

1 Appendix 1: Text C

PM speech on the UK's strength and security in the EU: 9 May 2016 (Archived)

Published 9 May 2016 From:

Prime Minister's Office, 10 Downing Street and **The Rt Hon David Cameron**

1. In 45 days' time, the British people will go to polling stations across our islands and cast their ballots in the way we have done in this country for generations.
2. They will, as usual, weigh up the arguments, reflect on them quietly, discuss them with friends and family, and then, calmly and without fuss, take their decision. But this time, their decision will not be for a Parliament, or even two. They will decide the destiny of our country, not for 5 years or for 10, but in all probability for decades, perhaps a lifetime.
3. This is a decision that is bigger than any individual politician or government. It will have real, permanent and direct consequences for this country and every person living in it. Should we continue to forge our future as a proud, independent nation while remaining a member of the European Union, as we have been for the last 43 years? Or should we abandon it?

Let me say at the outset that I understand why many people are wrestling with this decision, and why some people's heads and hearts are torn.
4. And I understand and respect the views of those who think we should leave, even if I believe they are wrong and that leaving would inflict real damage on our country, its economy and its power in the world.
5. I believe that, despite its faults and its frustrations, the United Kingdom is stronger, safer and better off by remaining a member of the European Union. Better off? Certainly.
6. We are part of a single market of 500 million people which Britain helped to create. Our goods and, crucially, our services – which account for almost 80% of our economy – can trade freely by right. We help decide the rules. The advantages of this far outweigh any disadvantages.
7. Our membership with the single market is one of the reasons why our economy is doing so well, why we have created almost 2.4 million jobs over the last 6 years, and why so many companies from overseas – from China or India, the United States, Australia and other Commonwealth countries invest so much here in the UK. It is one of the factors – together with our superb workforce, the low taxes set by the British government, and our climate of enterprise – which makes Britain such an excellent place to do business. All this is alongside – let us note – our attractive regulatory environment. According to the OECD, it is second only to the Netherlands, itself an EU member – giving the lie to those who claim that the British economy is being strangled by red tape from Brussels. If we leave, the only certainty we will have is uncertainty.
8. The Treasury has calculated that the cost to every household in Britain would be as high as £4,300 by 2030 if we leave. £4,300.

The overwhelming weight of independent opinion – from the International Monetary Fund to the OECD, from the London School of Economics to the Institute for Fiscal Studies – also supports the fact that Britain will suffer an immediate economic shock, and then be permanently poorer for the long-term.

The evidence is clear: we will be better off in, and poorer if we leave.

9. As Charles Dunstone, the founder of Carphone Warehouse, an entrepreneur not averse to risk, has said: “In my experience there are calculated risks, there are clever risks, and there are unnecessary and dangerous risks. And from all I can conclude, Brexit sits firmly in the latter camp.”
10. So the onus is on those who advocate leaving to prove that Britain will be better off outside the EU. Those advocating Brexit, some of those have spent many years preparing for this moment. And yet they seem unable to set out a clear, comprehensive plan for our future outside the EU.
Some admit there would be a severe economic shock, but assert nonchalantly that it would be ‘a price worth paying’.
Others are in denial that there would be a shock at all. And they can’t agree what their plan for post-Brexit Britain would look like.
11. One minute we are urged to follow Norway, the next minute Canada. A few days later Switzerland offers the path forward, until it becomes clear that their arrangement doesn’t provide much access for services to the EU’s single market – and services, as I’ve said, are almost 4 fifths of the British economy.
12. Most recently, the Leavers have noticed that a number of European countries that sit outside of the EU have negotiated separate trade arrangements with the EU.
They called this collection of countries the ‘European free trade zone’.
But in fact, this doesn’t exist: it is a patchwork of different arrangements, all of them far inferior to what we have now.
13. They have gone on to suggest that Britain might join this non-existent zone, just like Albania.
Seriously? Even the Albanian Prime Minister thought that idea was a joke.
14. The Leave campaign are asking us to take a massive risk with the future of our economy and the future of our country.
And yet they can’t even answer the most basic questions.
15. What would Britain’s relationship be with the EU if we were to leave? Will we have a free trade agreement, or will we fall back on World Trade Organisation rules?
The man who headed the WTO for 8 years thinks this would be and I quote “a terrible replacement for access to the EU single market.”
16. Some of them say we would keep full access to the EU single market.
If so, we would have to accept freedom of movement, a contribution to the EU budget, and accept all EU rules while surrendering any say over them.
In which case, we would have given up sovereignty rather than taken it back.
17. Others say we would definitely leave the single market – including, yesterday, the Vote Leave campaign – despite the critical importance of the single market to jobs and investment in our country.
I can only describe this as a reckless and irresponsible course. These are people’s jobs and livelihoods that are being toyed with.
18. And the Leave campaign have no answers to the most basic questions.
What access would we try to secure back into the single market from the outside? How

long would it take to negotiate a new relationship with the EU? What would happen to the 53 trade deals we have with other markets around the world through the EU? The Leave campaign can't answer them because they don't know the answers. They have no plan.

19. And yet sceptical voters who politely ask for answers are denounced for their lack of faith in Britain, or met with sweeping assurances that the world will simply jump to our tune.

If you were buying a house or a car, you wouldn't do it without insisting on seeing what was being offered, and making sure it wasn't going to fall apart the moment you took possession of it.

So why would you do so when the future of your entire country is at stake?

The British people will keep asking these questions every day between now and 23 June, and demanding some answers.

20. Nothing is more important than the strength of our economy.

Upon it depends the jobs and livelihoods of our people, and also the strength and security of our nation.

If we stay, we know what we get – continued full access to a growing single market, including in energy, services and digital, together with the benefit of the huge trade deals in prospect between the EU and the United States and other large markets.

If we leave, it is – genuinely – a leap in the dark.

21. But my main focus today will not be on the economic reasons to remain in the EU, important though they are.

I want to concentrate instead on what our membership means for our strength and security in the world, and the safety of our people, and to explain why, again, I believe the balance of advantage comes down firmly in favour of staying rather than leaving.

Because this a decision about our place in the world, about how we keep our country safe, about how Britain can get things done – in Europe and across the world – and not just accept a world dictated by others.

22. So today I want to set out the big, bold patriotic case for Britain to remain a member of the EU.

I want to show that if you love this country, if you want to keep it strong in the world, and keep our people safe, our membership of the EU is one of the tools – one of the tools – that helps us to do these things, like our membership of other international bodies such as NATO or the UN Security Council.

23. Let us accept that for all our differences, one thing unites both sides in this referendum campaign.

We love this country, and we want the best future for it. Ours is a great country.

Not just a great country in the history books, although it surely is that.

But a great country right now, with the promise of becoming even greater tomorrow.

24. We're the fifth largest economy in the world. Europe's foremost military power. Our capital city is a global icon. Our national language the world's language.

Our national flag is worn on clothing and t-shirts the world over – not only as a fashion statement, but as a symbol of hope and a beacon for liberal values all around the world.

People from all 4 corners of the earth watch our films, dance to our music, flock to our galleries and theatres, cheer on our football teams and cherish our institutions.

These days, even our food is admired the world over.

Our national broadcaster is one of the most recognised brands on the planet, and our monarch is one of the most respected people in the world.

25. Britain today is a proud, successful, thriving nation, a nation the world admires and looks up to, and whose best days lie ahead of it.
We are the product of our long history – of the decision of our forebears, of the heroism of our parents and grandparents.
And yet we are a country that also has our eyes fixed firmly on the future – that is a pioneer in the modern world: from the birth of the internet to the decoding of the genome.
26. If there is one constant in the ebb and flow of our island story, it is the character of the British people.
Our geography has shaped us, and shapes us today. We are special, different, unique.
We have the character of an island nation which has not been invaded for almost a thousand years, and which has built institutions which have endured for centuries.
As a people we are ambitious, resilient, independent-minded. And, I might add, tolerant, generous, and inventive.
But above all we are obstinately practical, rigorously down to earth, natural debunkers.
We approach issues with a cast of mind rooted in common sense. We are rightly suspicious of ideology, and sceptical of grand schemes and grandiose promises.
So we have always seen the European Union as a means to an end – the way to boost our prosperity and help anchor peace and stability across the European continent – but we don't see it as an end in itself.
27. We insistently ask: why? How?
And as we weigh up the competing arguments in this referendum campaign, we must apply that practical rigour which is the hallmark of being British.
Would going it alone make Britain more powerful in the world? Would we be better able to get our way, or less able?
Would going it alone make us more secure from terrorism, or would it be better to remain and cooperate closely with our neighbours?
Would going it alone really give us more control over our affairs, or would we soon find that actually we had less, and that we had given up a secure future for one beset by years of uncertainty and trouble with no way back?
Would going it alone open up new opportunities, or would it in fact close them down and narrow our options?
28. That is certainly the approach I have taken to judging whether Britain is stronger and safer inside the European Union or leaving it.
And I have just one yardstick: how do we best advance our national interest?
Keeping our people safe at home and abroad, and moulding the world in the way that we want – more peaceful, more stable, more free, with the arteries of commerce and trade flowing freely.
That is our national interest in a nutshell – and it's the question that has confronted every British prime minister since the office was created: how do we best advance Britain's interests in the circumstances of the day?
29. If my experience as Prime Minister had taught me that our membership of the EU was holding Britain back or undermining our global influence, I would not hesitate to recommend that we should leave.
But my experience is the opposite.
30. The reason that I want Britain to stay in a reformed EU is in part because of my experience over the last 6 years is that it does help make our country better off, safer and stronger.

31. And there are 4 reasons why this is the case.
First, what happens in Europe affects us, whether we like it or not, so we must be strong in Europe if we want to be strong at home and in the world.
Second, the dangerous international situation facing Britain today, means that the closest possible cooperation with our European neighbours isn't an optional extra – it is essential. We need to stand united. Now is a time for strength in numbers.
Third, keeping our people safe from modern terrorist networks like Daesh and from serious crime that increasingly crosses borders means that we simply have to develop much closer means of security cooperation between countries within Europe. Britain needs to be fully engaged with that.
Fourth, far from Britain's influence in the world being undermined by our membership of the EU, it amplifies our power, like our membership of the UN or of NATO. It helps us achieve the things we want – whether it is fighting Ebola in Africa, tackling climate change, taking on the people smugglers. That's not just our view; it's the view of our friends and allies, too.
Let me go through these in turn.
32. First: Europe is our immediate neighbourhood, and what happens on the continent affects us profoundly, whether we like it or not.
Our history teaches us: the stronger we are in our neighbourhood, the stronger we are in the world.
For 2,000 years, our affairs have been intertwined with the affairs of Europe. For good or ill, we have written Europe's history just as Europe has helped to write ours.
From Caesar's legions to the wars of the Spanish Succession, from the Napoleonic Wars to the fall of the Berlin Wall.
33. Proud as we are of our global reach and our global connections, Britain has always been a European power, and we always will be.
We know that to be a global power and to be a European power are not mutually exclusive. And the moments of which we are rightly most proud in our national story include pivotal moments in European history.
Blenheim. Trafalgar. Waterloo. Our country's heroism in the Great War.
And most of all our lone stand in 1940, when Britain stood as a bulwark against a new dark age of tyranny and oppression.
34. When I sit in the Cabinet Room, I never forget the decisions that were taken in that room in those darkest of times.
When I fly to European summits in Brussels from RAF Northolt, I pass a Spitfire just outside the airfield, a vital base for brave RAF and Polish pilots during the Battle of Britain.
I think of the Few who saved this country in its hour of mortal danger, and who made it possible for us to go on and help liberate Europe.
35. Like any Brit, my heart swells with pride at the sight of that aircraft, or whenever I hear the tell-tale roar of those Merlin engines over our skies in the summer.
Defiant, brave, indefatigable.
36. But it wasn't through choice that Britain was alone. Churchill never wanted that. Indeed he spent the months before the Battle of Britain trying to keep our French allies in the war, and then after France fell, he spent the next 18 months persuading the United States to come to our aid.
And in the post-war period he argued passionately for Western Europe to come together, to

promote free trade, and to build institutions which would endure so that our continent would never again see such bloodshed.

37. Isolationism has never served this country well. Whenever we turn our back on Europe, sooner or later we come to regret it.
We have always had to go back in, and always at a much higher cost.
The serried rows of white headstones in lovingly-tended Commonwealth war cemeteries stand as silent testament to the price that this country has paid to help restore peace and order in Europe.
38. Can we be so sure that peace and stability on our continent are assured beyond any shadow of doubt? Is that a risk worth taking?
I would never be so rash as to make that assumption.
It's barely been 20 years since war in the Balkans and genocide on our continent in Srebrenica. In the last few years, we have seen tanks rolling into Georgia and Ukraine. And of this I am completely sure.
39. The European Union has helped reconcile countries which were once at each others' throats for decades. Britain has a fundamental national interest in maintaining common purpose in Europe to avoid future conflict between European countries.
And that requires British leadership, and for Britain to remain a member. The truth is this: what happens in our neighbourhood matters to Britain.
That was true in 1914, in 1940 and in 1989. Or, you could add 1588, 1704 and 1815. And it is just as true in 2016.
40. Either we influence Europe, or it influences us.
And if things go wrong in Europe, let's not pretend we can be immune from the consequences.
41. Second, the international situation confronting Britain today means that the closest possible cooperation with our European neighbours isn't an optional extra.
It is essential for this country's security and our ability to get things done in the world.
We see a newly belligerent Russia. The rise of the Daesh network to our east and to our south. The migration crisis. Dealing with these requires unity of purpose in the west.
42. Sometimes you hear the Leave campaign talk about these issues as if they are – in and of themselves – reasons to leave the EU.
But we can't change the continent to which we are attached. We can't tow our island to a more congenial part of the world.
43. The threats affect us whether we're in the EU or not, and Britain washing its hands of helping to deal with them will only make the problems worse.
Within Europe they require a shared approach by the European democracies, more than at any time since the height of the Cold War.
44. It is true, of course, that it is to NATO and to the Transatlantic Alliance that we look to for our defence.
The principle enshrined in the North Atlantic Treaty – that an attack on one is an attack on all – that remains the cornerstone of our national defence.
That fundamental sharing of national sovereignty in order to deter potential aggressors.
That is as valid today as it was when NATO was founded in 1949.
It is an example of how real control is more important than the theory of sovereignty.
45. The European Union – and the close culture of intergovernmental cooperation between governments which it embodies – is a vital tool in our armoury to deal with these threats.

That is why NATO and top military opinion – British, American, European – is clear that the common purpose of the EU does not undermine NATO, it is a vital reinforcement to it. And they are equally crystal clear: Britain's departure would weaken solidarity and the unity of the west as a whole.

46. Now some of those who wish us to leave the EU openly say that they hope the entire organisation will unravel as a result.

I find this extraordinary.

47. How could it possibly be in our interests to risk the clock being turned back to an age of competing nationalisms in Europe?

And for Britain, of all countries, to be responsible for triggering such a collapse would be an act of supreme irresponsibility, entirely out of character for us as a nation.

48. Others suggest that Britain stalking out could lead to and I quote “the democratic liberation of an entire continent”.

Well, tell that to the Poles, the Czechs, the Baltic States and the other countries of central and eastern Europe which languished for so long behind the Iron Curtain.

They cherish their liberty and their democracy. They see Britain as the country that did more than any other to unlock their shackles and enable them to take their rightful place in the family of European nations.

And frankly they view the prospect of Britain leaving the EU with utter dismay. They watch what is happening in Moscow with alarm and trepidation.

Now is a time for strength in numbers. Now is the worst possible time for Britain to put that at risk. Only our adversaries will benefit.

49. Now third, the evolving threats to our security and the rise of the Daesh network mean that we have to change the way we work to keep our people safe. Security today is not only a matter of hard defence, of stopping tanks – it is also about rooting out terrorist networks, just as it is about detecting illegal immigrants, stopping human trafficking and organised crime. And that makes much closer security cooperation between our European nations essential.

50. I have no greater responsibility than the safety of the people of this country, and keeping us safe from the terrorist threat.

As the Home Secretary said in her speech a fortnight ago: being in the EU helps to makes us safer.

We shouldn't put ourselves at risk by leaving.

51. One of her predecessors, Charles Clarke, reiterated that only this morning.

And the message of Jonathan Evans and John Sawers, former heads of MI5 and MI6 respectively, is absolutely unmistakable: Britain is safer inside the European Union.

52. During the last 6 years, the terrorist threat against this country has grown.

Our threat level is now at 'Severe', which means that an attack is 'highly likely'. Indeed such an attack could happen at any time.

But the threat has not only grown, it has changed in its nature.

The attacks in Paris and Brussels are a reminder that we face this threat together – and we will only succeed in overcoming it by working much more closely together.

These terrorists operate throughout Europe; their networks use technology to spread their poison and to organise beyond geographical limits.

53. People say that to keep our defences up, you need a border. And they're right.

That's why we kept our borders, and we can check any passport – including for EU nationals – and we retain control over who we allow into our country.

But against the modern threat, having a border isn't enough. You also need information, you need data, you need intelligence. You need to cooperate with others to create mechanisms for sharing this information.

54. And, just as the Home Secretary said a fortnight ago, I can tell you this: whether it's working together to share intelligence on suspected terrorists; whether it's strengthening aviation security; addressing the challenge of cybercrime; preventing cross-border trade in firearms; tackling the migration crisis; or enhancing our own border security, the EU is not some peripheral institution, or a hindrance we have to work around – it is now an absolutely central part of how Britain can get things done.

Not by creating a some vast new EU bureaucracy. Nor by sucking away the role and capabilities of our own world beating intelligence and law enforcement agencies. But because their superb work depends on much closer cooperation between European governments and much faster and more determined action across Europe to deal with this new threat.

As the historian Niall Ferguson observed, it takes a network to defeat a network. And European measures are a key weapon.

55. The European Arrest Warrant allows us to bring criminals and terrorists, like one of the failed 21/7 Tube bombers who had fled to Italy, we can bring them back to the UK to face justice straight away.

56. Our membership of Europol gives us access to important databases that help us to identify criminals.

And we have begun to cooperate on DNA and fingerprint matching across borders, too. These tools help us in real-time, life-or-death situations.

One of the Paris attackers, Salah Abdeslam, was only identified quickly after the attack because the French police were able to use EU powers to exchange DNA and fingerprints with the Belgians.

Before this cooperation, DNA matching between 2 countries didn't take minutes, it could take over 4 months.

In the last few months alone, we have agreed a new Passenger Name Records directive, so that EU countries will have access to airline passenger data to enable us to identify those on terror watch-lists.

These new arrangements will also provide crucial details about how the tickets were bought, the bank accounts used and the people they are travelling with.

And the EU has recently switched on a new database, called SIS II, which is providing real-time alerts for suspected jihadists and other serious criminals.

57. Now I don't argue that if we left we would lose any ability to cooperate with our neighbours on a bilateral basis, or even potentially through some EU mechanisms.

But it is clear that leaving the EU will make cooperation more legally complex – and make our access to vital information much slower and more difficult.

Look at for instance Norway and Iceland: they began negotiating an extradition agreement with the EU in 2001 and yet today it is still not in force.

And of course we will miss out on the benefits of these new arrangements, and any that develop in future.

58. Now you can take the view that we don't need this cooperation – that we can just do without these extra capabilities.

That in my view is a totally complacent view. Especially in a world where the difference between a prevented attack and a successful attack can be just 1 missing piece of data; 1 piece of the jigsaw that the agencies found too late.

59. You can also decide, as some on the Leave side seriously do, that even though working together is helpful for keeping us safe, it involves giving up too much sovereignty and ceding too much power over security cooperation to the European Court of Justice. My view is this: when terrorists are planning to kill and maim people on British streets, the closest possible security cooperation is far more important than sovereignty in its purest theoretical form. I want to give our country real power, not the illusion of power.
60. Fourth, therefore, Britain's unique position and power in the world is not defined by our membership of the EU, any more than it is by our membership of the Commonwealth or the UN Security Council or the OECD or the IMF or the myriad other international organisations to which we belong.
But our EU membership, like our membership of other international organisations, magnifies our national power.
61. Britain is a global nation, with a global role and a global reach.
We take our own decisions, in our own interests. We always have done, we always will do.
62. In the years since we joined the EU, we have shown that time and again with British, national, sovereign decisions about our foreign and defence policy taken by British prime ministers and British ministers.
Liberating the Falkland Islands in a great feat of military endeavour. Freeing Kuwait from Iraq.
And, more recently, our mission to prevent Afghanistan continuing to be a safe haven for international terrorists.
As I speak here today, we are flying policing missions over the Baltic states. Training security forces in Nigeria. And of course, taking the fight to Daesh in Syria and Iraq.
So the idea that our membership of the EU has emasculated our power as a nation – this is complete nonsense.
63. Indeed, over the last 40 years, our global power has grown, not diminished.
In the years before we joined the EU, British governments presided over a steady retrenchment of our world role, borne of our economic weakness.
64. The decision to retreat East of Suez and abandon our aircraft carriers was taken in 1968.
Since then, starting with the transformation of our economy by Margaret Thatcher, we have turned around our fortunes.
In the 21st century, Britain is once again a country that is advancing, not retreating,
We have reversed the East of Suez policy, we are building permanent military bases in the Gulf, we are opening embassies all around the world, particularly in Asia.
We have a new strategic relationship with both China and India, have committed to spending 2% of our GDP on defence – 1 of only 5 NATO nations to be meeting that target.
65. Our expertise in aid, development and responding to crises is admired the world over.
We are renewing our independent nuclear deterrent.
Our 2 new aircraft carriers will be the biggest warships the Royal Navy has ever put to sea.
66. These are the actions of a proud, independent, self-confident, go-getting nation, a nation that is confident and optimistic about its future, not one cowed and shackled by its membership of the European Union.
On the contrary, our membership of the EU is one of the tools – just one - which we use, as we do our membership of NATO, or the Commonwealth, or the Five Power Defence Agreement with Australia, New Zealand and our allies in South East Asia, to amplify British power and to enhance our influence in the world.

67. Decisions on foreign policy are taken by unanimity. Britain has a veto.
So suggestions of an EU army are fanciful: national security is a national competence, and we would veto any suggestion of an EU army.
68. And as we sit in Britain's National Security Council, time and again I know that making Britain's actions count for far more means working with other countries in the EU.
69. Let me just take 3 specific examples of what I mean.
When Russia invaded Crimea and Eastern Ukraine, there was a real risk of a feeble European response, and of a split between the United States and Europe.
I convened a special meeting of the key European countries in Brussels, agreed a package of sanctions, and then drove that package through the full meeting of EU leaders – the European Council – later that same evening. I could not have done that outside the EU.
An example of Britain injecting steel into Europe's actions; delivering sanctions which have been far more effective because 28 countries are implementing them, not just the UK.
And at the same time, we maintained that crucial unity between Europe and the US in the face of Russian aggression.
On Iran, again, it was Britain that pushed hardest for the implementation of an EU oil embargo against that country.
And it was the embargo which helped bring Iran to the negotiating table, and ultimately led to the UN sanctions that led to Iran abandoning its ambition to build a nuclear weapon.
Who led those negotiations? It was the EU, with Britain playing a central role.
And on Ebola, it was Britain that used a European Council to push leaders into massively increasing Europe's financial contribution to tackling the disease in West Africa, thereby helping to contain and deal with what was a major public health emergency.
If Britain left the EU, we would lose that tool.
70. The German Chancellor would be there. The French President. The Italian Prime Minister. So would the Maltese, the Slovak, the Czech, the Polish, the Slovene, as well as all the others.
But Britain – the fifth largest economy in the world, the second biggest in Europe – would be absent, outside the room.
71. We would no longer take those decisions which have a direct bearing on Britain.
Instead we would have to establish an enormous diplomatic mission in Brussels to try and lobby participants before those meetings took place, and to try and then find out what had happened at them once they broke up.
Would we really be sitting around congratulating ourselves on how 'sovereign' we feel, without any control over events that affect us?
72. What an abject act of national retreat that would be for our great country, a diminution of Britain's power inflicted for the first time in our history not by economic woe or by military defeat, but entirely of our own accord.
And when it comes to the strength of our United Kingdom, we should never forget that our strength is that of a voluntary union of 4 nations. So let me just say this about Scotland: you don't renew your country by taking a decision that could, ultimately, lead to its disintegration.
So as we weigh up this decision, let's do so with our eyes open.
73. And, of course, there is something closely connected to our power and influence that is absolutely vital: and that's the view of Britain's closest friends and allies.
Before you take any big decision in life, it's natural to consult those who wish you well, those who are with you in the tough times as well as in the good times.
Sometimes they offer contradictory advice. Sometimes they don't have much of a view.

That's not the case here.

Our allies have a very clear view. They want us to remain members of the European Union.

74. Not only our fellow members of the EU – they want us to stay, and could be resentful if we chose to leave.

75. The Leave campaign keep telling us that there is a big world out there, if only we could lift our sights beyond Europe
But the problem is they don't seem to hearing what that big world is saying.

76. There is our principal and indispensable ally, the guarantor of our security – the United States – whose President made the American position very plain, as only the oldest and best friends can.

And then there are the nations to which we are perhaps closest in the world, our cousins in Australia and New Zealand, whose prime ministers have spoken out so clearly.

The Secretary-General of NATO says that a weakened and divided Europe would be “bad for security and bad for NATO”.

Only on Thursday, the Japanese Prime Minister – whose country is such a huge investor and employer in the United Kingdom – made very clear that Japan hoped the UK would decide to remain in the EU.

So too have big emerging economies like Indonesia. And then there are our major new trading and strategic relationships – China and India – in whom some of the Leave campaign claim to invest such great hopes, at least when they're not saying they want to impose hefty tariffs on them. They too want us to remain in the EU.

So from America to Asia, from Australasia and the Indian sub-continent, our friends and our biggest trading partners, or potential trading partners, are telling us very clearly: it's your decision. But we hope you vote to stay in the European Union.

By the way, so too are our own Dependent Territories – Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands – with whom we have such a special bond and for whom we have a special responsibility.

77. And so? Next month we will make our choice as a nation.

I am very clear.

Britain is stronger and safer in the EU, as well as better off.

And the EU benefits from Britain being inside rather than out.

This is a Europe that Britain has helped to shape.

A continent that Britain helped liberate not once in the last century, but twice.

And we always wanted 2 things from the EU.

One: the creation of a vast single market; one we thought would benefit our economy enormously and spread prosperity throughout our neighbourhood.

And two: a Europe in which Britain helped the nations which languished under Communism return to the European fold; nations who still look to us as a friend and protector and do not want us to abandon them now.

We've got both of those things.

We did all that.

78. And imagine if we hadn't been there.

Who would have driven forward the single market?

Who would have prevented Europe from becoming a protectionist bloc?

Who would have stopped the EU from becoming a single currency zone?

Who would have stood up and said no to those pushing for political union?

Who would have done these things?

Because the truth is that if we were not in it, the European Union would in all likelihood

still exist.

So we would still have to deal with it.

79. Now we have the opportunity to have what we have always wanted: to be in the single market, but out of the euro.
To be at the European Council, with our full voting and veto rights, but specifically exempted from ever closer union.
To have the opportunity to work, live and travel in other EU countries, but to retain full controls at our border.
To take part in the home affairs cooperation that benefits our security, but outside those measures we don't like.
And to keep our currency.
That is, frankly, the best of both worlds.

80. No wonder our friends and allies want us to take it. To lead, not to quit.
It is what the Chinese call a win win.
The Americans would probably say it's a slam dunk.

81. We are Britain.
No one seriously suggests any more that after 40 years in the EU, we have become less British.
We're proud. We're independent.
We get things done.
So let's not walk away from the institutions that help us to win in the world.
Let's not walk away from the EU, any more than we would walk away from the UN, or from NATO.
We're bigger than that.
So I say – instead, let us remain, let us fight our corner, let us play the part we should, as a great power in the world, and a great and growing power in Europe.
That is the big, bold, and patriotic decision for Britain on 23 June.

2 Appendix 2: Text J

Published: May 9, 2016

Boris Johnson's speech on the EU referendum: full text

1. Thank you very much, good morning, good morning everybody, good morning
“I am pleased that this campaign has so far been relatively free of personal abuse – and long may it so remain – but the other day somebody insulted me in terms that were redolent of 1920s Soviet Russia. He said that I had no right to vote Leave, because I was in fact a “liberal cosmopolitan”.
2. And that rocked me, at first, and then I decided, of course, that as insults go, I didn't mind it at all – because it was probably true. And so I want this morning to explain why the campaign to Leave the EU is attracting other liberal spirits and people I admire such as David Owen, and Gisela Stuart, Nigel Lawson, John Longworth – people who love Europe and who feel at home on the continent, but whose attitudes towards the project of European Union have been hardening over time.
3. For many of us who are now deeply sceptical, the evolution has been roughly the same: we began decades ago to query the anti-democratic absurdities of the EU. Then we began to campaign for reform, and were excited in 2013 by the Prime Minister's Bloomberg speech;

and then quietly despaired as no reform was forthcoming. And then thanks to the referendum given to this country by David Cameron we find that a door has magically opened in our lives.

4. We can see the sunlit meadows beyond. I believe we would be mad not to take this once in a lifetime chance to walk through that door because the truth is it is not we who have changed. It is the EU that has changed out of all recognition; and to keep insisting that the EU is about economics is like saying the Italian Mafia is interested in olive oil and real estate.
5. It is true, but profoundly uninformative about the real aims of that organization. What was once the EEC has undergone a spectacular metamorphosis in the last 30 years, and the crucial point is that it is still becoming ever more centralizing, interfering and anti-democratic.
6. You only have to read the Lisbon Treaty – whose constitutional provisions were rejected by three EU populations, the French, the Dutch and the Irish – to see how far this thing has moved on from what we signed up to in 1972. Brussels now has exclusive or explicit competence for trade, customs, competition, agriculture, fisheries, environment, consumer protection, transport, trans-European networks, energy, the areas of freedom, security and justice, and new powers over culture, tourism, education and youth. The EU already has considerable powers to set rates of indirect taxation across the whole 28-nation territory, and of course it has total control of monetary policy for all 19 eurozone countries.
7. In recent years Brussels has acquired its own foreign minister, its own series of EU embassies around the world, and is continuing to develop its own defence policy. We have got to stop trying to kid the British people; we have got to stop saying one thing in Brussels, and another to the domestic audience; and to end the systematic campaign of subterfuge – to conceal from the public the scale of the constitutional changes involved. We need to look at the legal reality, which is that this is an accelerating effort to build the country called Europe.
8. Look at that list of Lisbon competences – with 45 new fields of policy where Britain can be now outvoted by a qualified majority – and you can see why the House of Commons Library has repeatedly confirmed that when you add primary and secondary legislation together the EU is now generating 60 per cent of the laws passing through parliament.
9. The independence of this country is being seriously compromised. And it is this fundamental democratic problem – this erosion of democracy – that brings me into this fight.
10. People are alarmed and surprised and alarmed to discover that our gross contributions to the EU budget are now running at about £20bn a year, and that the net contribution is £10 bn; and it is not just that we have no control over how that money is spent.
11. No one has any proper control – which is why EU spending is persistently associated with fraud. Of course the Remain campaign dismisses this UK contribution as a mere bagatelle – even though you could otherwise use it to pay for a new British hospital every week. But that expense is, in a sense, the least of the costs inflicted by the EU on this country.
12. It is deeply corrosive of popular trust in democracy that every year UK politicians tell the public that they can cut immigration to the tens of thousands – and then find that they miss their targets by hundreds of thousands, so that we add a population the size of

Newcastle every year, with all the extra and unfunded pressure that puts on the NHS and other public services.

13. In our desperation to meet our hopeless so-called targets, we push away brilliant students from Commonwealth countries, who want to pay to come to our universities; and we find ourselves hard pressed to recruit people who might work in NHS, as opposed to make use of its services – because we have absolutely no power to control the numbers who are coming with no job offers and no qualifications from the 28 EU countries. I am in favour of immigration; but I am also in favour of control, and of politicians taking responsibility for what is happening; and I think it bewilders people to be told that this most basic power of a state – to decide who has the right to live and work in your country – has been taken away and now resides in Brussels.
14. And, as I say, that is only one aspect of a steady attrition of the rights of the people to decide their priorities, and to remove, at elections, those who take the decisions. It is sad that our powers of economic self-government have become so straitened that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to go around personally asking other finance ministers to allow him to cut VAT on tampons, and as far as I can see we still have not secured consent.
15. It is very worrying that the European Court of Justice – Luxembourg, not Strasbourg – should now be freely adjudicating on human rights questions, and whether or not this country has the right to deport people the Home Office believes are a threat to our security; and it is peculiar that the government is now straining at the gnat of the Convention and the Strasbourg court, whose rulings are not actually binding on UK courts, while swallowing the camel of the 55-article charter of Fundamental rights, which is fully justiciable by the European Court in Luxembourg, when you consider that it is the rulings of this court that are binding and that must be applied by every court in this country, including parliament.
16. It is absurd that Britain – historically a great free-trading nation – has been unable for 42 years to do a free trade deal with Australia, New Zealand, China, India and America.
17. It is above all bizarre for the Remain campaign to say that after the UK agreement of February we are now living in a “reformed” EU, when there has been not a single change to EU competences, not a single change to the Treaty, nothing on agriculture, nothing on the role of the court, nothing of any substance on borders – nothing remotely resembling the agenda for change that was promised in the 2013 Bloomberg speech.
18. In that excellent speech the Prime Minister savaged the EU’s lack of competitiveness, its remoteness from the voters, its relentless movement in the wrong direction.
19. As he said – I am quoting the Bloomberg speech
‘The biggest danger to the European Union comes not from those who advocate change, but from those who denounce new thinking as heresy. In its long history Europe has experience of heretics who turned out to have a point.
‘More of the same will not see the European Union keeping pace with the new powerhouse economies. More of the same will not bring the European Union any closer to its citizens. More of the same will just produce more of the same – less competitiveness, less growth, fewer jobs.
‘And that will make our countries weaker not stronger.
That is why we need fundamental, far-reaching change.’
I am still quoting the Bloomberg speech

He was right then. He was absolutely right then.

20. We were told that there had to be “fundamental reform” and “full-on” Treaty change that would happen “before the referendum” – or else the government was willing to campaign to Leave if they didn't get the changes they wanted.
21. And that is frankly what the government should now be doing now. If you look at what we were promised, and what we got, the Government should logically be campaigning on the leave side today.
22. We were told many times – by the PM, Home Sec and Chancellor – that we were going to get real changes to the law on free movement, so that you needed to have a job lined up before you could come here. We got no such change.
23. We were told that we would get a working opt-out from the Charter of Fundamental Human Rights – which by the way gives the European Court the power to determine the application of the 1951 Convention on Refugees and Asylum, as well as extradition, child protection and victims’ rights. We got nothing.
24. We were told that we would be able to stop the Eurozone countries from using the EU institutions to create a fiscal and political union. We got nothing. Instead we gave up our veto.
25. The Five Presidents’ report makes it clear that as soon as the UK referendum is out of the way, they will proceed with new structures of political and fiscal integration that this country should have no part in, but which will inevitably involve us, just as we were forced – in spite of promises to the contrary – to take part in the bail-out of Greece. They want to go ahead with new EU rules on company law, and property rights and every aspect of employment law and even taxation – and we will be dragged in.
26. To call this a reformed EU is an offence against the Trades Descriptions Act, or rather the EU Unfair Commercial Practices Directive that of course replaced the Trades Descriptions Act in 2008. The EU system is a ratchet hauling us ever further into a federal structure.
27. We have proved to ourselves time and again that we cannot change the direction. We cannot change the pace. We cannot interrupt the steady erosion of democracy, and given that we do not accept the destination it is time to tell our friends and partners, in a spirit of the utmost cordiality, that we wish to forge a new relationship based on free trade and intergovernmental cooperation.
28. We need to Vote Leave on June 23, and in the meantime we must deal with the three big myths that are peddled by the Remain campaign.

The first is the so-called economic argument. The Remainers accept that there is a loss of political independence, but they claim that this trade-off is economically beneficial.

The second argument we might broadly call the peace-in-Europe argument – that the EU is associated with 70 years of stability, and we need to stay in to prevent German tanks crossing the French border.

The third argument is more abstract, but potent with some people. It is that you can't really want to leave the EU without being in some way anti-European, and that the Remain campaign therefore have a monopoly on liberal cosmopolitanism.

All three arguments are wholly bogus.

29. The most important mistake is to think that there is some effective and sensible trade-off between the loss of democratic control and greater prosperity. The whole thrust of the Remain argument is that there is a democratic cost, but an economic benefit – that if we accept that 60 per cent of our laws are made in Brussels, we will see some great boost in our trade and our exports and in the overall economic performance of the EU. This is turning out to be simply false.
30. The loss of democratic control is spiritually damaging, and socially risky – and the economic benefits of remaining subject to the Single Market law-making machine, as opposed to having access to the Single Market, are in fact very hard to detect.
31. What the government wants is for us to remain locked into the Single Market law-making regime, and to be exposed to 2500 new EU regulations a year. What we want is for Britain to be like many other countries in having free-trade access to the territory covered by the Single Market – but not to be subject to the vast, growing and politically-driven empire of EU law.
32. And there is a good deal of evidence that this is the most sensible position to be in. Take the two relevant 20 year periods, before and after the creation of the Single Market, in other words from 1973 to 1992, and from 1992 to 2012.
33. Now when the single market dawned, I know I was there, we were told that it was going to be a great dynamo of job and wealth creation – 800 billion euros, the Cecchini report said, of extra European GDP. We were told that it was going to send exports whizzing ever faster across borders. So what happened?
34. Did Britain export more to the rest of the EEC 11, as a result of the Single Market? On the contrary, the rate of growth slowed, as Michael Burrage has shown this year. British exports of goods were actually 22 per cent lower, at the end of the second 20 year period, than if they had continued to grow at the rate of the 20 years pre-1992. And before you say that this might be just a result of Britain's sluggish performance in the export of manufactured goods, the same failure was seen in the case of the 12 EEC countries themselves.
35. We were told that goods would start ping-ponging around the EEC as if in some supercharged cyclotron; and on the contrary, the rate of growth flattened again – 14.6 per cent lower than the previous 20 years when there was no single market.
36. So what was the decisive advantage to Britain, or any other country, of being inside this system, and accepting these thousands of one-size-fits-all regulations? In fact you could argue that many countries were better off being outside, and not subject to the bureaucracy. In the period of existence of this vaunted single market, from 1992 to 2011, there were 27 non-EU countries whose exports of goods to the rest of the EU grew faster than the UK's; and most embarrassingly of all – there were 21 countries who did better than the UK in exporting services to the other EEC 11.
37. So where was this great European relaunch that was supposed to be driven by the 1992 Single Market? In the 20 years since the start of the Single Market, the rate of growth in the EU countries has actually been outstripped by the non-EU countries of the OECD. It is actually the independent countries that have done better; and the EU has been a microclimate of scandalously high unemployment. This year the US is projected to grow

by 2.4 per cent, China by 6.5 pc, NZ by 2 pc, Australia by 2.5 pc and India by 7.5 pc. The Eurozone – 1.5 per cent.

38. All that extra growth we were promised; all those extra jobs. The claims made for the Single Market look increasingly fraudulent. It has not boosted the rate of British exports to the EU; it has not even boosted growth in exports between the EU 12; and it has not stopped a generation of young people – in a huge belt of Mediterranean countries – from being thrown on to the economic scrapheap.
39. What has that corpus of EU regulation done to drive innovation? There are more patents from outside the EU now being registered at the EU patent office than from within the EU itself. The Eurozone has no universities within the top 20, and has been woefully left behind by America in the tech revolution – in spite of all those directives I seem to remember from the 1990s about les reseaux telematiques; or possibly, of course, the EU has been left behind because of those directives, that I remember.
40. There are plenty of other parts of the world where the free market and competition has been driving down the cost of mobile roaming charges and cut-price airline tickets – without the need for a vast supranational bureaucracy enforced by a supranational court. Never forget, whatever piece of EU legislation is promulgated immediately becomes something by that court.
41. I hear again the arguments from the City of London, and the anxieties that have been expressed. We heard them 15 years ago, when many of the very same Remainers prophesied disaster for the City of London if we failed to join the euro. They said all the banks would flee to Frankfurt. Well, Canary Wharf alone is now far bigger than the Frankfurt financial centre – and has kept growing relentlessly since the crash of 2008.
42. As for the argument that we need the muscle of EU membership, we brits need the muscle if we are to do trade deals –well, look, as I say, at the results after 42 years of membership. The EU has done trade deals with the Palestinian authority and San Marino and others. Bravo. But it has failed to conclude agreements with India, China or if I say even America.
43. Why? Because negotiating on behalf of the EU is like trying to ride a vast pantomime horse, with 28 people blindly pulling in different directions. For decades deals with America have been blocked by the French film industry, and the current TTIP negotiations are stalled at least partly because Greek feta cheese manufacturers object to the concept of American feta cheese.
44. They may be right aesthetically right or wrong, but greek feta cheese should not be holding up British trade agreements.
45. Global trade is not carried on by kind permission of people like Peter Mandelson. People and businesses trade with each other, and always will, as long as they have something to buy and sell.
46. But it is notable that even when the EU has done a trade deal, it does not always seem to work in Britain's favour. In ten out of the last 15 trade deals of the EU, British trade with our partners has actually slowed down, rather than speeded up, after the beginning of the deal.
47. Is that because of some defect in us, or in the deal? Could it be that the EU officials did not take account of the real interests of the UK economy, which is so different in structure from France and Germany? And might that be because the sole and entire

responsibility for UK trade policy is in the hands of the EU commission – a body where only 3.6 per cent of the officials actually come from this country?

48. In trying to compute the costs and benefits of belonging to the Single Market, we should surely add the vast opportunity cost of not being able to do free trade deals with the most lucrative and fastest-growing markets in the world – because we are in the EU.
49. When you consider that only 6 per cent of UK business export to the EU 28; and when you consider that 100 per cent of our businesses – large and small – must comply with every jot and tittle of regulation; and when you consider that the costs of this regulation are £600m per week, I am afraid you are drawn to the same conclusion as Wolfgang Munchau, the economics commentator of the FT, who said, “whatever the reasons may be for remaining in the EU, they are not economic.”
50. And so I return to my point; that we must stop the pretence. This is about politics, and a political project that is now getting out of control. To understand our predicament, and the trap we are in, we need to go back to the immediate post-war period, and the agony and shame of a broken continent.
51. There were two brilliant Frenchmen – a wheeler-dealing civil servant with big American connexions called Jean Monnet, and a French foreign minister called Robert Schuman. They wanted to use instruments of economic integration to make war between France and Germany not just a practical but a psychological impossibility.
52. It was an exercise in what I believe used to be called behavioural therapy; inducing a change in the underlying attitudes by forcing a change in behaviour. Their inspired idea was to weave a cat’s cradle of supranational legislation that would not only bind the former combatants together, but create a new sensation of European-ness.
53. As Schuman himself put it, “Europe will be built through concrete achievements which create a de facto solidarity.” Jean Monnet believed that people would become “in mind European”, and that this primarily functional and regulatory approach would produce a European identity and a European consciousness.
54. Almost 60 years after the Treaty of Rome, I do not see many signs that this programme is working. The European elites have indeed created an ever-denser federal system of government, but at a pace that far exceeds the emotional and psychological readiness of the British people of Europe. The reasons are obvious.
55. There is simply no common political culture in Europe; no common media, no common sense of humour or satire; and – this is important – there is no awareness of each other’s politics, so that the European Union as a whole has no common sense of the two things you need for a democracy to work efficiently. You need trust, and you need shame. There is no trust, partly for the obvious reason that people often fail to understand each other’s languages. There is no shame, because it is not clear who you are letting down if you abuse the EU system.
56. That is why there is such cavalier waste and theft of EU funds: because it is everybody’s money, and therefore it is nobody’s money.
57. If you walk around London today, you will notice that the 12 star flag of the EU is flying all over the place. That is because this is Schuman day today. It is the birthday of the founder of this project, and the elites have decreed that it should be properly marked.

58. But let me ask you today, do we feel any particular loyalty to that flag? Do our hearts pitter-patter as we watch it flutter from all sorts of public buildings, probably including city hall? On the contrary. The British share with other EU populations a growing sense of alienation, which is one of the reasons turn-out at European elections continues to decline.
59. As Jean-Claude Juncker has himself remarked with disapproval, “too many Europeans are returning to a national or regional mindset”. In the face of that disillusionment, the European elites are doing exactly the wrong thing. Instead of devolving power, they are centralizing.
60. Instead of going with the grain of human nature and public opinion, they are reaching for the same corrective behavioural therapy as Monnet and Schuman: more legislation, more federal control; and whenever there is a crisis of any kind the cry is always the same. “More Europe!”
61. What did they do when the Berlin wall came down, and the French panicked about the inevitability of German unification? They decided to lock German into a single currency. “More Europe!” And what are they saying now, when the single currency has turned out to be a disaster? “More Europe!”
62. They persist in the delusion that political cohesion can be created by a forcible economic integration, and they are achieving exactly the opposite. What is the distinctive experience of the people of Greece, over the last eight years? It is a complete humiliation, a sense of powerlessness. The suicide rate has risen by 35 per cent; life expectancy has actually fallen. Youth unemployment is around 50 per cent. It is an utter disgrace to our continent.
63. That is what happens when you destroy democracy. Do the Greeks feel any warmer towards the Germans? Do they feel a community of interest? Do they feel in heart and mind Europe? Of course not.
64. In Austria the far-right have just won an election for the first time since the 1930s. The French National Front are on the march in France, and Marine le Pen may do well in the Presidential elections. You could not say that EU integration is promoting either mutual understanding or moderation, and the economic consequences range from nugatory to disastrous.
65. The answer to the problems of Europe today is not “more Europe”, if that means more forcible economic and political integration. The answer is reform, and devolution - the reform of the kind prime minister demanded in his Bloomberg speech, and devolution of powers back to nations and people, and a return to intergovernmentalism, at least for this country – and that means Vote Leave on June 23.
66. And of course there will be some in this country who are rightly troubled by a sense of neighbourly duty. There are Remainers who may actually agree with much of the foregoing about the economic advantages that are rather overstated or non-existent or indeed negative. But they feel uneasy about pulling out of the EU in its hour of need, when our neighbours are in distress; and at this point they deploy the so-called “Peace in Europe” argument: that if Britain leaves the EU, there will be a return to slaughter on Flanders Fields.
67. I have to say, I think this grossly underestimates the way Europe has changed, and the Nato guarantee that has really underpinned peace in Europe. I saw myself the disaster in the Balkans when the EU was charged and mandated with sorting out former Yugoslavia,

and I saw how actually it was Nato and the American alliance that had to come in and sorted it out.

68. And it, in my view, understates, this argument, the sense in which it is, I am afraid, the EU itself, and its anti-democratic tendencies that are now a force for instability and alienation.
69. Europe faces twin crises of mass migration, and a euro that has proved a disaster for some member states; and the grim truth is that the risks of staying in this unreformed EU are intensifying and not diminishing.
70. In the next six weeks we must all politely but relentlessly put the following questions to the Prime Minister and to our friends in the remain campaign.
- 1) How can you possibly control EU immigration into this country?
 - 2) The Living Wage is an excellent policy, but how will you stop it being a big pull factor for uncontrolled EU migration, given that it is far higher than minimum wages in other EU countries?
 - 3) How will you prevent the European Court from interfering further in immigration, asylum, human rights, and all kinds of other matters which have nothing to do with the so-called Single Market?
 - 4) Why did you give up the UK veto on further moves towards a fiscal and political union?
 - 5) How can you stop us from being dragged in, and from being made to pay for these arrangements?
71. The answer is that the Remain campaign have absolutely no answers to any of these questions, because they are asking us to remain in an EU that is wholly unreformed, and going in the wrong direction.
72. If we leave on June 23, we can still provide leadership in so many areas that Britain always has. We can help lead the discussions on security, on counter-terrorism, on foreign and defence policy, as we always have. But all those conversation can be conducted within an intergovernmental framework, and without the need for legal instruments enforced by the European Court of Justice. We will still be able to cooperate on the environment, on migration, on science and technology; we will still have exchanges of students.
73. We will trade as much as ever before, if not more than ever before. We will be able to love our fellow Europeans, marry them, live with them, share the joy of discovering different cultures and languages – but we will not be subject to the jurisdiction of a single court and legal system that is proving increasingly erratic and that is imitated by no other trading group around the world.
74. We will not lose influence in Europe or in the world – on the contrary, you could argue actually that we will gain in clout. We are already drowned out around the table in Brussels; we are outvoted far more than any other country – 72 times in the last 20 years, and ever more regularly since 2010; and the Eurozone now has a built-in majority on all questions.
75. We can actually recapture or secure our voice – for the 5th biggest economy in the world – in international bodies such as the WTO or the IMF or the CITES, where the EU is increasingly replacing us and laying a claim to speak on our behalf. And again, if you want

final and conclusive proof of our inability to “get our way” in Brussels – and the contempt with which we will be treated if we vote to Remain – look again at the UK deal and the total failure to secure any change of any significance.

76. And finally and above all – to get to the third key point of the Remainers – If we vote to leave the EU, we will not be voting to leave Europe. Of all the arguments they make, this is the one that infuriates me the most. In a hotly contested field, I am a child of Europe. I am, as I say, a liberal cosmopolitan; my family is a genetic equivalent of the UN peacekeeping force. I can read novels in French I think I've even read a novel in Spanish - and I can sing the Ode to Joy' in German and I will, if you keep -if you keep accusing me of being a Little Englander, I will. Hang on, Freude, schoener Goetterfunken. Anyway, you know it, you know it.
77. Both as editor of the Spectator and Mayor of London I have promoted, promoted actively the teaching of modern European languages in our schools, French and German, which are dying out, by the way at the moment, dying out under this government of Remainers. I have dedicated much of my life to the study of the common origins, the common origins of our European civilization in ancient Greece and Rome.
78. So I find it offensive, insulting, irrelevant and positively cretinous to be told – sometimes by people who can barely speak a foreign language – that I belong to a group of small-minded xenophobes; because the truth is it is Brexit that is now the great project of European liberalism, and it is leaving the EU, we want to leave the EU, and I am afraid that it is the European Union – for or all the high ideals with which it began, that now represents the ancient regime.
79. It is we who are speaking up for the people, and it is they who are defending an obscurantist and universalist system of government that is now well past its sell by date and which is ever more remote from ordinary voters.
80. It is we in the Leave Camp, we who vote leave – not they – who stand in the tradition of the liberal cosmopolitan European enlightenment – not just of Locke and Wilkes, but of Rousseau and Voltaire; and though they are many, and though they are well-funded, and though we know that they can call on unlimited taxpayer funds for their leaflets, it is we few, we happy few who have the inestimable advantage of believing strongly in our cause, and that we will be vindicated by history; and we will win for exactly the same reason that the Greeks beat the Persians at Marathon – because they are fighting for an outdated absolutist ideology, and we are fighting for freedom.
81. That is the choice on June 23.
- It is between taking back control of our money – or giving a further £100bn to Brussels before the next election.
- Between deciding who we want to come here to live and work – or letting the EU decide.
- It is a choice between a dynamic liberal cosmopolitan open global free-trading prosperous Britain, or a Britain where we remain subject to a undemocratic system devised in the 1950s that is now actively responsible for low growth and in some cases causing economic despair.
- It is a choice between believing in the possibility of hope and change in Europe – or accepting that we have no choice but to knuckle under.

It is a choice between getting dragged ever further into a federal superstate, or taking a stand now.

Vote Leave on June 23, and take back control of our democracy.”