

Boris Johnson leaving Europe:

A STUDY ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN LANGUAGE USE AND THE 2016 EU
REFERENDUM RESULT

CANDIDATE NUMBER: 2922 NUMBER OF WORDS: 5996

1 INTRODUCTION:

This thesis is a study on Boris Johnson's language use during the 2016 Vote Leave campaign. The basis of the thesis are five campaign videos from Vote Leave and British media. The focus will be on Boris Johnson's discourse, rhetoric, and the campaign slogan, which was repeated throughout the campaign. It will examine Boris Johnson's language use through different settings, such as press conferences, debates, and interviews, all building on a qualitative analysis of his language use and how it is ultimately connected to the voting results in the 2016 EU referendum in the UK.

Success and failure in communicating politics have been an ever-changing allegory from Winston Churchill with his ability to combine the effects of erudition and earthiness; Margaret Thatcher's talent of rebuking her opponents; the charm and self-conviction of Tony Blair. (Charteris-Black, 2018) Investigating Boris Johnson's language still provides a common theme of successful political speech with regard to keeping the audience in mind when speaking. To that effect, the speech should be focused on the assumptions of what the audience's current state of mind and knowledge is (Charteris-Black, 2018).

Boris Johnson was especially renowned for repeating the slogan «take back control». As it was used in every conceivable discourse, Boris Johnson took advantage of an inert resentment in a vast amount of the population and built rhetoric based on the idea of the EU having improperly taken authority away from Great Britain (Eaglestone, 2018).

The aim of the thesis is divided into three different inquiries. The first aim is to explore Boris Johnson's use of language, rhetoric and how he is connecting with his audience. The second is to determine how the slogan he uses was impactful on the message, and the frame of the campaign's rhetoric. Thirdly, the researcher aims to explore how Johnson's use of language is connected to encouraging certain voters, and ultimately gaining the majority of votes in the 2016 UK EU referendum.

Therefore, the present study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How did Boris Johnson's language use in the 2016 EU referendum connect with his audience?
2. In what ways was the slogan "take back control" impactful on the message and campaign rhetoric?

3. How did certain language use been appeal to specific voter groups and was impactful in the 2016 EU referendum?

Firstly, this section explains the thesis outline and the importance of the chosen subject. This section also introduces the aims and research questions posed in the present study, in addition to providing a background to the study. The theory section of this thesis is divided into three different parts, namely (1) Explaining the basics of rhetoric, (2) determining the value of a strong slogan and (3) how voter groups are driven by certain language use. The methodology section explains how data have been collected, observed, and analyzed as well as the validity debated to ensure a transparent thesis.

The analysis is divided into four parts, approaching the use of language. The first part analyzes content and rhetoric. The second part analyzes themes and the value of the slogan «take back control». The third part examines how the setting and audience were relevant to the use of language. Further, the fourth part explores how this is connected to certain voter groups that were crucial to the referendum result. Finally, the conclusion summarizes and evaluates the findings of the present study.

2 THEORY:

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The 2016 EU referendum was a global event. For UK citizens it was an enormous decision. Boris Johnson, at the center of the referendum, has been studied by this thesis through three major areas, namely rhetoric, the effectiveness of slogans and how language use is connected to voters. The studies by Charteris-Black (2018), Thomson (2016), Beard (2015), Buckledee (2018) and Byrne et al. (2014), suggest that there has been a major change in the rhetorical landscape, not only in Britain, but across the globe.

In order to discuss rhetoric, the study will present the basics of rhetoric and then apply it to the study at hand. The second part of the theory is based on the value of a slogan. Using studies by Morse (1949), Newsome (2002) and Eaglestone (2018) will provide a clear examination of its purpose, as there is a common sense of power behind a slogan. Providing an introduction of the concept is important to the analysis.

The third part explains how language is ultimately connected with voter groups. The study will provide a common certainty about which voter groups voted to leave the European Union and who voted to remain. The studies and statistical analysis by Goodwin Heath (2018), Becker, Fetzer, Novy (2017) and Alabrese, et al. (2019) give us the indication of the major voting groups for the leave side, being older people, working class people, little or no education, lower wages and mostly rural living. This will be ultimately applied to the analysis as it is connected to language use.

2.2 RHETORIC

Rhetoric according to Charteris-Black is the formal study of persuasion, including both written and spoken language. Therefore, it is also valuable to understand that oratory is the practical application of this knowledge, especially in speech (Charteris-Black, 2018). This part will focus on the basics of rhetoric and how it can be applied.

To understand the basics, one must examine relevant types of rhetorical devices, logos, ethos and pathos. Also relevant are devices such as repetition, reiteration, and allusion. Logos is to be understood as arguments based in reason. It is referred to as an obligatory stage in speech. (Charteris-Black, 2018) Some argue in recent years that this is no longer the case. For instance, Brexit debate has been described as a clash between tribalism and anger (Buckledee, 2018), which would argue against the requirement of logos in speech. Thomson (2016) argues that:

«All rhetoric is designed for a particular time and place, above all for a particular audience» (Thompson, 2016). It is primarily connected to the promotion of other rhetorical devices.

Ethos is described as the act of the orator seeking to establish a relationship with the audience, and the appeal being rooted in the character of the speaker rather than his or her oratory, ultimately assuming a set of common moral values between the speaker and the audience (Charteris-Black, 2018). It can also be seen in a court room when a lawyer is presenting the good and strong character of him/herself and while portraying the innocence of a client. Also, it may be found when demonstrating personal or academic experience in a field of knowledge (Byrne, et al., 2014).

Pathos, or emotion, is presented as evoking fear, sympathy, happiness or belaying insult to a party. It is described as being used to influence our decisions and make evaluations that change our opinion or alter our judgements. Thomson (2016) also portrayed an existing element of emotional logic, where the use of pathos may be perceived as logos (Thompson, 2016). An example of this, is when the Vote Leave campaign says there are five new countries joining the EU, such as Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey, with their population count.

Repetition and reiteration are some of the simplest and most common devices and they have become more frequent in recent years. Often described as repeating the same words or phrases. In several cases it also includes similar sounding words and phrases. An example of this could be the word “renewal”, which is similar to the word “new”, and “renew”, or the phrase “a new”. The use of such devices inherently increases the speaker's conviction and it gains effect with every successful reiteration. With regards to repetition, one may also explore how often the same words or phrases are found together in a speech. There are also words and phrases that are often found together in the same sentence, building a common relationship that explains how we connect words and phrases that are not even present in the speech. Words such as poverty, illness and loneliness are interconnected in that sense as well (Charteris-Black, 2018).

Allusion is highly relevant to this study and will be apparent in the analysis section. Allusion is described as an indirect evocation of a well-known textual or cultural reference (Charteris-Black, 2018). That suggests it can be anything from a scripted film, book or play, a piece of art or musical lyric. Examples of this can be the moon landing and the words «one small step for man...», Martin Luther King's «I have a dream», or other common references that people have familiarized themselves with (Charteris-Black, 2018).

2.3 SLOGAN

From marketing to political campaigning, slogans have been a valuable tool for all who seek to persuade. In the political sense it has been described as a «Battle cry». During the Barack Obama Campaign, the slogan «Yes we can» had this obvious effect as many may remember crowds chanting «Yes we can» at American election rallies. A slogan is also supposed to crystallize an idea or define an issue (Newsome, 2002). The famous Trump slogan of 2016 «Make America Great Again» does not fall within this category, as its chanting potential is not inherent. In the Trump campaign there was a repeating slogan, «Build that wall», which gained the traction similar to «Yes we can» (Thompson, 2016). The case of building a strong, chant worthy slogan is based on the idea of evoking emotions that causes a thrill and inspires the persuasiveness required to encourage an audience (Newsome, 2002).

From an historical point of view, slogans have been impactful as to public opinion. The slogan has been seen as an aggregation or elevation of the campaign's primary message. The study by Morse (1949) suggests that slogans might even be more relevant than the actual utterances by the primary candidates. In some cases, he also suggests it works to make a political platform more palatable for the audiences. There is also a discussion to be made on campaign slogans being a response to popular demand, or to create a popular demand (Morse, 1949). The case of «Build that wall» in the US 2016 election is a sufficient example of creating popular demand.

2.4 VOTERS

This section will cover key terms and their relevance towards the subject of voters. The selected terms are voter groups or voter classes which are relevant to the research question of how certain language use relates to voter groups and voter classes. The second term is Euroscepticism, which is important for understanding why a theme of immigration could have been relevant during the campaign. The third subject is how financial markets, crisis and fluctuations are connected to voting patterns. A basic understanding of this will assist in further examination of the subject. The fourth segment in this section will summarize the relationship between national states, European court of justice and EU democratic functions (parliament/council). This section explores terms relevant to understand the data in this thesis and the democratic element of the argument in the transcripts.

Voter groups and classes in Britain are relevant to the research question and further analysis. Arzheimer (2017) describes voter classes as various combinations of education status, income

levels, employment situation, career prospects and life-time expected income. There has also been an increasing amount of movement by working class voters in western democracies. Countries such as Norway have had a fluctuation of working class votes due to an increased marketization and movement between economic classes. Even though this can be perceived as a decline in class voting, Arzheimer (2017) still persists that certain voting groups can be determined. Certain voter groups may be determined by gender, age, income and employment status, education level, job sector and geographic location (Alabrese, et al., 2019).

Euroscepticism is at the root of the referendum. Ultan (2015) describes Euroscepticism as an attitude and doubt or disregard with EU policies and the union. The nature of Euroscepticism may be reactive (Ultan, 2015). Understanding Euroscepticism as reactive we may suggest that when the Prime Minister of UK at the time, David Cameron announced the referendum, the Eurosceptics saw this as an opportunity to change the status quo and ultimately leave the European Union.

Financial markets are interconnected to voting patterns to a degree. Jha (2019) describes a specific situation from Israel where certain voter groups changed their voting patterns due to changes in the employment availability, which is connected to fluctuations in the economy. In Israel, data indicated that working class groups specifically had remarkable changes in their voting patterns (Jha, 2019).

To understand arguments posed in the transcripts we must explore the function and connection between nation states, EU court of justice and EU democratic functions such as the parliament and council. From the European Union's own official websites, we find the current definitions of the terms. The court of justice is described as a centralized unit, which interprets EU laws and makes sure it is implemented in a sufficient manner in nation states. It also has the role of settling legal disputes between governments and EU institutions (EU, 2020b). The European parliament is the law-making body of the European Union and passes laws in collaboration with the EU Council, based on the European Commission's proposal (EU, 2020c). The European Council is the democratic forum where representatives from the member state governments meet. The council is the main decision-making body. It negotiates and adopts EU law, including coordination of policies ratified by the European Union (EU, 2020a).

3 METHODOLOGY:

3.1 MATERIALS

This study relies on a qualitative analysis of five speeches, represented by four videos and one transcript, which were a part of the 2016 EU referendum leave campaign, concerning Boris Johnson. A qualitative analysis attempts to discover «...the quality of social life and locates the study within particular settings which; provide opportunities for exploring all possible social variables; and set manageable boundaries... Conviction that what it is important to look for will emerge...» (Holliday, 2007). A quantitative method was used to analyze instances of select themes, rhetorical devices and the campaign slogan.

In order to study the language of Boris Johnson in the videos, a transcript has been made to ease the process. The videos are based on one official BBC debate, one interview, two rallies and one press conference (transcript). The number of and particular videos and transcripts have been selected due to the lack of diversity in the language used, and the selected videos and transcript captures a totality of the rhetoric in Boris Johnson's language during the 2016 Campaign. The number and selection also assist in excluding anomalies in the final data. The press conference was held on 6th of June 2016, and its duration is unknown as it was found in the research discovery as a transcript. The location of the press conference was the headquarters of the Vote Leave campaign. The first video was captured by BBC on the 22nd of February 2016 and has a duration of seven minutes and four seconds. It was captured as an interview outside his office. The second video was captured on the 9th of May 2016 and lasts 36 minutes and one second. It was captured in the Vote Leave campaign headquarters. The third video was captured on the 21st of June as part of the BBC show “The Great Debate” featuring several famous British politicians. The duration of the video is one hour, 59 minutes and eleven seconds. The fourth video was captured on the 16th of November 2016, and its duration is two minutes and 57 seconds, from a rally arranged by the Vote Leave campaign.

3.2 DATA ANALYSIS

After the transcripts were made (see Appendix A-E), an analysis of the most prominent rhetorical devices was made, referrals to the slogan, and themes connected to certain voting groups. Voting groups as listed: low income, little or no education, people living in rural areas, areas containing high backlash from the financial crisis, areas most affected by immigration

and working-class manufacturing citizens (Goodwin & Heath, 2018). These groups are the foundation for the majority, and data collected examines the connection between the language used and the voting groups.

The actual analysis is done manually by studying the transcripts, as there are no automated services for this type of analysis. Charteris-Black’s (2018) work on rhetoric has been used, as well as the works of Eaglestone (2018), Becker (2017) and Alabrese, et al. (2019). These are providing useful information to ensure a fair analysis and examination of rhetorical devices, arrangement of speech, rhetorical style and persuasion.

Criteria for the analysis will be based on six different factors: The setting, the audience, recurring themes, the use of the slogan, use of rhetorical devices, and the language referring to voting groups. Language used by the speaker is relevant to the recipient voter and therefore it is relevant to the appeal of a candidate (Ricks, 2018). It is relevant to the study of the connection between Boris Johnson's language and how certain voter groups were encouraged.

CRITERIA
Setting
Audience
Themes
Slogan
Rhetorical devices
Voter groups

Table 1

4 ANALYSIS:

4.1 RHETORICAL DEVICES

Most political communication contains a vast number of rhetorical devices. This section will explore the most prominent devices used in the transcript and how it may have been impactful during the discourse in the 2016 EU referendum. The most prominent devices can be defined as repetition/reiteration, allusion, misdirection, allegation/counter-allegation, ethos, pathos and logos. The table below provides an overview of how often certain rhetorical devices occur throughout the transcripts.

DEVICE	OCCURRED IN TRANSCRIPTS
Repetition/Reiteration	96 instances
Allusion	12 instances
Misdirection	15 instances
Allegation/Counter-allegation	87 instances
Ethos	44 instances
Pathos	56 instances
Logos	61 instances

Table 2

Repetition/reiteration is the most common rhetorical device and is found in all the transcripts. Only two of the examples will be explored beyond their face value. Selected examples of this are

Example 1: “They would in their sober moments accept that there is a serious and growing democratic problem, and that on the question of democracy it is this side – the Leave side - that holds the high cards.” (see Appendix A, p.23), example 2: “I’m a passionate believer in immigration, but it’s got to be controlled... It’s obviously time to take back control.” (see Appendix B, p.27), example 3: “A single judicial order from which there is absolutely no recourse, and no comebacks.” (see Appendix C, p.30), example 4: “This is our cue, this is our chance, this is our moment.” (see Appendix D, p.32), example 5: “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...” (see Appendix E, p42). The first example puts emphasis on the word “control” and is a fine example of

reiteration. As a rhetorical device, emphasizing “control” has been impactful for those feeling a lack of control in the job market. Experiencing a lack of control due to immigration, fluctuations in the job market, automation and decline in wages (Goodwin & Heath, 2018). These can all be powerful factors causing an emphasis on control to be impactful. Highlighting the third example where Boris Johnson himself describes the subject at hand. In his closing statement at “The Great debate” (see Appendix B), he talks about this referendum being chance to speak up, a chance to have your voice heard (BBC, 2016a). This is relatable to the quote from Appendix C. There are 96 instances of repetition/reiteration in the transcripts.

The major example of allusion is from “the Great debate”, where the final words of the debate read as follows, “if we vote leave and take back control, I believe that this Thursday can be our country's independence day.” (see Appendix B, p.30) Examining the phrase “independence day” we find a correlation with the 1996 “Independence Day” movie, especially taking an interest in the final motivational speech in the movie. It specifically relates to leaving Europe and in a simplistic way gaining independence. A somewhat romantic nationalism where the people are unified through leaving the European Union. (Byrne, et al., 2014) In the transcripts there are 12 instances of Allusion ranging from the example above to the famous quote of Ronald Reagan, “There you go again”.

As one of the major sources is a debate, exploring elements of misdirection may be valuable. An example of misdirection is, “It hasn't taken them long. They started by telling us they were going to have a positive and patriotic case and they're back to project fear within moments of this debate. There they go again; they have nothing positive to say.” (see Appendix B, p.26) When posed with rant of critique, Boris Johnson uses misdirection to his advantage by changing the subject. The subject he chooses is an important and impactful part of the campaign as it frames the opposing campaign and speaker as negative. Positive thinking and reference are important for working class voters and this type of reference will be influential as to certain voters (Arzheimer, 2017). Most of the 15 instances of misdirection found in the transcripts are from the transcript of the debate.

A vast number of debates contain allegations and/or counter-allegations. “The Great debate” has several. To elevate a specific case, this example has been chosen, “I want to respond to some of the unnecessary invective we’ve heard earlier on, by pointing out that somebody on the panel opposite. Who said only a couple of years ago that, In the past we were too quick to

dismiss concerns about immigration, even worse, accuse people of prejudice? Who do you think that was, it was Zadiq Khan.” (see Appendix B, p.28) It’s both an allegation and a counter-allegation as it accuses the opposite speaker of unnecessary invective, as well as the example changes the argument to be about the initial speaker’s statement. It is impactful in the sense it points out an image of the Vote Leave campaign being prejudiced, for their opinions on immigration. The statement might have impacted their image on this particular topic. This argument was commented and discussed several times during segments in the debate and commented by journalists after (BBC, 2016a). The transcripts contain 87 instances of allegations/counter-allegations.

Ethos, pathos and logos are the most common rhetorical devices. Analyzing the transcripts gives the indication of a very logos based rhetorical line of argument. It might be connected to the British political language use being more sophisticated than some other countries comparatively (Ricks, 2018). With the exception being the debate as it bolsters the instances of pathos and ethos. The transcripts contain a lot of references to businesses and situations that reinforces arguments, which could be an attempt to bolster the speaker’s credibility and employing practical wisdom of the subject, which refers to building ethos towards the audience (Charteris-Black, 2018). The referendum was an emotional affair, even though most discourse wouldn’t necessarily be categorized as such. There are still examples of ethos, especially during the rally where Boris Johnson speaks to his supporters. A specific example, “...believe in ourselves, believe in our country, because this country is at its best when we believe in ourselves. And let us speak up for the hundreds of millions of people around Europe who agree with us, but who at the moment have no voice...” (see Appendix D, p.33) This was said several times by Boris Johnson at different occasions and it attempts to build an emotional argument around leaving the European union (AP, 2016a). There are many uses of ethos, pathos and logos as they are key components of forming arguments, with 44 instances of ethos, 56 instances of pathos and 61 instances of logos.

4.2 THEMES AND SLOGAN

In this section, the thesis will connect major themes found in the transcripts with their value to the voter interest. Research connected to voters in the 2016 referendum viewed cases such as the economy and welfare, immigration control and democratic deficit as major concerns (Curtice, 2019). When discussing themes, it is also important to discuss the slogan “take back control” as it became a superior theme reoccurring throughout most discourse during the

referendum (see Appendices A-E). The table below provides an overview of how often certain themes occur throughout the transcripts.

THEME	OCCURRED IN THE TRANSCRIPTS
Economy and welfare	37 instances
Democracy	53 instances
Immigration	21 instances
Control	79 instances
Slogan	38 instances

Table 3

Leave voters were interested or motivated by less government intervention in the economy. Data provided that 55% of people interested in reducing business regulation voted leave, whereas almost a third were undecided. Also, 55% who wanted cuts in government spending and around 50% who wanted to protect jobs. In both categories about 10% were undecided (Curtice, 2019). The Leave side used language fitting the concerns and wants of the majority when choosing their use of language. An example of this is, “What the government wants is for us to remain locked into the Single Market law-making regime, and to be exposed to 2,500 new EU regulations a year.” (see Appendix E, p.37) This example elevates specifically governmental regulation which was an important part of the campaign as well as in agreement with voter data collected after the referendum. In the transcripts there are 37 instances of economic or welfare related arguments.

Democratic deficit was in many ways the primary argument laid out by the Vote Leave campaign. An example of this was “...The EU system is a ratchet hauling us ever further into a federal structure. 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...” (see Appendix E, p.37) It refers to the system of the court of justice already presented in this thesis, but connects with the voters especially in the case of dissatisfaction with politics and politicians. According to the study by Curtice (2019), 65% of those who distrust governmental structures greatly voted to leave (Curtice, 2019) and 70% of voters held the opinion that the politicians disregarded their constituents’ interest. Most of these constituents voted leave (Goodwin & Heath, 2018). These statistics give us the indication that there was a vast amount of disdain for politics and politicians. The Vote Leave campaign used

certain language to act on this premise. The transcripts show 53 instances of arguments referring to the democratic deficit.

Immigration was a major theme during the 2016 referendum, especially with certain voters. Among those who named immigration as their primary concern, 73% of those voted to leave the European union. The primary concern was immigrants' access to welfare services like the NHS (National Health Service) (Curtice, 2019). An example of language used towards this theme is, "Look at the numbers, look at the pressure that large scale uncontrolled immigration is causing for public services such as the NHS, and the downward pressure on wages." (see Appendix B, p27) Throughout the transcripts there are 21 instances of arguments referring or emphasizing on immigration.

Central to the campaign is the slogan "take back control". Through the campaign the slogan was mentioned on almost every occasion and was the central message in the campaign. In the transcripts there are 38 instances of the slogan covering approximately 3% of the entire transcripts. While the word "control" is mentioned 79 times throughout the transcripts, covering approximately 6% of the content (see Appendix A-E). This gives us the indication that it was instrumental to the campaign and an important theme for the language used in the referendum. As a powerful rhetorical tool, it has also proved to have an inert repetitive value (Newsome, 2002) which has enforced the slogan from a simple campaign slogan to a campaign theme.

4.3 SETTING AND AUDIENCE

The setting and audience present at the speeches, interviews and debate are important to acknowledge, because they relate to whether the language used is formatted beforehand to suit the different occasions. Examining the transcripts, there are few differences between the language used with the exception of a few cases. The rally utilizes more emotion as described in the section about rhetorical devices. The debate contains more humor, an example of this is, "Day after day in the last week we've seen senior figures in the labour party, I think Jeremy Corbyn this morning, he's the leader, said that there was no way of controlling immigration as long as we're in the EU." (see Appendix B, p.28) As most language use in the campaign has been similar, the setting and audience proved to have little effect on the chosen language.

4.4 DISCUSSION

In the discussion part of this thesis, I will reflect on the findings of the analysis, and how it relates to the research questions. The research questions are as follows: 1. How did Boris Johnson's language use in the 2016 EU referendum connect with his audience? 2. In what ways has the slogan "take back control" been impactful on the message and campaign rhetoric? 3. How has certain language use been appealing to specific voter groups and been impactful in the 2016 EU referendum?

To reflect on whether Boris Johnson's language use connected with his audience, we need to understand who voted to leave. Explained earlier through the works of Curtis (2019) and Goodwin & Heath (2018), we know that a typical audience of leave voters were people who had a great distrust in the government, had a low household income and felt disadvantaged in the modern industrial workplace. Including people who had received fewer benefits and stagnating wages. Thomson (2016) and Charteris-Black J. (2018) gives us insight to how speech is effective and how it can connect with an audience. Inferring the right topics to the right audience may earn sympathy or encouragement for a certain cause. The part of the audience referred in this thesis may have been likely to relate to issues regarding unemployment, the economy and democratic deficit, with themes such as democracy and the economy being repetitive throughout the transcripts, (as shown in Table 3).

The slogan "take back control" occurred 38 times throughout the transcripts and the word control was used in 41 other instances. Newsome (2002) and Morse (1949) elaborates on how a slogan can be a result or consequence of popular demand. Regarding the slogan used in the campaign we find the slogan to be part of a recurring theme. Ultan (2015) talks about the rise of Euroscepticism and how certain groups were more Eurosceptic than others. The groups described earlier as the audience in this section were subject to the slogan in all the recurring themes and became relatable by popular demand, as Eaglestone (2018) describes how the changes in views on immigration changed to a more restrictive view. Considering all the impact of the slogan, its manifestation as a theme, and marketing towards audience that may be in the state of mind believing Britain losing control of political areas such as democratic institutions, immigration, and economic affairs. The slogan may have been impactful when making the leave argument.

Charteris-Black J. (2018) outlines how emotional arguments, also known as pathos, are important to make messages have great impacts, though logos is more common than pathos

in Boris Johnson's language use, there are 56 instances of pathos in the transcripts, and 61 instances of logos. As Ricks (2018) explains, the use of logos being more prominent in British political speech than compared to other countries. Rhetorical devices might also impact labeling of opponents often seen through the use of allegations or counter-allegations, referring to the use of phrases like "project fear" or misdirection through humor. Even though allusion is not nearly as common as other devices, they are key moments when heard in the videos, often at the end of an argument or used as misdirection. Rhetorical devices can be immensely impactful when used correctly and make speech more relatable to the audience.

All British citizens above the age of 18 were eligible to vote, and of those a majority voted in the referendum. The final result concluded Britain would be leaving the EU with a 2% margin. People who were uneducated stood for an important part of the vote, as 75% of people with little to no education are estimated by polling to have voted for leaving the union. Household income was also an important factor. Voters with household incomes below £20,000 per year were highly inclined to vote for leaving (Goodwin & Heath, 2018). These voters felt disadvantaged by the modern economy in Britain, and these were often those who struggled to find work, while in areas with a majority of a high-skill population the vote was more in favor of remaining (Goodwin & Heath, 2018). This is an important part of the language connection as the rhetoric was implying in some cases an anti-establishment/anti-elite identity.

Euroscepticism is also an important part of this segment as it refers to the population's state of mind before the vote. From 1996 Britain has seen a rapid rise in Euroscepticism, with its peak in 2016, most likely due to the election (Curtice, 2019). Even though skepticism was increasing the moderate view of staying in the EU but reducing the power of its entities held half of the Eurosceptics when polled.

5 CONCLUSION:

This thesis has inquired into Boris Johnson's language use in the 2016 EU referendum and the connection to the election result. The first research question explored how Boris Johnson's language use in the 2016 EU referendum connected with his audience. This thesis indicates that language use was a major factor during the referendum. Certain voters were feeling disadvantaged to the point of feeling not in control, because of several factors. There were 79 instances of the word "control", which became a general theme in the election and connected with his audience, especially lower income households.

The second research question explored in what ways the slogan "take back control" was impactful on the message and campaign rhetoric.

The slogan "take back control" was impactful on the message and campaign rhetoric. The transcripts contain 38 instances of the slogan. Morse (1949) describes that a quality slogan might be more important than actual utterances. In this case, the slogan's repetitiveness throughout the transcripts and its establishment as a part of a theme makes it impactful.

The third research question investigated how certain language use appealed to specific voter groups and was impactful in the 2016 EU referendum.

Voter groups outlined such as uneducated workers, low income communities, people with distrust in government and Eurosceptics were contributors to the result. The language used coincides with concerns and interests of the voters outlined. Language relating to themes such as democracy (53 instances), the economy and labor (37 instances), combined with the elaborate use of repetition and reiteration (96 instances) made an impact with these voters.

The 2016 Brexit referendum is continually an area of study for researchers in several disciplines. This thesis did not attempt a qualitative analysis of all the statements made by Boris Johnson during the 2016 referendum, as the language use was similar in most cases during the campaign. Another area of this subject that could be explored is whether there are major differences between the language use of the different politicians in the Vote Leave campaign, as well as politicians from the Remain side in the referendum. This thesis may provide an indication as to what language could communicate well with certain voter groups, but future research may provide more insight as to how and why our interpretation and reaction differs, when we hear political speech.

In conclusion, this study implies that language was a major contributor to the 2016 referendum result. The use of rhetoric suited for voter groups, and language use appropriate for the concerns and themes attributed the campaign, as well as a campaign slogan which caught on and became a major theme, provide validity to the claims of this thesis. However, one may discuss whether the underlying conditions were more prominent. This thesis has opted to emphasize the language. In the case of the 2016 European Union referendum, it is likely that the result was contingent upon all the factors discussed in this thesis.

REFERENCES:

- 1: Alabrese, E., Becker, S. O., Fetzer, T., & Novy, D. (2019). Who voted for Brexit? Individual and regional data combined. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 56, 132–150. doi: 10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2018.08.022: Arzheimer, K., Evans, J., & Lewis-Beck, M. (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour: Volume 2*. doi: 10.4135/9781473957978
- 3: Beard, M. (2015, February 6). Have modern politicians lost the art of rhetoric? *BBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-31128840>
- 4: Becker, S. O., Fetzer, T., & Novy, D. (2017). Who voted for Brexit? A comprehensive district-level analysis. *Economic Policy*, 32(92), 601–650. doi: 10.1093/epolic/eix012
- 5: Buckledee, S. (2018). *The language of Brexit: how Britain talked its way out of the European Union*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.
- 6: Byrne, B., Burrow, R., Crines, A. S., Dommett, K., Foxlee, N., Hayton, R., ... Toye, R. (2014). *Rhetoric in British politics and society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 7: Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analyzing political speeches: rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. London: Macmillan Education.
- 8: Curtice, J. (2019). The vote to leave the EU. *British Social Attitudes*, 34, 1–24.
- 9: Eaglestone, R. (2018). *Brexit and literature: critical and cultural responses*. London: Routledge.
- 10: EU. (2020, March 23). Council of the European Union. Retrieved from https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/institutions-bodies/council-eu_en
- 11: EU. (2020, March 26). Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). Retrieved from https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/institutions-bodies/court-justice_en

- 12: EU. (2020, March 23). European Parliament. Retrieved from https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/institutions-bodies/european-parliament_en
- 13: EU Referendum: The Great Debate. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=30ijwPbjzns>
- 14: Goodwin, M., & Heath, O. (2018, December 17). Brexit vote explained: poverty, low skills and lack of opportunities. Retrieved from https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/brexit-vote-explained-poverty-low-skills-andlack-opportunities?gclid=CjwKCAjwgbLzBRBsEiwAXVIygDXDQr1_3M_olUMriGCWsUEmBau8_zckwTOsQtF-IHLSIv7fVqSMrhoCuAEQAvD_BwE
- 15: Holliday, A. (2007). *Doing and writing qualitative research*. London: SAGE.
- 16: Interview; "I've made up my mind". Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=327UM8ih7zg>
- 17: Jha, S., & Shayo, M. (2019). Valuing Peace: The Effects of Financial Market Exposure on Votes and Political Attitudes. *Econometrica*, 87(5), 1561–1588. doi: 10.3982/ecta16385
- 18: Key speeches, interviews, and op-eds. Retrieved March 1, 2020, from http://www.voteleavetakecontrol.org/key_speeches_interviews_and_op_ed.html
- 19: Koller, V. (2019). *Discourses of Brexit*. London: Routledge.
- 20: Kvale, S. (1989). *Issues of validity in qualitative research*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- 21: Lauerbach, G. E., & Fetzer, A. (2007). Political discourse in the media. *Political Discourse in the Media Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*, 3–28. doi: 10.1075/pbns.160.03lau
- 22: Mehlika Ozlem Ultan, Serdar Ornek (2015). Euroscepticism in the European Union - International Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. IV(2), pp. 49-57., 10.20472/SS.2015.4.2.006
- 23: Morse, A. J. (1949). The Effect of Popular Opinion on Campaign Slogans-an Illustration. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 3(3), 507. doi: 10.1086/266100

24: Newsome, C. (2002). The Use of Slogans in Political Rhetoric. *The Corinthian*, 4, 21–35.

25: Press conference; "We will be vindicated by history". Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=piiHgJW_oAg

26: Ricks, J. I. (2018). The Effect of Language on Political Appeal: Results from a Survey Experiment in Thailand. *Political Behavior*, 42(1), 83–104. doi: 10.1007/s11109-018-9487-z

27: Thompson, M. (2016, August 27). From Trump to Brexit rhetoric: how today's politicians have got away with words. Retrieved from

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/aug/27/from-trump-to-brexit-rhetoric-how-todays-politicians-have-got-away-with-words>

28: AP (2016) *Vote leave rally; "This is our chance"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JbxHU9JrxlA>

29: AP (2016) *Vote leave rally; "UK Independence Day"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uVaJF2K8vLA>

APPENDIX A:

BORIS JOHNSON - THE RISKS OF REMAIN – DEMOCRACY (PRESS CONFERENCE)

The biggest myth in this whole debate is that there is some clear division between the arguments about democracy, and the arguments about economics. We are invited to believe that there are two ways of measuring the question of EU membership for Britain; two sets of scales; two units of calibration. For instance there are many reasonable people on the Remain side who are willing to accept that the EU suffers from what has for a long time been acknowledged to be a democratic deficit. If pushed, they would admit that there are legitimate concerns about the accountability of the Commission, about the popular legitimacy of the European parliament, and about the increasingly wayward judgments of the European court of justice. They would accept – when they are being reasonable – that there is something troubling about the sheer volume of EU law, and the way it now contributes 60 per cent of the law passing through parliament. They would acknowledge that this vast corpus of EU law is generated by the Brussels commission; and that it is now extremely worrying that only 3.6 per cent of EU Commission officials actually come from this country. They would accept that it is disturbing, to say the least, that the UK is now outvoted more and more often – 72 times in the last 20 years. They would in their sober moments accept that there is a serious and growing democratic problem, and that on the question of democracy it is this side – the Leave side - that holds the high cards. But they argue that this sacrifice is worth it, because of the economic advantages of being in the EU. I think I am fair to their argument. I also believe that argument to be both morally disturbing and practically wrong. On the contrary, it is the very absence of democratic control that is having all sorts of disastrous economic consequences, both for Britain and for the EU.

- 1... We are currently unable to exercise democratic control over such basic economic matters as our tax rates – so that we cannot cut the price of fuel for elderly people; we cannot cut the cost of motoring; and despite the pleas of the Chancellor we cannot even cut the tampon tax.
- 2... We cannot exercise democratic control over the energy costs of our steel firms, even when those costs are far higher than in other EU countries – so that companies in this country are going to the wall because of our slavish adherence to EU rules.

- 3...We cannot do anything to stop the torrent of EU legislation, coming at a rate of 2,500 a year, and imposing costs of £600m per week on UK business.
- 4...We cannot control the EU budget, not just in the sense that we send £350m a week gross to Brussels, much of which we never see again, but also because we can be asked to pay more – without warning – if the UK is deemed to have performed better than other EU countries.
- 5...We can neither stop other countries going ahead with ill-advised plans to create an economic government of Europe – since we explicitly gave up our veto in February – and nor can we protect the UK taxpayer from the demands of the euro-zone countries for bail-out funds; nor can we protect the UK economy from the impact of further single market measures – on company law and property and many other areas, as set out in the Five Presidents report.
- 6...Above all, we can do nothing to protect this country from the biggest economic change we have seen for a century or more – the very rapid growth in population that is largely a function of immigration, which is in turn a function of the euro crisis. I repeat my challenge to the Remain campaign: what is their vision for Britain, with our population set to climb so rapidly? Where do they intend to build the houses? How will the health service cope?

There is one answer to all these economic problems, and that is to take back control – so that we make our laws and our trade policy and our immigration policy to suit the needs of the UK economy. The benefits of being in the single market have been wildly overstated – look at the far greater success that countries OUTSIDE the EU have had, in exporting INTO the EU, than we have. It is a myth and a delusion to think that we can somehow gain greater prosperity by bartering away our freedom and our democracy. In fact, we can see at every stage how the loss of democratic control is turning into an economic disaster. There is nowhere else that is engaged in anything like this experiment, of trying to fuse countries into a giant political entity; and in its centralizing tendencies the European project is going against the tide of events and history. The risks of remaining in this over-centralizing, over-regulating job-destroying machine are becoming more and more obvious, which is why I believe we are winning the arguments today. It is time to take back control, and speak for freedom in Britain and around the whole of the EU.

ANSWER ON SMALL BUSINESSES STRUGGLING UNDER EU
REGULATION

Thank you very much tonight, I must say I think it was extraordinary to hear that we would have tariffs imposed on us. Because everybody knows that this country receives a fifth of Germany's entire car manufacturing output. 820 000 thousand vehicles a year. Do you seriously suppose they are going to be so insane as to allow tariffs to be imposed between Britain and Germany. I've been listening to businesses large and small, up and down our country the last few months. And I've been how many passionately want to come out of the single market. Because of the rules and regulations it imposes on 100% of UK businesses even though only 6% actually do any trade with the rest of the EU. And I've listened to some of the most extraordinary success stories of UK manufacturing. JCB the makers of the fantastic diggers that are building this city, building roads and cities around the world. They want to come out of the EU. Not just JCB but James Dyson who is the single biggest manufacturing of vacuum cleaners in Germany. And he wants to come out, and he is saying that staying in who be an act of economic self harm. The way to more wealth and more jobs, is to leave EU and take back control.

ANSWER ON STATEMENTS MADE BY BORIS JOHNSON ECONOMIC
ADVISOR

It hasn't taken them long. They started by telling us they were going to have a positive and patriotic case and they're back to project fear within moments of this debate. There they go again, they have nothing positive to say. And I just remind everybody, it was Lord Rowe who said that there would be no shop, things would go on as they are. Except for one thing, he said that people on low incomes, as Gisela has rightly said would get a pay rise, and he was supported in that view by some of the panel opposites because somebody said, and I'll leave you to guess. In too many places immigration has driven down local wages. Now who do you think that was on the panel. Actually it was Zadiq Khan. And I think he was making a good point. And in my view as a conservative and I'm a proud conservative in believing in free markets. I think the differentials in income, in our country have become too great. And I think it is wrong that people that footsie one hundred chiefs are now earning 150 times the average pay of people on the shop floor. And it will be a fine thing if people as Lord Rowe says that people with low incomes got a pay rise. As the result of us taking back control of our country

and our system.

ANSWER ON RULES AND REGULATIONS

If the remain side cannot think of a single one of EU's multitude of regulations that they would get rid of, not even the clinical trials directive that prevents vital pharmaceutical work from being carried out. The EU is I'm afraid a job destroying engine, you can see it all across southern Europe. And you can see it alas in this country as well. Gisela also mentioned the case of Fordyce. I will also mention what happens to Tate & Lyle, who just tonight said they want to come out of the EU because of the destruction the common agriculture policy has brought upon them. Not just on jobs in London, but also of course in the developing world who export cane sugar to the EU. And I would mention Tata steel. Who are told that we cannot cut energy costs to protect jobs in Port Talbot because Brussels says no.

ANSWER ON PROJECTIONS FOR BUSINESSES AND TRADE

I think we have heard an amazing amount of running down of our city and our country. And the astonishing thing I think is that they underestimate, the remain side continually underestimate our ability to do better deals if we're left to do it on our own. Let me give you an example, because of the EU system our entire trade negotiating policy is consecrated, is handed over to the EU commission, where only 3,6 percent of the officials actually come from our country. And it is no wonder they have not been, as Angela rightly says. They have not been able to do essential free trade deals with China, with India, with all the great economies of the world. Including America, including America, the united states to the point where we cannot because the EU is in charge of our trade negotiations. We cannot export haggis to America. We cannot export haggis to America.

ANSWER ON UKS ABILITY TO TRAIN DOCTORS AND NURSES IN LIGHT OF EUS IMMIGRATION POLICIES

Well I think the first thing we should tonight in a discussion about immigration is celebrate immigrants and immigration, everything they do for our country, I can speak entirely from my personally they are, my family has benefitted massively from immigration. And so, I know millions of people are watching us tonight. The crucial thing though, is to look in an informed way at what is going on. Look at the numbers, look at the pressure that large scale uncontrolled immigration is causing for public services such as the NHS, and the downward pressure on wages. I've already mentioned, as Zadiq Khan has discussed. And look at the in which we are forced by an imbalanced system to push away people who might contribute

mightily to our NHS in favor of uncontrolled access to 510 million people from the rest of the EU. What we think should happen is an Australian style points-based system. So, we get the people need for our NHS and all the other services, and the only way you can do that is to vote leave and take back control on Thursday come.

ANSWER ON ACCUSATION OF RUNNING A CAMPAIGN BASED ON HATRED OF IMMIGRANTS

I want to respond to some of the unnecessary invective we've heard earlier on, by pointing out that somebody on the panel opposite. Who said only a couple of years ago that, In the past we were too quick to dismiss concerns about immigration, even worse, accuse people of prejudice. Who do you think that was, it was Zadiq Khan. I do agree with Zadiq, I think you need a grown-up approach to this. I'm a passionate believer in immigration, but it's got to be controlled. When you got numbers running at 330 thousand net globally, 184 thousand net from the EU, 77 thousand coming without even the offer of a job last year. It's obviously time to take back control. And the answer to your question is to have the Australian style points-based system.

ANSWER ON COMMENTS MADE ABOUT TURKEY JOINING THE EU

Its government policy, its government policy, as far as I know last time I looked, the government wants to accelerate Turkish membership. Gisela posed the dilemma very very clearly, is this something they want to happen in the year 3000 or is it something that they wish to accelerate. And I think it's perfectly reasonable to ask people whether they would rather proceed based on government promises or on immigration or would rather take back control, and institute a points-based system and actually the electorate could hold the government to account.

ANSWER ON CONTROLLING IMMIGRATION

Directly to Zadiq Khan, I actually think there is a lot of agreement around this panel. They should come over to our side. Because everything I've heard tonight is their admission that something is wrong with our immigration system. And there is only one way to fix it and that is to take back control. Day after day in the last week we've seen senior figures in the labour party, I think Jeremy Corbyn this morning, he's the leader, said that there was no way of controlling immigration as long as we're in the EU. Tom Watson, Harriet Harmon, they're all finally accepting that the deal that was done did absolutely nothing to restore control of our immigration system in this country. And there is only one way to achieve that and that is to

vote leave and take back control. And put in an Australian style points-based system. That makes sure we get the people we need to help our businesses, our services, like the NHS.

ANSWER ON THE FUTURE AFTER BREXIT

I think we've heard enough from project fear over the last couple of weeks. I'll give you one statistic. They go on and on about the single market. Let me tell you. Since the dawn of the single market which I remember reporting, actually there have been, I think since January 1992, 1993. There have been 27 countries not in the European Union that have done better than the United Kingdom in exporting goods into the single market. There are 21 countries that have done better at exporting services, they include most of the growth economies in the world. Including India, China and America. The best place for us is to be out of this morass, this supreme legal system. I think Zadiq Khan is completely wrong, the European court of justice is the supreme legal authority in our country. From which, and he knows that because he is a lawyer. He would not deny that, would you deny it, he would not deny it. The European court of justice and its acquiring steadily more powers, under the Lisbon treaty the EU expanded competences to 45 new areas of competences. And the European court of justice adjudicating in home affairs matters, in the deportation of terrorist suspects, divorce law for heavens sake, things that have nothing to do with the single market. (.....) I think, remember what John Major said about the single currency, he said it had all the quaintness and impossibility of a rain dance. And look where it is now, destroying jobs across the European union. Let's get out of this thing and we'll be better striking free trade deals on our own. Vote leave and take back control.

ANSWER ON SECURITY

I believe alas that the EU is going in the totally wrong direction and it's a great mistake that it's trying to take on this defense component and to try to evolve into united states of Europe in a way that it is. And I remember vividly when the EU was given the task of trying to sort out the tragedy in the Balkans, you all remember what was happening in Bosnia. The EU was mandated specifically, for four years the EU was given that diplomatic and military task, it was a disaster. About a million people died. It was only solved when the Americans came in. I remember reporting it, and we saw what happened when NATO finally asserted. And I do worry about the security on our streets of this city to get back to a point that was made earlier. And I think its absolutely extraordinary that the European court of justice, not the court of human rights, but the European court of justice is telling our home secretary that she may not

deport people with serious criminal convictions to other European countries or indeed people who have been arrested for serious terrorist offences, such as Abu Hamza's daughter in law. I think its absolutely amazing how the remain side have the cheap to come and tell us that we improve our security by staying in this organization, I do not understand. The best way forward is to make European arrest warrants intergovernmental.

CLOSING STATEMENT

At the end of this campaign, I think you'll agree there is a very clear choice between those on their side who speak of nothing but fear of the consequences of leaving the EU and we on our side who offer hope. Between those who have been endlessly rubbishing our country and running it down and those of us who believe in Britain. They say we can't do it, we say we can. They say we have no choice, but to bow down to Brussels. We say they are woefully underestimating this country and what it can do. If we vote leave we can take back control of our borders, of huge sums of money, £10 billion a year net, of our tax raising powers, of our trade policy and of our whole law making system, the democracy that is the foundation of our prosperity and if we stand up for democracy we will be speaking up for hundreds of millions of people around Europe who agree with us but you currently have no voice. And if we vote leave and take back control, I believe that this Thursday can be our country's independence day.

APPENDIX C:

BORIS JOHNSON: "I'VE MADE UP MY MIND" ON EU - BBC NEWS (INTERVIEW)

STATEMENT

Hello, good afternoon everybody. I thought I should come out and say something, because I can see that you're all in a great mass here, and I apologize for being slow with coming. I know you want to ask my views on Europe. Let me tell you where I've got to. Which is that I am, I've made up my mind. And a lot of stress, we have a huge crowd. This is not about whether you love Europe or not, actually I love Brussels. I used to live in Brussels, fantastic city, wonderful place. And I love European culture and civilization. I consider it to be the greatest civilization this planet has ever produced. And we're all product, at least most of us here are products of that civilization. And it's a fantastic thing, but there should be no confusion between the wonders in Europe, the Holidays in Europe. Fantastic food and friendships, and whatever else you get from a political project. That has basically been going on now for decades. Which Britain has been a member of since 1975 and I now think is in real danger of getting out of proper democratic control. That is my view. That's a view I've held for a long time, I've written a number of articles about it. When people talk about sovereignty, this is not something that is possessed by politicians. Sovereignty is people's ability, the ability of the public to control their lives. And to make sure, that the people they elect pass the laws that matter to them. The trouble with Europe is that it has been greatly eroded. And you see more and more over border controls, over human rights, over all sorts of stuff. And you've got a supreme judicial body in the European court of justice that projects down on this entire 500 million people territory. A single judicial order from which there is absolutely no recourse, and no comebacks. And in my view that has been getting out of control. There is too much judicial activism, there is too much legislation coming from the EU. And so I looked at what the prime minister achieved the other day, and I've got to say given the time he had, he did it fantastically well. Everybody should pay tribute to what David Cameron pulled off in a short space of time. But I don't think anyone could realistically claim that this is fundamental reform of EU or Britain's relationships with the EU. And it's my view that after 30 years of writing about this we have chance to actually do something, I have chance to actually do something. And I want to see a new relationship based more on trade on corporation, but less of this supranationalism. And that's where I'm coming from. And that's why I've decided after a huge amount of heartache, because I did not want to do anything, the

last thing I wanted was to go against David Cameron or the government. But after a great deal of thought, I don't think there is anything else I could do. I will be advocating vote leave or whatever the team is called, I understand there are many of them. Because I want a better deal for the people of this country. To save them money and to take back control. And that is really what I think this is all about. What I won't do is take part in loads of TV debates against other members of my party and I've heard what the prime minister said this morning about not sharing platforms with George Galloway and other individuals, I won't do that either. You have been kind enough to come in considerable numbers to ask my views. I will give my views, that's what they are.

ANSWER ON WHY HAVE YOU WAITED SO LONG TO ENGAGE

Because, the truth is that it has been agonizingly difficult. And I think for many of us, what I've said for a couple of years now is I would like to be in a reformed EU. An EU based more on trade and fundamental exchange. I don't think that that has really been offered. So that's where I am.

ANSWER ON IF THIS IS A CALCULATED PLAY FOR THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PARTY

On the contrary, I think that really and truly it would be the best thing possible for the people who are listening to this debate. A lot of people are undecided on this, it's so important to focus on the question at hand. Is it better for Britain to remain in the EU as it already is, or is there a way that we could get a better deal that did more for British democracy, restored some control to the people of this country.

ANSWER ON WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PRIME MINISTER

I have to make one thing clear. Whatever happens at the end of this, he's got to stay. The big battalions of the argument are unquestionably arranged against people like me, we are portrayed as crazy cracks and all the rest of it. I don't mind, I happen to think I'm right. It's a very difficult case to me, I've thought an awful lot about it. I've thought about it for many, many years. And I don't see how having worried for quite so long, and having fulminated for quite so long, about the lack of democracy in the EU, I can pass up what I think the only chance any of us have in our lifetime to put an alternative point of view.

STATEMENT

Thank you and good morning everybody. If we remain we will go on with the EU morphing relentlessly. Because we cannot keep status quo. The EU morphing relentlessly into a super-state with an increasingly active court of justice taking more and more decisions about the aspects of our lives. Who can be on the cities of this street whether they are terrorists or convicted criminals or not. And we'll be locked into to an ever more desperate attempt to bolster the euro by creating an economic government of Europe with Brussels dealing with everything from company law to property taxes to ever growing quantities of employment law. Areas of the single market that we cannot veto. And whose implementation and consequences of that economic government we would end up pending for. Now I ask you my friends, is that what we want to see on Friday morning. Do we want to be locked into that system, I don't think we do. I think we should take the chance now as a country to take back control, take back control of huge sums of money, huge sums of money, of 350 million pounds a week and spend it on our priorities. And yes let us take back control of our borders, with a sensible fair and impartial system. And I think we should listen to our prime minister in his previous mode, before project fear kicked in. When he said this country could prosper and thrive outside the European union, he said then there would be a lot of scaremongering. What an accurate prophecy that was. It turned out. We got a very short time left now, I just urge everybody whose come along today to believe in ourselves, believe in our country, because this country is at its best when we believe in ourselves. And let us speak up for the hundreds of millions of people around Europe who agree with us, but who at the moment have no voice in this debate. This is our cue, this is our chance, this is our moment.

BORIS JOHNSON, VINDICATED BY VICTORY - VOTE LEAVE (PRESS CONFERENCE)

STATEMENT

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 someone 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”. That rocked me, at first, and then I decided 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. For many of us who are now deeply skeptical, 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. 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. 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. 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 for 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 in the eurozone. 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 defense policy. We have got to stop trying to kid the British people; we have got to stop saying one thing in Brussels, and another thing to the domestic audience; we have got to stop 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 a continuing and accelerating effort to build a country called Europe. Look at that list of Lisbon competences – with 45 new fields of policy where Britain can be 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. The independence of this country is being seriously compromised. It is this fundamental democratic problem – this erosion of democracy - that brings me into this fight. People are 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. 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. 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. 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; we find ourselves hard pressed to recruit people who might work in our 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. As he said - ‘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.’ He was right then. 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. And that is frankly what the government should now be doing. If you look at what we were promised, and what we got, the Government should logically be campaigning on our side today. 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. 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. 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. Instead we gave up our veto. 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. 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. 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. 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 camp therefore have a monopoly on liberal cosmopolitanism. All three arguments are wholly bogus. The most important mistake is to think that there is some effective and sensible trade-off between the loss of democratic control and greater economic 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. 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. 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. There is a good deal of evidence that this is the more 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. Now when the single market dawned, 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? 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. 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. 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. 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 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. All that extra growth we were promised; all those extra jobs. The claims made for the Single Market are looking 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 scrapheap. 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 remember from the 1990s about les reseaux telematiques; or possibly, of course, the EU has been left behind on tech precisely because of those directives. 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. 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. As for the argument that we need the muscle of EU membership, 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. Bravo. But it has failed to conclude agreements with India, China or even America. 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. They may be right, aesthetically, but it should not be delaying us in this country. 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. 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 deals, British trade with our partners has actually slowed down, rather than speeded up, after the deal was done. 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? 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. 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 estimated at £600m per week, I am afraid you are driven 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.” 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. 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. 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. As Schuman 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. 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 peoples of Europe. The reasons are obvious. There is simply no common political culture in Europe; no common media, no common sense of humour or satire; and – this is important – 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. That is why there is such cavalier waste and theft of EU funds: because it is everybody’s money, it is nobody’s money. 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. It is the birthday of the founder of this project, and the elites have decreed that it should be properly marked. Do we feel loyalty to that flag? Do our hearts pitter-patter as we watch it flutter over public buildings? 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. 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. 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, more Europe!” What did they do when the Berlin wall came down, and the French panicked about the inevitability of German unification? “More Europe!” And what are they saying now, when the ensuing single currency has become a disaster? “More Europe!” 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. That is what happens when you destroy democracy. Do the Greeks feel warmer towards the Germans? Do they feel a community of interest? Of course not. 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. 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 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. 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 agree with much of the above; that the economic advantages for Britain are either overstated or non-existent. 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. I think this grossly underestimates the way Europe has changed, and the Nato guarantee that has really underpinned peace in Europe. I saw the disaster when the EU was charged with sorting out former Yugoslavia, and I saw how Nato sorted it out. And it understates the sense in which it is the EU itself, and its anti-democratic tendencies that are now a force for instability and alienation. 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. In the next six weeks we must politely but relentlessly put the following questions to the Prime

Minister and to 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 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?

The answer is that the Remain campaign have 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. If we leave on June 23, we can still provide leadership in so many areas. We can help lead the discussions on security, on counter-terrorism, on foreign and defense 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. We will trade as much as ever before, if not more. We will be able to love our fellow Europeans, marry them, live with them, share the joy of discovering our 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. We will not lose influence in Europe or around the world – on the contrary, you could argue 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. We will 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. 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. Above all – to get to the third key point of the Remainers – if we leave the EU we will not, repeat not, be leaving Europe. Of all the arguments they make, this is the one that infuriates me the most. I am a child of Europe. I am

a liberal cosmopolitan and my family is a genetic UN peacekeeping force. I can read novels in French and I can sing the Ode to joy in German, and if they keep accusing me of being a Little Englander, I will. Both as editor of the Spectator and Mayor of London I have promoted the teaching of modern European languages in our schools. I have dedicated much of my life to the study of the origins of our common – our common -European culture and civilization in ancient Greece and Rome. 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 I am afraid that it is the European Union – for all the high ideals with which it began, that now represents the ancient regime. 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. It is we in the Leave Camp – 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. 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. 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 economic despair. 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.