

BREXIT: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES**Zhanna Semchuk**

*Doctor of Economics, Professor
Lviv University of Business and Law,
Lviv, Ukraine*

**Ilona Petryk**

*Doctor of Economics, Associate Professor
University of Social Sciences,
Krakow, Poland*

JEL Classification: F02

Abstract. The article deals with the problem of the UK's exit from the European Union and analyzes the causes of brexit. The article describes the main characteristics of brexite for the UK. The main advantages and disadvantages of UK exit from the European Union are analyzed. It also shows the implications of brexit for the United Kingdom itself and for the European Union. The analysis of the influence of brexit on the countries of the world, including the impact on the future membership of Ukraine in the EU.

Keywords: *Brexit, European Union, Ukraine, European integration, referendum, causes, consequences.*

Introduction

Strengthening the position of euroskeptics takes place during the premiership of D. Cameron who, in order to win votes and to prevent a split inside conservatives in January 2013, promised that in the event of a conservative victory in the parliamentary elections of 2015, the new government will negotiate with the European Union on more favorable conditions for the continuation of the British membership in the EU, and then will hold a referendum on UK membership in the EU. At the same time, D. Cameron left a field for maneuver by giving the government's position on membership as a result of negotiations with the EU leadership. It should be noted that the time for London's pressure on the EU leadership was chosen extremely well: the struggle to preserve Greece's

membership in the European Union was to encourage the EU leadership as well as the governments of the leading member states to make concessions to London.

On May 28, 2015, the new government of D. Cameron introduced to the House of Commons a question regarding the holding of a referendum by the end of 2017 on further membership in the European Union. On November 10, the same year, D. Cameron informed the President of the European Council, D. Tusk, of Britain's demands for reform in the Union. The specified requirements can be divided into four blocks [3]:

- Integration and sovereignty: London demanded from Brussels that the main goal of integration - the creation of an "ever closer union" - did not extend to the UK, which allowed the latter not to participate in further political integration. In addition, the British government has demanded the creation of a so-called "red card" system, which would allow national parliaments to cancel or veto the Brussels directives;
- Competitiveness: London demanded expansion of the scope of the common market and the restriction of "Brussels bureaucracy";
- social assistance: the Cameron government has demanded the introduction of a "emergency braking" mechanism that would allow Britain, as well as any other EU country to restrict access to social benefits of migrants from other Union countries, if it is substantiated that the social system of the state concerned is excessive load;
- relations between the euro area and the rest of the EU: London, which kept its own currency, demanded, first, the veto power of the monetary decisions made in the euro area, and secondly, guarantees that measures to establish a financial union would not be third countries that are not part of the euro, thirdly, guarantees that London will not be obliged to provide emergency financial assistance to the countries of the euro area. In fact, Britain wanted to introduce the principle of multicountry of the EU. If Brussels were to accept this, it would mean recognizing that it is impossible to bring all EU member states into the euro area. UK [5].

It should be noted that if in Brussels and the capitals of the leading member states

these demands were perceived as inappropriate and the referendum was a threat, then Cameron's party members were upset by the fact that the stated demands for EU reform were not radical enough. The position of most EU member states was expressed by German Chancellor A. Merkel, who believed that all the countries of the Union are seeking to maintain UK membership, but not everyone is ready to accept its terms. Since all other Member States were aware that it was unlikely that such preferences received by London would have been achieved, no one in the EU resisted the conclusion of an agreement between Britain and the EU.

After several months of negotiations, the Government of Cameron succeeded in concluding an agreement with the European Union on the special status of Great Britain on 19 February 2016.

On June 23, 2016, a referendum took place in the UK, which was of great historical significance for the country. The British, by voting, decided whether it would make sense for the UK to remain a member of the European Union, or it would be more appropriate to leave it.

The agreement included three blocks [1]:

- UK introduces restrictions on access to the social security system for migrant workers from the EU. For four years from the date of arrival, new migrants will not receive any social assistance. This means that labor migrants need to have their own savings, as well as secure an employer's guarantee of employment for a term of at least four years;
- The British financial system has gained independence from the European Central Bank, but London has not received the right to veto monetary decisions of the euro area;
- Britain has the right not to participate in the processes of European integration, if this is contrary to the interests of Britain [8].

Thus, the British government has achieved what the supporters of Britain's exit from the EU have been struggling with. The agreement, which was unanimously endorsed by the European Council, was supposed to come into effect only on condition that the United

Kingdom will remain in the European Union on the basis of the referendum.

The result of the referendum was that 51.9% of Britons (17.41 million people) voted to leave the United Kingdom with the EU, while 48.1% (16.14 million people) supported European integration [7]. The country will be able to exit from the EU only in a few years, but the process of divorce between the UK and the European Union has already begun: British Prime Minister Teresa May officially informed Brussels about this and sent a letter there.

Great Britain has been doing this for a long time. In 2013, David Cameron, who headed the post of prime minister in front of his party counterpart from the Conservative Party, Teresa May, the current prime minister of the country, assured the British that such a referendum would be held if his party won the election.

It was simply not possible to hold a nationwide referendum, as the conservatives also won a part of the party that was skeptical about Europe and the ultra-right. The United Kingdom's Independence Party exercised political pressure on David Cameron [2].

But this was not the only reason for voting: almost the entire British population was dissatisfied with the direction of the European Union policy, according to which it had been moving since 1973. Great Britain has always tried to intervene in the first instance of the European Community, and then of the European Union itself. She was cautious about her membership in the European Union, remaining almost aloof. For example, the fact that the United Kingdom never entered the Schengen area and introduced the currency of the European Union in the country quite convincingly confirms this [4].

Great Britain often complained about the decisions that were adopted by the European Union, which it itself did not want to discuss because of its inattention.

Britons consider migration to be the most important reason for the termination of membership in the European Union. They are outraged by the uncontrolled "open door" system that prevails in the European Union and believes that this could lead to a massive influx of migrants from the EU (especially from the recently acceded countries - Poland, Romania, Slovakia). This issue is one of the most important for the British population, as more than 2 million migrants are currently

living in Britain. Many young people, even from countries such as Portugal, Spain, Italy, move to Britain to find work and a better life because of certain economic difficulties that have gone through Europe [7].

Another reason for leaving the EU is financial. According to some calculations, the EU "costs" 430 pounds a year to British households. Eurosceptics believe that this money can be spent more for the benefit of its own state, that is to research and inventions in the fields of science and technology. But, on the other hand, the EU is paying attention to the fact that these households cover their losses, gaining up to 3,000 pounds of benefits from membership in the European Union.

And another important reason was standardization. The British do not like the fact that the EU sets standards and standards for sizes, forms of things, and more. EU lawyers are convinced that the availability of one European standard is much more convenient and advantageous than the twenty-eight national standard. In turn, opponents of EU membership believe that the country must have national control of everything, especially on security, employment and health.

It is believed that Britain's exit with the EU can create a "domino effect". That is, other EU member states will want to leave. That will weaken the EU position and strengthen Russia's position in the geopolitical arena. This should be expected from countries such as Denmark, Austria, the Netherlands or even Poland and the Czech Republic, because the heads of these states are often seriously criticizing the EU policy [9].

It is important to note that the UK's exit from the European Union is not a matter of days, not even one year. The European Union has its own well-established system of ties that will be severely disrupted. Take the example of the question of money: the EU forms its budget for 7 years ahead and determines which country and how much to get and how much to give. It is impossible to break down the work of this mechanism so quickly.

Also, the EU is pursuing a common policy with other countries in various areas of vital activity of the population. For example, consider the agrarian sector. Farmers in Britain use agricultural subsidies from the EU. The size and procedure for the grant of grants is calculated for several years in advance. To

stop this all will not come out in a few months, it takes years. The same applies to salaries and pensions.

Also, the parliament will have to accept at least 7 laws relating to the independent life of the United Kingdom about trade, finance, border and customs issues [6].

Another important consequence is the issue of trade. The European Union and the United States have no free trade zone, but talks have already begun. It is clear that after the release of Britain, it is necessary to negotiate with the USA independently, but it alone has a much less influence. At the same time, thanks to decades of integration with the EU, Britain will have nothing to do with targeting the European market. Probably not such consequences were expected by fans of brexit.

It is obvious that brexit will be a shock to the European Union and the West as a whole, the consequences of which are extremely difficult to predict: if one of the experts believes that it will be the beginning of the end of the EU, the latter will see it as an important step towards unification of Europe, because in order to preserve unity, Europe is compelled will be consolidated. So, it's obvious that Britain's withdrawal from the EU will have both obvious consequences and those that are hard to predict today.

Under conditions where the opposition will deepen political integration in London, while the elites in Brussels and the national capitals will be scared by the prospect of a collapse of the EU, Europeans can give Berlin a complete map of blanche for quick and decisive integration reforms aimed at making a European Unity is so deep and fundamental that nobody even has the idea of leaving the Union. Under these conditions, Berlin will be able to slow down the implementation of the steps Britain has hampered,

namely:

- registration of a pan-European migration policy;
- creation of a single EU army;
- Strengthening the integration of the budgets of the EU member states.

It should also be noted that without the participation of London, the EU position in international negotiations will be more consolidated and unique, which will allow the EU over time to reconsider many of the previous agreements, based on the "special

position" of Great Britain, making them much more beneficial for continental Europeans.

It is also clear that the UK's withdrawal from the EU and the further consolidation of other members of the Union are likely to result in the cessation of the recruitment of new, poor members, which could be a bad news for Ukraine. Before united Europe will inevitably raise the question of how to prevent the withdrawal from the Union of other states? In this regard, it is likely that the Union will take measures to punish Britain in order to show the other countries that are waiting for them to exit. The exit from the EU makes sense if guaranteed a more prosperous life. However, if the British example demonstrates the opposite, then those who want to stand apart will greatly diminish. As for Ukraine, the success of brexit will create serious problems for it in the medium term. First of all, Ukraine will lose a strong ally with a tight anti-Russian position within the EU. Strengthening internal contradictions within the EU will distract Europeans from Ukrainian problems. Finally, the EU is likely to close the extension issue indefinitely [10].

Brexit will have significant consequences not only for the UK and the EU but for other key players in the international arena, including the United States and Russia. The influence of the results of the British referendum will also be felt by Ukraine, which, in the context of the hybrid war with the Russian Federation, has been pursuing a consistent European integration policy for the last few years. Below, based on the opinions of recognized international experts, we will try to find out the possible external and internal political and economic implications of Brexit for Ukraine.

In general, after the UK's exit, risks to remain indefinitely beyond the attention of the European Union and of Britain themselves increased. Andreas Umland, a political scientist and expert in Eastern Europe, said that "European politicians, diplomats, journalists and experts will be even more distracted by what is happening in Ukraine and the Russian-Ukrainian conflict" as a result of the Brexit referendum. "A significant part of future attention, including EU forces and resources, will be absorbed by building new relations between Britain and the EU," Umland said [11]. Undoubtedly, Brexit will form many internal problems for the European Union, which will mean that Ukraine may for some

time disappear from the spotlight of its partners in the EU.

There is no doubt that, with the release of the United Kingdom, Kyiv will lose some of the strong support for its European aspirations within the EU. Britain, as we know, was against the deepening of integration within the European Union, but supported its expansion at the expense of new members. The United Kingdom has long been one of the key players supporting the European aspirations of our state. In addition, Britain is one of the main forces in the European Union, which advocates the preservation of sanctions against Russia. The United Kingdom plays the role of a nucleus in the camp of European countries (Poland, the Baltic States, Romania, Bulgaria, Sweden), which are cautious about Russia after its aggression in Ukraine and are not going to make concessions about sanctions.

According to G.Kukhaleishvili, Britain is the only European country that, in its authority and economic influence, can equitably enter into a debate with the Franco-German tandem, as well as with certain political circles of member states that question the expediency of continuing anti-Russian sanctions (Italy, Greece, Slovakia). As a result, according to O.Riabchina, we will lose one of the strongest friends of Ukraine in the European Union, whose rigid position in counteracting Russian aggression often balances the moderate Franco-German position [1].

As the diplomat, Maidan of Foreign Affairs expert O. Hara, Britain, as a strategic ally of the United States, played an important role in shaping the united position of Washington and Brussels on Russia's containment. Brexit, meanwhile, entrusts the fate of European sanctions to the Franco-German tandem, which reinforces the position of supporters of the "carrot policy". The French Senate, for example, recently spoke in favor of the phasing out of sanctions. And the Social Democratic Party of Germany has always been critical of the latter. So without scrupulous British intervention, the analyst concludes, Russia can quite possibly achieve, if not abolition, the weakening of sanctions.

There are opposing views on this. So, according to expert internationalist A. Shelest, Brexit will not change the European Union's position on Russian aggression, and, moreover, will not affect the position of the UK, which was one of the strongest in the EU in supporting Ukraine. Even Russian experts are convinced that it is not worthwhile to overestimate Brexit's influence on changing the EU's attitude towards Russia. In particular, the latter may prove to be the only "threat" that will be able to rally countries within the European Union and become a kind of "anchor" for "pan-European identity". Therefore, the development of policy in this direction can be more likely to unite than to disassociate players in the European arena.

Conclusions

After analyzing the above facts, we can conclude that the process of UK withdrawal from the European Union will be delayed for a long time and will have rather negative than positive effects for both parties. It should also be noted that without the participation of London, the EU position in international negotiations will be more consolidated and unique, which will allow the EU over time to reconsider many of the previous agreements, based on the "special position" of Great Britain, making them much more beneficial for continental Europeans. It is also clear that the UK's withdrawal from the EU and the further consolidation of other members of the Union are likely to result in the cessation of the recruitment of new, poor members, which could be a bad news for Ukraine.

References

1. Bagehot J. "Theresa May confirms: Britain is heading for Brexit Max." The Economist. The Economist Newspaper, 17 Jan. 2017. Web. 02 Mar. 2017.
2. "Brexit plan published in government." White Paper BBC. 2017. February 2. URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-38836906>

3. „Brexit: UK officially on its way out of the European Union.“ BBC. 2017. March 29. URL: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/newsround/39257799> 142 Scientific Journal. No 1 (18), 2017
4. Cilluffo N., Frank J., and Sharon L. Cardash. "NATO After Brexit." Foreign Affairs. N.p., 04 July 2016. Web.
5. „EU Referendum: Results.“ BBC. URL: http://www.bbc.com/news/politics/eu_referendum/results
6. Giles C. "Brexit in seven charts - the economic impact." Financial Times. Financial Times, 27 June 2016. Web. 02 Mar. 2017.
7. Hasan I. "Data protection and Brexit." Law Society Gazette. N.p., 04 Sept. 2016. Web. 16 Mar. 2017.
8. Kirkup J. "How much money does Britain currently pay the EU?" The Telegraph. Telegraph Media Group, 24 Feb. 2017. Web. 30 Mar. 2017.
9. Peers S. "How would Brexit affect data protection, privacy and surveillance laws in Britain?" The Conversation. N.p., 17 Mar. 2017. Web. 18 Mar. 2017.
10. Simms B. „The world after Brexit. The crucial variable is not British power but the weakness of Europe.“ NewStatesman. 2017. March 1. URL: <http://www.newstatesman.com/world/europe/2017/03/world-after-brexit>
11. Umland A. „What Brexit Means for Ukraine.“ Atlantic Council. 2016. June 27. URL: <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/ukrainealert/whatbrexit-means-for-ukraine>