well. Immigration to the United Kingdom has been significant compared to a number of European states since 1945, at the time immigrants to the United Kingdom were most commonly from the Republic of Ireland, and also from former colonies and commonwealth countries such as the Caribbean’s, India, Nigeria, Bangladesh and South Africa. In total the net migration into the United Kingdom from 1945 up until now has been higher than the net emigration which is why population in the United Kingdom has been constantly increasing. Through data collected through a census for example it was found that around 70% of the population increase in the UK between 2001 and 2011 was a result of foreign born immigrants. About 7.5 million people which was just over 11% of the population at the time were not born in the United Kingdom. In 2013 over half a million people entered the United Kingdom while just over 300,000 left meaning that net migration for that year was recorded at around just over 200,000. The number of immigrants coming into the United Kingdom rose both in 2012 and 2013. In the subsequent year of 2013-2014 the total number of immigrants recorded to have entered in the United Kingdom was estimated at 560,000 only 81,000 were British nationals returning. The main countries in these years that people were arriving from were India, China and Poland. In 2013 the United Kingdom 208,000 people were naturalized as citizen which was the highest figure recorded since 1962 which was when these records began to be quantified. The main countries of previous nationality before naturalization in the United Kingdom were India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Somalia, China, Poland, South Africa and Bangladesh. In 2013 the United Kingdom
granted 154,000 permanent residence to immigrants mostly originating from also the countries mentioned above (Green, n.d.).

**Figure 1:** *Net immigration to the United Kingdom*

The United Kingdom also adopted a point-based immigration system in 2008 in order to regulate immigration coming into the United Kingdom from countries outside of the EEA (European Economic Area), this replaced the existing work permit and entry schemes which
were previously put in practice and was directed by the United Kingdom Border Agency. This new point-based immigration system introduced different tier by which applicants apply with, these range from skilled workers, to unskilled workers, students and investors. This system determines whether the applicant is fit for entry and is then granted or denied a visa depending on his eligibility. This system also determines which individuals, institutions or enterprises can sponsor individuals, for example Universities or higher learning institutions through the tier 4 visa can sponsor international students if they offer them a place of study, and its then up to immigration authorities in the United Kingdom to assess the student normally on a variety of factors such as criminal history, and financial stability (Green, n.d.).

Immigration levels within the United Kingdom by EU nationals has been a key point of discussion in UK’s domestic politics and has been subject of speculation by the British public as well. Under the European Union the UK enjoyed the freedom of movement as did all other member states. Before 2004 membership to the union included 15 states including the United Kingdom. The other states in the union pre-2004 were, Spain, Sweden, Austria, Belgium, Germany, France, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Luxemburg, Portugal, the Netherlands, Finland and Denmark. In 2004 membership was extended to countries from the Eastern bloc, these included, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia and Malta and Cyprus. Later on, in 2007 membership was also extended to Romania and Bulgaria, and later on in 2013 also to Croatia. All member states that were members of the union pre-2004 except for Sweden, Ireland and the United Kingdom decided to restrict and regulate the access to labor markets to immigrants to all countries that joined post-2004 which are the eastern bloc countries and Malta and Cyprus, this was possible because a term of agreement in the inclusion of these countries was that pre-2004 member state could apply
these restrictions to new members of the union for a period of seven years (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2005).

Currently the population of the United Kingdom is of 63.7 million, of this number 5.3 million which make up 8% of the population are not British and out of that figure 2.9 million which is 5% of the population are from Europe. Around 1.2 million British citizens live in Europe. The largest percentage of European immigrants living in Britain are Polish which are estimated to be around 850,000 Poles, followed by Romanians and Portuguese nationals according the ONS (Office for National Statistics). These figures only include people living in the UK for a period of at least a year. According to the same issuing body of statistics, out of the 2.9 million European nationals residing in the UK around 2.15 million are employed on a full or part-time basis. On the other hand, out of the 1.2 million British citizens living in Europe, Spain has the highest number of British residents followed by Ireland and France (Green, 2017).

According to the migration observatory at the university of Oxford in 2016 the number of EU nationals that migrated to the UK was 250,000 and in 2015 that same figure stood at 269,000. Between the periods of 1991 and 2013 the inflow of EU nationals was stagnant at an average of 61,000 per year therefore the spike in immigration from Europeans into the United Kingdom happened between 2004 onwards which was the same period the United Kingdom alongside with other member states extended the freedom of movement from citizens of Eastern bloc countries which gained membership to the union during the same period. Over half of European nationals which went to the United Kingdom in 2016 were from the Eastern bloc countries which gained membership in 2004. According to the same migration observatory out of the EU nationals migrating to the United Kingdom, 69% of them migrate
for work related reasons, around 45% receive definite job offers and 24% migrate in search of employment. The next category of migrants residing in the UK migrate for formal studies (Green, 2017). The number of migrants who go the United Kingdom for employment or in the search of employment can be confirmed to an extent by the NINo (National Insurance Number) registrations. The National Insurance number is allocated by the DWP (Department for Work and Pension) and people working in the UK are required to have it to work. National Insurance registration to European nationals made up 59% of total registration in 2017. Nationals of Bulgaria and Romania were found the most consistent increase in National Insurance registration amongst European nationals (Green, 2017). As of recent in the last year the United Kingdom has seen a decline in net migration coming in from nationals of other European countries while there has been an increase in net migration coming from outside of Europe this is a change in figures which a number of people attribute to the Brexit vote.

It is important to also account for limitations and evidence gaps when dealing with statistics regarding European immigration into the United Kingdom, due to European legislation and the freedom of movement across borders which Europeans have access to data gathered to record these statistics can never be fully accurate.

Brexit has created wide division amongst the public and also the political class. Some regard it as a loss to Britain and claim it to be economic recklessness while others regard it to be as the as a turning point to regain sovereignty and bring back the decision making of Britain back to the British parliament and the British public. Brexit was a monumental and historic democratic exercise which was reflected by the large voter turnout and participation by the public and also the engagement of different aspects of the political class in expressing their
opinions and propagating their beliefs and ideologies regarding the vote. The Brexit vote was not decided by a single factor or a single policy, but by a mixture of complex points and how these encompassed with the lives of British citizens. At the same time, it was also evident by both the manner of campaigning and topics of discussion that immigration was one of the most important factors that affected how people voted especially amongst the ones advocating for Brexit (Paxton, 2018). During the campaigning of Brexit by both the remain and leave parts, there were many points of discussion, the main topics of discussion at the time of the campaign were immigration, national security, democracy, the NHS (National Health Service) and the police and justice system.

It is of importance to note that immigration in the United Kingdom was a topic of scrutiny and discussion long before the Brexit vote happened, and this shows the important role that immigration played in determining the outcome of Brexit. In 2010 under pressure from the public and some of his conservative party members David Cameron made the promise to the public that he would cap the annual flow of migrants coming into the United Kingdom at less than 100,000. The only problem with that promise was that it went against European Union legislature and treaties as a term of membership into the union is the freedom of movement of people which cannot be capped and has to be open to all despite of numbers, therefore Cameron at the time could not achieve this promise through direct policy. Due to this David Cameron was not able to uphold the pledge he made during his campaign and immigration into the United Kingdom at the time was running at a rate of three times higher than he originally promised. This understandably cause anger and resentment amongst the British electorate, not only amongst Conservatives but also amongst Labour voters as well. This was not only viewed as a failed promise by a conservative government who had been facing
reduced popularity and support as previous years, but it also created a negative sentiment against the institutions of the European Union because they were seen as a Union that did not engage their member states and allow for concessions and changes when the electorate of state wanted one (Wadsworth, Dhingra, Ottaviano & Van Reenen, 2017).

4.7 EUROSCEPTICISM IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

In rise of anti-European rhetoric David Cameron also attempted and publicized his intent for the United Kingdom to stay in a reformed European Union by negotiating with the EU in Brussels. These negotiations involved a number of changes which David Cameron was trying to achieve one of these included a change to the immigration policy which was being currently followed by the UK and a number of reforms involving the energy and security sector. According to Lord Howard a conservative member of the House of Lords Cameron failed at these negotiations and the European Union did not concede to any of the main points which Cameron and his government were attempting to address, a view shared by the public which in turn created an even stronger anti-Europe sentiment in domestic British politics. Lord Howard claims he himself supported the idea of the United Kingdom remaining part of a reformed Europe but due to the failures of the Cameron negotiations in Brussels became a Brexiter and campaigned in favor of leave(n.d, 2017).

Figure 2: British Social Attitudes, the vote to leave the European Union
In response to this failed promise and a rising sentiment of Euroscepticism by the public and some members of the political class, and the rise of UKIP (United Kingdom Independence Party) whose main manifesto was leaving the European Union David Cameron promised a referendum in order to ultimately give the public the last say on whether the United Kingdom would be part of the European Union.

Statistically speaking it’s important to note that immigration in the United Kingdom by European nationals despite increasing especially due to the improvement and growth of the British economy within the period of 2000-2014 has not been exceptional by comparison of other member states. For example, within the same period net migration inflows in Spain and Italy were higher than those of the United Kingdom, keeping in mind that there are more immigrants living in the UK that have come from outside Europe than from within Europe.
this raises the question of why immigration become one of the biggest factors relating to whether or not the United Kingdom would remain or leave the union. Brexit became synonymous with uncontrolled imagination, instead of it being a discourse regarding reforms, the economy and security and that is due to a number of reasons.

4.8 ARGUMENTS AGAINST IMMIGRATION

A reason for why the topic of immigration became one of the main determinants of Brexit is attribute to the wages of British workers. The average wage in Britain experienced a sharp decline between the periods of 2008 and 2014 especially low wage jobs. There is not much quantitative evidence to suggest that European migration into the UK was responsible for this, but regardless immigration was viewed as one of the factors responsible for this decrease in wages. The leave campaign exploited this and employed a logic of demand and supply which was then embraced without much statistical evidence by the public. They posed the point that with more people possibly being able to enter the country there would be less jobs available to the British people, and that with more and more people willing to do lower wage jobs at even lower wages then that would keep affecting low wage jobs. Job competition was also discussed by the leave campaign which also argued that people coming from countries with significantly lower economies would be willing to work jobs in Britain at wages even below the standard minimum wage set by law and hence affecting the demand for lower jobs for British citizens, according to some key members of the leave campaign businesses and enterprises would prefer to higher foreigners as the would be willing to do the same job for less pay in a way to save on costs (Goodwin, 2018).

Figure 3: Employment and unemployment, working age population 2015
The figure above displays that EU immigrants are more likely to be employed (78.2%) than UK-born individuals (72.5%) and less likely to be unemployed or economically inactive.

Another blame which the *leave* campaign put on immigration was that of a strain on the housing sector. The building of houses in the UK has not met its demand for over 30 years, and many times this has been described as housing crisis. The *leave* campaign employed the same tactics as it did in regard to the decrease in wages and claimed that already in a housing crisis the UK could not afford or provide enough housing to the immigrants projected into the UK and it could not accommodate in terms of housing the possible numbers of immigrants which could legally settle into the United Kingdom. Due to the current housing crisis in the UK house prices both for rent and for purchase have been out of reach to the people on average incomes and low incomes. This has left many people living in small rented accommodation as it would be very difficult for them buy a house. The current housing crisis has left Britain with the lowest living space per inhabitant compared to all the others EU-15 countries. The blame for this was put on high levels of immigration by the *leave* campaign, again there is little quantitative evidence to support this, and the real blame is argued by many to be a failure of public policy and domestic reforms by government (Sheldrick, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of whom</th>
<th>UK-born</th>
<th>EU immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source CEP analysis of Labour Force Survey*
The NHS (National Health Service) and education services were also key points of discussion during Brexit. Like all other citizens in the UK all residents including European migrants are net contributors to the British economy and public finances. The NHS has been faced over the last five years with lack of qualified personnel, delayed treatment and surgery of patients in need of attention, longer lines and waits at hospitals and lack of funding. Immigration was used again as a reason for the constant strain on the NHS and other public services. The same tactic was employed by the leave campaign when addressing the education services and lack of spaces for students in primary schools especially at primary school level. In all the above the leave campaign constantly reiterated that even if immigration was manageable at the present time and its strain on public services was limited, the situation would not get better as immigration was projected to rise constantly in spite of the problems faced by the public sector (Giuntella, Nicodemo & Vargas-Silva, 2018).

Another evident factor behind the rise of resentment towards immigration is the decline in social status of the white working class. For example, in the UK there has an improvement in educational attainment and level in the last decade, but this improvement has not been the case for the British white working-class household.

**Figure 4:** Education and immigrant status – working age population 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age finished education</th>
<th>UK-Born</th>
<th>EU immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (21 or older)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (17-20)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (16 or under)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the figure above, EU immigrants are more educated than UK born individuals, showing that EU immigrants are two times more likely to have higher education. The white working class is now the least educated ethnic group in Britain when in comparisons to other ethnic groups and is also the most likely group of people to work low wage jobs. Children of white working-class parents are also less likely to attend university as compared to the children of immigrant parents, therefore despite being good at integrating immigrants and their families Britain has not sufficiently addressed the problems affecting the white working class (Rogaly & Taylor, 2018).

Public opinion is shaped by a number of factors, the anti-immigrant sentiment which became so apparent in the years leading up to Brexit can also be blamed on the role which ruling governments have played in the United Kingdom and their failures to address social and public policy needed to fix the issues which the public and some leave campaigners blamed on immigrants. Immigration has been used by both sides of the government as a scapegoat for the social and economic problems being faced in the country rather than addressing the failures in governance and policy making which are more responsible for the situation the country is in. By claiming immigration is a problem, and the need to stop it being the solution government has normalized a degree of xenophobia which is counterproductive to the issues facing Britain. It is argued that to some degree hostility towards immigration was a result of government, from both the conservatives and the labor party who showed a lack of leadership and instead of refusing to blame immigration for the social problems being faced by Britain, decided to engage the rhetoric against immigrants already being propagated by the mainstream media (Tilford, 2018).
Figure 5: What do *Remain* voters think the main motivation people voted *Leave*?

The figure above shows what remain voters thought the main reason behind leave voters clear motivation was: immigration.

Euroscepticism began to be more visible in the 1990’s under the Conservative party who had and still have many senior figures who are Eurosceptic. When David Cameron became leader of the party in 2006 he tried to bury the anti-European discourse within his party, this meant that the British electorate who was against the union was not represented by the two biggest political parties in the UK, this gave way to the rise of UKIP (United Kingdom Independence Party), which filled the void and gained the support of people who were against the establishment and were not in favor of the European Union (Daddow, 2017). UKIP is not a populist party that turned Eurosceptic but rather a Eurosceptic party that became populist due to its nationalist anti-European nature that was under represented at the time in government by the leading parties. UKIP was founded in 1993, yet its rise in popularity peaked in the 5 years leading up to Brexit, and as a party saw its best electoral results under the leadership of

**Source:** YouGov 2016
Nigel Farage who won the key national figures in the campaign to leave the European Union. The existence of UKIP originates from the Anti-Federalist League, which was founded in 1991 and was a single-issue party who focused most of their efforts into raising support and awareness into the European Union and the damaging risks it poses to Britain, the party was then restructured and renamed to UKIP. Nigel Farage became party leader in 2006 and under his leadership the party embraced wider policy platform while still holding firmly to their Eurosceptic beliefs, while at the same advocating for the suffering British white working class (Daniel, 2005).

The new approach by Nigel Farage and UKIP resulted in significant support and for a small party compared to the Conservative and Labour party UKIP’s electoral success in the 2013 local election, 2015 European elections and general elections in 2015 was significant. Some argue the rise and increased popularity of UKIP was one of the factors that pressured the Conservative government to promise a referendum regarding membership of the Union. A reason for the successes enjoyed at various stages by UKIP are due to the populist approach which they adopted, and constantly referred to the difficulties of the ordinary citizen, this appealed to large sects of the population who felt disheartened and betrayed by the two major parties who offered no alternative from each other. Both the Labour and Conservative despite having Eurosceptic members had never initiated the discourse of Brexit leaving many people in the country marginalized as the government was not representative and inclusive of different ideologies regarding the European Union, hence why a large part of UKIP voters previously regarded themselves as disheartened Conservatives (Daniel, 2005).

There have been a number of pools and public surveys carried out by think tanks and research institutes in order to determines people’s main reasons behind their vote, these
surveys and polls were conducted both during the Brexit campaigns as well as after the Brexit vote. According to a major survey of social attitudes in Britain, the Brexit vote was led by anti-immigration sentiment instead of dissatisfaction with domestic politics. The BSA (British Social Attitudes) found that concern over numbers of people coming into the UK under the freedom of movement ensured by the European Union was one of the biggest determinants of why the electorate voted in favour of Brexit. The research by the BSA was done in collaboration with the NCSR (National Centre for Social Research), this research included over 3000 British people, and according to the NCSR the vote showed that the political agenda of the British government is not in tune with the needs and wants of the electorate, and Brexit was a way to show this disenchantment between what the public wants, and what the government and politicians discuss.

According to the same research out of the people interviewed, 73% of those who were worried about immigration voted to leave as compared to the 36% who did not express concerns over immigration who instead voted to stay, this shows the divergence between the leave and remain voters. Another finding from this same research showed that the longer a voter felt an individual should reside in the UK before being eligible to claim benefits the more likely they were to vote leave. Out of the studied sample it was also found that those who completely distrusted the government and voted to leave were 65% compared to the 45% who claimed a certain degree of trust. This shows a link between the electorates trust towards the government and the effect that potentially played on their decision, this suggest that the government is was in favour to leave, and in turn did not want to address the euro-scepticism present in the UK, Brexit could then be further interpreted to some degree as a protest vote against the British government in general. This survey was not intended to
question people directly on how they voted and why, but it was instead intended to assess correlations and common behaviours between the electorate which in turn doesn’t only show how people voted, but the reasoning behind the vote (Bulman, 2017).

4.9 CONTENT ANALYSIS ON NATIONAL PRINT MEDIA COVERAGE DURING AND AFTER THE REFERENDUM

This section of the study carried out a content analysis of newspapers, and assessed the articles circulated during the period of the 2016 EU referendum by a number of the prominent United Kingdom national newspapers. The content analysis was carried out for the period of 4 weeks, that is 9th June 2016 to 7th July 2017, 2 weeks before the referendum and 2 weeks after. Of all the numerous available outlets, the researcher decided to assess two leading newspapers endorsing both sides of the referendum, therefore a total of four newspapers. The Sun and the Daily Express, endorsed the leave position of the referendum, whereby the Times and the Guardian were leaning towards the remain camp during this period.

It was evident that coverage of immigration increased dramatically during the referendum period, and it rose faster than any other political subject, including the economy, sovereignty and campaign actors such as UKIP. This is based on the fact that immigration was the most noticeable referendum discussion point, due to the amount of appearances it made on newspaper print front pages. During this four-week period (9th June to 7th July), on all the four selected newspapers, there were 21 front pages appearances about immigration, whereby 16 were about the economy. It was quite apparent that the coverage of immigration, especially in the newspaper outlets favoring the leave campaign – the Sun and Daily Express – covered immigration in an extremely negative light.
EU Immigrants were accused of causing and being solely responsible for a number of the United Kingdom’s social and economic issues, especially for placing an increasing amount of stress on the public services and welfare system. Not only was this discussed, but a number of particular nationalities such as the Polish, Romanian, Albanian and Turkish were most often chosen for negative coverage during this period. Most of the negative news coverage of the aforementioned nationals were printed distributed by the *Daily Express* and the *Sun*.

The print coverage of immigration throughout the EU Referendum campaign period was distinguished through a number of different methods. Firstly, the volume and number of times with which the subject of immigration and its impact on the nation were discussed was notable. Another way immigration was covered was through the level to which *Leave* campaign political leaders rose and elevated the problem of immigration and its effect on the
country, and the degree to which certain media outlets reported and analyzed the comments of those Leave leaders about the issue of immigration.

Moreover, some newspaper outlets went even further than Leave leaders in their coverage on the issue of immigration. Numerous titles including those by the Sun and Daily express showed immigrants in a bad light and blamed them for a rise in crime, violence and sexual harassment. These newspapers, nevertheless, did not pursue to publish stories that counteracted their narrative, and did not present a different or more positive depiction of immigrants. Additionally, the Daily Express published more than 8 stories about the European migrant crisis including Calais, France. This was predominantly about violence, and immigrants attempting to forcefully enter trucks and boat vessels to the United Kingdom, as well as migrants attempting to swim across the English Channel. Several of the articles posted by the Daily Express made use of photos and pictures published on social media platforms. With this, the impression created by the combination of these eye-catching headlines was that law and order had completely been destroyed, and hundreds of black immigrants were aggressively combating the French police on their way to the United Kingdom. Headlines such as ‘Calais at War’ were commonly seen in prints supporting the leave campaign.

Figure 7: Daily Express newspaper describing the Calais Crisis
In addition, if not linked with rape, murder or violence, then immigrants were often branded as job thieves and benefit tourists. A publication by the *Sun*, stated on the front page that four in five jobs in the United Kingdom had been taken by immigrants in the past one year. Eventually, this assertion was uncovered to be completely incorrect.

Moreover, the words used by numerous newspaper outlets in regards to immigration usually inclined to be those words commonly linked to natural disasters and catastrophic events.

**Figure 8:** Most common headlines used in newspapers supporting *Leave*
From all the published newspapers by the *Sun, Daily Express, Guardian* and *Times*, analyzed for this study during the four-week period, the following is a summary of descriptions in relation to immigration and immigrants:

- Number of times negative statements have been depicted about EUnationals in relation to immigration: 35
- Number of positive statements appearing in these papers during the study period: 7
- Number of both positive and negative depictions seen in the study sample: 5
- Number of times immigrants are given a chance to voice in their own story: 3
- Number of times immigrants are shown in assumed specific professions: 15

**4.10 THE RISE OF THE FAR-RIGHT**

The rise of Eurosceptic political parties is not the case only in the UK, but it is a trend that has risen around western Europe especially in the last decade. Anti-European parties normally tend to be nationalist, patriotic and populist and tend to be right winged, and have
gained popularity in some European member states for several reasons. Immigration has increase substantially in a lot of European states over the last decade and where there is a sharp rise in immigration, there tends to be a rise in right winged and far-right politics. Large scale immigration poses similar policy challenges for the different countries it affects such as education, employment, healthcare, crime, integration; Immigration is determined to be one of the main factors that led to the rise of far-right party in Austria, Germany, the United Kingdom, Switzerland and Denmark (Davis & S. Deole, 2018).

These are countries where far-right electoral success was simultaneous with high rates of immigration and rhetoric against migrants. After increased levels of immigration during the period of 2002 to 2017 countries like Austria experienced a 15% increase in votes gained by far-right parties. Finland in the same period experienced an increase of 17% far-right party won votes while countries like Sweden experienced a rise in votes to the far-right by 11% during the same period (Davis & S. Deole, 2018). This data could be affected by many factors, such as the economies of the countries, the political culture, population and many more factors. Despite this, the rise of popularity of parties that campaign around the stop of flows of immigration during times of high levels of immigration cannot be dismissed, and rather shows a change in public attitude by the electorate in these countries. The rise of far-right politics in Europe poses a serious threat to the European Union, its institutions and its continuous plan for more open, developed and inclusive Europe. If immigration is one of the biggest determinants of far-right party success in Europe then it is vital for the European Union to not only acknowledge this, but also find a way to resolve the issues in order to halt the growing resentment towards European policy (Davis & S. Deole, 2018). So far far-right politics in a number of countries have gained political presentation marginally in
government, yet if the issue causing their growth are not addressed than the likelihood of these parties gaining majorities and forming government as is the case in Hungary will become more likely hence the need to tackle the issues causing this change in European politics. Some of these political parties are a serious threat not only to Europe but are also domestic threats, they possess ideologies that are now normalized but in some cases are hateful and possibly racist. These parties all share the common feature that they are reactive to specific incidents and in some cases carry out unjust actions in the name of security or defense. France is an example of this, after the Charlie Hebdo and Nice terrorist attacks, the government gave police more powers and relaxed stop and search laws, often targeting young people of color. The United Kingdom has received much criticism as well due to their deportation laws which make it easy for the police and courts to deport an individual for committing minor crimes. A problem with this new wave of politics in Europe is that it is being embraced by the center right and the center left, for example in France it was the socialist party under the leadership of Hollande that declared the state of emergency and gave police the extra powers.

EU member states are aware of the role that immigration played in the Brexit vote in the UK, Brexit itself will have many effects on the European Union, in terms of travel, business, industry and immigration. The most visible and discussed impact is that of business and enterprise and how Britain self-decided exclusion in the Union will affect businesses both in the UK and member states. This period of transition until a deal is reached by both Britain and the EU is being closely followed by businesses and multinational companies, who have decisions to make over employees and their status and whether international companies would continue to operate in Britain depending on the deal reached by the British
government. Brexit will inconsiderably have an effect of other EU member states in terms of immigration, and in turn in the manner that the European Union deals with immigration and the legislature regarding it. Post Brexit UK and the EU have two divergent models of, through the procedure of negotiation it is evident that the manner in which the UK is trying to curb out immigration from within Europe is by introducing work and residence permit issued by a single authority, while the EU which is lobbying for all member states and trying to facilitate both movement for tourists and workers.

The EU fundamentally represents a more liberal stance during its negotiation and is trying to ensure accessibility of all Europeans into Britain even despite the possibility of visas and work permits. One of the most discussed points during the ongoing negotiation is regarding the possibility of a hard border between Britain and Ireland. The only land border in the United Kingdom is the one it shares with the Republic of Ireland, which is a member of the European Union. According to the European Law, and member states which shares a border with a state that is not a member of the union, must regulate and carry out passport checks on their external borders. During the current negotiations the Irish border issue was discussed, and the EU suggested a common regulatory area which comprises of the EU and Ireland to be part of the custom union, this in turn means breaking up the United Kingdom’s common market due to the creation of a regulatory borders and customs.

It is of importance to remember that many EU member states are having a growing and more publicized discourse on immigration which in some countries such as Italy is dominating the political agenda. By seeing Brexit unfold, mostly due to a lack of flexibility by the EU to address the British resentment towards EU immigration policy, member states might regard leaving the union as the only way to genuinely tackle the problem of immigration. It is
argued that if the EU gave Britain certain concession during the government of David Cameron and agreed to relevant immigration reforms that the UK would still be a member of the union. In countries such as Hungary a far-right party which is anti-immigration dominates the coalition and is ruling the government, yet even after winning the elections they are still not able to substantially reform immigration due to imposed laws by the EU, this will in the future increase euroscepticism within member states such as Hungary and possibly lead to even more member states considering membership of the union in general.

It is of importance to also note that Britain cannot engage member states individually and create immigration procedure with different states unilaterally. This is action taken by the union which all member states must abide by, different countries especially depending on their location and their relationship with Britain such as Ireland will have to adopt any measure taken by the EU, this would result in some countries having to adopt a immigration policy towards Britain that they might not necessarily want to adopt, this would only increase resentment against the EU by member states. In the case of the Irish border both the Irish government and the British government have said they do not want a hard border, therefore if in the future a hard border is introduced by the EU then that could lead to a growth in anti-European sentiment in Ireland which negatively affects the union and as a result the rest of the member states.

Many in Britain and around the world described the vote to leave as the biggest political issue affecting both Britain and the EU since its creation, the general feeling in the Union and its institutions is one of disappointment not only towards the British electorate, but also to the British political class who failed to stop this. For Britain, the period of two years since Article 50 was initiated. Member states have a right to withdraw from the union based on
their own constitutional requirements, and once this is the case there is a certain period of
time where the member state in question and the European union negotiate, the EU in turn
concludes the agreement with the state and sets out the terms and arrangement of the exiting
state.

Regardless of Brexit, Britain is still a leading superpower, it has a permanent seat in the
United Nations Security Council, London is regarded as the European financial capital and
has close ties and yields influence on many countries around the world. This status that
Britain holds are not under any risks, but it is of vital importance that the British parliament
ensures Britain gets the best deal possible and does not suffer from the vast changes that will
be happening. Majority of laws and regulations in Britain at the moment are decided by the
European Union, and these laws address many aspects of society such as immigration,
business regulations, banking, police and security and more. Therefore, due to the large
change needed this British government will have to exercise unprecedented executive powers
in order to change and pass the high volume of legislation. The options facing Britain right
now, is to incorporate all EU laws into British laws and reform and change them accordingly,
or to scrap the EU laws and redraft and reinstate British laws. Both these options require vast
effort the current conservative government and will be naturally faced by a lot of scrutiny
from the public.

Brexit also opens up the chance for Britain to reform the manner in which they deal with
countries outside the EU, due to the freedom of movement within the EU immigration
coming from outside of the EU had to be over regulated. Britain now has the chance to create
new terms of trade unilaterally with countries from around the world as according to Theresa
May they will not be a part of the single market and customs union when the period of
negotiation is finished. This means Britain will able to engage commonwealth countries and ex-colonies more in terms of trade and immigration.
CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION

European immigration into the UK played a big role in the Brexit vote. It was one of the biggest points of debate and discourse during the campaign by both sides, and public polls showed that the electorate that voted *leave* considered immigration to be one of the biggest factors affecting their choice. Both the *remain* and *leave* campaigners made immigration one of the key points of debate and this elevated it more than other issues which would have normally been regarded as of more importance such, the Eurozone, the bureaucracy within European institutions, the European economy and the regulation of specific industries by the EU.

The issue of freedom of movement of people and the open borders was also debated at length, and events happening at the time such as the migrant crisis in Calais were being constantly discussed and televised. It’s also important to note that mainstream media incited the debate regarding immigration and according to many gave it more attention than was necessary. The parties and individuals that were campaigning to leave the union employed tactics, and alongside with the attention given by senior politicians from both parties and the media managed to link immigration to many of the public and social issues currently affecting Britain. Immigration was used as an excuse to justify the failures of the current and previous government which instead of reforming policy carried on borrowing and put public services under pressure through austerity cuts.

The lack of quantitative evidence to show immigration in Britain had a substantial effect on these services shows that a lot of the discourse was based not only on rhetoric but open borders and the rate at which immigration could happen in the future. *Leave* campaigners constantly repeated that over 400 million had absolute freedom to travel and live in Britain,
and this is something that worried the British electorate. In the UK the NHS is one of the most discussed topics during general elections, and it’s a very big factor in determining votes and support to the parties contesting the election, therefore by linking the problems being faced in the NHS to immigration, the leave campaign managed to sensationalize the issue and win many votes. The constant throughout the leave argument was that of demand and supply, if there is new and high demand because of immigrants for schools and housing then there won’t be enough supply of the services which in turn affects the British national. The same was done with the issues of decreasing wages which main campaigners blamed on foreigners willing to work under the minimum wage decreasing an employer’s demand for British citizens in order to save costs.

The arguments being made regarding immigration show that it was a feeling and change in political beliefs by the British electorate. The vote itself showed new and deep divisions amongst the British electorate, there was clear voting patterns which involved age of voters, and location of voters, voters under the age of 30 were more likely to vote in favor of remain especially ones in London and ore cosmopolitan cities, while rural older voters were found to have voted more in favor in Brexit, ironically a large group of voters who voted to leave lived in places that were not affected by immigration to a large extent, which leads to a belief that Brexit was a decision based on a nationalist ideology and a fear of what uncontrolled immigration could cause in the future for Britain.

Post the second world war after immigration substantially increased in the UK couple with globalization there has been what is argued to be a loss in culture and a loss of identity in Britain, seeing by the pattern of votes in terms of age and location it can then be assumed that the vote was an expression of nationalism and want by the electorate to restore British values,
culture and identity. With large and uncontrolled immigration integration is very difficult to achieve and having large portions of the population that even if naturalized follow different values and cultures could lead to a rise in nationalistic parties as is the case in some central and eastern European states.

The long-term impact and of the Brexit vote, and how it will shape the EU and United Kingdom will not be apparent for some time to come. As of August 2018, it has been 25 months after the vote, and we have a very small clue of the nature of prospective British-EU relations, or a framework of any arrangement or trade agreement amongst London and Brussels. Nonetheless, there are a number of evident consequences. First and foremost, a decision by a Member State to exit the union, is an enormous blow to the EU’s self-perception, global status and sense of resilience of the European project. If a Member can decide to leave, so possibly can other member states: there is no certainty about an ever-growing and rising EU. It can easily be turned back. Reason being that feeling of EU fragility previously existed due to the Euro Crisis, the UK’s decision to vote Brexit will only further deteriorate the European Union’s legitimacy reliability, and political capability to undertake it duties.

In addition, it also puts additional weight on the EU bodies and the Member countires, stressed with the Eurozone crunch, immigration flows from outside Europe, threat from terrorism in the Middle East and Russian hostility to the east. Coping with complicated Brexit discussions and negotiations decreases the funds available to handle all the aforementioned crises, and it also intensifies the intricacy of handling these crises as they start to influence each other. This mixture of crises can be observed being used by nationalistic forces, like the Front National in France to use the Brexit outcome in a larger assault against
the European Union. It only strengthens anti-EU players throughout the continent, with the view that the EU is undeniably collapsing and it will only require similar events like Brexit to end the Union’s existence.

Moreover, as we are yet to understand the potential outcomes of an EU-UK economic agreement, the Union has possibly lost one of its most economically liberal members. The consequence of the Brexit vote will probably result in a slower growth of the single market. Future undertakings like the Energy Union Project will similarly lose a key player among the EU. Furthermore, there is also added contact with increasing nationalism in Europe, as with the loss of the United Kingdom, single market improvements might disappear. Growing nationalist political parties are very much likely to call for more protection and safeguarding for local businesses. Without the United Kingdom’s presence to contribute against such protectionism, the ability of the European free traders to protect the single market is an uncertainty.

An added danger to the single market flows from the British withdrawal, as clarified previously, the United Kingdom has some reputation of being an employment shock absorber for the Eurozone and has absorbed up laborers from the Union states. If the United Kingdom never again gives the right to be employed to EU nationals in its country, those EU nationals will look over to other countries for jobs. An additional risk therefore emerges that for increasing number of nationalist parties, bigger flows of EU citizens into their countries develops into a major political problem. Nationalist parties, such as UKIP pursue to not just attack the Union for its botches in handling external migration flows, but also for the increased movements of EU job-seekers into their countries.
Some may argue that the potential harm to occur to the UK from leaving the EU will deliver greater comfort and backing for the European Union, or at minimum the acknowledgement that there are risks of exiting the Union. However, this may well not be how Brexit turns out because the United Kingdom are not similar to the other Eurozone countries, as the UK remains a currency sovereign nation. This means that it can borrow loans at rates, specific to terms in its own currency, permitting infrastructural and industrial loans to create new sources of development. London can hinge itself towards profound regulatory competition against the EU and the major fall in the currency offers the United Kingdom the ways to acquire a key benefit in international markets. This provides London the selection of creating a large funded economic scheme to counterbalance the losses caused andow to the uncertainty of Brexit. As a result, Britain might as well participate in discussions over the next few years with the European Union, with restricted economic damage, at the same time as the economy upholds a steady level of economic development (Riley, 2017).

As the storm begins to calm, all the political players and parties are having a difficult time to come to terms with the current political landscape that was deeply altered by the events of June 23rd 2016 and with a program set to be dominated and controlled for many years to come by the most multifaceted and high-stakes transnational negotiation in contemporary British history. No matter the approach used by the British government in executing the referendum outcome, Brexit has enhanced the division of values, viewpoints, and primacies that continuously divides university-educated individuals from poorly qualified nationalists.

The time of problematic and long-drawn-out negotiations between the United Kingdom and the European Union has deep-seated the divisions separating Britain’s liberal youth from conservative pensioners. It also divides its distinct and diverse major cities from its
homogeneous small town. If anything, these divisions were only engrained by the result of the 2017 general election, where the electorate turned out to be even more divided along the lines of age and ethnic background.

The 2016 Brexit vote exposed the complexities of the division between these groups and put them on conflicting sides of the important decision for a long time. Together the main parties will now have to struggle with in-house battles between Leavers and Remainers, those who want to highlight the single-market approach, and those who wish to highlight sturdier controls on free movement and migration. The calls for a strong voice for Remainers will probably grow as the complications and worries of Brexit grow, and if none of the traditional parties are capable of delivering them with their demands, then at some stage, it may be that they may pursue it elsewhere. Leave voters also give a major problem to the traditional parties. Their strong liking for immigration regulation on EU laborers is deemed by several in Europe to be mismatched and unsuited with Britain preserving complete access to the single market. This complex scenario puts Prime Minister Theresa May in the extremely challenging position of attempting to negotiate an arrangement with the European Union that exploits access to European markets for United Kingdom, whereas incorporating the immigration alteration that Leave voters evidently wish to have. The Prime Minister’s challenge is amplified by the fact that a small number of complete trade agreements have ever been undertaken and resolved in such a relatively small timeframe, and the Brexit negotiation is clearly more complicated than most negotiations.

On the other hand, if the British government chooses to act on immigration instead access to European markets, this may well have a great and unpredictable outcome for the economy. It is very likely that any possible deal will yield some backlash, irrespective of its contents.
Numerous *Leave* voters have extremely low levels of trust in the political system, yet they have great expectations that Brexit will reverse the social and economic transformations they oppose. These high expectations will be unmanageable to attain. A consideration would then be a foreseeable possibility that would create a fresh opening for an opportunity for radical right-wing populists. Handling the unavoidable dissatisfaction and disorder that will follow Brexit will be the government’s main task, whereas strengthening and rallying a popular backlash might be UKIP’s greatest chance for a post-Brexit revitalization.

The roots of the decision to vote for Brexit, then, can be sketched back over years and decades to transformations in the British society and political landscape that, by the 2016 vote, had abandoned an increasing section of older, white, nationalist, and socially conservative voters that felt sidelined from conventional mainstream politics and resisted to the socially liberal principles that have become a norm in their own country. The 2016 vote for Brexit laid bare and deepened a set of divisions that are mainly cultural rather than economic.

Throughout the West, the divisions between nationalists and cosmopolitans, or liberals and conservatives, cut through old disagreements and current established parties with new and tough challenges. In the United Kingdom, the negotiation of an exit deal with the European Union is the main policy task for the government of today. But for all the nation's political parties, expressing and answering to the divides laid bare in the Brexit vote will be the main challenge of tomorrow. Perhaps this could lead to opportunities for further studies to be done on Brexit, issues of immigration and the resurgence of nationalism in the 21st century.
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