Brexit and its Impacts on Iran-EU Relationship

Abdolmajid Seifi

Assistant Professor Political Science, Ayatollah Borujerdi University, Borujerd, Iran, seifi2002@gmail.com

Shahrzad Maftooh

British Studies, Faculty of World Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran, shahrzadmaftooh@gmail.com

Abstract

The British people vote to withdraw from the European Union (Brexit) in 23 June 2016 referendum is one of the most important events occurred in the European Union since its formation. Brexit can highly affect the future status of the EU in the international system and the relationship between the EU and other regions of the world. Withdrawal of the UK from European Union occurred after the agreement reached between Iran and E3+3 on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), and at the time when Iran-EU relationship seemed to improve, so this departure can highly shape and affect Iran-EU relationship. The question this paper addresses is that how the Brexit would affect the relationship between the EU and Iran. To answer this question, the hypothesis proposed here is that the Brexit would improve the relationship between Islamic Republic of Iran and the European Union by decreasing the transatlantic weight and the US-oriented tendency in the EU. This article uses descriptive-analytical approach.

Introduction

The years following the second world war witnessed the enormous efforts of Europe to improve the level of convergence and unification among European countries. The European Union (then the European Community), as the result of these efforts, is considered a wonderful phenomenon in international relations studies which not only increased the number of actors in the international scene and brought the international studies out of the single issue of governing states, but also helped to moderate the subject of national sovereignty. However, this transition did not happen that smoothly, and the convergence of European countries in the post-world war II highly experienced its ebb and flows, and faced various challenges (Naghibzadeh, 2003: 6).

One of the significant challenges was that there were certain paradoxical approaches and policies among some European states, especially influential ones. No state among European states has ever proved so problematic and has created severe contrasts in different phases of the integration process than the UK.

It is worth mentioning that even Britain tried to continue its historical balancing policy among European countries as well as between the US and the EC/EU after joining the bloc. On the other hand, the UK has always been more inclined toward its transatlantic partner, and has prioritized the US over her relationship with European countries. The reason lies in the shared history, an overlap in religion and a common language and legal system which formed a specific relationship between them known as the "special relationship" which is the exceptionally close political, diplomatic, cultural, economic, military and historical

relations. Former German chancellor Helmut Schmidt once said: "the Atlantic Ocean between England and America is broader than the channel between England and continental Europe" (Häussler, 2015: 2).

This preference policy led to some disagreement in the UK over the EU policies and finally a proposal for withdrawal from the bloc was put forward. The issue of remaining or leaving the EU has been raised since the late 1980s, and has always been a major concern for the British politicians and policy makers, especially for the Conservative activists. This party promised to hold a referendum when it came to power in 2010.

The 23 June 2016 referendum and the British vote for Brexit is one of the important (some experts believe the most important) developments occurred in the European Union since its formation. The immediate effects of Brexit soon affected the international markets and many speculations have been raised on the issue of the EU fate, and the UK relationship with the EU and other states. This referendum and the popular vote to leave the EU would have short-term and long-term consequences at different levels. The Brexit consequences on international relations and the EU relationship with other regions and states on the global scene would show itself in the near future especially after the real Brexit would happen.

Various countries all over the world are more or less affected by the Brexit and the Islamic Republic of Iran is no exception in this regard. Iran, as one of the regional, influential and emerging powers, has been affected in one way or another by the Brexit. The EU- Iran relationship in the post- Islamic revolution has experienced ups and downs, and this relationship has always been under the influence of both sides' domestic developments. For example, the creation of the European single currency (the Euro), the convergence of the EU member states' foreign policy and the EU energy policy are among the domestic issues for the EU which have deeply affected the Iranian economy and foreign policy. Iran and the European Union are considered important trade partners

for each other and except during the past couple of years (sanctioning Iran over its nuclear program and ensuing dispute between the two sides), they have enjoyed high levels of trade and commerce in the past two decades. The Islamic Republic of Iran has also considered the European Union as an important counterbalance against the United States on various occasions, especially after the EU played an important role in the nuclear deal reached between Iran and P5+1 group which was called Iran nuclear deal the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), in this regard Iran- EU relationship would be affected by the EU domestic developments including the Brexit.

Now the question that this paper addresses is that how the Brexit would affect the relationship between the EU and Iran. To answer this question, the hypothesis proposed here is that the Brexit would improve the relationship between Iran and the European Union by decreasing the transatlantic weight and the US-oriented tendency in the EU.

After briefly reviewing the historical relationship and ups and downs of the relations between Britain and the European Union and the causes and consequences of the Brexit, finally the effects of Brexit on the EU- Iran relationship would be examined. To do so, this paper uses analytical-descriptive approach.

Theoretical Framework

The rise of integration theories in International Relations owed European developments after Second World War. There are considerable theories which try to explain the nature and process of integration in this era. These theories attempt to clear why and how European Union established and how works to now. Functionalism, federalism, intergovernmentalism, transactionalism and neofanctionalism are the substantial theories of European integration.

In these theoretical approach, it seems to intergovermentalism can explain integration and disintegration in European Union better than others. Intergovernmentalism emphasises the role of

the nation state in integration, and argues that the nation state is not becoming obsolete due to European integration. Alan Milward, an intergovernmentalist writer, argued that the national governments of the member states were the primary actors in the process of European integration, and rather than being weakened by it as some of their sovereignty was delegated to the EU, they became strengthened by the process. This is because in some policy areas it is in the member states' interest to pool sovereignty. Intergovernmentalists argue that they are able to explain periods of radical change in the EU as when the interests of the member states governments converge and they have shared goals, and periods of slower integration as when the governments' preferences diverge and they cannot agree. They continually emphasise the role of national governments and the bargaining between them in the integration process (Hatton, 2011: 1).

Some scholar uses from integration theories to clarify the nature of Brexit and disintegration in the Union. In integration theories, it seems to intergovernmetalism has more capability to explain disintegration in European Union. Intergovernmentalism provides a better perspective on recent developments especially Brexit. It suggests that states who question further European integration or threatening to repatriate competences, like the UK, do so by appealing to their 'national interest'. If Europe should disintegrate, it will certainly be left to the nation states to pick up the pieces (Clemm, 2013).

Yet, as Clemm (2013) argued that the theory insufficiently explains why integration occurs. Intergovernmentalism, meanwhile, defines national interest mostly in economic terms. But this ignores that European disintegration heavily hinges on social factors that economics can't explain. If the UK government wants to repatriate matters of national security to Britain, is it really following its economic interest? Or does it just cater for the EU-skepticism of the British electorate? Populations (and hence electorates) may have EU-skeptic or EU-friendly (or EU-ignorant) preferences that are perhaps economically irrational but

nonetheless relevant for explaining integration or predicting disintegration. Few theories of European integration have accounted for 'softer', i.e. sociological factors."

However, some scholar such as Erik Jones (2016) believed that "the British vote to leave the European Union (EU) has introduced a new political dynamic in Europe. For lack of a better term, let's call it 'disintegration'. The problem is that we know very little about the many different motivations and other forces at work. Disintegration is not integration in reverse. We cannot simply take the many different models or interpretations of what brought European countries together and run them backward to understand events as they are unfolding. We cannot use past experience as much of a guide to anticipate future events or developments either. Lacking a coherent theory of disintegration, we are left to rely primarily on guesswork."

I. UK-EU Relationship on Historical Views

The idea of a united Europe, dating centuries ago, was not fulfilled until after the World War II. The continent of Europe which was shattered by the two world wars was in need of peace, and European countries came to the conclusion that forming some kind of union constituting of the then main states of Western Europe (France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) was the best solution to achieve this peace. So the first major step toward European integration took place in 1950 and the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and then the European Community (EC) were established respectively in 1951 and 1967. The first enlargement took place in 1973 by the accession of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom and later Greece, Spain and Portugal in the 1980s. Following the creation of the European Union in November 1993, it has enlarged to include a further sixteen countries by July 2013. Now it involves 28 European countries.

The reasons for having a European supranational organization lied in the political and economic motives. The political motive

was based on the idea that only a supranational organization could eliminate the threat of war between the European countries. And the economic motive rested on the belief that larger markets would promote competition, and thus lead to greater productivity and higher standards of living. In short, the principal goal was to promote and expand cooperation among member states in economics and trade, social issues, foreign policy, security and defense, and judicial matters. But not all countries shared the same idea from the beginning. The relationship between the European Union (then the EC) and Britain proved problematic since the early days of its formation. The British government initially refused to participate in the negotiations leading to the setting up of the European communities in the 1950s, then applied to join in the 1960s and was twice rejected. Entry was finally negotiated in 1971 and Britain became a member in 1973.

As the history shows, the UK's relationship with Europe has always played a major role in the British politics and various politicians were and still are influenced by how this relationship works. It was thought in the United Kingdom that conceding power to any outside body meant the loss of national sovereignty, so the UK was initially more interested in creating a European free trade area which would not involve any sacrifice of national sovereignty. Therefore, in 1959 the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) was created by countries like Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, Portugal, Iceland and Switzerland, with Finland as an associate member. But Britain soon found out that she was at the danger of economic and political isolation if she refused to join the Community, and finally Britain became a member in 1973.

On the whole, this relationship has been, and remains, controversial. Gordon Brown once said: "Since the end of the Second World War Britain has faced no question more important and more contentious than that of our relationship with Europe" (Brown, 1997).

Britain held its first national referendum on the issue of

whether she should remain a part of the EEC (which she had joined in 1973). The importance of this referendum was that for the first time the population had been asked to decide on a specific issue, and also the fact that entering the EEC shifted the center of powers from British laws to Brussels and European law which had priority over the former wherever they may conflict.

The second referendum held in 23 June 2016 was the turning point in the UK-EU relationship in which "Leave" won by 52% to 48%. The turnout was 71.8% – more than 30 million people voting. This referendum was held given the Article 50, the EU treaty's withdrawal clause which is about "the right of a Member State to withdraw from the European Union introduced for the first time with the Lisbon Treaty" (Article 50, 2016).

This referendum led to the resignation of Prime Minister David Cameron who resigned on the day after losing the referendum. He is the second Prime Minister who resigned over the issue of EU – the first one was Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

II. The Causes and Consequences of Brexit

But how and why the idea of Brexit (the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union is commonly known as Brexit) pervaded in the UK? Since the early days, more conspicuously in Thatcher and John Major periods, the issues of parliamentary sovereignty and national interests always made the relationship between Britain and the EU not go smoothly. The transfer of powers from the UK to Brussels and the problems over the EU budget that the UK believed it unjustifiably contributed to it highly, the EU immigration policy and that the number of the EU workers in the UK has grown quite substantially in recent years, the existence of many rules on business, the disagreement of the two sides over the environmental law, negotiating treaties, labor rights, human rights under the Charter of Fundamental Rights along with other old problems such as national identity (epitomized in the form of Britishness), and the fact that the

British people never really felt themselves as European are among the issues that led to the In/ Out referendum being held to decide over the fate of the UK and as seen, people chose to leave the EU. The truth behind the result, achieved under the high level of propaganda of Eurosceptic such as the UKIP (the UK Independence Party) or that people themselves chose to exit the EU after pondering over it carefully, remains unclear as there were, and still are, some requests for holding a second referendum on Brexit.

But what are the possible consequences of Brexit for the EU? In today's interconnected world, countries are trying to connect themselves with other countries, and Brexit would deprive the EU of a strong ally in fighting global challenges. There is no need to say that by cutting ties with the European system and going back to its old system, the UK would incur much cost on the EU and so the block has to redesign most of its programs. The EU also has to make up for the loss of the UK's budget contribution, and this means the increased contributions of other member-states.

Brexit not only impacts the EU as a whole, but it also affects individual countries. This effect is seen, for example, in France in the form of boosting her anti- euro, anti- immigration party – the national front party – less than a year before the presidential elections. The leader of this party, Marine Le Pen, as the next year's possible presidential election candidate "has already seized on the in-out campaign to call for a similar referendum on French membership if she wins powers" (Chassany et al, 2016).

In general, Brexit seems to trigger the anti- EU sentiment in various countries, and this may lead to the domino effect of leaving the EU – what currently concerns the German policy-makers. If this domino effect takes place over time, the Union sooner or later would face its demise, and the European integration process that united 28 countries during the past 40 years would disintegrate.

In a Union that now uncertainty pervades over its future, issues such as security, foreign policy and border control are yet

to be addressed. Britain has been crucial to many of the EU's policies on foreign, security and defense policies. Losing Britain could undermine efforts which have been made for implementation these policies.

Another issue that should be taken into consideration here is that which country is now willing to lead the European Union in this chaotic situation that the anti- EU voices are heard all over it. Germany has already tried to deal with other problems like – the global financial shock, the Greek rescue program, the Ukrainan conflict and the refugee crisis – and if it continues to lead the way, it is possible that it would be charged with the tendency to become the EU hegemon.

This fact cannot be ignored that the UK is one of the EU's big three states, and losing her means being deprived of "a country with deep diplomatic and military experience, and a voice for market-oriented deals" (ibid). Brexit is likely to undermine the EU's ability to become a leading global actor. "The UK is the EU's third most populous member state, comprising 12.76% of the EU's overall population. This makes the UK an influential player in the Council of the European Union and in the European Parliament (EP)" (Patel and Reh, 2016: 12). Another impact would be felt by the European businesses investement or trading in the UK and supply chains involving the UK firms.

Also the absence of the UK in the EU would shift the balance of power in the EU, and particularly in the European Council. "Franco-German relations, often considered the engine of European integration, have often used the UK to balance the other" (Oliver, 2016).

Brexit also affects the EU's political system. Naturally, a change in the UK representatives and nationals in Brussels and the EU's policy agenda would follow after the Brexit. Currently, there are British nationals employed in the European Commission, and 73 British MEPs sit in the Parliament. Not to mention that the UK is to hold the EU's rotating presidency from July to December 2017.

But on the whole, the long-term effects of the Brexit depend on how the negotiations between the European Union and the UK would progress. According to the article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty, the two sides are given two years to negotiate and reach to an agreement over the the terms of departure from the EU. Looking at the past shows that the reasons for the British applications being vetoed twice by the French President Charles de Gaulle could be seen in what Winston Churchill stated in 1948 that Britain's interests lay behind being the point of intersection of three circles of influence – the relationship with the US, with the Commonwealth countries, and Europe – and this is perhaps what influenced de Gaulle's judgment not to let Britain in, since Britain was always associated with the US. Now with the US ally gone and the decrease in the western influence in the EU, the European Union as well as some states may find it an opportunity to work with each other. The role of the EU is important due to its size and impact on the global politics and economy, as well as its unique combination of supra-national and intergovernmental features.

The state which this paper specifically refers to is Iran which can use this western absence in the EU to develop new relationship with the European Union.

III. Iran- EU Relationship After Brexit

Iran- EU relationship in the post-Islamic Revolution period has experienced numerous ups and downs. The important strategic position of the European Union in the international system, on one hand, and the geostrategic position and vast energy resources of Iran, on the other, have necessitated both sides to develop their relationship for enjoying mutual benefits. However, this relationship has faced various challenges ranging from the issues of human rights and terrorism to the nuclear issue and the Middle East crises which causedfluctuations in their relationship (Khaloozadeh, 2002, 260).

Since 1998 dialog between Iran and the EU is no longer critical, and has found a new form known as the "constructive

dialogs". In addition to political issues, scientific, economic and trade cooperation are also considered in these new dialogs. However, this situation did not last long, and as the nuclear issue developed, the relationship between the two sides deteriorated again. However, Iran and the European trio (Britain, Germany and France) under the Saadabad Agreement tried to find a solution for resolving nuclear disputes, the United States' interference and high levels of disagreement between the two sides led to the failure of these efforts. After referring the Iranian nuclear case to the security council in 2006, negotiations on this case were performed by EU3+3, more commonly referred to as the "E3+3" (France, Germany and the United Kingdom as the EU members and China, Russia and the United States as the permanent members of the Security Council) with Iran. Following tightened sanctions against Iran to stop its nuclear activities, the EU members attempted to pass a law for imposing sanctions on Iranian oil industry and on the Islamic Republic's Central Bank on January 23, 2012. These sanctions severely damaged the economic and trade relationship between the two sides, and the relationship deteriorated to its lowest level at the outset of the 21st century.

When president Hassan Rouhani's administration came into power, nuclear dialogs entered a new phase, and a new horizon was opened to achieve a full agreement for resolving the Iranian nuclear program. Extensive negotiations in this respect led to achieving the 2013 Geneva agreement, and finally (the JCPOA) the so-called joint comprehensive plan of action on July 2015 which reads as "The agreement, once implemented, marks a conclusion to the long-running diplomatic efforts to reach a comprehensive, long lasting and peaceful solution to the Iranian nuclear issue: one that will provide the necessary assurances on the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program on the one hand, and the lifting of sanctions on the other. As such it represents a significant achievement and a tribute to the merits of patient diplomacy, from all sides" (EU Statement, 2015).

As seen, the European Union as an important international player played a major role in the process of achieving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, as three members of this bloc took part in the nuclear negotiations, and since then it has tried to develop relations with Iran in all areas, especially in trade, economy and energy, to create a new chapter in the EU- Iran relationship.

It is interesting to point that the decision of the British people to exit the European Union was made at the time of improved relationship between Iran and the EU. The withdrawal of Britain, as an influential member of the European Union, would affect Iran-EU relationship in one way or another. However, these effects would not be seen immediately, it seems that they can be regarded as important parameters in shaping the way and level of this relationship. In general, the Brexit effects on the EU- Iran relationship can be studied from different aspects including:

Brexit would undermine the Atlantic- oriented and the US- inclined tendency in the EU. The UK has always been a central player in the US- EU relations. British transatlantic policies during the post- world war II created the impression in some European capitals that Britain was the US Trojan horse in Europe. The name which is given to the US- UK relationship as the "special relationship" is itself revealing. From protecting the intellectual property rights and entrepreneurship to collecting information and the use of military force, American values have been always closer to the British than to those of any other European states. A striking example that can be given for the UK- US alliance is the war against Iraq in 2003, while France and Germany openly opposed this war. Another example can be the case of imposing sanctions on Iran over its nuclear program, and sanctions on Russia over its invasion of Crimea and aggression in Ukraine. In both cases, it was Britain which directed a wavering EU to the US position.

Given the role of the UK as a bridge between the US and the EU, Brexit would affect the American role as a European power

and Europe's interests in the United States. Now the question is that how this would affect Iran- EU relationship. It can be said that the weakened Atlanticism would decrease the United State's influence in the European Union, and this process would increase the independent decision-making level in the EU. (Dehghani FirouzAbadi, 2016). Based on the high level of conflict and tensions between Iran and the US, a more independent European Union would create the chance to develop a positive interaction and more cooperation with Iran. As the US influence in the EU decreases, Iran and the EU can work with each other under less structural pressures in the trade, economic and scientific fields. In this regard, the European Union would face less pressure for signing various agreements, especially for buying natural gas and developing diversification policy. Also based on the US high sensitivity and its different approach to the complex issues of the Middle East, the EU can focus more independently on the consultation and exchange of views with Iran on the regional tensions including counterterrorism in the Middle East.

Another possible scenario is that Brexit would strengthen the British- US strategic relationship, and this in turn would lead to the strengthened European unity and this development would aggravate the transatlantic disputes. This may seem likely, but that remains to be seen if this scenario would come true, because the Brexit would cause some damages to the US influence and trade in the EU, though some officials have stated their opinions on strengthening the US- UK relationship on trade (Dehghani FirouzAbadi, 2016). For example, U.S. Senator Bob Corker, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said: "That close partnership will endure, and we will continue to work together to strengthen a robust trade relationship and to address our common security interests" (Roberts, 2016). On the whole, the special relationship would remain intact, and in fact, Brexit would practically result in no change in the US- UK special relationship as the US President Barack Obama said: "While the UK's relationship with the EU will change, one thing that will not

change is the special relationship that exists between our two nations. That will endure" (Rampton, 2016). However, Brexit means the US should look for other ways to influence the European policy-making in the absence of Britain.

On the other hand, the political weight and role of the EU would decrease without Britain as a main member of the bloc in international system. This has a paradoxical effect for Iran. If there is the possibility that Europe creates balance with the US, this would harm Iran. But history and experience both show that this is impossible, so the resulting outcome would benefit Iran.

Also due to the fact that Europe would need a stable partner in international system, especially in the Middle East, to compensate for its decreased political power in proportion to its economic one, Iran can prove a suitable partner in this regard.

Iran- EU's shared interests and threats in the Middle East also require both sides' cooperation. The best example is the threat facing the EU in the form of the return of numerous armed terrorists from Iraq and Syria to Europe which most likely made the EU authorities think of containing the crisis from within the Middle East. Given the widespread instability in many countries of the Middle East, the Iranian strategic position and its great influence in the region would best suit to play the role of the EU's partner to resolve Middle Eastern countries disputes. Repeated visits of many European Union officials to Iran including Federica Mogherini, high representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission, in October 2016 for consultations on the regional issues, particularly Syrian issue, indicate the reinforced Iranian position in the European Union officials' view for the regional crisis management.

Another issue which is worth to mention here is that the presence of the UK on behalf of the United States in the European Union had created some political barriers in the EU not to let the bloc expand its relationship with Iran easily, so Brexit would remove some of these barriers. In addition the relative decline of

European political weight means the necessity of reinforcing its economic role for compensating its decreased political role. This situation can pave the way for the development of Iran- EU economic relationship. In other words, the withdrawal of Britain from the EU would decrease the opposition against the development of relationship with Iran in the EU and would increase the weight of the pro- Iranian side.

On the other hand, the long history of British interference and influence in the Iranian domestic affairs (especially in the 18th century and more particularly its role in overthrowing the democratically elected government of Dr. Muhammad Mossadegh in the 1952 coup d'état in the case of nationalization of Iranian oil) have negatively affected the Iranian public and policy-makers, and the departure of Britain from the Europe Union would increase the tendency of the Iranian decision-makers to strengthen the relationship with the EU. This tendency can act as a catalyst in Iran -EU relationship.

Brexit would also weaken the position and relative role of this country in international system in such a way that it can no longer use its European weight and leverage in its international interactions. There is also the possibility that this departure may lead to the independence of Northern Ireland and Scotland from the UK. If this happens, this will severely damage the UK status and role in international relations, and this, in turn, would weaken the British position and influence in the Middle East.

As history shows, Britain has enjoyed a long-standing presence in the region and from the 18th century to the beginning of world war II, it has always been one of the main actors and major powers forming the relationships and structures in the middle east. After the world war II, this influence decreased, especially after the departure of the British forces from the persian gulf in 1971. However, in the post-Cold War, Britain formed its relationship in the Middle East based on the EU strategies and the UK alliance and coalition with the US. Now with the withdrawal of Britain from the EU, the role of an influential historical power

in the middle east developments would fade and with it the European Union would face a decreased influence in the region in the absence of Britain and this would provide a better chance for the Iranian activism in the region, so the regional balance would shift in favor of Iran.

However, the effects of Brexit on the relationship between Iran and the EU would take some time to reveal itself and the reason lies in the prolonged process of Brexit which seems to last -untill 2020.

In spite of these effects, it seems that some serious challenges in relationship between Iran and the EU, even after the departure of Britain, would persist. Serious disagreements of both sides on the human rights issue is considered one area of contention. Both sides have some fundamental differences regarding the human nature, and this has formed some conflicting perspectives on the issue of human rights. On the other hand, both sides have serious disagreement on some of the Islamic liberation movements in the Middle East.

Conclusion

In spite of the British departure from the European Union as the US major ally, the US might still play an important role in the EU developments by finding another channel to exert her influence in the EU, because the United States still looks for having her interests secured in the EU and in the absence of her influential partner - the UK -, it is likely, as some guess, that the German-US relationship would replace the US-UK relationship. This makes it possible for the US to influence the relationship between Iran and the EU in some areas as well. However, due to the fact that a new President – Donald Trump from the Republican Party – has been recently elected for the US, and the domestic tensions that this election has brought to this country, it remains to be seen how, in general, the US-EU relationship and the UK-US relationship, in particular, would be formed in the future as the result of the new situation.

It should be also stated here that the statement given by the new US elected President Donald Trump on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) reached between Iran and E3+3 that "his Number-One priority would be to dismantle the disastrous deal with Iran" (Ladane Nasseri, 2016) triggered the reactions from both Iranian and the EU authorities stressing that the agreement cannot be violated unilaterally. In general, Trump seems to have added to the uncertainty already governing the EU after the Brexit. The EU leaders feel the future of the EU-US relationship is not clear yet.

Generally speaking, though it is possible that Brexit would not much affect Iran's relations with the EU, it is still likely that the British departure from the EU might make it easier for Iran and the EU to resolve some of their disagreements (Javad Heirannia, 2016). If Iran could use the current vacuum in the political arena in the US and the UK, both struggling with domestic tensions, and develop a more constructive relationship with the EU, both Iran and the European Union would benefit much.

References

Chassany, Anne-Sylvaine, Stefan Wagstyl, Duncan Robinson and Richard Milne. 2016. "How will Brexit result affect France, Germany and the rest of Europe?". *Financial Times*. June 24.

Clemm, B. 2013. Integration on Trial: EU disintegration is still possible and the theories behind supernational govenance offer little guidance. Retrieved on 11 Feb 2018, from: https://blog.politics.ox.ac.uk/integration-theory-on-trial-eu-disintegration-is-still-possible- and- the- theory- behind- supernational- governance-offer-little-guidance/

"EU Statement – United Nations Security Council: Meeting on Non-Proliferation". 2015. *The Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations*. http://eu-un.europa.eu/eu-statement-united-nations-security-council-meeting-on-non-proliferation/

Häussler, Mathias. 2015. "Why Cameron shouldn't gamble with Germany: Helmut Schmidt's story". *LSE's European Institute*. 2015/11/24.

Heirannia, Javad. 2016. "Brexit might help resolve EU-Iran disagreements easily: Georgetown professor". *Tehran Times*, July 8.

Hutton, L. 2011. Theories of European Integration, Retrieved on 10 Feb 2018, from: http://www.civitas.org.uk/content/files/OS.16-Theories.pdf

Jones, E. (2016). Why we need a theory of disintegration. Retrieved on 12 Feb 2018 from: http://ukandeu.ac.uk/why-we-need-a-theory-of-disintegration

Oliver, Tim. "Dahrendorf Analysis, What impact would a Brexit have on the EU?". *lse.ac.uk*. March 2016.http:// www. lse. ac. uk/ IDEAS/ pdf/ Dahrendorf- pdf/ Dahrendorf-Analysis-Brexit-Tim-Oliver.pdf

Oliver, Tim and Michael John Williams. 2016. "Special relationships in flux: Brexit and the future of the US–EU and US–UK relationships". Chathamhouse. https://www. chathamhouse.org/ sites/ files/ chathamhouse/ publications/ia/inta92-3-03-oliver% 20and%20williams.pdf

Nasseri, L., and Motevalli, G. 2016. Trump Can't Undo Nuclear Deal, Iran's President Rouhani Says. *Bloomberg*. Retrieved on 2 Oct 2017 from: http://www.bloomberg. com/ news/articles/2016-11-09/trump-can-t-undo-nuclear-deal-stop-iran-s-growth-rouhani-says

Patel, Oliver and Christine Reh. 2016. "UCL Constitution Unit Briefing Paper, Brexit: The Consequences for the EU's Political System". *ucl.ac.uk*. 5 May 2016. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/research/europe/briefing-papers/Briefing-paper-2

Roberts, D. and Smith D. 2016. US and UK special relationship is 'enduring', Obama says after Brexit. *The Guardian*. Retrieved on 2 Oct 2017, from: https://www. theguardian. com/ politics/ 2016/jun/24/ brexit- vote-impact-on-us-donald-trump-election-2016

Rampton, Roberta. 2016. "Obama tries to limit fallout from British EU exit vote". *Reuters*. Jun 25. http:// www. reuters. com/ article/ us- britain- eu- usa- biden-idUSKCN0ZA24G

Trump Cannot Undermine JCPOA. 2016. *Fars News Agency*, Retrieved on 16 Oct 2016 from: http://en.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13950821000805