

participation of all economically active actors. Particular attention in this process should be paid to the interaction of governments and companies, as data generation and exchange. On the one hand, it will promote effective decisions on the implementation of sustainable digitalization. Working together will be able to create the conditions for solving global problems. On the other hand, there is a deepening gap in the levels of economic development of countries. The close interweaving of opportunities and risks requires informed and informed decisions to promote sustainable development.

Pytura Juliana

West Ukrainian National University
Ternopil

THE IMPLICATIONS OF BREXIT FOR THE UK AND THE EU

Britain's exit from the EU, or Brexit, is an issue that has been repeatedly raised by conservative and nationalist parties. On June 23 2016, a referendum was held on Britain's EU membership in the UK and Gibraltar, in which 51.9% of voters expressed their desire to leave the EU, and 48.1% of voters wished to remain in the EU [3]. An agreement on the terms of Britain's withdrawal from the EU was signed on January 25, and on January 31 2020, Britain ceased to be a member of the EU.

And it is logical that such a significant event will leave certain consequences. One such consequence is that Britain will lose its voice in the EU's highest political bodies, which in turn will affect the balance of power and decision-making. In general, it could have a significant impact on what decisions will now be supported in the EU. Moreover, Britain's allies will lose about 12% of the influence of their votes in Brussels, while the southern powers will play a more significant role [4].

London may also introduce new immigration rules. Before Brexit, the UK was obliged to adhere the principle of the EU – freedom of movement of labor from the EU and the European Economic Area (citizens of these countries could live and work relatively freely in Britain). But leaving the EU is changing that reality. Migration now falls within the scope of British law and London intends to introduce new rules in this area and limit the influx of unskilled migrants from EU countries.

This event could also pose a security threat, as Brexit will complicate international cooperation in the fight against terrorism and the search for criminals. The UK will maintain access to EU crime databases only for a transitional period. These include border crossing data, information on aircraft passengers and vehicle registration, fingerprint databases and DNA profiles, and so on. But Britain will soon have to agree on how to work with the EU on security.

Brexit could also pose a risk to European cooperation in education and science. This could likely negatively affect the cooperation of British scientists with their European counterparts, as well as universities and students in Britain and the EU.

Due to the withdrawal from the EU, Britain may lose funding for British research from European sources, as well as students from other EU member states. There may be problems with the employment, and British students may have some nuances with admission to higher education institutions abroad.

Through Brexit, the UK is withdrawing from the Erasmus program. Instead, Britain plans to launch an Alan Turing student exchange program.

London is threatened with losing its status as the financial capital of the world. This status, which attaches great importance to Britain, has been called into question because of Brexit. Recently, the share of those who consider New York to be the financial center of the world has risen to 56% [4]. At the same time, the number of supporters of London fell by 20 percentage points to 36% – thus, the British capital may be in second place [4].

Withdrawal from the EU will also give British courts an advantage over European law. The plan for Britain's withdrawal from the EU provides that British courts will be able to review the existing European law in the UK.

There is still a risk of bilateral tariffs with the EU and an impact on world trade. European fisheries may also undergo some changes. The "battle for fish" is another of the most problematic topics. After Brexit, London will abandon the EU's Common Fisheries Policy – it allowed all EU countries to fish within 12 nautical miles of the British coast, and the EU – to set catch quotas [4].

There is also controversy over how to control trade between Britain and Northern Ireland, which is part of Britain but remains in the EU's single market under the EU Exit Treaty.

Brexit is dealing an economic blow to Britain and Europe. Since the British vote to leave the EU, many predictions have been published about the economic damage that Brexit will do to Britain and the EU in the near future. Moreover, some studies have shown that the UK's losses range from – 1.2 to 4.5% of its GDP – in the event that the country fails to conclude a trade agreement with the EU and the parties return to trade according to the rules of WTO [2].

However, it is assumed that the EU (unlike Britain) will be able to compensate for most of the losses in exports and imports from the UK – due to increased intra-EU trade and trade with third countries. Britain's withdrawal from the EU has been an event that has many bad consequences. Many polls show that the majority of British citizens are dissatisfied with the results of Brexit (more than 60% of voters believe that Brexit was worse than they expected) [1].

The agreement with the EU still has many unresolved issues. British exports to the EU fell by 40.7% [1]. The reduction was mainly due to new bureaucracy and post-Brexit trade disruptions. That's a loss of £ 5.6 billion [1]. Food exports were particularly hard hit, falling 63.6% [1]. Fish and shellfish producers saw their exports fall by 83% [1]. It turns out that EU exporters to the UK have more opportunities, while British business suffers from bureaucratic damage. Britain is now really experiencing the real disappointing consequences of Brexit. Confrontation with the EU could negatively affect the future of the UK's international position.

References:

1. Європейська правда Британія втратить більше, ніж ЄС, після Brexit. URL: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2017/04/20/7064745/>
2. Наслідки Brexit. URL: <https://www.unian.ua/tag/naslidki-brexit>
3. Brexit. URL: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/articles/2021/01/5/7118218/>
4. Життя після Brexit. 10 знакових наслідків виходу Британії з ЄС для країни, Європи та всього світу. URL: <https://nv.ua/ukr/world/countries/vihid-britaniji-z-yes-yaki-naslidki-brekzita-dlya-vsogo-svitu-ostanni-novini-50066923.html>

Shymuda Olena

West Ukrainian National University
Ternopil

THE IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

The COVID-19 pandemic is unlike any other crisis. Its consequences are very significant and the population of the poorest countries in the world will feel them the strongest and for the longest time. The impact of the pandemic on people's lives can be estimated in numbers: more than 6.13 million deaths and this figure continues to rise, 120 million people are below the poverty line, and unemployment has risen to 81 million[1]. At the moment inequality is deepening in many countries leading the growing poverty and income growth of billionaires. However, there is good reason to believe that the pandemic has not only exacerbated economic inequality and income gaps within countries but has also partially halted it, primarily through massive public transfers, without which inequality is likely to increase after job losses among low-paid workers. Thus, there are the following trends of COVID-19's impact on economic inequality:

- in the two years since the corona crisis, the wealth of the richest one thousandth of a percent (0.001%) of the world's population has grown by 14% (about \$ 1.5 trillion) with an overall growth of only 1%. That would be enough to lift 680 million people out of extreme poverty a year, providing them with a daily income of more than five and a half dollars;

- the pandemic has increased inequality between high- and low-paid occupations. For example, in April 2020, 52.7% of employees in the UK were laid off or sent on forced leave, as opposed to 15.1% of high-paid workers [2]. In Australia, during this period, redundancies for low-paid workers increased to 14%, while for high-paid workers – only 2.6% [3]. In the United States, from January 2020 to mid-April, 37% of low-paid workers lost their jobs compared to 14% of high-paid workers [4]. At the same time, the employment rate of the latter was restored to pre-crisis level in mid-May 2020, and for low-paid workers it remained 20% lower in September;