



## Impact of Rising Nationalism on The Global Governance: Case of Brexit and European Union

<sup>1</sup>Anum Munir, <sup>2</sup>Bibi Omul Baneen & <sup>3</sup>Sadaf Iftikhar

<sup>1</sup>MS International Relations, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Pakistan.

<sup>2</sup>MPhil Political Science, Punjab University, Lahore, Pakistan.

<sup>3</sup>MS International Relations, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Pakistan.

### ABSTRACT

#### **Article History:**

Received: Jan 21, 2024  
Revised: Feb 12, 2025  
Accepted: March 19, 2025  
Available Online: March 30, 2025

**Keywords:** Brexit, economic policies, European Union, global governance, nationalism

#### **Funding:**

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

The revival of nationalism is an increasingly visible and influential trend shaping contemporary international relations and political discourse. Across regions, nationalistic sentiments have challenged the established norms and institutional structures of international governance, leading to significant geopolitical shifts. This paper critically examines the resurgence of nationalism through a focused case study of Brexit—the withdrawal of the United Kingdom (UK) from the European Union (EU)—which stands as a seminal event in 21st-century global politics. The 2016 referendum, resulting in the UK's departure from the EU, is explored not merely as a domestic political development, but as a manifestation of deeper ideological and systemic tensions between national sovereignty and supranational governance. Through an interdisciplinary framework combining political theory, EU law, and international relations scholarship, the paper analyzes the economic, political, and institutional ramifications of Brexit. It illustrates how nationalist movements erode multilateralism, challenge the legitimacy of transnational institutions, and reshape foreign policy priorities around self-determination and border control. Furthermore, the paper contextualizes Brexit within broader global patterns of democratic backsliding, populist rhetoric, and the reassertion of state-centric ideologies.

© 2022 The Authors, Published by CISSMP. This is an Open Access article under the Creative Common Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0

**Corresponding Author's Email:** [anumm4833@gmail.com](mailto:anumm4833@gmail.com)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.61503/ciissmp.v4i1.298>

**Citation:** Munir, A., Baneen, B. O., & Iftikhar, S. (2025). Impact of rising nationalism on the global governance: Case of Brexit and European Union. *Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences and Management Practices*, 4(1), 208-220.

## **1.0 Introduction**

After a period of relative neglect in recent years, nationalism has rapidly become a powerful political trend, thus disrupting the previously balanced relationship between national politics and multilateralism that had defined international cooperation since the middle of the twentieth century (Mounk, 2018). A timely example is the case of the United Kingdom leaving the European Union or Brexit. The choice to exit the EU, as Clarke, Goodwin, and Whiteley (2017) note, indicates how states can adjust involvement in supranational institutions under the impacts of internal political contestation. This resurgent nationalism is evaluated in the current discussion concerning the legitimacy, effectiveness, and direction of multilateral governing institutions with a specific focus on the European Union. Over a few decades, the EU was developed as an interstate integration process aimed at deterring conflict and promoting economic and policy collaboration between member states (Schimmelfennig, 2018). However, the 2016 Brexit referendum also revealed a hankering by large swathes of the population against supranational control and what they saw as its immunity to democratic control. The Leave campaign appealed to the idea of regaining control over their own country, and this appealed to audiences with interests in national control over its own destiny and against mixed or shared governance (Hobolt, 2016). Similar trends of nationalism within other member states of the EU, such as Hungary, Poland, and Italy, have complicated the further consolidation of the Union as a political entity even further.

The increased activity of nationalist forces in recent years has advanced in various regions, putting pressure on the existing postulates of international cooperation and integration. The process through which the United Kingdom decided to pull out of the European Union is also a poignant example of this trend. Brexit has caused short-term political, economic, and social consequences, but it also has caused skepticism about the long-term viability of multilateral organizations. As a result, the cohesion of the EU, its ability in international trade negotiations and the wider international governance architecture are all now working with a higher level of strain. This paper explores how much this event, fuelled by nationalism, impacts both the internal navigations of the EU and the international system, specifically in reference to the rise of similar nationalism in other countries.

## **1.1 Research objective**

1. To examine how Brexit affected the capacity of the European Union to operate as a multilateral institution.
2. To review the consequences of Brexit on the design of the world trade regime and economic governance systems.
3. To evaluate whether Brexit will have impacts on nationalist movements in other countries and what effects it is likely to have on the entire system of international governance.

## **1.2 Research Questions:**

1. What has been the impacts of Brexit on the functioning capacity of the EU as a multilateral institution?
2. What does Brexit mean to international trade and economic management?
3. In what ways is Brexit likely to affect nationalist movements elsewhere and what are the

implications of this to global governance?

Nationalism is now challenging the established lines of the global governance system-an architecture that has, in most aspects, been founded on multilateral cooperation and liberal internationalism. Brexit is a prominent example: the deep-seated nationalist feeling brought about the exit of the United Kingdom out of the European Union, the prime example of the supranational regional integration. A case study of Brexit thus presents a fertile perspective through which to evaluate the consequences of nationalism on regional integration, international collaboration, and global governance at large.

This line of inquiry bears specifically on the interest of policymakers, scholars and multilateral institutions since it shows how nationalist mobilizations may undermine multilateral institutions, rebalance trade and economic relationships, and trigger comparable developments in other countries undermining world order and collaborative efforts

## **2.0 Literature Review**

Boersel and Risse (2018) describes nationalistic surges as a backlash against austerity measures in the aftermath of the Eurozone crisis following the European Union. This reading fits the discussion by Wellings (2023): whereas EU institutions achieved macro-financial stability, their tools could not reduce socioeconomic inequality. This democratic gap created resentment, especially among those who were not economically served by traditional parties in their security provision. At the same time, the sovereigntist forces posited EU regulations as a vehicle of exporting national wealth, which weakened popular adherence to European integration.

Wellings (2023) argues that the recent politicization of European integration has revealed the fragility of European identity, especially in areas of policies that directly influence daily life. With EU integration entering the cultural and social arenas, EU integration fostered a nationalist backlash. This has resulted in the fact that rather than stifling nationalist sentiment the European integration unintentionally abetted it which can be seen in Brexit and the growing distrust of the institutions of the EU, the Schengen Free Movement area, and welfare policies.

Mansfield et al. (2023) also illustrate that Brexit also served as a salient example, influencing nationalist parties in the EU. The Leave win at first emboldened anti-EU propaganda among elites in other countries but the ensuing Brexit deal revealed notable economic and political obstacles which pushed nationalist elites to alter their rhetoric- an inhibitory effect. After the post-Brexit results, such as the United Kingdom vaccination effort, gained international attention, the nationalistic rhetoric picked up. The following feedback loop shows how nationalist projects might shape governance outside of Europe as a result of transnational learning processes among elites.

Smith (2019) methodically evaluates the post-Brexit impacts on the EU external relations in the fields of commerce, development, transatlantic relations, and security. His discussion shows that the exit of Britain weakened the EU in military and diplomacy at the same time that it required the Union to play a greater leadership role in global governance. The episode rebalances the discursive formation of EU foreign policy, centralising critical roles previously held in collaborative procedures with the United Kingdom to more independent stances. In this regard, English departure can destabilize the current governance structures and trigger institutional

change.

Hugo (2020) argues that Brexit reflects a wider shift from neoliberal globalism to neorealist nationalism. The rejection of the British position suggests a new wave of populism and increased self-determination in the international system. Traditionally considered as a defender of liberal international order, the British move marks a significant decline in multilateral participation. The resulting break, therefore, highlights the resurgence of nationalism, which questions predominating global governance principles and shifts authority back to the sovereign state.

### **3.0 Methodology**

The current research is qualitative in its research orientation and performs a case study of Brexit as a crucial issue that is being examined in the context of unraveling the impact of rising nationalism on international governance with particular regard to the European Union. To that end, data have been obtained through official documentation (issued by EU organizations and the United Kingdom government) and through academic articles, and pertinent media coverage. In this study, discourse analysis is used to analyse nationalist rhetoric and determine its consequences on the popular mood and policy-making. The results are placed into the contrasting analysis of the governance systems prior and after the UK leaving the EU, which will allow making a careful evaluation of how nationalist movements undermine supranational bodies and transform the international cooperation architecture.

#### **3.1 Theoretical framework**

This paper questions the phenomenon of the emergence of nationalism and how this has affected international governance by comparing two such international-relations paradigms Constructivism and Realism. It is based on Brexit and European Union (EU), and the possibility to appeal to institutionalist approaches is conditioned by the level of analysis. Constructivism puts more stress on identity, norms and societal setting, in contrast with Realism, which puts stress on power politics, national interest and sovereign states. In combining forces, these theoretical lenses explain the ideational and material aspects of nationalism challenging supranational institutions.

Constructivist approach holds that in addition to material capabilities, social constructed reality like identity, beliefs, and norms defines international politics (Wendt 1999). In the context of Brexit, the wave of nationalism can be viewed as the response to the perceived loss of British national identity. The bloc was packaged by the EU critics as an international technocratic elite that was destabilizing national sovereignty and homogenizing cultural identity (Risse 2010). This story appealed to a specific sense of Britishness that was based upon historical accounts of independence and exceptionalism.

The main idea of realism is that power politics and national interest in an anarchic state of the world is primary, and hence provides a complementary but balanced view. Within this context, the emergence of nationalism in the context of Brexit can be seen as a reinstatement of the sovereign prerogatives of Britain in relation to the EU. The search of material and psychological reassurances in an uncertain international order by sovereign states, especially great powers, can lead to the revival of nationalist narratives.

Institutionalism argues that Brexit is a sign of the EU not adjusting to the interests of the people in the member states. This view holds that international cooperation is achieved through institutional effectiveness, legitimacy and responsiveness as a long-term solution (Keohane, 1984).

## **4.0 Findings and Results**

### **4.1 Brexit and 2016 Referendum: Detailed Explanation**

The term Brexit or British exit refers to the process by which the United Kingdom (UK) voted to leave the European Union (EU) during a referendum held on 23 June 2016. The result a 52 to 48 per cent vote to leave the EU, was a tipping point in modern European politics and one with not only internal British ramifications but also global ones on the international model of governance.

#### **4.1.1 Causes and background**

The UK has had a long equivocal relationship with the EU, as it is exemplified by its late accession to the EU in 1973 and its non-adoption of the euro. The issue of sovereignty, immigration, and regulatory control have always contributed to a wave of Euroscepticism in British politics (Geddes, 2013). The rise of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), pressure groups of Eurosceptic elements of the Conservative Party, and the increasing disillusionment of the populace regarding the rule of Brussels, had induced Prime Minister David Cameron to include a promise of a referendum on EU membership in his 2015 election manifesto. The plan had two intended consequences: to answer the UK EU question once and for all, and to entrench unity within the party.

#### **4.1.2 Implications and outcomes**

Brexit had both immense political, economic, and geopolitical implications to the UK and, by extension, to the general global system of governance. The political impact of the decision was to rearrange power structures in the country, exaggerate party-political cleavages and reorganize civil-society mobilization. The economic effects of the process were financial market uncertainty, trade disturbances, and resilience-testing changes in production networks, both domestic and transnational. In geopolitical terms, Brexit changed Britain position in terms of negotiations with the EU and the United States, increased regional issues in Europe as regards to stability, and shifted British strategic positioning in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

#### **4.1.3 Campaign Dynamics**

In the June 2016 referendum, the Remain campaign (which was backed by the U.K. Government, the major political parties, and a variety of global financial institutions) focused its arguments on economic dangers of leaving the EU. Also highlighting the benefits of being a part of trade, investment, and international influence, this coalition threatened that Brexit might trigger uncertainty, loss of jobs, and a weaker pound (HM Treasury, 2016). Comparatively, the Leave campaign took the motto of Take Back Control and prioritised national sovereignty, control over its borders and what it characterised as undemocratic nature of the EU. The Leave advocates vowed to withdraw the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice, stop paying EU budget, and reclaim the authority over immigration (Clarke et al., 2017).

The burning question was immigration, which was raised to a new level due to the 2015

refugee crisis. The Leave campaign presented the freedom-of-movement regime of the European Union as damaging to such areas as social cohesion, state services, and national identity. This message connected with the voters in economically disadvantaged regions with the feeling that they were left behind due to globalization and European integration (Hobolt, 2016). Emotive messaging, especially around potential Turkish accession to the EU and the possible uncontrolled migration, was a determining factor in defining the public sentiment, but it received much criticism as misinformation (Dennison & Geddes, 2018).

#### **4.1.4 Post-Referendum Developments**

Following the national vote, Prime Minister David Cameron resigned, and Theresa May replaced him. May used the process to trigger Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union in March 2017. The Brexit negotiations which followed were complex, as the negotiations fell apart over trade, Irish border and the rights of the European Union citizens. The withdrawal agreement was finally agreed in 2019 under the premiership of Boris Johnson, and the United Kingdom made an official exit out of the European Union on 31 January 2020 with a transition period following until 31 December 2020 (European Council, 2020). Brexit has notably transformed the status of the United Kingdom as a global player, and the discussions regarding national sovereignty, free trade, and internal stability, especially concerning Scotland and Northern Ireland have become an ongoing debate (Menon & Fowler, 2020).

#### **4.1.5 The effects of Brexit on European union**

The withdrawal of the United Kingdom, termed as Brexit, out of the European Union on 31 January 2020 was a significant turning point to the EU that transformed the European Union composition, institutional power, economic dependence, its global status, regulation systems, and way of political identity. Based on a range of academic, institutional, and journalistic perspectives, the current discourse outlines the various and diverse implications of Brexit to the EU on systematic analyses of ideological trends, economic and financial impacts, regulatory adjustment, defence and foreign policy considerations, and general political-institutional dynamics.

#### **4.2 The Ideological and Institutional Shuffle**

The processes that preceded and accompanied the withdrawal of the United Kingdom of Europe to the European Union were marked by ideological and institutional realignment. Before Brexit, the United Kingdom was a part of the so-called liberal bloc within EU, a grouping of northern states (i.e., Germany, the Netherlands, and the Nordics) that championed economic liberalisation, deregulation, and EU expansion.

The departure of the United Kingdom saw this coalition lose a significant amount of influence, thus skewing the balance of power in the Council. The resulting vacuum allowed more prominence by a protectionist and state-interventionist position, especially that argued by the bloc of southern member states led by France. According to one notable commentator, Britain represented a massively influential balancing force within the EU. The departure has undermined the openness and liberalism of the EU.”

The result of this ideological re-alignment is seen in the later EU policymaking that took a more conservative course of regulation, especially when it came to digital markets and use of

artificial intelligence.

#### **4.3 Dislocation of Capital Market and Trade**

The formal Brexit of the United Kingdom of the European Union has elucidated considerable economic and financial consequences, the most prominent of which are the trade-corridor disruptions and deviation of the connections of the capital markets. A gravity-model-based empirical study has found that intra-regional trade between the two regions declined by about 10.5 percent during the referendum period, whereas the intra-regional trade within the EU grew by a relatively modest 1.5 percent-4.6 percent since some precipitated flows were shifted inside the Union.

At the same time, financial markets in the EU, which have long relied on the deep capital markets in London, are facing the threat of losing cohesion. European Central Bank has already assessed that Brexit has only increased the need to complete the Capital Markets Union (CMU) to preempt the risk of concentration of assets and regulatory arbitrage.

#### **4.4 Relocation of Financial Services**

Despite what the EU has accomplished in avoiding systemic financial shock, significant dislocation of financial services has still taken place. London has lost tens of thousands of jobs, also in investment banking, to EU financial centers including Dublin, Luxembourg, and Paris.

#### **4.5 Shuffled to State's Initiated Digital Regulation**

The decision of the United Kingdom to leave the European Union (EU) has triggered a significant reshaping of regulatory and strategic relations in the European process of integration. The most prominent example is how EU member states are pushing the pace of interventionist digital regulations. The focus of this course is on the trilogy of policies of the European Commission consisting of the Digital Markets Act, Digital Services Act, and the EU Artificial Intelligence Act, which was pushed forward due to the French political block and unopposed by the British. The opponents argue that, although these instruments are expected to extend consumer protection levels, they threaten to stop innovation and instill in the EU regulatory system a bureaucracy of overdrive. At the same time, some non-European tech giants (e.g. Meta, Apple) express their concern over the venality and the complexity of compliance requirements and European tech giants have not yet been fined yet, which demonstrates the asymmetry of enforcement.

#### **4.5 Increased Security Cooperation**

Simultaneously, Europe has been turned into a more coherent European security architecture. The exit of the United Kingdom, which was once an important player in EU defence, has shifted power arrangements. However, Brexit has also hastened a closer defence cooperation: initiatives like European Defence Fund and Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) have received an impetus, partly as a result of new evaluations that followed the Bratislava and Rome declarations.

#### **4.6 Political and Governance Domain**

Another primary area of study when it comes to EU is political and governance dynamics. The case of Brexit serves as a good lesson, which highlights the importance of strengthening the

institutional integrity of the Union and maintaining the single market. Here, the conduct of Michel Barnier in his leadership role during the negotiations was unprecedented in its transparency and institutional closeness. In turn, analysts argue that the post-Brexit period has seen the EU becoming increasingly cohesive and therefore more successful; this improved unity allowed the EU to implement collaborative projects like NextGenerationEU during the COVID-19 pandemic and coordinate sanctions against Russia.

At the same time, Brexit has catalyzed the loss of governing networks reliant on British inclusion. The literature captures the erosion of the so-called second-order effects of governance, as civil society organizations, sub-national entities and policy networks became deprived of key avenues of information, influence and legitimacy.

#### **4.7 Soft Power and World Rule**

The Brexit of the United Kingdom reduces the overall economic size and strategic capacity of the European Union as a whole. The Brexit has an outsized effect on EU representation in multilateral organizations, especially at the UN Security Council, as well as in institutional arrangements such as the European Investment Bank, which Britain used to subsidize. But the exit also forces the EU to seek a more unified trade policy abroad, leveraging both Brexit and the wider geopolitical environment, the most prominent element of which is the protectionist rhetoric of the Trump administration, to position itself as a European champion of open trade.

At the same time, increased competition over diplomatic favor between the United Kingdom and the European Union towards China and the United States is transforming the world order. Shortly after Brexit, the EU actually signed a Geographical Indication Agreement with China in order to cement ties with Beijing. Nonetheless, Britain leaving has complicated the following process of EU China negotiations since the UK had been involved to act as a mediator between the two sides previously.

#### **4.8 Effects of Brexit on Global Economy and Trade**

Brexit was a fundamental shift in the world order of economic and trade governance. With the United Kingdom being one of the largest economies of the world, its withdrawal process in the EU single market and the customs union created tremendous echoes in the economy of the EU and world trading systems, international regulation, and the multilateral institutions.

#### **4.9 Restructuring of the World Trade Patterns**

The signed EUUK trade and cooperation agreement (TCA) in December 2020 avoided imposing tariffs but created major non-tariff commerce leading to customs checks and discrete regulations (Springford, 2021). The volume of trade between the UK and the EU plummeted following the withdrawal, with UK exports to the EU decreasing by almost 15 % in 2021 and staying lower than the levels before Brexit (Crowley, Exton & Han, 2022). These effects were not compensated by trade with non-EU states; whereas the UK government sought more trade agreements, the net effect of all of them was not significant, and the smaller economies often faced increased barriers without the provisions of full bilateral agreements (Mendez-Parra, 2023).

#### **4.10 Disturbance in The Global Value Chain**

The advocacy of the United Kingdom leaving the European Union, which is usually



referred to as Brexit, has had severe consequences in the international value chains especially on aspects like automobile manufacturing, production and supply of textiles and pharmaceuticals. This has been confirmed by empirical evidence that these effects have been particularly strong in areas such as the apparel and the textile industries. The survey of 692 UK companies carrying on business in these areas shows that many of them had to restructure the distribution chains, relocate the production sites, or reduce the export to the European Union to meet the increased customs and regulatory tasks (Casadei and Iammarino, 2021).

Brexit has also shaken long-standing preferential trading arrangements enjoyed by developing countries that had gained access through EU Generalized system of Preferences. Countries like Kenya and Bangladesh are also now at a risk of reduced access to the United Kingdom market as a result of the failure to extend EU-level preferences (Te Velde, 2021). Such turns of events raise more far-reaching questions to the extent that the United Kingdom is genuinely interested in the long-term cooperation with the other countries and in stimulating economic growth by means of trade.

#### **4.11 Disturbance in Trade Laws and Agreements**

There has been much reporting about the recent disintegration of trade deals and regulatory regimes since the United Kingdom exited the European Union. Brexit led to the withdrawal of British involvement in more than 40 agreements that the EU had agreed with third states. In further attempts to replicate such arrangements, the UK signed so-called continuity agreements, but what these agreements usually did not share with their predecessors in the EU was their scope and detail (Evenett & Winters, 2021). Agreements made with Japan and Canada, say, keep tariff-free trade going on but do not include the more advanced form of regulatory convergence and bilateral-recognition process that had been created by EU oversight. As a result, the UK currently enjoys a significantly reduced negotiating power compared to the EU, and the ability to influence the new global trade standards is therefore reduced (Evenett & Winters, 2021).

#### **4.12 Implications for WTO**

After Brexit, United Kingdom resumed its participation in World trade organization (WTO) in that it was in a position to influence the structure of multilateral trade. However, its reduced geographic and economic size also restrains its power of influencing collective rules. The scholars argue that WTO multilateralism, especially the Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) rule, has been compromised as a result of the post-Brexit trade strategy of the UK (Hoekman, 2020), which reflects the taste of bilateral agreements and industry-specific protection. Besides, the uncertainty over the UK obligations in services and agriculture sectors is causing strains within the WTO membership (Reidel, 2023).

#### **4.13 Economic and Trade Policy Designs**

The trade governance architecture of the United Kingdom (UK) has taken a different shape after Brexit. A new Department for International Trade (DIT) has now been created to undertake trade negotiations and then implement the resulting policy. However, researchers argue that governance of trade in the UK is characterized by a lack of transparency, inter-agency coordination, and poor accountability (Holden, 2021). Contrastingly, the institutional framework

of the European Union (EU) guarantees that the concerns of social, environmental and human rights are markedly offered within the framework of trade agreements. The inconsistency in the EU standards, e.g. on digital governance, food safety and environmental management, is associated with the likelihood of rising fragmentation of regulations thus jeopardizing the integrity of international regulatory frameworks (Evenett & Winters, 2021).

#### **4.14 Strategic and Alliance Shift**

At the moment, the United Kingdom and the European Union are both involved in strategic rebalancing in the context of international trade. In the EU, the organisation has also stepped up its outreach to Asia and Latin America. At the same time, the United Kingdom has joined the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) in 2023, thus pursuing access to rapidly growing markets. Nevertheless, analysts continue to raise questions about the ability of the UK to offset the removal of EU trade in remote relationships (Springford, 2021).

#### **4.15 Impacts on Brexit on The Nationalist Movements of Other Countries**

##### **4.15.1 Strengthened Nationalist Sentiments Among Elites**

The leave ballot in the United Kingdom referendum on the membership of the European Union in 2016, otherwise known as Brexit, provided an educative prism to the nationalist rhetoric and shaped the process of elite learning among various parties and institutions. Brexit can be described as an experiment in nationalism in practice that unexpectedly revitalised nationalist and populist parties in European politics (Martini & Walter, 2023). Even public personalities like Marine Le Pen in France and Geert Wilders in the Netherlands supported the results of the referendum and promoted the same initiative in their constituencies (Martini & Walter, 2023). However, as Britain was facing economic shocks, political instability, and drawn-out trade discussions, support of similar directions rose among nationalistic and populist political causes.

##### **4.15.2 Regional Nationalism**

Brexit has transformed the regional independence visions especially in the United Kingdom. Brexit has also triggered distrust in Westminster governance, in Scotland and Northern Ireland, which voted to stay. The re-emergence of the Scottish National Party (SNP) has increased pressure to a second independence referendum, placing EU membership as a more beneficial option compared with maintaining membership of the United Kingdom (Keating, 2020). At the same time, Sinn F in the Northern Ireland has used the Brexit scenario to promote the idea of Irish unification, taking advantage of the uncertainty about borders and trade (Tonge, 2021). Together with these responses, these situations demonstrate how Brexit is reorganizing sub-state nationalist politics with a new offering of a political cleavage.

##### **4.15.3 Sovereigntism Expansion**

The Brexit has not been followed by a cascade of other departures but it has increased the sovereigntist rhetoric in Hungary, Poland and other Central and Eastern European countries that are members of the European Union. Fidesz, Law and Justice (PiS), and Lega are the main representatives of political forces that define the EU institutions as the threat to national sovereignty (Brack & Startin, 2019). Though these groups do not typically support complete

distancing of the Union, they challenge its jurisdiction on the national policy areas, including migration management, judiciary reform, and other governance policies. The formation of transnational right-wing formations after Brexit, such as the movement labeled as Patriots for Europe, display the extent to which the sovereigntist spirit has taken an institutional form and unity (Kelemen & Pech, 2019).

#### Repercussions for global governance

The consequences of Brexit go far beyond the European continent, and the global governance structure is disturbed. It first undermined liberal internationalism since it showed that the rejection of multilateralism can bring immediate political dividends (Junker & Grosse, 2021). This trend also emboldened the likes of the United States under Trump, Brazil under Bolsonaro and others mushrooming similar instances at the time to challenge existing international conventions. Second, Brexit was able to change the external-policy environment of the EU. France and Germany have taken a greater role to promote the creation of full-scale EU-level defence systems in the absence of the United Kingdom, which was previously a significant actor in the EU military and diplomatic activities (Biscop, 2019). However, nationalistic barriers still make it difficult to achieve the realization of such aspirations in the EU.

### **5.0 Discussion and Conclusion**

The recent revival of nationalism presents a potentially serious threat to the design and functional dynamics of global governance in the past few decades. The Brexit of the United Kingdom or the withdrawal of the latter out of the European Union can be deemed as a rather tangible example of this trend in one of the leading western democracies and thus a very relevant case by which more general world trends can be assessed. Through a critical examination of the political, economical, and institutional aspects of the departure of the United Kingdom to the European Union, the paper has pointed out the possibility of nationalism to interfere with supranational organisations, multilateral cooperation, and the normative assumptions of world governance.

Nationalism in its core goes to the fore with the need of national sovereignty, self-determination, and cultural identity. Even though these aspirations form the basis of statehood, they often come into conflict with those of global governance, which is based on shared sovereignty, joint decision-making, and international law. This confrontation is clearly dramatised by the Brexit.

Brexit was a definitive political break, pre-conditioned by the driving force of the return of the power of making the laws, regulating migration, and trade agreements, an undisguised rejection of the EU shared governance model. The withdrawal process has therefore taken the form of an ideological battle between the nationalist and cosmopolitan notions of the political power. Operationally, the exit of Britain out of the EU muddies up international cooperation processes especially in areas of climate policy, migration control and security coordination. In the past, the United Kingdom had set an example of a liberal-internationalist posture in multilateral forums; however, the tendency of post-Brexit move toward bilateralism, flexible coalitions, and maintenance of latitude of national policies has reduced the predictability and collective strength to address transnational demands of action. This trend is consistent with the overall trends in other

nationalist minded governments, all of which work to create a shrinking of multilateral obligations, undermining the existing institutional systems, and leading to a globalization of inefficiency and division.

To conclude, Brexit demonstrates the long-term consequences that nationalism is capable of having on the world government. The phenomenon undermines existing expectations of common sovereignty and institutional accommodation, such that these institutions will examine their own constraints, review their own legitimacy, and, in many circumstances, adapt. This means that the future of global governance will depend both on resisting the outward pull of nationalism and on addressing the underlying causes of this phenomenon that give it its allure, the roots of which are economic inequality, cultural discontent and democratic failure. In the final analysis, it is only through the formulation of inclusive, responsive, and elastic governance systems that the international community can harmonize the nation-specific identity and global interdependence in a multipolar world.

**Anum Munir:** Problem Identification and Theoretical Framework

**Sadaf Iftikhar:** Data Analysis, Supervision and Drafting

**Bibi Omul Baneen:** Methodology and Revision

Conflict of Interests/Disclosures

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest in this article's research, authorship, and publication.

## References

Biscop, S. (2019). *European Strategy in the 21st Century: New Future for Old Power*. Routledge.

Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2018). European economic governance and rising sovereignty. In *Economic sovereignty and supranational coordination* (pp. 23-...). Springer.

Brack, N., & Startin, N. (2019). Introduction: Euroscepticism, from the margins to the mainstream. *International Political Science Review*, 40(2), 179–190.

Checkel, J. T. (1998). The constructivist turn in international relations theory. *World Politics*, 50(2), 324–348. (link unavailable)

Clarke, H. D., Goodwin, M., & Whiteley, P. (2017). *Brexit: Why Britain voted to leave the European Union*. Cambridge University Press.

Clarke, H. D., Goodwin, M., & Whiteley, P. (2017). *Brexit: Why Britain voted to leave the European Union*. Cambridge University Press. (link unavailable)

Dennison, J., & Geddes, A. (2018). Brexit and the perils of 'Europeanised' migration. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(8), 1137–1153. (link unavailable)

Electoral Commission. (2016). EU referendum results. <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/who-we-are-and-what-we-do/elections-and-referendums/past-elections-and-referendums/eu-referendum/results-and-turnout-eu-referendum>

European Council. (2020). *The United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union*.

Geddes, A. (2013). *The European Union and British politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Goodwin, M., & Heath, O. (2016). The 2016 referendum, Brexit and the left behind: An aggregate-level analysis of the result. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(3), 323–332. (link unavailable)

HM Treasury. (2016). *HM Treasury analysis: The immediate economic impact of*

leaving the EU. (link unavailable)

Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: A divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), 1259–1277.

Hugo, R. G. (2020). The rise of nationalism in the United Kingdom and its impact on globalisation: a critical analysis (Doctoral thesis). North-West University.

Hyde-Price, A. (2008). A normative power Europe? Ethical foreign policy, realism and the EU's global role. *European Security*, 17(1), 3–24. (link unavailable)

Junker, P., & Grosse, T. G. (2021). Brexit's implications for European and global multilateralism. *Global Affairs*, 7(3), 241–258.

Keating, M. (2020). The independence of Scotland in the age of Brexit. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 8(2), 135–149.

Kelemen, R. D., & Pech, L. (2019). The rule of law and the state of emergency in the EU. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(3), 475–493.

Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.

Mansfield, E., Walter, S., et al. (2023). Learning from precedent: how the British Brexit experience shapes nationalist rhetoric outside the UK. *Journal of Politics & Governance*.

Martini, A., & Walter, S. (2023). Learning from precedent: How Brexit has shaped Euroscepticism in Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 30(1), 1–22.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W.W

.  
.   
.