

Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Bakalářská práce

Rozálie Stejskalová

Rhetorical Aspects of Political Speeches: Remain or Leave?

Rétorické aspekty politických projevů: zůstat, nebo opustit EU?

Poděkování

Ráda bych poděkovala PhDr. Pavlíně Šaldové, Ph.D., za vedení mé bakalářské práce a za její cenné rady, připomínky a vstřícnost při konzultacích. Ráda bych také poděkovala Mgr. Tomáši Váchovi za podporu a trpělivost.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 24. května 2019

.....

Rozálie Stejskalová

Abstrakt

Práce zkoumá rétorické aspekty jazyka politického diskurzu na dvou projevech britských politiků, Davida Camerona a Borise Johnsona, na téma brexit. Práce projevy obecně charakterizuje z formálního hlediska, dále analyzuje žánr a uspořádání projevů a srovnává tři módy persváze (patos, logos, étos), které vznikají užitím různých rétorických prostředků používaných v politickém diskurzu, přičemž se zaměřuje na metaforu, metonymii, sylogismus a prolepsis. Práce si klade za cíl prozkoumat, zda v daných politických projevech jeden či oba z politiků kladou větší důraz na jeden z těchto módů persváze a jak se toto projevuje na míře přesvědčivosti jejich projevů. Práce vychází převážně z teorií tradiční rétoriky a z metodologického přístupu prací Jonathana Charteris-Blacka (2014), (2018), který kombinuje tradiční analýzu diskurzu s kritickou analýzou diskurzu. Dalším cílem této práce je zjistit, zda aplikace těchto metodologických přístupů na daných projevech přináší vhled do stylu jazyka politického diskurzu.

Abstract

This thesis analyses rhetorical aspects of political discourse in two speeches given on Brexit by British politicians, David Cameron and Boris Johnson. Our study characterizes the formal aspects of the speeches, analyses the genre and arrangement of the speeches, and compares three modes of persuasion (pathos, logos, ethos) which are created through the employment of various rhetorical devices typically used in political discourse. The focus of our study is on metaphor, metonymy, syllogism and prolepsis. The objective of the thesis is to determine whether the political speakers put an emphasis on one of the three modes of persuasion in their speeches and how this contributes to the persuasiveness of their speeches. The study is based mostly on the concepts of traditional rhetoric and the methodology used and described by Jonathan Charteris-Black (2014), (2018) who combines traditional approaches to political discourse with approaches from critical discourse analysis. Therefore, the next objective of our analysis is to discover whether the application of this methodology provides insight into the style of political discourse.

Table of contents

1	INTRODUCTION	9
2	THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	10
2.1	LITERATURE AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH	10
2.2	LANGUAGE AND POLITICS	11
2.2.1	<i>Political speaker and political speech</i>	11
2.2.2	<i>Persuasion</i>	12
2.3	RHETORIC: CLASSICAL RHETORIC APPROACH	12
2.4	BRANCHES OF ORATORY	13
2.5	CANONS OF RHETORIC	14
2.5.1	<i>Invention</i>	14
2.5.2	<i>Arrangement</i>	18
2.5.3	<i>Style</i>	19
2.6	RHETORICAL DEVICES	20
2.6.1	<i>Schemata</i>	20
2.6.2	<i>Tropes</i>	20
3	MATERIAL AND METHOD	22
3.1	BREXIT REFERENDUM	22
3.2	THE SPEAKERS	23
3.3	MATERIAL	23
3.4	METHOD	25
3.5	HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	26
4	EMPIRICAL PART	27
4.1	ANALYSIS OF ARRANGEMENT OF TEXT C AND TEXT J	27
4.1.1	<i>Analysis of Text C</i>	27
4.1.2	<i>Analysis of Text J</i>	29
4.1.3	<i>Comparison of Text C and Text J</i>	30
4.2	METAPHOR ANALYSIS	31
4.2.1	<i>Definition</i>	31
4.2.2	<i>Source domain and target domain</i>	32
4.2.3	<i>Counting metaphors and what counts as a metaphor</i>	32
4.2.4	<i>Which phrases to count?</i>	33
4.3	RESULTS AND PROCEDURE OF METAPHOR ANALYSIS	33
4.3.1	<i>Results and procedure: Text C</i>	34
4.3.2	<i>Results and procedure: Text J</i>	37
4.3.3	<i>Comparison of Text C and Text J</i>	39

4.4	METONYMY ANALYSIS	40
4.4.1	<i>Methodology</i>	40
4.4.2	<i>Results and procedure</i>	41
4.4.3	<i>Analysis of Text C: identifying and explaining metonymies</i>	41
4.4.4	<i>Analysis of Text J: identifying and explaining metonymies</i>	42
4.4.5	<i>Comparison of Text C and Text J</i>	43
4.5	ANALYSIS OF SYLLOGISM AND PROLEPSIS	43
4.5.1	<i>Analysis of Text C</i>	43
4.5.2	<i>Analysis of Text J</i>	44
4.5.3	<i>Comparison of Text C and Text J</i>	44
5	CONCLUSION	46
6	REFERENCES AND SOURCES	49
7	RÉSUMÉ	52
8	APPENDIX 1: TEXT C	55
9	APPENDIX 2: TEXT J	66

List of tables

Table 1: Summary	20
Table 2: Formal characterization of Text C and Text J.....	25
Table 3: Number of metaphors.....	33
Table 4: Source domains in Text C	34
Table 5: Source domains in Text J	37
Table 6: Number of metonymies in Text C and Text J.....	41
Table 7: Number of syllogisms and prolepsis in Text C and Text J	43

List of abbreviations

Ibid.	ibidem, in the same place
Ex.	Example
Text C	Speech by David Cameron
Text J	Speech by Boris Johnson

1 Introduction

The objective of this thesis is to compare two political speeches presented during the respective campaigns on Brexit, applying a combination of the traditional rhetoric and some more recent approaches. In particular, our analysis will compare the speeches of two contemporary British politicians, David Cameron and Boris Johnson, focusing on whether and how they appeal to reason (logos), emotion (pathos) or ethos (character).

The study of political discourse has its roots in ancient Greek democracy and ancient Rome where philosophers such as Aristotle and Cicero were shaping and developing their thoughts and persuasive and effective use of language in communication into what is now known as the Western rhetoric tradition. Rhetoric was advocated by Aristotle to be the cornerstone of democracy as it enabled the orator to elaborate his oratory for a good cause based on techniques of reasoning, but also on the use of emotions as they prompted the intended reaction.

The existing approaches to the study of the language of political discourse include both the approaches from traditional discourse analysis and the critical discourse analysis. The former provides us with an essential background in understanding how political speeches work from the perspective of Western rhetoric tradition. The latter illustrates a set of more recent critical approaches to discourse, such as critical metaphor analysis. This combination of traditional and more recent approaches will be carried out and tested in this thesis

Rhetoric may be used not only for a good cause, but also for a personal or subjective benefit and power. (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 1) Charteris-Black (2011) states that “[w]ithin all types of political system, from autocratic, through oligarchic to democratic, leaders have relied on the spoken word to convince others of the benefits that arise from their leadership” (p. 1). In other words, politicians need to persuade people in order to be elected and to gain power or support for their ideology. The concept of persuasion is of utmost importance mainly in Western democracies where citizens have the right to vote, which they do on the basis of their beliefs and likings of the candidates or their ideologies. Politicians give political speeches during campaigns to convey their shared values, ideas, arguments and visions for the future in order to reach their target electorate and the more successful they want to be, the more persuasive must be their speech. We will, therefore, try to look at how varying degrees of persuasiveness are achieved.

2 Theoretical background

The theoretical part characterizes the main sources consulted for this study and defines the key terms necessary for the analysis, namely the genre of political speeches, persuasion and the significance of language of politics and the principal concepts of Western rhetorical tradition, which will provide us with the framework for analysing the speeches.

2.1 Literature and previous research

A general extensive and most recent overview of rhetoric in political discourse is outlined by Jonathan Charteris-Black in *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor* (2018). Charteris Black (2018) offers an overview of traditional and contemporary approaches to analysing political discourse and his methodology stresses the importance and benefits of combining those approaches in analysing political speeches in order to gain understanding of the speeches from different perspectives.¹ Ultimately, the approach or approaches chosen for an analysis might depend on the nature of a particular speech or on the focus of the study.

R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort in *Persuading People* (1992) give an extensive theoretical background of the theories of Western rhetorical tradition and its practical application on both functional and literary texts. The detailed study of the three rhetorical appeals (logos, pathos, ethos) and of the devices which constitute these appeals is instrumental in this work. *Persuading People* also presents a detailed analysis of how the devices contribute to the specific appeal and how they should be used to be effective.

In *The Language of Politics* (2000), Adrian Beard gives a basic guide for the study of political speeches, and focuses on the most common features and devices used in the language of politics such as metaphor, metonymy, irony etc.

Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner in *Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (2002) explain in the introductory chapter the relation between language and politics and introduce existing approaches relating to political discourse from a wide range of scholars, such as Aristotle, Plato, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, and T. A. van Dijk.

¹ “What is distinctive about the approach taken here is that it does not restrict itself to a single theoretical approach. Just as rival schools of rhetoric-Gogas, Isocrates, Plato and Aristotle emerged in ancient Greece, so a rich diversity of approaches has developed in the contemporary period. These range from the work of Norman Fairclough, drawing on systemic-functional linguistics (Fairclough, 1989, -1995, 2003, 2010); Teun van Dijk's extensive work on racist discourse (van Dijk, 2008) and Paul Chilton's (2004) and Ruth Wodak's (Wodak and Meyer, 2015) analysis of ideology and political discourse. More recently, critical metaphor analysis (Charteris-Black, 2004, 2011, 2013) has received support from, amongst others, Goatly (2007), Musolff (2006, 2010) and Semino (2008)” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 18).

In *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics* (2014), Michael Burke explains the relation of stylistics to rhetoric as well as he provides a brief history of development of rhetoric and explains all the key terms of rhetoric and the way rhetoric can be used for persuasive communication.

Sylva Rhetoricae is a detailed guide to the terms and concepts of classical and renaissance rhetoric provided by Dr. Gideon Burton of Brigham Young University

These sources have been taken as a starting point for our analysis of the two speeches, but other sources have also been used where necessary.

2.2 Language and politics

2.2.1 Political speaker and political speech

A political speaker is one who, by giving a speech, intends to persuade people to share his opinion or to vote for him and they rely on the spoken word to persuade people to their benefit. (Chilton & Schaffner, 2002: 3) “At the micro level, we use a variety of techniques to get our own way: persuasion, rational argument, irrational strategies, threats, entreaties, bribes, manipulation, anything we think will work” (Jones et al., 1994: 3 as cited in Chilton & Schaffner, 2002). Chilton & Schaffner (2002) argues that “[w]hat is strikingly absent from conventional studies of politics is attention to the fact that the micro-level behaviours [...] are actually kinds of linguistic action — that is, discourse” (p: 4). The linguistic choices politicians make will determine their success.

Charteris-Black (2018) defines political speech as “a coherent stream of spoken language that is usually prepared for delivery by a speaker to an audience for a specific purpose on a political occasion” (p. xiii). Nowadays, political speeches are mostly prepared by a team of professional speech writers, though this is often done in collaboration with the speaker and/or with respect to the personality of the speaker. (ibid: 93, 98) Charteris-Black further points out that two main classes of political speech can be distinguished: deliberative and epideictic², though in reality the division is not usually as clear-cut as in theory (see Section 2.4). (ibid: 5)

² “The Greek *epideictic* means "fit for display." Thus, this branch of oratory is sometimes called "ceremonial" or "demonstrative" oratory” (*Sylva Rhetoricae*).

2.2.2 Persuasion

Persuasion may be defined as getting someone to change their point of view, to adopt someone's point of view, or to act in ways in accordance with someone's point of view of things without any resort to force. R. M. Perloff in *The Dynamics of Persuasion* (2003) defines persuasion as “a symbolic process in which communicators try to convince other people to change their attitudes or behaviour regarding an issue through the transmission of a message, in an atmosphere of free choice” (p. 8).

Charteris-Black (2018) defines persuasion as follows; “[w]hen we say that someone has been persuaded, we usually mean that they have changed their point of view about a topic which might be marked by an expression such as ‘You’re right’” (p. 99). And he outlines a basic set of techniques for successful persuasion, including establishing identity, expressing political arguments, heightening emotional impact, all in all brought about by the style using mental representations, myths, frames and schemata. All of these are delivered in an appropriate manner and style (see Section 2.5.3). (ibid: 100)

Charteris-Black further stresses that “[t]he minimum requirements for persuasion in public communication are fluency, a high level of confidence, authenticity, spontaneity and the ability to inspire trust” (Charteris-Black, 2018: xviii). This means that “formal oratorical analysis—for example studying lists of figures of speech as in the rhetorical schools of ancient Greece—may have exactly the opposite effect to the one intended, as by over-intellectualising the speaker may lose authenticity” (ibid). He concludes that “[w]hen the appearance of artifice and manipulation disappear, the ghost of the pulpit master is no longer present, and an audience offers that most essential precondition for persuasion—their trust” (ibid).

The techniques for successful persuasion outlined by Charteris-Black (2018) mostly reflect what classical rhetoric theory establishes as the main aspects of effective or persuasive communication (see Section 2.3). The speaker's establishing identity, expressing political arguments and heightening emotional impact is achieved through rhetorical appeals to ethos, logos, pathos (see Section 2.5.1 I.). And so, to study persuasion in political speeches, we have to study and analyse the three rhetorical appeals, which are also intertwined with the study of genre, arrangement and style of a speech, as defined by classical rhetoricians (see Section 2.3).

2.3 Rhetoric: classical rhetoric approach

“Rhetoric, in the general sense of the use of language in such a manner as to impress the hearers and influence them for or against a certain course of action, is as old as language itself and the beginnings of social and political life” (Aristotle, 2006: vii). It is therefore the art of

persuasive discourse. (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 5) According to Aristotle, “Rhetoric [...] may be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever” (Aristotle, 2006: 15).

The Western rhetorical tradition developed its own methods to analyse effective speeches and communication and, in ancient Greece and throughout the history, students were trained to recognize all of the constitutive categories of rhetoric and how language works and how it can be used in speaking and writing. Branches of oratory were described for orators to distinguish between the different genres of speeches; Canons of rhetoric are logical steps or stages of producing a persuasive speech, including Invention which deals with modes of persuasion or rhetorical appeals, Arrangement and Style of oratory. (Burke, 2014: 1, 21)

Although the methods and instruments for description of political language are now much more detailed and advanced, traditional Western rhetoric is generally accepted in academia and many scholars still draw on these theories as a basis for understanding persuasive language and rhetoric in political field or in general. (Burke, 2014: 1)

It is argued that “[t]here can be no doubt that the fundamental core of stylistics lies in the rhetoric of the classical world” (Burke, 2014: 2). “Stylistics, or ‘literary linguistics’ as it is sometimes called, is the study and analysis of texts; it is in particular, although not exclusively, the study and analysis of literary texts” (ibid: 2). Rhetoric is therefore a form of stylistics and we may understand the study of rhetorical devices in political speeches as studying a register in stylistics. “In ancient rhetoric it is principally the third of the five canons which is of importance to stylistics. The ancient Greeks called this third canon ‘*lexis*’, and the Romans referred to it as ‘*elocutio*’. We know it today as style (see Wales 2011, p. 372 for more on this)” (Burke, 2014: 1). As well as in stylistics today, style was considered probably the most important of the five canons and a major focus is also put on style in the empirical part of this study.

2.4 Branches of oratory

Western rhetorical tradition recognizes three kinds of oratory which we would understand today as register in stylistics: forensic (law), epideictic (ceremonial), and deliberative (political). All of them are connected with a specific time, purpose and special topic of invention (subject matter). (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 3-7) The forensic branch is connected exclusively with the law courts and therefore it is not relevant for the study of political speeches. The other two kinds of oratory correspond with the two main types of political oratory defined by Charteris-Black (2018): deliberative and epideictic. (p. 14)

Epideictic oratory is situated at the present time, its purpose being praise or blame and its subject matter virtue or vice. (*Sylva Rhetoricae*) This type is used for ceremonial oratory, such as weddings, funerals or at political assemblies. Deliberative (political) oratory is oriented towards future policy-making, including public topics that Aristotle defined as follows: “the good and the unworthy, [and] the advantageous and the disadvantageous” (*Sylva Rhetoricae*), with regard to what is the best for the benefit of the society or otherwise. Charteris-Black (2018) extends this to “[a] policy-forming speech [which] necessarily addresses some specific aspects of policy about which a decision needs to be made in the near future” (p. xiv).

2.5 Canons of rhetoric

“Rhetoric is also about structure and strategy. Structure can be viewed at both a macro and micro level. The former pertains to the arrangement of the whole process of rhetoric, while the latter refers to the discourse itself, irrespective of whether this is spoken or written text. The macro level is expressed by means of the five canons of rhetoric. These are the five logical steps in the process of producing a persuasive discourse. These steps are: (i) the discovery or ‘invention’ stage; (ii) the arrangement stage; (iii) the stylisation stage; (iv) the memorisation stage; and (v) the delivery stage” (Burke, 2014: 20, 21). Memory and delivery will not be given attention here as they are irrelevant for the textual analysis.

2.5.1 Invention

Invention concerns finding the material for the speech, that is the topic or topics and arguments. (Burke, 2014: 1) The topic of the texts under analysis in this thesis is Brexit referendum (see Chapter 3). “[N]ext you need to go about gathering, discovering or generating arguments, also known as ‘proofs’, in support of your proposition. [...] [T]here are two categories of arguments, or ‘means of persuasion’ [...]. We can refer to these broadly as ‘internal’ and ‘external’ resources. The internal resources are also sometimes referred to as ‘artistic’ or ‘technical’ proofs, while the external ones are ‘non-artistic’ or ‘non-technical’ proofs” (Burke, 2014: 21).

The non-technical means of persuasion are not part of the art of rhetoric (ibid: 21), and therefore the non-artistic proofs will not be studied here. “The internal mode of persuasion, the ‘technical’ or ‘artistic means’ [...] is central to the art of rhetoric and includes three modes: (a) rational appeal (logos); (b) emotional appeal (pathos); and (c) ethical appeal (ethos),” (ibid: 21) which will, accordingly, be in the focus of our analysis.

I. **Three rhetorical appeals**

The three appeals can be created and analysed separately but each speech will usually operate with the combination of the three appeals with an emphasis on a specific appeal depending on the type and the purpose of oratory, on the part of the speaker but also on the speaker and the style he decides to adopt in order to persuade the audience. (Charteris-Black, 2018: 8)

As Adrian Beard (2000) states, “[a]ll three categories will be used by the speaker as part of the performance; how well they are constructed, and how each member of the audience responds to them, will decide whether the politician is seen as sincere or manipulative” (p. 37). Nevertheless, the three appeals do not usually work in a linear sequence but rather simultaneously. (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 58) Therefore, for example, establishing ethos in the prologue may be strengthened by the persuasive appeal to pathos (as by pleasure; humour, or even anger; attacking the opponent).

1) Ethos (character)

Ethos is an appeal to the character of the speaker (Burke, 2014: 22) and its purpose is to establish a relationship with the audience, which should be done right at the beginning of the speech. Ethos should therefore be typically employed by every orator in the introduction of the speech. (Charteris-Black, 2018: 8) R. and S. Cockfort define ethos as a persuasion through personality and stance, stressing the importance of the persuader and the self and the persuader as humourist (p. 23).

The speaker should involve an appropriate amount of self with a stance spanning from anything from confrontation to flattery. “[T]he persuader must also decide how much ego and ‘personality’ to inject into his or her presentation. Whilst an over-impersonal stance will seem chilly and bloodless, an ‘ego-trip’ or flashy display of personality will be just as repellent” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 23). And then, “[i]t is [...] warmth, energy and exuberance of personality which, appropriately channelled, will assist the persuader, finding expression via changing mood and tone” (R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 23).

An example of constructing ethos through pathos can be seen in the opening of a speech by Boris Johnson given on 11 March 2016 (a different speech than the one analysed in this work). “The pro-leave supporting Boris Johnson is a politician whose reputation was established primarily through his appeal to pathos by humour as in the opening to a speech during the referendum campaign to the big business logistics group, Europa” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 17).

(ex. 1)

Well thank you very much, Andrew, and good morning everybody. What a pleasure, what a privilege to be here at this incredible firm Europa, which of course is the single market. This is it; this is the absolute quintessential British success in Europe and will remain so in or out of the European Union. I apologise for being late—we need to take back control of Southeast trains [LAUGHTER], apart from anything else and about time [that] TFL [Transport for London], about time TFL were given the run around. (11 March 2016)

(ibid)

2) Logos (reason)

Logos is an appeal to arguments based in reason and, “[...] broadly speaking, logos is about producing arguments in support of your thesis statement that are solid, honest and valid, rather than ones that are weak, false and invalid” (Michael Burke, 2014: 22). “As a structuring principle in rhetoric, logos includes: the range of diverse arguments in the discourse; the structure of thought, whether simple or complex, which these arguments compose; and the sequence, coherence and logical value of these arguments” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 10).

Logos should be applied mainly in the proof and refutation part (see Section 2.5.2) and the most persuasive means of arguing is by syllogism (ex. 2 and 3) and by prolepsis (ex. 4 and 5). “Syllogism is a structure in which there is a major premise, a minor premise and a conclusion” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 12) and “[a]cceptance of the conclusion is possible only if the audience accepts the premises” (ibid). Syllogism with a major premise and minor premise is illustrated in ex. 2, but minor premise can also be omitted. The major premise also can be backed up by reason or reason and analogy, the former structure illustrated in ex. 3.

(ex. 2)

[Major premise] Universities need a socially equitable means of funding.
[Minor premise] A graduate tax is a socially equitable method of funding.
[Conclusion] Therefore universities need to support a graduate tax.

(ibid)

(ex. 3)

[Premise] A graduate tax is a fair way of funding universities.
[Reason] After all, with taxation, the more you earn, the more you pay.
[Conclusion] So people should support a graduate tax.

(ibid)

Another technique for argumentation is prolepsis. “Orators were accustomed to anticipate the objections or counter-arguments of their opponents, and so forestalled them by proleptic metastatements,” (Wales, 1990: 344) such as:

(ex. 4) “*I know it will be said that . . . [.]*” (Wales, 1990: 344).

A more specific example in which the speaker offers an alternative position (eg. a different opinion or solution to the counterposition) is in ex. 5.

(ex. 5)

1 Present a counterposition:

It might be thought that higher tuition fees and putting universities completely into a free market situation is the only way they can get sufficient funding.

2 Refute the counterposition:

But in reality that is not the case, because there are other ways of funding universities.

3 Offer an alternative position:

They could be funded entirely through general taxation, through a combination of general taxation and lower fees, or by a graduate tax.

(Charteris-Black, 2018: 13)

3) Pathos (emotion)

Pathos is a persuasive appeal to emotion and its purpose is to move or affect the feelings of the audience and it was advised that pathos should be emphasized mainly in the conclusion of a speech. “Pathos [...] can be said to deal with the psychology of persuasion, focusing on how emotions are triggered by language and performance and then channelled within the minds of the people in an audience. Modern theories of communication and persuasion from the field of social psychology will tell you that pathos persuades more often than any of the other proofs. Irrespective of our intelligence, at times we all process information ‘mindlessly’, peripherally, unthinkingly” (Burke, 2014: 22).

“Undoubtedly emotion is the ‘raw material’ of rhetoric, because without real (or simulated) emotion, effective persuasion is unlikely to take place, whatever the issue involved” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 40). This is also why pathos was encouraged to be used in the conclusion of the speech since it is meant to arouse emotions in the audience ‘right before’ any decision is taken by the people in the audience. Since emotion is the most effective aspect of persuasion, many orators and politicians put an emphasis on pathos as it is very convenient when persuading people. The overemphasis of pathos at the expense of logos has been often criticized by philosophers and scholars (*Sylva Rhetoricae*) precisely because of the possible misuse of emotions for one’s cause. (Charteris-Black, 2018: 16)

“Emotions could be aroused by evoking fear of injury, sympathy with an aggrieved party or anger arising from an insult” (ibid). But emotions can be evoked by fear of danger as well as by humour. R. and S. Cockfort offer a list of the most frequently experienced emotions: “anger, pity pride, shame, love, hate, hope, fear, envy, greed, aggression, emulation, vengefulness, indignation, scorn, admiration, jealousy and generosity” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 41). Aristotle defined these emotions in more general terms; his definition of emotions is that they “are all those affections which cause men to change their opinion in regard to their judgements, and are accompanied by pleasure and pain ; such are anger, pity, fear and all similar emotions and their contraries” (Aristotle, 2006: 173).

Among the lexical means that contribute to the appeal to pathos belong graphic language³ and emotive abstraction as well as figurative language. “In public oratory abstract concepts with strongly positive or negative connotations are frequently used, like ‘liberty’, ‘justice’, ‘dishonour’ or ‘tyranny’. These words reflect communal experience and common aspiration, and when skilfully managed in an appropriate context, will arouse powerful emotions in an audience” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 45, 46).

An example of arousing emotions in the conclusion of the speech is in Text J. The same example was given by Charteris-Black (2018) and it is likewise analysed in Section 4.2.2. In ex. 6, the speaker elicits laughter from the audience by employing humour such as when using metaphors or singing in front of the audience in German.

(ex. 6) 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 [LAUGHTER FROM AUDIENCE], 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 (audience shout encouragement for him to sing and laughter) and I will, if you keep -if you keep accusing me of being a Little Englander, I will. [Three-second pause] Hang on, Freude, schoener Goetterfunken. [Laughter] Anyway, you know it-you know it. (9 May 2016)

(Charteris-Black, 2018: 17)

2.5.2 Arrangement

In arrangement, the speaker is concerned with how “the material was then ordered for optimal effect in a given situation” (Burke, 2014: 1) and which artistic proofs would be most

³ “Graphic language appeals directly to the senses to recreate a scene vividly to the audience, thus arousing emotions,” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 45) as in “[s]hall I not bring before my eyes all the circumstances which it is reasonable to imagine must have occurred” (ibid).

persuasive for each part. (Charteris-Black, 2018: 19) The distinct parts of the oratory are; introduction, narrative, proof, refutation and conclusion, but “[t]here is no real consensus as to how many parts a text should have” (Burke, 2014: 22).

The first part is an introduction and the appeal that should be emphasized in this part is ethos; “[...] the orator sought to create rapport with the audience and to arouse interest. Some techniques, such as flattery or an appeal to goodwill, were directed towards the audience; others, such as a confession of inadequacy or of a lack of expertise on the part of the speaker, were directed more towards establishing the ethos or character of the orator. [...] Interest could be aroused by emphasizing the importance of the topic of speech or creating surprise [...]” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 19). But an attention-arousing prologue also can be also created by direct attack such as on the opponent. (Charteris-Black, 2018: 20)

Narrative is “directed towards the events that it is claimed have occurred or will occur and which will form the topic of the argument and to establish the key information” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 21).

The Proof follows “the narrative (or it is sometimes integrated with it)” (ibid) and it is “the main body of the speech where one offers logical arguments as proof” (ibid). The appeal to logos is emphasized here. (*Sylva Rhetoricae*)

“The refutation can either be treated as part of the proof [...] or as a separate part, where the orator tackles his opponents’ arguments; this can involve naming the opponent, attacking his character or ethos and presenting an opponent's argument prior to its rejection” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 24).

Conclusion is used for “summarising arguments and arousing appeal to the audience’s emotions. It is especially important in situations where an audience might be taking a decision following the speech (a vote in a deliberative speech)” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 25).

2.5.3 Style

“Classical rhetoricians differentiated between style and delivery by treating style as actual word choices and delivery as the control of the voice [...]” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 36). The style is concerned with how things will be said; what words will be chosen by the orator. “For Aristotle, style drew on the aesthetic resources of language - the choice of words and delivery- to ensure their maximum psychological effect” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 37). This is presumably the most important category, at least with regard to the influence on the audience.

The style was divided into three types ‘high’, ‘middle’, and ‘low’ or ‘plain’. (Burke, 2014: 1) High or grand style was associated with elevated and more complex words while the

plain style was associated with ordinary and less complex words. (Wales, 1990: 193) The middle style was a combination of both plain and high style.

The three types were associated with different appeals and had different purposes: the purpose of high style was to move and excite the audience and it “[...] was often reserved for literature and poetry. It was also very persuasive, drawing as it did on pathos [...] to influence thinking patterns” (Burke, 2014: 1). The middle style was associated with ethos and its purpose was to please. And finally, the ‘plain’ style was associated with logos and its purpose was to teach, therefore it was oriented rather to the content or the clarity of the arguments than to the way the content was conveyed. (*Sylva Rhetoricae*)

Table 1: Summary

Appeal to:	Style:	Purpose:	Part of arrangement:
Ethos (character):	middle style	to please	introduction
Logos (reason):	plain style	to teach/explain	argument/refutation
Pathos (emotion):	high style	to excite	conclusion

2.6 Rhetorical devices

2.6.1 Schemata

Scheme is “[a]n artful deviation from the ordinary arrangement of words” (*Sylva Rhetoricae*). Our analysis will focus only on syllogism and prolepsis as these two are the most important techniques used for the appeal to logos and therefore need to be analysed in order to determine to what extent the speakers appeal to logos. Among the most important schemes related to the study of rhetoric in political language also belong devices such as anaphora, epiphora, tricolon, antithesis.

2.6.2 Tropes

Trope is “[a]n artful deviation from the ordinary or principal signification of a word” (*Sylva Rhetoricae*). “From Gk ‘turn’, a trope twists words away from their usual meanings or collocations: what Geoffrey Leech (1969) described as a foregrounded irregularity of content, and Tzvetan Todorov (1967) termed anomaly. Common traditional kinds of tropes are metaphor, metonymy and oxymoron; also figures like hyperbole, litotes and irony which play with literal meaning” (Wales, 1990: 428).

“Such use of language is valuable when the orator wants to evaluate positively or negatively or to intensify an appeal, usually to pathos by drawing on the rich associative power of language. When directed towards the speaker, they evoke positive emotions and values such as pride, honour, courage and solidarity, but when directed towards political opponents, they evoke negative emotions and values such as fear, shame, estrangement and ostracism” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 50).

I. Metaphor

Metaphors can often arouse emotions and therefore their rhetorical appeal is often associated with pathos. According to Charteris-Black (2018), “[m]etaphor is effective in public communication because it draws on the unconscious emotional associations of words and assumed values that are rooted in cultural and historical knowledge. For this reason, it has potentially a highly persuasive force and activates unconscious, often mythic knowledge to influence our intellectual and emotional responses by evaluating actions, actors and issues” (p. 202) and “they frame ways of thinking about the social world that actually construct power relations and become political realities” (ibid).

II. Metonymy

Even though metonymy is also on the list of tropes that can be analysed, and it may have the same or very similar effect as metaphor, Charteris-Black and many other scholars focus mainly on metaphor analysis in analysing political speeches. Nevertheless, there are other linguists, such as Lakoff and Johnson (2003), who also extend their focus on the analysis of metonymy and therefore here the focus in the analysis of tropes will be also on metonymy.

3 Material and method

The subject of the analysis of rhetorical devices are two political speeches given in May 2016 before the Referendum on Brexit in the UK, during which time many campaigns were ongoing for and against Brexit. Both speeches were given on 9 May 2016, and each of them was given by a member of a Conservative party. The focus will be on one speech given by the then Prime Minister David Cameron (Text C) and on one speech which was given by a member of the Conservative Party, Boris Johnson (Text J). Both speeches relate to why and why not vote for or against Brexit. David Cameron argued against Brexit and Boris Johnson campaigned for Brexit.

Brexit Referendum has been highly controversial and of national importance, arousing strong emotions and attracting large public audience, and therefore both politicians presumably strived for displaying the best of their rhetoric, which is one of the reasons for the choice of this topic. The second reason is that while the ‘audience’ (the British people) was the same, the views, opinions, and arguments of the two politicians were in opposition. The use of the language to convey their thoughts and arguments could therefore be different and it may be interesting to look at in what the difference consists.

3.1 Brexit referendum

“Brexit is Britain’s exit from the European Union.”⁴ The first Brexit referendum took place in and had been on the political agenda since 1975, and it has been constituting a part of British political debate since then. There has been rising criticism of the membership in the European Union since the 2010s, the rhetoric for withdrawal being based mainly on the issues of rising immigration and with that connected economic situation and advocacy for nationalism. The political and socio-economic situation in the United Kingdom led to the launch of Brexit Referendum promised by David Cameron in his famous Bloomberg speech given on 23 January 2013.

The withdrawal from the EU has been advocated by Eurosceptics, while pro-Europeanists advocated membership in the EU. Both of these two groups consist of politicians who span the whole political spectrum and both groups campaigned nationwide to promote their ideology.

⁴ Mikey Smith, Bloom Dan a Jason Beattie. “What is Brexit? We answer the most Googled questions about Britain leaving the EU.” 10 August 2018. *Mirror*. <https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/politics/what-brexit-answer-most-googled-13023598> 12 Feb. 2019.

Politicians gave many parliamentary and public speeches to express their views, among which the most prominent were David Cameron, Boris Johnson, Theresa May and Nigel Farage. On 23 June 2016, the day of Brexit referendum, 51.9 percent of voters chose to leave the EU.⁵

3.2 The speakers

David Cameron is a British politician, a member of the Conservative Party who served as a PM of the UK from 2010 to 2016 when he resigned on his post after the Brexit referendum. During the campaign for the 2015 general election, David Cameron made a manifesto pledge that he would launch Brexit referendum so that people could decide whether to stay in or leave the EU, which had been one of the most discussed issues, and this campaign secured the Conservative Party to stay at power. The Conservative Party won the general election and to fulfil his promise, David Cameron introduced the Brexit referendum even though he himself was against leaving the EU. Regarding the Remain campaign, David Cameron focused on the economic argument and also claimed that he would not personally target Boris Johnson.⁶

Boris Johnson is a British politician, a member of the Conservative Party and a prominent figure in the Leave campaign.⁷ He is known to base most of the campaign on immigration as his ‘slogan’ was “we will be able to set the right policies to immigration when we take back control.”⁸ Johnson and the Leave campaign also gave false or inaccurate data when it comes to the contribution to the EU budget as in “we send the people 50 million a day.”⁹

3.3 Material

The official transcripts of political speeches may be accessed online usually on the day of delivery. Our analysis draws on transcriptions of speeches published on the internet; the

⁵ Sarah Pruitt, “The History Behind Brexit: The often-rocky relationship between Britain and the European Union stretches back nearly half a century.” 13 March 2019. [history.com. https://www.history.com/news/the-history-behind-brexit](https://www.history.com/news/the-history-behind-brexit) 4 April 2019.

Will Kenton, “Brexit.” 22 May 2019. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/brexit.asp> 22 May 2019.

⁶ Peter Kellner, “David Cameron: PRIME MINISTER OF UNITED KINGDOM.” 15th May 2019. Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/David-Camero> 19 May 2019.

Gov.uk. “The Rt Hon David Cameron: Biography.” 2019. <https://www.gov.uk/government/people/david-cameron#biography> 20 May 2019.

⁷ Encyclopædia Britannica. “Boris Johnson.” 2019. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Boris-Johnson> April 2019.

⁸ AP Archive. “Johnson urges Britain ‘to take back control’.” 17th May 2016. [youtube.com. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EUFLMu0-H1k](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EUFLMu0-H1k) 1 May 2019.

⁹ Full Fact Team. “The UK's EU membership fee.” 3rd December 2018. Full Fact: THE UK’S INDEPENDENT FACTCHECKING CHARITY. <https://fullfact.org/europe/our-eu-membership-fee-55-million/> 5 April 2019.

speech by David Cameron was published on 9 May 2016¹⁰ and the speech by Boris Johnson was also published on 9 May 2016.¹¹

The transcripts differ from the delivered speech to some extent and so, for the purpose of this study, the differences between the written texts and the speeches were corrected watching the official delivery of the speeches.¹² The differences in the delivery from the pre-composed speeches (the official transcripts published on the internet) in Text C are few and minor, including functional words or replacing verbs or nouns for their synonyms.

On the other hand, the differences in Text J were quite numerous as there are approximately 70 differences identified in Text J. Only some of them are differences in conjunctions or other minor differences. There are approximately 10 additional sentences or sentences that were modified to a greater extent. Other differences consist in an emphasis on personal involvement in politic, history, being British and overall the speaker's opinions including phrases such as "I know, I was there.", "I seem to, in my view.", "I am afraid.", and once the speaker in Text J sings in German. Other differences are additional intensifiers and words such as 'actually'.

For the purpose of referring to sections in both Text C and Text J, the transcripts of the speeches were further divided into smaller segments, ranging from one paragraph to several paragraphs and consisting on average of 80 words in Text C and 69 words in Text J. Both the transcripts (Text C and Text J) are attached in the Appendices of this study with all of the changes and corrections as described above.

Table 2 gives the basic information about Text C and Text J. Text J is approximately 912 words longer, which will be taken into account every time when presenting the results.

¹⁰ David Cameron, "PM speech on the UK's strength and security in the EU: 9 May 2016 (Archived)." British Government, 9 May 2016 <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-the-uks-strength-and-security-in-the-eu-9-may-2016> 22 May 2019.

¹¹ Boris Johnson, "Boris Johnson's speech on the EU referendum: full text." 9 May 2016. <https://www.conservativehome.com/parliament/2016/05/boris-johnsons-speech-on-the-eu-referendum-full-text.html> 22 May 2019.

¹² The videos of both Cameron's and Johnson's speeches were watched from the following websites respectively. David Cameron, "PM speech on the UK's strength and security in the EU: 9 May 2016 (Archived)." British Government, 9 May 2016 <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-the-uks-strength-and-security-in-the-eu-9-may-2016> 22 May 2019.

Boris Johnson, "EU Referendum - Boris Johnson - BrExit - Vote Leave." 9th May 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4ViQNeZRK3w&t=2275s> 22 May 2019.

Table 2: Formal characterization of Text C and Text J

	Text C	Text J
Length	41:13 minutes	37:55 minutes
No. of words	6 556 words	5 537 words
No. of sentences	351 sentences	220 sentences
Word per sentence	18,7 words per sentence	25,2 words per sentence
No. of segments	81	81
No. of differences written/spoken	10	70 approximately

Both traditional rhetoric and critical approaches to discourse analyse the style of the speech delivery; such as mood, tone, tempo, as well as the appearance and body language and gestures of the speakers. These approaches can be also found in the literature mentioned in Section 2.1. For the sake of simplicity, this thesis will focus only on textual analysis of the speeches.

3.4 Method

The Empirical part will analyse Text C and Text J, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative method enables us to consider why a particular choice was made and what effect it might have on the listener/reader, using the methodology (terms and theory of rhetoric) as described in the theoretical part (Section 2.3 - 2.6). In the empirical part the genre of each speech, the parts of arrangement in both speeches, and the dominant rhetorical appeal in the parts of the arrangement will be determined. Subsequently, the analysis of metaphor, metonymy, syllogism and prolepsis will be carried out with a view to finding out how these devices contribute to pathos, logos and ethos.

The quantitative analysis will enable us to determine the distribution of the techniques used in Text C and Text J. Subsequently, we will compare the speeches and determine whether any of the appeals prevail in each speech, and therefore if the speeches differ in their rhetorical appeal to ethos, logos or pathos.

Following the previous research in this field, we may establish a set of rhetorical techniques applied by politicians. We will focus on the use of the major strategies that were used in the previous research in the field of political discourse, and that were as well identified in the theoretical part of this study, and we will apply the methodology of Charteris-Black

(2018). Nevertheless, the number of the techniques used in this analysis is not by any means complete and the choice of just few techniques will be specified in individual sections of Chapter 4.

3.5 Hypothesis and research questions

The objective of this study is to discover whether politicians use rhetorical devices in their speeches and whether the devices contribute to the persuasiveness of the speeches.

This work will analyse rhetorical devices in two political speeches of contemporary British politicians, David Cameron and Boris Johnson, and the rhetorical appeals to pathos, logos, ethos (as defined in Section 2.5.1 I.) which are created through certain rhetorical devices. The aim is to discover if the speeches differ in the distribution of the selected devices, if these devices contribute to one of the rhetorical appeals, and consequently, if any of the three appeals dominate in the speeches.

The hypothesis assumes that the speeches of Boris Johnson and David Cameron differ in the linguistic aspects of the speeches and selected rhetorical devices applied in the speeches. The second hypothesis is that Cameron's speech emphasizes the rhetorical appeal to logos and that the speech of Johnson emphasizes the rhetorical appeal to pathos. This hypothesis is based on long-term observation of the speeches of both the politicians and the same argument was found in Charteris-Black (2018).

Research questions

1. Do the speakers use rhetorical devices such as metaphor, metonymy, prolepsis and syllogism in their speeches?
2. Does the distribution of rhetorical devices differ?
3. Do the rhetorical devices (metaphor, metonymy, prolepsis and syllogism) contribute to one of the rhetorical appeals?
4. If the rhetorical devices (metaphor, metonymy, prolepsis and syllogism) contribute to one of the rhetorical appeals, does any of the three appeals dominate in the speeches?

4 Empirical Part

4.1 Analysis of arrangement of Text C and Text J

This analysis divides the material into distinct functional parts which are outlined in the theoretical part as: intro, narrative, proof, refutation, conclusion. We will focus on the three parts where the appeal to ethos, logos or pathos should be given prominence; introduction, proof/refutation and conclusion.

4.1.1 Analysis of Text C

The whole speech may be classified as both deliberative and epideictic (ceremonial). The speech is deliberative because it addresses some aspects of policy about which a decision will be made in a referendum. (Charteris-Black, 2018: 13) The speech was classified also as epideictic since a great part of the speech focuses on the history of Britain, having a central role in Europe and on praising Britain as leading power at present and British people in general. The arrangement of the speech does not precisely follow the traditional division suggested by classical orators since the narrative seems to be integrated within the proof as well as the proof and refutation are integrated. Overall, Text C mixes the use of “[...] tropes and schemes with an appeal based primarily on logos and ethos (which) characterizes the choice of Isocrates’ middle style” (Charteris-Black, 2014: 223).

I. Text C: Intro

The introduction spans from units 1- 3 in the transcript in the appendix. The introduction in Text C is firstly directed towards the audience (1) and only after that towards the speaker who presents himself as being rational and down-to-earth (2) since the speaker considers not only his supporters but also his opponents (3) and therefore the appeal of ethos is established on the understanding of different opinions and of his referring to family topics (4) which is how the speaker establishes a relationship with the audience.

(ex. 7) In 45 days’ time, the British people (1) will go to polling stations across our islands and cast their ballots in the way we have done in this country for generations (4). (C 1)

They will, as usual, weigh up the arguments, reflect on them quietly, discuss them with friends and family (4), and then, calmly and without fuss, take their decision. (C 2)

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? (3) (C 3)

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. (2) (C 3)

II. Text C: argumentation and refutation

The argumentation and refutation parts span from unit 4-76 but it was difficult to distinguish the argumentation and refutation parts from the narrative part since the narrative part seems to be integrated within it (see Section 2.5.2). The speaker in Text C uses the most effective techniques to convey arguments, prolepsis (13x) and syllogism (6x), which are discussed and exemplified in Section 4.5. Charteris-Black (2014) comments on the use of syllogism and prolepsis when analysing Cameron's speech on the European Union in 2013 and this comment may be applied here as well. "This foregrounding of all the possible arguments against his policies allows Cameron to appear rational and as having considered fully a range of options before deciding on a policy. This is a style implying that the speaker is engaged in dialogue with his political opponents, and integrating their voices implies that he is aware of the range of opinion around Europe" (Charteris-Black, 2014: 221). And therefore, by using these techniques, the speaker appeals to logos to make the arguments most effective.

III. Text C: Conclusion

In the conclusion, which spans from unit 77-81, the speaker appeals not only to pathos but also logos and ethos. The appeal to pathos may be seen below in the use of anaphora. "In rhetoric, anaphora [...] is a popular figure of speech involving repetition of the same word [or phrase] at the beginning of successive clauses, sentences or verses [...]. It is found in verse and prose of all periods and can be effectively deployed to underline descriptive and emotional effects" (Wales, 1990: 20). Apart from anaphora and the emphasis on Britain's role (ex. 10) the conclusion does not emphasize appeal to pathos as the use of metaphorical expressions in the conclusion is not so frequent.

(ex. 8) 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? ^[L]_{SEP}
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? (C 78)

(ex. 9) We're proud. We're independent. We get things done. (C 81)

The appeal to ethos may be seen in the emphasis and praise of both Britain and British people.

(ex. 10) 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. (C 81)

The appeal to logos may be seen in the use of syllogism/logical structuring of an argument.

(ex. 11) 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. (C 77.)

The speaker in Text C does not put emphasis exclusively on pathos, which is recommended by classical rhetoricians, but employs also the appeal to logos and ethos.

4.1.2 Analysis of Text J

The whole speech may be classified as deliberative speech since it is directed towards the future policy decision. The structure of the speech can be classified as the traditional arrangement of classical orators since all the parts were identified.

I. Text J: Intro

The introduction in Text J spans from unit 1-2. The ethos is constructed mainly through pathos, which can be seen in the opening of the speech by Boris Johnson; he establishes his ethos by expressing pleasure (1), and his stance by indirectly attacking opponents, expressing anger and indignation over an insult (2), which is compared by analogy to the communistic regime in Soviet Russia. However, as the orators in ancient Greece and Rome suggested, Johnson also showed goodwill by reconciliation (3) as can be seen in the following example.

(ex. 12)

I am pleased (1) that this campaign has so far been relatively free of personal abuse – and long may it so remain – but the other day someone insulted (2) me in terms that were redolent of 1920s Soviet Russia (2). He said that I had no right to vote Leave, because I was in fact a “liberal cosmopolitan”. That rocked me (2), at first, and then I decided (3) that as insults go, I didn't mind it at all (3) – because it was probably true. (J 3)

Expressing ethos through pathos is very effective technique since the use and arousal of emotions may strengthen the speaker's influence over the audience since the emotions add to the “warmth, energy and exuberance of personality” (R. R. Cockfort & S. M. Cockfort, 1992: 23).

II. Text J: argumentation and refutation

The argumentation part spans from unit 6-27 and the refutation part from unit 28-76. In Text J, the speaker scarcely uses prolepsis and does not use syllogism at all (see Section 4.5). The arguments in Text J are based on other techniques such as the use of metaphor (see Section 4.2) which is one of the main means contributing to the arguments and narrative underlying the speech.

III. Text J: conclusion

The conclusion spanning from unit 77-81 in Text J is based on the appeal to pathos. The conclusion begins with the example taken over from Charteris-Black and also shown in the theoretical part. In the following paragraph, we may see that the speaker shifted into the first person singular using the pronoun 'I' instead of 'we' emphasizing the speaker's important role and positives followed by an amusing part where the speaker starts to sing and cheers up the audience.

(ex. 13)

“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.” (J 76)

The conclusion also consists of numerous passages where the speaker shows indignation (1) and communicates insults (2) targeted toward his political opponents (2) such as in the following passage.

(ex. 14)

So, I find it offensive, insulting, irrelevant (1) and positively cretinous to be told (2) – sometimes by people who can barely speak a foreign language (2) – that I belong to a group of small- minded xenophobes (1) (J 78)

The conclusion is based primarily on the appeal of pathos since each sentence of the conclusion appeals to pathos either by means of metaphor or by communicating emotions such as insult, indignation and targeting the political opponent.

4.1.3 Comparison of Text C and Text J

The speaker in Text C employs traditionally the emphasis on ethos in introduction and logos in argumentation and refutation part. There is no prevalent appeal in the conclusion as

the speaker employs all three modes of persuasion. The emphasis on ethos and logos is therefore more prominent than the emphasis on pathos.

The speaker in Text J emphasizes appeal to ethos through pathos in introduction, lacks appeal to logos in argumentation and refutation part, and appeals to pathos in the conclusion. The prominent appeal in Text J is therefore pathos and then also ethos.

4.2 Metaphor analysis

The purpose of the metaphor analysis is to gain insight into the rhetorical style of each of the speakers since “[i]dentifying, classifying and analysing such metaphors contributes to the identification of the underlying narrative structures that Charteris-Black (2018) refers to as ‘myths, but that have also been described as ‘metaphor scenarios’ by Musolff (2006)” (p. 193). To do so, we will analyse and compare the metaphors and the frequency of metaphors used in Text C and Text J.

The analysis of metaphors will be based on the definitions and classification of metaphor outlined in the following sections to discover if the metaphors appeal to pathos and to what degree, we have also divided the metaphors into metaphors with positive, negative and neutral connotation.

4.2.1 Definition

Metaphor is when “[...] one field or domain of reference is carried over or mapped onto another on the basis of some perceived similarity between the two fields: so when Hamlet says *the world is an unweeded garden, That grows to seed (I. ii)* the features of gardens are applied to the world. As this example also reveals, metaphor is a device usually to make sense of relatively complex, abstract or unfamiliar experiences in terms of more familiar ones” (Wales, 1990: 265).

“Metaphor occurs when a word or phrase in one semantic field is transferred into another semantic field in order to talk about one thing as if it were another quite different thing.” (Montgomery, 2013: 118). It works “[...] on the basis that there is some similarity between the two ideas that have been brought together, as can be seen in the similarity between ‘highest point’ and ‘summit’ (the highest part of a mountain). To interpret the metaphor, we look for the element of similarity between the non-literal word or phrase (here ‘summit’) and the implied idea (highest point) and transfer it into the new context” (Montgomery, 2013: 118).

According to Charteris-Black, metaphor can be identified as “a shift in the sense of a word or phrase from its earlier more concrete or more embodied sense to a later sense that is

more abstract or less embodied” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 51) or that “it connects two things that are not normally related” (ibid).

4.2.2 Source domain and target domain

We can classify metaphors on the basis of their literal meaning; that is their source domain or shared lexical characteristics from the same semantic field, such as light, force, travel. We can also classify them according to what they refer to; that is their target domain, such as war, praise, hope, organizations, arguments, though the reference may be much more specific, such as British nation or European Union. (Wales, 1990: 65) “Very common metaphors, in both conversation and literature, show *LIFE is a JOURNEY*; *LOVE is a DISEASE*, etc. (the capital letters here marking the homologies of target and source respectively). The discourse of politics is often marked by conventional metaphors to do with battlefields (*ARGUMENT is WAR*), or building (*NATION/ECONOMY is a HOUSE*)” (ibid).

This classification will be used in our analysis, as it helps to divide the respective metaphors into smaller groups for the sake of interpretation of their meaning and effect. In each of the groups we have identified whether each metaphor has a positive, negative or neutral associations/connotations in order to evaluate consequently whether the metaphor does relay appeal to emotions (whether positive or negative) and consequently to be able to compare in what ways they differ from the metaphors used in the other speech.

4.2.3 Counting metaphors and what counts as a metaphor

“If one were to ask ten metaphor scholars to count the metaphors a text, they would almost certainly arrive at different answers. Similarly, experience shows that even the same analyst can produce different counts of metaphors on different days” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 213). The problem can arise not only from how to recognize metaphor, but also from how to count them; whether each separate word in a metaphor is a metaphor, or whether a whole phrase is a metaphor. The criteria we have established for counting metaphors is to count them as a unit or a phrase, so the following three metaphorical expressions would be counted as three separate units, that is three metaphors, unless any of them was repeated, which would be counted as many times as it was repeated.

(ex. 15)

“The sky was dark and angry.”

“I think this will throw some light on the issue.”
“That politician is a sly fox.”¹³

4.2.4 Which phrases to count?

We have defined what metaphor is and how to count them, but even at this stage, the final number of metaphors can be different when counted by different scholars as recognizing metaphors is a subjective process. This is because “knowledge of historically earlier senses and how language is processed varies among individuals; for example, someone who is aware of the primary sense of ‘beacon’ as a fire in a prominent position will count it as a metaphor in the phrase “Britain is a beacon, and experience some awareness of meaning shift. Conversely, someone who has only come across ‘beacon’ with an abstract sense - as in political rhetoric - will not do so, because they do not experience any resemblance relation” (Charteris-Black, 2018: 220, 221).

Apart from this, another reason for this is that metaphors are not given or inherent, but created and understood by the speakers which is argued both by Lakoff & Johnson (2003) and Charteris-Black (2018) “The relationship between the two entities connected by metaphor is not one that pre-dates the metaphor; it is a relationship that is created by it. Awareness of incongruity is an act of interpretation and is therefore ultimately subjective” (ibid).

4.3 Results and procedure of metaphor analysis

As described in the first part of the empirical section, we have identified metaphors in both texts. During the second stage, we have confirmed and rejected initial decisions, the result of which is expressed in numbers in Table 3, which shows a higher incidence of metaphors in Text J.

Table 3: Number of metaphors

TEXT	N. of metaphors	occurrence / 100 words
Text C	70 metaphors	1.07 / 100 words
Text J	87 metaphors	1.57 / 100 words

¹³ Waylink English. “Metaphors and metaphorical expressions in English.” not dated. <http://www.waylink-english.co.uk/?page=11800>. 16 14 March 2019.

4.3.1 Results and procedure: Text C

I. Text C: identifying source domains and target domains

After the metaphors were identified, they were grouped into eight sub-categories as shown in Table 4. The grouping was done according to their shared semantic/lexical characteristics in order to distinguish what lexis creates the basis of the metaphors.

Table 4: Source domains in Text C

Source domain:	number	negative connotation	positive connotation	neutral connotation
TECHNICAL	9	0	0	9
JOURNEY/MOVEMENT	11	3	1	7
ARGUMENT/WAR	11	3	8	0
FAMILY	4	0	4	0
ECONOMIC	3	1	1	1
COLOURS	4	4	0	0
BODY RELATED	9	3	4	2
SEA	5	0	5	0
VARIOUS	14	4	6	4
TOTAL:	70	18	29	23

The most frequent metaphors were related to the semantic field of JOURNEY/MOVEMENT, seven of which were evaluated as having neutral connotation (ex. 16 and 17). The only metaphor with positive connotation refers to the future of the UK (ex. 18). The target domain of the metaphors with negative connotation refers to leaving the EU (ex. 19), but so do most of the metaphors with neutral connotation.

(ex. 16) A few days later Switzerland offers the path forward (C 11)

(ex. 17) Let's not walk away from the EU (C 81)

(ex. 18) 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. (C 25)

(ex. 19) Others suggest that Britain stalking out could lead to and I quote "the democratic liberation of an entire continent". (C 48)

The WAR/ARGUMENT source domain includes eight metaphors with positive connotation and three with negative one. The target domain of the positive metaphors refers to Britain to inspire awe (ex. 20) and towards Britain staying in the EU (ex. 21) to establish consensus that the EU is a vital tool for Britain to thrive (ex. 22 and 23). The target domain of

the four metaphors with negative connotation refers to the past and other contemporary dangers (ex. 24 and 25).

(ex. 20) Should we continue to forge our future as a proud, independent nation (C 3)

(ex. 21) So I say – instead, let us remain, let us fight our corner [...] (C 81)

(ex. 22) And European measures are a key weapon. (C 54)

(ex. 23) The European Union [...] is a vital tool in our armoury to deal with these threats. (C 45)

(ex. 24) [...] so that our continent would never again see such bloodshed. (C 36)

(ex. 25) [...] their networks use technology to spread their poison (C 52)

There are another three interesting source domains. The first one is COLOURS source domain, where all four metaphors refer to the dark past (ex.26) and to the speaker's doubts about the consequences of leaving the EU (ex. 27). There is also a metaphorical expression in ex. 1 'bulwark,' but it belongs to the source domain of WAR/ARGUMENT.

(ex. 26) And most of all our lone stand in 1940, when Britain stood as a bulwark against a new dark age of tyranny and oppression. (C 33)

(ex. 27) If we leave, it is – genuinely – a leap in the dark. (C 20)

Both FAMILY and SEA source domains are metaphors with positive connotation. The target domain of the former is to establish consensus about the special role Britain has in Europe (ex.28), and the latter glorifies Britain (ex.29) and emphasizes the assets of staying in the EU. (ex. 30)

(ex. 28) 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. (C 48)

(ex. 29) If there is one constant in the ebb and flow of our island story, it is the character of the British people. (C 26)

(ex. 30) 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. (C 26)

The group VARIOUS refers to metaphors which do not share any common source domain, but they also frame the ideas in a more embellished way. Metaphors with positive

connotation target Britain as a leading power (ex. 31), the negative metaphors refer to the consequences of leaving Britain in the past or at present (ex. 32). The metaphors with neutral connotation refer both to Britain and to leaving the EU.

(ex. 31) [...] that is a pioneer in the modern world (C 25)

(ex. 32) How could it possibly be in our interests to risk the clock being turned back (C 47)

Overall, fifty-two metaphors have neutral and positive connotation, and the target domains are the history of European countries with Britain having a crucial role, glorification of Britain and British people and benefits and necessity of remaining in the EU. The metaphors were not used much to emphasize negative emotion or evaluation of the opponents and only one of the metaphors was directed towards the opponents (ex. 33), some towards leaving the EU (ex. 34), or towards the decision making about leaving or staying (ex. 35) and some as already exemplified above towards the dark past.

(ex. 33) Others suggest that Britain stalking out could lead to and I quote “the democratic liberation of an entire continent.” (C 48)

(ex. 34) I can only describe this as a reckless and irresponsible course. (C 17)

(ex. 35) [...] and why some people’s heads and hearts are torn. (C 4)

Rather than that, metaphors with negative connotation were applied to talk about the history of European countries and also about leaving the EU as such. When metaphors were directed towards the speaker and his ideology, they have mostly positive connotation such as pride, honour and solidarity, or they have also neutral connotation.

The use of metaphors in this speech does emphasize the appeal to pathos which adds to the persuasive effect of the speech, but this is only limited to the metaphors with positive and negative associations. Even though the use of metaphor draws on the rich associations of language and may be used to create negative and persuasive representations of the opponents or their ideology, the metaphors in this speech are scarcely used to do so. This may suggest the purpose of the speaker, that is the effort to portray Britain and its past as thriving or even heroic and by means of that to establish a consensus when it comes to remaining in the EU.

4.3.2 Results and procedure: Text J

I. Text J: identifying source domains and target domains

After the metaphors were identified, they were grouped into seven sub-categories as is shown in Table 5. The grouping was done according to their shared semantic/lexical characteristics in order to distinguish what lexis creates the basis of the metaphors. Nevertheless, some of semantic characteristics of metaphors overlap and so the more appropriate category was chosen, e.g. the phrase “and we will be dragged in” could be categorized both into the semantic field of MOVEMENT and FORCE. The solution was to look at the whole sentence and to consider the more central meaning, which is the involuntary involvement in a particular situation, and therefore it was categorized as FORCE.

Table 5: Source domains in Text J

Source Domain:	Source Domain: Number	Source Domain: Negative Connotation	Source Domain: Positive Connotation	Source Domain: Neutral Connotation
FORCE	37	32	3	2
PHYSICAL/DISINTEGRATION	8	8	0	0
JOURNEY/MOVEMENT	12	8	3	1
BODY RELATED	8	1	2	5
PEJORATIVE METAPHORS	5	5	0	0
PROXIMITY	3	3	0	0
VARIOUS	16	9	0	7
TOTAL:	89	66	8	15

The most frequent metaphors in the speech of Boris Johnson were related to the semantic field of FORCE; for the sake of simplicity and due to the possible overlaps, these include the semantic fields not only of FORCE but also of WAR, POWER, OPPRESSION and ARGUMENT since all of them conceptually relate to FORCE. Thirty-two out of them were evaluated as metaphors with negative connotation and all of them target the EU, its policies, supporters, and consequences, eg;

(ex. 36) [...] in a hotly contested field. (J 76)

(ex. 37) [...] from being thrown on to the economic scrapheap. (J 38)

(ex. 38) What the government wants is for us to remain locked into the Single Market law-making regime. (J 31)

(ex. 39) The EU system is ratchet hauling us [...]. (J 26)

(ex. 40) [...] we were told that it was going to be a great dynamo of job and wealth creation. (J 33)

Only three of the metaphors with the source domain of FORCE were evaluated as having positive connotation and these refer to the people supporting Brexit

(ex. 41) [...] and we are fighting for freedom. (J 80)

The second most frequent source domain is JOURNEY/MOVEMENT. All of the eight metaphors with negative connotation refer to the EU and the UK while remaining in the EU. The three metaphors with positive connotation refer to the opportunity of Brexit, eg;

(ex. 42) [...] a door has magically opened in our lives. (J 3)

(ex. 43) We can see the sunlit meadows beyond. (J 4)

(ex. 44) [...] to walk through that door (J 4)

The most interesting semantic group is PHYSICAL/DISINTEGRATION which has only negative connotation and the target domain is solely the EU and its policies. European Union is portrayed as a system or a thing which has changed for the worse and which is in a state of physical disintegration, causing erosion of democracy and of the rights of people, e.g.;

(ex. 45) [...] undergone a spectacular metamorphosis (J 5)

(ex. 46) And it is this fundamental democratic problem – this erosion of democracy (J 9)

(ex. 47) [...] aspect of a steady attrition of the rights of the people (J 14)

(ex. 48) [...] that is now well past its sell by date (J 79)

This semantic group of PHYSICAL/DISINTEGRATION co-operates with the source domain PEJORATIVE METAPHORS. These metaphors share the semantic characteristics of pejoration such as the use of general word/noun instead of the proper name when referring to the EU (ex. 1) or the use of the pronoun “that” where pronoun “this” would be more appropriate (ex. 2), or other metaphors which were purposely used to emphasize the negative aspects of the EU based on the opinion that the EU policies and regulations are absurd (ex. 3).

(ex. 49) [...] this thing [...] (J 6)

(ex. 50) [...] that organisation [...] (J 5)

(ex. 51) [...] to query the anti-democratic absurdities of the EU. (J 3)

In text J the group VARIOUS also refers to metaphors which do not share any common source domain but they also frame the ideas neutrally and negatively. Group VARIOUS contains novel metaphorical expressions (ex. 52) but also idioms (ex. 53), both with negative connotation, or metaphors that do not have any common specific source domain (ex. 54) which has neutral connotation.

(ex. 52) Their inspired idea was to weave a cat's cradle of supranational legislation that would not only bind the former combatants together [...] (J 52)

(ex. 53) [...] while swallowing the camel of the 55-article charter of Fundamental rights. (J 15)

(ex. 54) [...] in a huge belt of Mediterranean countries [...] (J 38)

Overall, most of the metaphors have negative connotation and their target domain is the EU and any processes related to it. When directed towards the speaker or the speaker and his supporters, they evoke positive emotions and values such as courage to fight for freedom. Nevertheless, the number of metaphors directed towards their opponents and the EU are much higher and they evoke negative emotions and values such as fear, anger, estrangement, scorn and other negative emotions. These metaphors are effective and persuasive as most of them have mostly negative but also positive associations.

This negative evaluation and connotation related to the EU may suggest the purpose of the speaker, that is to emphasize the underlying myths/narrative related to the EU; such as the bureaucratic processes and oppressive policies which don't allow the UK to fulfil its potential and the people to exercise their rights. We can therefore conclude that the metaphors used in Text B do really draw on the associative power of language and add to the appeal of pathos which is created mostly through negative emotions targeted at the political opponents.

4.3.3 Comparison of Text C and Text J

Both speakers employ metaphors to emphasize the appeal to pathos, though the use and number of metaphors in Text C is different from that in Text J. In comparison to speaker in Text C, the speaker in Text J employs nineteen more metaphors than in Text C. Therefore, the incidence of metaphors in Text J is 1.50 times higher than in Text C. The use also differs in the connotation and the target domain.

Metaphors in Text C are directed mainly towards the audience (The UK and British people) and the connotation is mostly positive or neutral. On the other hand, metaphors in Text

J mostly targets the European Union (and therefore its opponents) and the prevalent connotation is negative. So while the speaker in Text C uses metaphors to create or emphasize the narrative or myths about the country as such and its direction for the better while remaining in the EU and does not target the opponent, the speaker in Text J employs metaphors to evaluate and attack the EU and the political opponents by emphasizing the negative underlying myths about the EU.

4.4 Metonymy analysis

4.4.1 Methodology

This analysis compares the use of metonymy in Text C and J to discover whether metonymy contributes to the appeal of pathos, which will be achieved by identifying, interpreting and explaining the metonymies found in the speeches.

I. Definition

Metonymy is “a rhetorical figure or trope by which the name of a referent is replaced by the name of an attribute, or of an entity related in some semantic way (e.g. cause and effect; instrument; source)” (Wales, 1990: 267). “Metonymy (Greek for ‘a change of name’) is distinguished from metaphor in that, whereas metaphor works through similarity, metonymy works through other kinds of association (cause–effect, attribute, containment, etc.)” (Montgomery, 2013: 119, 120). “[W]hen an announcement is made by a member of the British royal family, it is often described as follows” (Beard, 2000: 19).

(ex. 55)

“Buckingham palace today denies claims that the royal family is out of touch with the people” (Beard, 2000: 19).

(ex. 56)

“The above announcement (example above) without use of metonymy would read ‘The Royal family today denied claims that they are out of touch with the people’ or ‘The Queen denied...’” (Beard, 2000: 19).

Beard (2000) argues that “[ex. 55] gives a more sympathetic picture of the royal family than [ex. 56]” (ibid) since ex. 55 unlike ex. 56 is impersonal. This though may be used the other way around to present a less sympathetic view of something in order to shape the underlying political idea of a speech. “Thus, metonymy serves some of the same purposes that metaphor does, and in somewhat the same way, but it allows us to focus more specifically on certain aspects of what is being referred to.” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 37). Beard (2000) presents the following argument: “Lakoff and Johnson go on to show that metonymic uses are not random,

but systematic, in that they show how we organize our thoughts, actions and attitudes” (Beard, 2000: 26).

4.4.2 Results and procedure

We have analysed and identified metonymies according to the methodology and definition outlined above the result of which is expressed in Table 6.

Table 6: Number of metonymies in Text C and Text J

	Number of metonymies:	occurrence / 100 words
Text C:	3	0.05 / 100 words
Text J:	15	0.27 / 100 words

4.4.3 Analysis of Text C: identifying and explaining metonymies

In Text C we can see that the use of metonymy is very sporadic. One of the metonymies in Text C is the following:

(ex. 57) In the last few years, we have seen tanks rolling into Georgia and Ukraine. (C 38)

Here, the use of part-whole metonymy picturing ‘tanks’ instead of ‘army’ or ‘armed forces’ is figurative in the sense that it pictures the thing or event and makes it more real and tangible. Therefore, this use of metonymy may appeal to pathos as it may arouse emotions such as fear or insecurity. The other instance of metonymy found in the text is interesting to look at and analyse from the perspective suggested by Lakoff & Johnson (2003) and Beard (2000).

(ex. 58) [...] giving the lie to those who claim that the British economy is being strangled by red tape from Brussels. (C 7)

We saw in Section 3.5.1. I. Definition that metonymy can be used to show the speaker’s attitudes since it can refer to a certain aspect of a thing or an action or it can portray things or events in a good or bad light. Here, both red tape and Brussels refer to the European Union; red tape refers to the bureaucracy in the EU and Brussels refers to the European Union since the city is the main headquarters of the institutions belonging to the European Union; it is therefore quite clear that the metonymy has very negative connotation. The city of Brussels is mentioned in the text several times, but only this mention refers to the EU or its institutions. In this example, we may see that the speaker in Text C reacts to arguments targeted against him, which is also why Brussels is used metonymically only in this example. By the use of ‘red tape in Brussels’ The speaker in Text C acknowledges that there is this narrative about the European

Union and its institutions, rejects its veracity and therefore expresses his attitude through metonymy. This refutation of argument (prolepsis) will be discussed further in the analysis of the speeches (see Section 4.5), but it may be said that this use of metonymy appeals to logos as anticipating arguments before rejecting them is one of the techniques for good argumentation.

4.4.4 Analysis of Text J: identifying and explaining metonymies

The use of metonymy in text J is more frequent than in text C. One of the examples used in Text J is the same as in text C:

(ex. 59) [...] and we need to stay in to prevent German tanks crossing the French border. (J 28)

Therefore, we may acknowledge to the Text J and its use of metonymy the same function of arousing emotions. Most of the other metonymies (8) refer to the European Union as Brussels (as we have seen previously):

(ex. 60) [...] has been taken away and now resides in Brussels. (J 13)

(ex. 61) [...] “get our way” in Brussels [...] (J 75)

(ex. 62) [...] or giving a further £100bn to Brussels before the next election. (J 81)

Eight out of eight references to Brussel refer to the European Union. Even though none of these examples of metonymy talk about a ‘red tape’, all of them convey a negative idea when referring to Brussels as the EU. These examples are such as the one in the analysis of Text C, but here we may see that the metonymy is used to insult rather than to anticipate an insult. So, as we saw in the introduction and in the analysis of metonymy in Text C, since bureaucracy and centralization of power within the EU and decentralization of power in the member states is often associated with Brussels, the metonymy here is used to highlight those negative aspects held about the European Union and it therefore conveys the underlying narrative structures which portray the European union in a bad light. Other example of metonymy in Text J is the metonymy of attribute, to call something according to one of its features (ex. 1) and therefore to focus on a negative aspect of the target, here the EU. (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 37)

(ex. 63) In fact you could argue that many countries were better off being outside, and not subject to the bureaucracy. (J 36)

4.4.5 Comparison of Text C and Text J

The result of the analysis of metonymy shows that Text J employs metonymy more than Text C, but in both of the texts we may see that metonymy contributes to a specific purpose underlying the narrative of each speaker. Apart from one example (identified above) metonymy is used for different purposes. It has been analysed in Text C that metonymy appeals to pathos and is used also as a part of refutation of an argument (prolepsis); rejecting arguments that portray the EU in negative light and appealing to logos (see Section 4.5). It was found out that metonymy in Text J is also used to appeal to pathos, metonymies in Text J are used more frequently, and they contribute to the narrative portraying the EU in a negative light; mostly referring to its bureaucracy.

4.5 Analysis of syllogism and prolepsis

In this section, prolepsis and syllogism are analysed in order to discover whether Text C and Text J appeal to logos by using these techniques in argumentation and refutation part of the speech.

Table 7: Number of syllogisms and prolepsis in Text C and Text J

	Syllogism	Refuting arguments/prolepsis	occurrence / 100 words	occurrence / 100 sentences
Text C	6	13	0.33	6.2
Text J	0	1	0.02	0.5

4.5.1 Analysis of Text C

In Text C in argumentation and refutation, the speaker uses the most effective techniques to convey arguments; prolepsis (refuting arguments) and syllogism. In both examples of prolepsis (ex. 64, 65), the first part presents some counterposition and the second part refutes the counterposition. Ex. 64 offers an alternative position immediately, ex. 65 is implicit or expressed after several more prolepsis (ex. 65 (3)).

(ex. 64)

- (1) And I understand and respect the views of those who think we should leave,
- (2) even if I believe they are wrong
- (3) and that leaving would inflict real damage on our country, its economy and its power in the world. (C 4)

(ex. 65)

- (1) 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.
- (2) And yet they seem unable to set out a clear, comprehensive plan for our future outside the EU. (C 10)
- (3) If we leave, it is – genuinely – a leap in the dark. (C 20)

The example of syllogism below presents major premise (1), minor premise (2), analogy (3) and conclusion (4).

(ex. 66)

- (1) The Leave campaign can't answer them because they don't know the answers. They have no plan. (C 18)
- (2) 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) So why would you do so when the future of your entire country is at stake? (C 19)

4.5.2 Analysis of Text J

In Text J, proof and refutation contain only one prolepsis and no syllogism. The prolepsis outlines three arguments of the opponent's campaign and rejects them afterwards in (4). The speaker does not immediately offer any clear alternative position but does so only further and throughout the speech.

(ex. 67)

- (1) 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.
- (2) 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) All three arguments are wholly bogus. (J 28)

4.5.3 Comparison of Text C and Text J

This analysis showed that while the speaker in Text C conveys many of his arguments (19) through the most effective techniques for argumentation (prolepsis and syllogism), the speaker in Text J uses only prolepsis and just once. The speaker in Text J conveys his arguments through

other means (as already showed in previous analyses). Using these techniques in Text C contributes to the logical structuring of arguments, appealing to logos. Therefore, the speaker in Text C as opposed to the speaker in Text J makes more rational arguments throughout most of the speech.

5 Conclusion

The objective of our thesis was to compare rhetorical devices in two political speeches which relate to Brexit, focusing on whether and how they appeal to reason (logos), emotion (pathos) or ethos (character), if one of the appeals is prevalent in the speeches, and to explain the persuasive effect of the speakers in Text C and Text J. The next objective of this analysis was to discover whether the methods and concepts used in this study would provide insight into the style of political discourse.

The speeches were studied from the perspective of traditional rhetoric in combination with some approaches from critical metaphor analysis. Our study analysed the most important devices as identified and explained in the theoretical background in Chapter 2 and in material and method in Chapter 3, focusing on genre and arrangement of the speeches, metaphor, metonymy, syllogism and prolepsis.

The results show that the styles of the two speeches are different, which is reflected in the distribution of formal features, genre and arrangement of the speeches as well as in the distribution of selected rhetorical devices and in the emphasis on different persuasive appeal.

The analysis of genre and arrangement shows that the genre of Text C is both deliberative and epideictic and does not follow precisely the arrangement of classical rhetoricians. Text J was classified as deliberative and its parts of arrangement were identified. The prevalent mode of persuasion in Text C was identified as appealing mainly to ethos and logos (see more in results of the analysis of prolepsis and syllogism below) and in Text J as pathos and ethos.

The analysis of metaphors constituted the principal and the most contributing part of our study. Metaphors were identified according to their source domain based on their semantic field, then divided into metaphors with positive, negative and a neutral connotation, and the final interpretation of metaphors identified their target domain (to what the metaphors refer).

The results show that the incidence of metaphors in Text J is 1.5 times higher than in Text C. The source domains show what lexis constitutes the basis of the metaphors, and what is its potential effect. The most numerous source domains in Text C were the groups of source domain called JOURNEY/MOVEMENT, ARGUMENT/WAR, TECHNICAL and BODY RELATED, while in Text J the most numerous source domains were identified as FORCE, PHYSICAL/DISINTEGRATION, JOURNEY/MOVEMENT and BODY RELATED. While two identical source domains were used in both speeches, the connotation of these metaphors and its referent differ.

The connotation of the metaphors in Text C is prevalently positive (29), neutral (23) and then negative (18). The prevalent connotation of metaphors in Text J is negative (66), then neutral (15), and only few of the metaphors were identified as having positive connotation (8). These results indicate that the language of metaphors used in Text C, though also appealing to emotions through the use of positive and some negative metaphors, is less emotive than the language in Text J, in which the appeals to pathos/emotion is prevalent and mostly based on fear.

While the target domain of the metaphors in Text C was mainly directed towards the EU and not towards the opponents, the metaphors in Text J were directed mostly towards the political opponents. The employment of metaphors based on negative emotions and with reference to the political opponent show that the speaker in Text J creates myths with underlying negative narrative about the political opponents. The analysis of metaphors in Text C does not show this tendency of negative portrayal of the political opponent.

Analysing and interpreting metaphors by using this method was insightful and effective in describing and comparing the speaker's styles and the prominent appeal/mode of persuasion.

The number of metonymies used in Text C is 0.05/100 words and in Text J 0.27/100 words. The employment of metonymies contributes to pathos even though the occurrence of metonymies is not frequent in the speeches. This analysis proved that metonymy is used in political speeches to refer to some entity focusing on some specific and usually negative aspect of the entity. In particular, Text J employs metonymy to target the EU and its institutions focusing on their negative aspects.

The number of syllogism and prolepsis which appeal to reason is much higher in Text C than in Text J. Text C employs these devices with the occurrence of 6.2/100 sentences, and Text J 0.5/100 sentences. This shows that the language of the speaker in Text C appeals more to logos – reason – than the speaker in Text J. The study of syllogism and prolepsis was insightful since it shows whether the speakers base a part of their speech on clear arguments or not.

Both speeches employ all three persuasive modes/rhetorical appeals, and both speakers use rhetorical devices to make their speeches persuasive. While in Text C the emphasis is put mainly on logos and ethos, that is on reason and character, in Text J the emphasis is put mainly on pathos and ethos, that is on emotion and character. Overall, both speeches are persuasive, though since persuasive mode appealing to pathos – emotions – is the most effective in persuasion, it might be concluded that the persuasive potential in Text J is higher than in Text C.

As the results show, the methodology used in this study and the analyses of the selected rhetorical devices, most importantly the analysis of metaphor, enabled us to gain insight into the speeches and to determine the persuasive modes and the persuasive effect of the speeches. The methodology is therefore effective in describing the language of political discourse, mainly the modes of persuasion that underly the language of political discourse.

6 References and sources

References:

- AP Archive. "Johnson urges Britain "to take back control." 17th May 2016. youtube.com.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EUFLMu0-H1k> 1 May 2019.
- Aristotelés. *The "art" of rhetoric*. Reprinted. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006. Print. Loeb classical library.
- Beard, Adrian. *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Burke, Michael. *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018. Print. Routledge Handbooks in English Language Studies.
- Burton O, Gideon. "Silva Rhetoricae" (rhetoric.byu.edu) May 15 2019.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. 2. edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. Print.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Politicians and Rhetoric: the Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Chilton, Paul Anthony, and Christina Schäffner. *Politics as text and talk: analytic approaches to political discourse: Discourse approaches to politics, society, and culture*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2002. Print.
- Cockfort, R. and Cockfort, S. M. *Persuading People*. Macmillan: London. 1992. Print.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. "Boris Johnson." 2019.
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Boris-Johnson> 24 April 2019.
- Full Fact Team. "The UK's EU membership fee." 3rd December 2018. Full Fact: THE UK'S INDEPENDENT FACTCHECKING CHARITY. <https://fullfact.org/europe/our-eu-membership-fee-55-million/> 5 April 2019
- Gov.uk. The Rt Hon David Cameron: Biography. 2019.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/people/david-cameron#biography> 20 May 2019.

Kellner, Peter. "David Cameron: PRIME MINISTER OF UNITED KINGDOM." 15th May 2019. Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/David-Camero> 19 May 2019.

Kenton, Will. "Brexit." 22 May 2019. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/brexit.asp> 22 May 2019.

Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark. *Metaphors we live by*. London: The university of Chicago press., 2003. 24 May 2019.

Montgomery, Martin., et al., *Ways of Reading*, 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Wales, Katie. *A dictionary of stylistics*. Harlow: Longman, 1990. Print. Studies in language and linguistics.

Pruitt, Sarah. "The History Behind Brexit: The often-rocky relationship between Britain and the European Union stretches back nearly half a century." 13 March 2019. history.com. <https://www.history.com/news/the-history-behind-brexit> 4 April 2019.

Smith, Mikey, Bloom Dan a Jason Beattie. "What is Brexit? We answer the most Googled questions about Britain leaving the EU." 10 August 2018. Mirror. <https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/politics/what-brexit-answer-most-googled-13023598> 12 Feb. 2019.

Ústav pro jazyk český Akademie věd ČR, v. v. i. Internetová jazyková příručka. 2008-2019. 22. May 2019. <http://prirucka.ujc.cas.cz/> 23 May 2019.

Waylink English. "Metaphors and metaphorical expressions in English." not dated. <http://www.waylink-english.co.uk/?page=11800>. 16 14 March 2019.

Sources:

Cameron, David. "PM speech on the UK's strength and security in the EU: 9 May 2016 (Archived)." British Government, 9 May 2016. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-the-uks-strength-and-security-in-the-eu-9-may-2016> 22 May 2019.

Johnson, Boris. "Boris Johnson's speech on the EU referendum: full text." 9 May 2016. <https://www.conservativehome.com/parliament/2016/05/boris-johnsons-speech-on-the-eu-referendum-full-text.html> 22 May 2019.

Cameron, David. "PM speech on the UK's strength and security in the EU: 9 May 2016 (Archived)." <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-the-uks-strength-and-security-in-the-eu-9-may-2016> 22 May 2019.

Johnson, Boris. EU Referendum - Boris Johnson - BrExit - Vote Leave - 9th May 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4ViQNeZRK3w&t=2275s> 22 May 2019.

7 Résumé

Tato bakalářská práce se věnuje rétorickým prostředkům ve dvou projevech britských politiků, Davida Camerona a Borise Johnsona, a dále se zaměřuje na to, jak tyto rétorické prostředky napomáhají persvázi v daných politických projevech. Pozornost je především zaměřena na tři módy rétorické persváze, logos, patos a étos, a jakým způsobem jsou tyto módy přesvědčování dosaženy, přičemž práce analyzuje žánr a uspořádání projevů, metaforu, metonymii, sylogismus a prolepsis. Tato práce si klade za cíl zjistit, zda jeden z těchto módů persváze v projevech převažuje.

Práce čerpá převážně z metodologických přístupů Jonathana Charteris-Blacka (2014), (2018), který ve své metodologii ke studiu politického diskurzu kombinuje tradiční rétorické metody klasických řečníků ze starověkého Řecka a Říma spolu s moderními metodami používanými například současnými lingvisty v oblasti kognitivní lingvistiky, jako je například kritická analýza metafor v politickém diskurzu. Sekundárním cílem této práce je aplikace těchto metodologických přístupů na daných projevech a zjištění, zda přinášejí vhled do jazyka politického diskurzu.

V první – teoretické – části tato práce shrnuje hlavní zdroje, ze kterých čerpá a na nichž zakládá teoretické poznatky. Poté se práce zaměřuje na jazyk v politickém diskurzu a vysvětluje, jakou roli v politickém diskurzu má politický mluvčí, jeho proslov a persváze. Stěžejní část tvoří popis tradiční rétoriky, koncepty a metody, které se v ní užívají, přičemž toto zahrnuje žánr a postup tvorby řečnických děl, v němž se zaměřuje na *inventio*, *dispositio a elocutio*. *Inventio* se zabývá nalezením tématu a módy persváze (logos, étos a patos), jakým způsobem tyto módy přispívají k přesvědčivosti projevu a jakými prostředky se tvoří.

Dispositio se zabývá strukturou látky, tedy jak logicky uspořádat projev a jaký mód persváze využít v jednotlivých částech, aby projev měl co největší přesvědčovací potenciál. *Elocutio* se zabývá stylem a rétorickými prostředky (figurami: tropy a schémata), které mluvčí v projevu využije. Zde se podrobněji vysvětluje, jakým způsobem funguje metafora a také metonymie, jakou funkci mají v politickém diskurzu a jak přispívají k persvázi.

Druhá část práce se zabývá charakteristikou zdrojového materiálu, představením problematiky britského referenda a dvou britských politiků, jejichž projevy analyzujeme, popisem metod, představením hypotéz a výzkumných otázek. Analýza pracuje s dvěma politickými projevy, jejichž přepisy jsou dostupné na internetu. Vzhledem k tomu, že projevy jsou tradičně připravovány předem, a tudíž se od přednesených projevů mohou lišit, přepisy byly opraveny na základě originálních videí mluveného projevu obou mluvčích. Tyto přepisy

byly následně rozděleny do menších sekcí, aby bylo možné k analyzovanému textu lépe odkazovat. V této části je dále obsažena formální charakteristika projevů, např. délka projevu, počet vět, slov. Vzhledem k tomu, že jeden z projevů je o 1119 slov delší, následující analýzy prezentují výsledky v přepočtu na sto slov (u prolepsis a sylogismu v přepočtu na sto vět). Upravené přepisy tvoří přílohu této bakalářské práce (příloha 1, příloha 2). K projevům, resp. přepisům, v této práci odkazujeme jako na Text C a Text J.

Praktická část se nejprve zaměřuje na rozbor upořádání projevů, tj. rozbor jednotlivých částí projevů, a zda se v jednotlivých částech uplatňuje jeden z módů persváze. V této části je rovněž specifikován žánr projevů. Tato analýza ukázala, že mluvčí Textu C používá převážně dva módy persváze, a to étos a logos, zatímco mluvčí Textu J užívá převážně patos a étos.

Následně jsou analyzovány metafory obou projevů zvlášť, jsou identifikovány jejich konotace, sémantická pole, a jaké jsou tendence z hlediska cílového referenta metafor. Následně se v analýze srovnávají výsledky obou projevů. Výsledky analýzy ukazují, že výskyt metafor v Textu J je 1,5krát vyšší než výskyt metafor v Textu C. V Textu C se užívají více metafory s pozitivní a neutrální konotací a referent metafor je nejčastěji Velká Británie či brexit, nikoli političtí oponenti. V Textu J se jednoznačně nejvíce užívají metafory s negativní konotací, poté s neutrální konotací a malé množství metafor s pozitivní konotací a referent je nejčastěji politický oponent.

Tyto výsledky naznačují, že jazyk v Textu C využívá převážně pozitivní emoce jako jeden z módů persváze, přesto je o něco méně emotivní než Text J, v němž je užito větší množství metafor založených na emocích jako jeden z módů persváze, přičemž se však jedná převážně o emoce negativní. Užití těchto metod při analýze a interpretaci metafor bylo užitečné k popisu, porovnání a pochopení stylů mluvčích těchto projevů a posléze k určení dominantního módu persváze.

Další část se věnuje analýze a porovnání metonymií. Počet metonymií v Textu C je 0,05/100 slov a počet metonymií v Textu J je 0,27/100 slov. I přesto, že počet metonymií není tak vysoký, výsledky analýzy ukázaly, že metonymie je užívána v jazyku politického diskurzu k odkazování na politické oponenty a instituce, přičemž se zaměřují převážně na negativní aspekty odkazovaného. Tato tendence je pouze v Textu J.

Analýza prolepsis a sylogismu ukazuje, že výskyt těchto rétorických prostředků založených na logu je 6,2/100 vět v Textu C a 0,5/100 vět v Textu J. Tyto výsledky ukazují, že jazyk argumentace v Textu C se zakládá více na logu, kdežto Text J nikoli. Tato analýza nám umožnila vhléd do stylu politického diskurzu těchto mluvčích, neboť nám pomohla určit, zda mluvčí zakládají své argumenty na logu – rozumu – či nikoli.

Výsledky potvrdily, že se styly zkoumaných projevů liší, což se ukázalo jak v žánru, uspořádání projevu, z hlediska formální charakterizace projevů, tak v distribuci zkoumaných rétorických prostředků. Hlavní rozdíl však spočívá v módu persváze, který mluvčí v projevech využívají, a v míře jejich přesvědčivosti. Vzhledem k tomu, že oba mluvčí v projevech využívají množství rétorických prostředků, které napomáhají přesvědčivosti jejich projevů, oba projevy mohou být klasifikovány jako přesvědčivé. Zatímco mluvčí v Textu C ve svém projevu klade důraz na logos a také étos, mluvčí v Textu J klade důraz na patos a étos. Na základě studií a metod, které jsou prezentovány v teoretické části, je možné říct, že mód persváze založený na emocích, tedy patos, má největší přesvědčovací potenciál, a proto můžeme dojít k závěru, že míra persváze v Textu J je větší než v Textu C.

Metodologie, kterou jsme použili v této práci, tedy přináší vhled do jazyka politického diskurzu, obzvláště do jazyka metafor v politickém diskurzu a užití módu persváze v politickém diskurzu.

8 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.

9 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 sort 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.”