

UDC 341.217.02(4-672 EU):63(497.11)

Biblid 0543-3657, 67 (2016)

Vol. LXVII, No. 1164, pp. 90–105

Original Scientific Paper

BREXIT: IMPLICATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE IN THE WORLD, IN EUROPE AND SERBIA

Dušan DABOVIĆ¹

Abstract: The aim of this work is to determine the implications of Brexit for agriculture, on a global level, in Europe, that is, in the European Union, and in Serbia. The methods used are the method of text analysis, formal-legal method, comparative method, and statistical methods. The sources used in this work are prominent theoretical works in the given area, national and international regulations, reports from the relevant institutions, electronic databases, and newspaper articles. The work consists of an introduction, a section about the genesis of Brexit, a section about the implications for agriculture and a conclusion. In the section about the genesis of Brexit, a theoretical explanation by A. J. Toynbee is presented, which explains the rise, collapse and disintegration of a civilization, as well as the facts regarding the Constitution for Europe, Brexit, and the Migrant crisis. Also, in this section, the immediate causes of Brexit are analyzed, as well as possible directions of further development of the EU. In the section referring to the implications of Brexit for agriculture, we analyzed the consequences on a global level, in the EU and Serbia. On a global level, we analyzed the consequences that Brexit will cause within the World Trade Organization, as well as the very important issue of the future approach of the United Kingdom to genetically modified organisms. The consequences of Brexit in Europe, that is, the EU, are presented primarily in two models (the Norwegian and Swiss model) by which the United Kingdom will most likely continue to cooperate with the EU, as well as in other aspects of the disassociation. In the part that relates to the consequences of Brexit in Serbia, we analyzed the immediate consequence, which refers to the Serbian foreign trade with the United Kingdom, as well as the indirect effects relating to the pace of accession, or rather the access of Serbia to the agricultural funds of the EU.

Key words: Brexit, the United Kingdom, the European Union, the Republic of Serbia, agriculture.

¹ Dušan Dabović, PhD. Higher Advisor. Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Serbia.

INTRODUCTION

Theorist A. J. Toynbee (2002) determined that every dynamic society (civilization) goes through different stages, which can be categorized as the formation, rise, breakdown, and disintegration. Analogously, Brexit could be the point, after which either comes the further development of the European Union (hereinafter: the EU) in an altered form, or a collapse, due to over-regulation and militarism, with a tendency for disintegration.

In its development, the EU went through the different phases, which was not only caused by international relations in Europe, but also in the world, as well as by the technological development and the development of economy and law. In this sense, Brexit could denote the end of the current phase of development of the EU, rather than the beginning of a new one. Namely, the message that the citizens of the EU (from the United Kingdom – hereinafter: the UK) sent to the administration in Brussels could have been predicted because it is only one in the series of warnings which were not taken seriously (the European Constitution, the Grexit, and the Migrant crisis). After Brexit, two opposing political concepts regarding the further development of the EU have imposed: the conservative and evolutionary concept. The conservative approach represents the maintaining of the existing system, with the strengthening of the central government, while on the other hand, the evolutionary approach strives for the redefinition of the existing system by reducing the competences of the central government and strengthening the sovereignty of the member states. The implications for agriculture can be observed on a global level, in the EU and Serbia. On a global level, the effects can be seen within the World Trade Organization (hereinafter: the WTO), due to the double membership of the UK in this organization, as well as in its future relation to genetically modified organisms (hereinafter: the GMOs). In Europe, the most important consequences of Brexit in the field of agriculture reflect on the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU, that is, on the relation between the UK and the EU in this field. The consequences of Brexit in the Republic of Serbia can be classified as immediate and indirect. The immediate consequences relate to the foreign trade with the UK, or rather the possibility to use the Stabilization and Association Agreement concluded with the EU, while the indirect consequences relate to the Serbian pace of accession to the EU, that is, to the agricultural funds.

Methods and resources

In this article, we have used the method of text analysis, for analysis of the respectable theoretical works, and texts of the relevant reports and the prominent newspapers on implications of Brexit for agriculture, on the global level, as well

as in Europe, that is, in the EU, and in Serbia. On the same subject, we have used the formal-legal method, for analysis of the relevant national and international legislation, the comparative method, for comparative analysis of the legal acts of the different countries, and on the international level, as well as the statistical methods for analysis of the adequate statistical data.

The sources, that is, materials used in this work are prominent theoretical works in the given area, national and international legislations, reports from the relevant institutions, as well as electronic databases and newspaper articles.

THE GENESIS OF BREXIT

Given that it originated on the idea of unity between the European countries, the Union was established to make the cooperation between the member states easier, especially within the economic sphere, and later on in the other spheres of life of citizens of the European countries. To this end, as a multinational formation, the EU has over time obtained a complex organization as well as more competences, including almost all social activities. Considering all of the important benefits, which the Union has enabled for the member states, that is, their citizens, the number of member states had increased more and more with the tendency to include the most of the countries of Europe (except the member states of the EFTA and some other exceptions). At the same time, with the increased benefits, which the Union offered to its member states, the number of obligations of these countries to the Union also rose, primarily concerning the financial obligations for the participation in the common budget, but also on obligatory implementation of some of the EU regulations, with the decrease of national sovereignty in the fields of interest for the functioning of the Union. Over time these obligations and restrictions became so difficult, that some of the member states refused further development of the Union in the direction of decrease of national sovereignty (France and the Netherlands rejected the Constitution for Europe by the referendums in 2005). Also, in 2015 the citizens of Greece rejected the Union's decisions which were not of any interest to them.

Furthermore, with the outbreak of the migrant crisis, the dissatisfaction of some of the member states increased in regard to the decision on the redistribution plan of the asylum seekers, which was forced upon by the EU in 2015-2016. Apart from that, there was a great influx of internal migrants (from the member countries) moving towards countries with the higher standards, primarily towards the UK. This brought on the increased dissatisfaction of the citizens of those countries, which resulted in Brexit in 2016 and the announcement from other state members (Hungary) to call a referendum on further membership in the EU. Hence, the further development of the EU can be observed from two opposite standpoints: the conservative and evolutionary

standpoint. The conservative approach offers to keep the current relationship between the EU and its member states with, on one hand, further strengthening of the sovereignty of the Union, or rather the current administration, whereby, on the other hand, weakening of the member states' sovereignty, while militarism emerges. As oppose to that, the evolutionary approach proposes a complete redefinition of the Union's concept, in accordance with the wishes and needs of its member states (their citizens), which is reflected in the decrease of the Union's competences and expenses, as well as the strengthening sovereignty of the member states.

Theoretical explanation of Brexit

The theoretical explanation for discontinuity and the turning point in the development of dominant social organizations can be found in the influential work *A study of history*, by A. J. Toynbee (2002), in which the author brings forth a thesis that a dynamic society (civilization) is formed by the leadership of a creative minority. Then, during the development of the society, the leading minority loses creativity and by overregulation and militarism becomes the leading minority. This creates antagonism with the masses, that is, with the proletariat, on the national and international basis, when it comes to the breakdown of a civilization and its disintegration begins: The existing evidence actually implies that an increased ruling over an environment is rather an element which leads up to the disintegration than enlargement. Militarism as a common characteristic of breakdown and disintegration ...' (Toynbee, 2002. p. 312).

Also, D. C. Somervell (1970), the compiler of Toynbee's ideas, vividly interpreted this idea: The leaders can take on the mechanics of their followers and that would result in the halt of a civilization or they could substitute the magic flute for the whip of coercion. In this case, the creative minority would become the ruling minority, and the "pupils" would become the unwilling and alienated "proletariat"... When this happens a society steps onto the path of destruction (Somervell, 1970, p. 531). We now move into an active form of distortion summarily expressed in the Greek formula... (glut, violent behaviour, and obliteration). Militarism is an obvious example (Somervell, 1970, p. 533).

The Constitution for Europe

The Treaty on Constitution for Europe was signed by the then 25 member states of the EU in October 2004, however, during the ratification process, only 18 member states confirmed the treaty, given that France and the Netherlands rejected the agreement by their referendums (in May and June 2005), and the ratification processes in the other member countries ceased. Instead of the

Constitution, in 2007 the Treaty of Lisbon was signed, which brought only some of the changes suggested by the original text. The Constitution for Europe predicted the formation of a political union, and the other radical changes in the organization of the Union in the direction of a higher level of unification and centralization, i.e. voluntary transfer of part of the sovereignty of the national countries to the Union. Given that the concept of the Constitution for Europe not only included the transfer of part of the national sovereignty to the EU, but also included a system of making a decision on the basis of the majority instead of consensus, the citizens of France and the Netherlands protested against these changes. Thereby, the other planned referendums relating to the ratification of the Constitution were uncertain, especially in the UK and Ireland, and it had a high probability of being negative. Namely, the citizens of Europe were not ready to give up their national sovereignty, or rather decision-making about parliamentary questions, as well as their legal traditions, which are maintained in their national constitutions, which would, in this case, have to be partially suspended. It is obvious that the EU administration had not sufficiently examined the public opinion for these kinds of radical changes neither had it taken into consideration the traditional perceptions of the communities in the provinces in all of the member states (The European Union Constitution, 2003-).

Grexit

Since 2001, when Greece joined the Eurozone, its foreign trade debt, as well as internal debt, has become higher and higher due to the objective and subjective causes. The matters were made worse when the financial crisis of 2008 occurred. In order to get out of this crisis, creditor nations, with Germany at the forefront, advocated that rigorous austerity measures should be taken in Greece that would inevitably make severely affects, one of which would probably be the increase of unemployment. At the early elections in Greece in January 2015, a majority of the voters chose the left-wing coalition, which recommended that debts should be written off, as well as the austerity measures. In order to confirm the will of the people, a referendum was called in July 2015, where the voters could either accept or reject the recommended belt-tightening measures. Before the referendum, Germany, as the largest single creditor, supported by the European Commission, as well as the relevant international institutions, considered excluding Greece from the Eurozone, and also from the EU (this plan was named Grexit). It could have been predicted that this kind of development of the crisis would be very painful not only for Greece but also for the EU and even for the whole world. However, even though in the international public a lot of pressure was put on them to accept the suggested set of restricted measures, the voters in Greece had overwhelmingly (61%) rejected those measures. After the

referendum, a compromise was made between the Greek government and the international creditors concerning the implementation of some austerity measures, along with a new credit of around 68 billion Euros (Kirby, 2015).

The Migrant crisis

According to the data of the UNHCR, the global refugee crisis at the end of 2014 reached a number of 60 million forcibly displaced souls, which is the most since World War II, with an increase of 40% since 2011 (UNHCR Statistic, 2015). The European refugee crisis began in 2015, when refugees from west and south Asia, Africa and west Balkan started to arrive in large numbers at the Greek and the Italian coasts by vessels, as well as by the land between Turkey and Greece, in order to get to the final destination, usually Germany and Sweden. Thereby, nearly all member states of the EU have an increased rate of asylum seekers, whereas some are particularly vulnerable, as Hungary, which is part of the migration route and has more than 20 requests for asylum per 10,000 residents. In April 2015, the European Commission suggested border service measures in order to prevent the unauthorized crossing of external borders in Italy and Greece. Also, Germany suggested using the quota system to distribute the asylum seekers between the EU member states, or rather to establish a special agency for the Union, which would do those duties. However, some of the member states, primarily Hungary, voted against the plan, but Germany suggested that the Union would not decide upon the question based on the principle of consensus but by the principle of the qualified majority. Meanwhile, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary regarded this system as unfair towards the asylum seekers, proposing that they should be allowed to decide for themselves where they would apply an asylum application. Still, in September 2015, based on the principle of majority, the decision to realize the plan for distribution of the asylum seekers was made, but the UK, Ireland, and Denmark abstained from voting and excluded themselves from the decision, against the idea were Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Romania, while Finland abstained. Given the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015, the realization of the plan was brought into question and Poland officially requested security guarantees in order to carry out the plan. Apart from that, Slovakia initiated proceedings against the decision before the European Court of Justice (Sputnik, 2016).

Immediate causes of Brexit

During the preparations for the referendum for Brexit, which was held on June 23, 2016, the campaign for leaving the EU was mostly based on issues on sovereignty and immigration. However, during the research conducted right

before the voting among the voters, 48% of the examinees stated that the biggest problem which Britain faced was in fact migration, and then, the EU (32%), while economy came in third place (27%). During the research conducted on the day of the referendum, nearly half of the examinees (49%), who voted to leave the EU answered that the biggest reason for leaving the EU is the principle of bringing decisions concerning the UK are brought in the UK, while nearly a third (32%) of these examinees stated that the biggest problem which the UK faced was the EU. Also, within the same group of examinees, a third (33%) stated that the fundamental reason for leaving the EU is the best way for the UK to regain control over immigration and its borders. This kind of division of the public opinion was caused by a mass immigration during the years before the referendum from member states of the EU into the UK, based on the principle of the freedom of movement for workers. Namely, during the period 1990-2003, the average influx of the internal migrants (from the EU member states) into the UK amounted to around 61,000 per year, in 2013 it amounted to 201,000 and in 2014 to around 268,000 internal migrants (Lord Ashcroft, 2016).

Therefore, the Brexit referendum was organized during the time when the discussion about the distribution of migrants was taking place by the majority decision of the EU, even though the UK excluded itself from taking part in this discussion. The influx of internal migrants boosted, with a tendency to increase even more, especially with the implication of the further enlargement of the Union, which would not only refer to the west Balkan countries but also to Turkey. Having mentioned this, the concern among the voters of the UK for their workplaces rose sharply. Namely, it became obvious that the EU brings decisions which are obligatory for all the member states, even though some of them disagree with those decisions. This kind of relation toward national sovereignty was obviously unacceptable for most of the voters in this referendum, especially having in mind the traditionally high level of national consciousness among the British citizens.

Two concepts for resolving the EU crisis

Given the fact that the majority of voters in the UK voted to leave the EU, which is the first ever recorded case in the history of the EU, two different perceptions for the further development of the EU arose: on one hand there are the 'western member states', or rather the founders (Germany, France, the Netherlands, Italy...), which represent the conservative approach, by which the further development or the Union should focus on strengthening the central authority, which is mirrored in forming a common army, which would symbolize the wish of the member states to defend their common interests, i.e. the safety of their external borders. On the other hand, the evolutionary approach is represented

by the ‘eastern member states’ or the members of the ex-eastern bloc (Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary...) whose beliefs Beata Szydło, the Prime Minister of Poland, formulated the best. She states that the EU must be changed, or rather, that there is a need for the strong union of sovereign countries. Even though it is obvious that the phase in which the EU currently is, requires new organisational concepts and ways of thinking which would give new energy, it is estimated that the eastern countries will have a hard time trying to put on their concept, if there is no will from the other side, concerning the economic strength of the western countries and bigger influence on the EU authorities (Foster, 2016).

The most vital part of the Union is its legislation, that is, *acquis communautaire*, which the European countries, which are not the member states or the candidates, and even some countries outside of Europe, are trying to harmonize with because of its quality. Therefore, if the obligatory implementation of the legislation would be abolished, many misunderstandings and dissatisfaction of the member states, which for some reason do not want to implement some of the legislation, would be avoided. Regarding this, the legal acts could be in the form of recommendations, without obligatory implementation and without a deadline to harmonize with, that is, in the sphere of ‘soft law’. This kind of legislation would suit the system of decision making based on the majority, given that the decisions wouldn’t be obligatory, but only advisory. Therefore, some of the institutions of the EU would lose their competences, and some could be cancelled. This would enable the reduction of the administration, that is, costs, which would lead to lesser givings of the member states to the budget of the Union.

IMPLICATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE

In the event that Brexit leads to the withdrawal of the UK from the EU, it might produce various consequences on Britain’s relation to the EU and on a global level relation within the WTO. These effects would be felt in all areas, especially in agriculture, given that agriculture, because of its significance, is specifically regulated by the EU and the WTO. Also, one of the most important issues in the field of agriculture is a relation of a country towards GMO products. These consequences in the agricultural sector would be directly transferred to the Republic of Serbia, having in mind that our country, as a candidate for membership, has a special trade relation to the EU, whereby it is also in the process of joining the WTO.

Implications for agriculture in the world

The UK is currently a member of the WTO both independently and within the EU, given that the EU is a collective member of the WTO. However, all trade

relations between the UK and the other members of the WTO (customs, quotas, etc.) are agreed on the EU level. Therefore, the UK would have to make individual trade arrangements with every member of the WTO, as well as with the non-member countries. This refers specifically to agricultural products which are in international trade considered as ‘sensitive’ products. Therefore, it brings a need for a series of bilateral agreements between the UK and every country individually, as well as a redefinition of trade relations of the third countries with the EU (Institute for Government, 2016).

One of the most important questions within the agriculture on a global level, which is asked after Brexit, is the future relation of the UK towards GMO. Namely, given its membership in the EU, the UK is obliged to apply deliberate legislation of the Union, which regulate the production, trade, and labelling of GMO products. On the other hand, global manufacturers of GMO products (USA, Canada, Argentina, Australia...) do not make a difference between GMO products and products which do not contain GMO, that is, they have liberal legislation in this field. It is still unsure whether the UK will bring the national legislation on GMO from the deliberate or the liberal point of view. This decision would not affect only the manufacturers of food in the UK but also the consumers. In this way, if the UK would change its policy about GMO products, a large market would open for the manufacturing and consummation of GMO products. On the other hand, if the UK would opt for the production of GMO, it would not be able to count on the EU market anymore, given that the EU countries, with which the UK carried out the most of its trade of agricultural products, are closing their markets to GMO products, with their own national legislations, but also with the legislations of the local governments. In that case, GMO manufacturers from the UK could look for other markets, such as China, where the use of these products is still possible (Warmflash and Entine, 2016; Shelton, 2016).

Implications for agriculture in Europe

According to the Article 50 of the Treaty on the EU, if the UK decides to leave the EU, it should notify the European Council, which will then give a time limit of two years for the negotiations for withdrawal. After the withdrawal, the UK faces the question about the further relation to the EU. Namely, the UK can decide to keep the status of a ‘third country’, without any special relation to the EU, which is not very likely, because the EU is the largest economic bloc in the world, whereby the UK exports 73% of its total export of agricultural products in the EU (Lever and Prassl, 2015). Apart from that, the UK can accept any of the existing models of economic relations between the EU and ‘the third countries’, such as the Norwegian or Swiss model. If it does not accept any of

the models, the UK can join other trade integrations, either European (EFTA) or North-American (NAFTA), or it can regulate its own economic relations with other countries based on the WTO rules.

The Norwegian model of economic relations between the non-member countries and the EU refers to the European Economic Area, or rather the space that not only includes all the EU member states, but also Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway. This economic area enables equal participation in the Single Market for countries which are not a member country, in terms of the free movement of goods, services, workers and the capital. Given that they equally participate in the Single Market, in trade in industrial as well as agricultural products, these countries must implement the EU regulations regarding employment, consumer protection, competition and environmental protection. However, these countries cannot participate in the process of bringing the regulations, that is, the politics regarding the Single Market (Dhingra and Sampson, 2016, p. 4-5; Swinbank, 2016, p. 8).

The Swiss model is based on the bilateral agreements regarding different issues on the functioning of the Single Market. Namely, Switzerland is a signatory of the EFTA which enables it the freedom of trade with the EU in the industrial area, while agreements are made about specific issues regarding the agricultural products, including the rates of customs and quotas for the trade of specific agricultural goods (cheese, chocolate, biscuits etc.) This model allows more freedom for the non-member countries in terms of the implementation of the EU regulations, but also includes smaller benefits of the equal participation in the Single Market. Also, as in the Norwegian model, the non-member country has no right to participate in the legislative procedure (Dhingra and Sampson, 2016, p. 5-6; Swinbank, 2016, p. 7).

The UK is an important payer of the EU budget, but also it is a user of the budget, mainly for the purpose of the agriculture (Buckwell, 2016, p. 8). Therefore, it is necessary that the EU carries out a rebalance of the current budget for the agricultural policy, which was adopted for the period 2014-2020. Apart from that, the constant requirements of the large givers of the agricultural budget will have to be taken into consideration under the new circumstances. Namely, the countries which are the budget's large givers required that the agricultural subsidies would be given on a national level and that the economically weaker member countries would receive help from the economically stronger member states on a voluntary basis, or rather as a donation.

Implications for agriculture in Serbia

The impact of Brexit on Serbia in the field of agriculture can be twofold, immediate and indirect. The immediate impact is reflected primarily on the foreign trade in agricultural products with the UK, that is, the possibility to export

these products on a non-tariff basis. On the other hand, the indirect impact of Brexit on Serbia can be observed in relation to the EU, or rather the pace of accession to its agricultural funds. Namely, if the UK leaves the EU, Serbia could suffer a damage from lost profits, given that the foreign trade, that is the agricultural products exported into the UK, would especially be in danger, because now the foreign trade is based on the principle of free trade with the EU member states, i.e. the non-tariff trade regime based on the Stabilization and Association Agreement.

Thus, it can be expected that the amount of Serbian export to the UK will be significantly reduced or it will completely be excluded. This is particularly important because the Serbian foreign trade balance with the UK is positive. In the period 2010–2015, Serbia had exports of agricultural products in the UK worth 118 million Euros, and imports worth 41 million Euros. At the same time, exports reached a maximum amount (approximately 28.5 million Euros) in 2015, while, compared to the previous year, increased by 81%. In the structure of exports raspberries and other berries were dominant, with the exception of 2010, when wheat and maize was mostly exported. In 2015, a worth of 14 million Euros of these products was exported, while a worth of 6 million Euros of other fruits was exported. On the other hand, imports during the observed period mildly increased, from about 5.5 million to about 9.5 million. Thereby, in 2015, whiskey was the most imported product (around 2.5 million Euros) followed by fish, coffee, cocoa and others (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2016).

Figure. Import-export between Serbia and the UK, 2010–2015 (in 000 Euros)



Resource: The Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia

The indirect effects of Brexit on the Serbian agriculture relate to the delay of accession to the EU, which may lead to changes in the EU policy towards its enlargement. In that way, 's agriculture would be deprived of subsidies for agriculture from the EU funds. The subsidies to farmers of the member states mainly consist of 'direct payments', which are regulated by the Regulation

1307/2013, and payments for the rural development, which are stipulated by the Regulation 1305/2013. Apart from that, in a smaller part, the giving to the EU farmers is also regulated by the Regulation 1308/2013 on market interventions and the Regulation 1306/2013 on the purpose of supporting the financing, management, and monitoring. Direct payments are entirely funded by the EU, where the recipient is required to fulfill the requirements in terms of environmental protection, animal and plant health, while payments for the purpose of rural development are paid out in cooperation with the relevant member state.

According to the Regulation 1307/2013, the maximum amount of total benefits from direct payments to farmers in 2016 were determined, giving Hungary around 1.3 billion Euros, the Czech Republic about 870 million Euros, Slovakia about 390 million Euros and Croatia around 150 million Euros. In addition, although the Serbian agriculture, by the number farmers and the size of the estates and general development, is between Hungary and Croatia, Serbian farmers, according to the budget of the Republic of Serbia in 2016, were given subsidies totalling to about 28 billion dinars (Law on the budget of the Republic of Serbia for 2016). Therefore, the interest of Serbian agriculture is to join the EU as soon as possible, in order to increase the financing of farmers, therefore delaying the accession affected by Brexit could indirectly cause a substantial loss to Serbian agriculture.

CONCLUSION

Within the genesis of Brexit, we determined that the facts upon which Brexit could have been foreseen were: the rejection of the Constitution for Europe by France and the Netherlands, Greece's denial to implement the restrictive economic measures, as well as the refusals of several member states of the EU to follow through with the decision on the distribution of migrants among the member states. In addition, two concepts for the further development of the EU were presented, the conservative and evolutionary concept. The conservative approach, represented by the western member states, refers to the retaining of the current government system in the EU, further strengthening of the central government and the weakening of the sovereignty of the member states. The evolutionary approach, presented by the eastern member states, suggests the redefining of the EU competences, that is, strengthening the sovereignty of the member states and the reduction of EU competences to a level that is necessary for the member states. It was found that the implications of Brexit for agriculture on a global level related mainly to the WTO because the UK will have to establish new foreign relations with other member states of the WTO, as well as with the EU member states. Besides, a question which is important on a global level is

whether the UK would in the future, after leaving the EU, adopt the liberal approach towards GMO or would it, as it has to do as a member of the EU, maintain the deliberate approach. On the European level, i.e. the EU, it was found that the UK would establish new relations with the EU based on the Norwegian or Swiss model, that is, the UK would be obliged to apply the EU regulations on agriculture, or it would implement the regulations on a voluntary basis. Also, it has been concluded that the effects of Brexit on the agriculture of Serbia can be divided into immediate and indirect effects. The indirect effects are mainly related to the foreign trade with the UK, given that, because of the UK's exit from the EU, the non-tariff trade regime will no longer be applied. Therefore, the reduction in trade with the is inevitable, although the export and import of agricultural products especially in recent years have risen. In addition, one of the most important indirect consequences of Brexit could be the slowing down of Serbia's accession to the EU, that is, the use of agricultural funds because the subsidies from these funds should strengthen our agriculture, as it is the case with the surrounding member states.

REFERENCES

- Buckwell, A. (2016). *Agricultural implications of Brexit*. Worshipful Company of Farmers. Accessed October 4, 2016, from <http://ca1-fml.edcdn.com/downloads/WCF-Brexit-18.01.16-pdf.pdf?mtime=20160207094708>.
- Dhingra, S., & Sampson, T. (2016). *Life after BREXIT: What are the UK's options outside the EU?* London: The London School of Economics and Political Science.
- EC. (2004). Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, *Official Journal C310*, 16.12.2004. (European Council, Brussels).
- EC. (2007). Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on the EU and the Treaty establishing the European Community, *Official Journal C306*, 17.12.2007. (European Council, Brussels).
- EU. (2013). Regulation 1306/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 352/78, (EC) No 165/94, (EC) No 2799/98, (EC) No 814/2000, (EC) No 1290/2005 and (EC) No 485/2008, *Official Journal L347*, 20.12.2013, p. 549–607 (EU, Brussels).
- EU. (2013). Regulation 1307/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy and

- repealing Council Regulation (EC) No. 637/2008 and Council Regulation (EC) No. 73/2009, *Official Journal L347*, pp. 608-670 (EU, Brussels).
- EU. (2013). Regulation 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007, *Official Journal L347/671*. (EU, Brussels).
 - EU. (2013). Regulation 1305/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, *Official Journal L 347*, 20.12.2013, p. 487–548 (EU, Brussels).
 - The European Union Constitution, 2003-. Accessed October 1, 2016, from <http://www.projectos.cchs.csic.es/euroconstitution/Home.htm>.
 - Foster, P. (Ed.). (2016). Authoritarian European Commission created Brexit and could destroy the Union, eastern states warn. *The Telegraph*. 13/9/2016. Accessed 5, October 2016, from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/09/13/authoritarian-european-commission-created-brexit-and-could-destro/>
 - Institute for Government. (2016). Brexit - brief 10 things to know about World Trade Organization. Accessed October 5, 2016, from <http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/brexit/brexit-brief-10-things-know-about-world-trade-organization-wto>
 - Kirby, P. (20 July 2015). Greece debt crisis: Has Grexit been avoided. *BBC News*. Accessed October 4, 2016, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-32332221>
 - Lever, J., & Prassl, J. (2015). *Brexit Seminar Series*. All Souls College. Accessed October 5, 2016, from <https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxlaw/brexit4-6nov15-full-report.pdf>
 - Lord Ashcroft. (2016). How the United Kingdom voted on Thursday...and why. Lord Ashcroft Poll, Accessed October 5, 2016, from <http://lordashcrofthpolls.com/2016/06/how-the-united-kingdom-voted-and-why/>
 - Poland plans EU reform proposals after Brexit vote - prime minister. *Sputnik*. 22/9/2016. Accessed October 5, 2016, from <https://sputniknews.com/politics/20160624/1041892266/poland-reforms-eu-pm.html>.
 - Randelović, S., & Arsić, M. (2015). Grčka kriza – uzroci, mitovi i pouke [Greek crisis- causes, myths and lessons], *Kvartalni monitor*, 41/15.
 - Shelton, H. (2016). After Brexit, British agricultural biotech firms have big opportunity in China, Genetic Literacy Project. Accessed 5, October 2016,

- from <https://www.geneticliteracyproject.org/2016/09/13/after-brexit-british-agricultural-biotech-firms-have-big-opportunity-in-china/>
- Somervell, D. K. (1970). Dodatak [Appendix], In A. Tojnbi. *Istraživanje istorije II [Study of History II]*. Beograd: Prosveta.
 - Sputnik. (09.03.2016.). “Return of the East-West Divide”: Migrant Crisis Sees the History Repeat Itself. Accessed 3. October 2016, from <https://sputniknews.com/europe/201603091036032714-europe-east-west-refugees/>
 - Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, application No.9839.
 - Swinbank, A. (2016). Gest editorial Brexit or Bremain? Future Options for the UK Agricultural Policy and the CAP, *Eurochoices*, 15(2).
 - Tojnbi, A. (2002). *Proučavanje istorije [Study of History]*. Beograd i Podgorica: JP Službeni list SRJ i CID.
 - UNHCR Statistics. (2015). 2015 likely to break records for forced displacement – study. Accessed October 3, 2016, from <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2015/12/5672c2576/2015-likely-break-records-forced-displacement-study.html>
 - Warmflash, D., & Entine, J. (2016). How Brexit will impact the future of farming, GMOs and gene editing in Britain and Europe. *Genetic Literacy Project*. Accessed October 5, 2016, from <https://www.geneticliteracyproject.org/2016/06/29/brexit-will-impact-future-farming-gmos-gene-editing-britain-europe/>.
 - Zakon o budžetu Republike Srbije za 2016. godinu [Law on budget of the Republic of Serbia for 2016]. Službeni glasnik RS. Br. 103 (2015).

Dušan DABOVIĆ

BREGZIT: POSLEDICE NA POLJOPRIVREDU, U SVETU, EVROPI I SRBIJI

Apstrakt: Cilj ovog rada je da utvrdi posledice Bregzita na oblast poljoprivrede, kako na globalnom nivou, tako i u Evropi, odnosno Evropskoj uniji i Srbiji. Korišćeni metodi su metod analize teksta, formalno-pravni metod, komparativni metod i statističke metode. Izvori koji su korišćeni u radu su istaknuti teorijski radovi u datoj oblasti, domaći i međunarodni propisi, izveštaji relevantnih institucija, elektronske baze podataka i novinski članci. Rad se sastoji od uvoda, odeljka o genezi Bregzita, odeljka o posledicama na poljoprivredu i zaključka. U odeljku Geneza Bregzita, predstavljeno je teorijsko objašnjenje A. DŽ. Tojnbi o usponu, slomu i raspadu civilizacija, a zatim činjenice u vezi Ustava Evrope, Gregzita i Migrantske krize. Takođe, u ovom odeljku su analizirani

neposredni uzroci Bregzita, kao i mogući pravci daljeg razvoja EU. U odeljku koji se odnosi na implikacije Bregzita na oblast poljoprivrede, analizirane su posledice na globalnom nivou, u Evropi (EU) i Srbiji. Na globalnom nivou analizirane su posledice koje će Bregzit imati u okviru Svetske trgovinske organizacije, kao i u odnosu na veoma važno pitanje proizvodnje, prometa i obeležavanja genetički modifikovanih organizama (GMO). Posledice Bregzita na Evropu, odnosno Evropsku uniju, predstavljene su u dva modela (Norveški i Švajcarski) po kojima će Velika Britanija najverovatnije nastaviti saradnju sa Evropskom unijom, kao i drugi aspekti razdruživanja. U delu koji se odnosi na posledice Bregzita na Srbiju analizirane su neposredne posledice, koje se odnose na spoljnu trgovinu Srbije sa Velikom Britanijom, kao i posredne posledice koje se odnose na tempo pridruživanja, odnosno pristupa Srbije poljoprivrednim fondovima Evropske unije.

Ključne reči: Bregzit, Velika Britanija, Evropska unija, Srbija, poljoprivreda.

Received: 23.10.2016

Revised: 01.11.2016.

Accepted: 02.11.2016