



eutopia

Romantic and Right

MAURICE SAATCHI



Maurice Saatchi originally delivered this lecture on 15 June 2016 (the 500th anniversary of the publication of Thomas More's Utopia). The event was co-hosted by the Royal United Services Institute (founded by the Iron Duke, the Duke of Wellington) and the Centre for Policy Studies (founded by the Iron Lady, Margaret Thatcher).

Maurice Saatchi is Chairman of the Centre for Policy Studies. He is the co-founder of Saatchi & Saatchi and is now a partner in M&C Saatchi. He is a Governor of the London School of Economics and the author of numerous influential Centre for Policy Studies reports. He was elevated to the peerage in 1996. He served on the Conservative Front Bench in the House of Lords as Shadow Minister for the Treasury and the Cabinet Office between 1999 and 2003. He was Chairman of the Conservative Party from 2003 to 2005.

Acknowledgment

Support towards research for this report was given by the Institute for Policy Research

ISBN No. 978-1-910627-33-4

© Centre for Policy Studies, June 2016

Printed by 4 Print, 138 Molesey Avenue, Surrey

EUTOPIA

A map of the world which does not include utopia is not worth looking at.

So says Oscar Wilde. I agree.

So let me draw you a map of eutopia, where Britain has taken its rightful place as the natural leader of Europe. And give you the directions for how to get there.

In one hour, I am going to send you skipping out along Whitehall like the child who has just blown out the candles and made a wish.

Yet no British citizen has ever heard of this idealist possibility.

Instead, in this EU Referendum, we are faced with two dismal alternatives. Both are unacceptable.

To remain is too frustrating.

To leave is too frightening.

No wonder we the people, are ambivalent: split 50/50, right down the middle.

That is a logical response when human beings are asked to choose the lesser of two evils:

Remain: a little cog in the European machine. No control! No control at all! Not our borders! Not our laws! Who wants that!

Leave: a little island on the edge of Europe. No money! No jobs! Who wants that!

This ambivalence has already lasted for decades. Professor Anthony King captured it years ago:

The British people prefer cooperation to integration.

But integration to isolation.

It is time to move on. We need a completely different approach.

What to do when faced with a choice of two evils? Be idealistic!

So now I am going to answer two simple questions.

How did we get into this mess? Too much pragmatism.

And how are we going to get out of it? More idealism.

Idealism is essential for teenagers and teachers, Prime Ministers and Presidents alike. The record seems to show that idealism is not only more inspiring than realism. It is also more powerful.

Individuals who lack the idealism to express their hopes and dreams have a poor prognosis.

Whether you want to be in control of an army or a political party, a company, a country, the whole world or just yourself, you are better off to follow St Paul:

Always pressing onward to the upwards call

A further dose of pragmatism is the last thing we need.

So first I have to cleanse your mind of all traces of pragmatism.

This is not brain washing, this is dry cleaning.

We hear a lot about 'sovereignty' these days, but to those who have no objection to the English language, what the word means is:

Who's in charge?

What we want is eutopia – the benefits of this 'big trading bloc' that President Obama likes so much; without the price that goes with it – a subordinate, a supplicant, a mere courtier.

You may say that is a fantasy! A dream! Childish candle blowing!

Really?

So how did Germany's dream come true? German children blew out the candles and made a wish too!

Ashes to ascendency! Dust to dominance!

Their wish came true. How on earth did they do it?

Winston Churchill advised:

The further backwards you look, the further forward you can see.

Buoyed up by the Russian proverb:

If you live in the past you'll lose an eye.

And encouraged by Solzhenitsyn's amendment of it:

If you ignore the past, you'll lose both eyes

Let me take you back to the beginning.

In accordance with the first economic law – economies of scale – Germany sought greater scale through reunification.

The greater the volume, the lower the cost of production. The lower the cost, the lower the price. The lower the price, the higher the sales.

It's not complicated.

Germany understood basic economics. We didn't.

Meanwhile, British diplomats followed the exact reverse strategy. In the name of pragmatism, they planned to break-up Britain into smaller bite-size pieces, the easier for the EU to digest.

Scottish Smoked Salmon for the starter.

Welsh Rarebit for dessert.

And for the main course? *English Roast Beef*.

While we were worrying about the menu, the Germans ate our lunch.

There are many examples of fine diplomacy by the British Foreign Office.

The EU is not one of them.

Prepare for leadership. British leadership

According to the Centre for Policy Studies, Britain will soon have a bigger population than Germany and a bigger economy. Obviously, therefore, Britain should now prepare to take its natural place as the leader of Europe.

Historian Corelli Barnett evokes such a moment of 'leadership':

For the British people, the official VE-Day ("Victory in Europe Day") on 9 May 1945 marked the occasion of proud remembrance of their long struggle from early defeat through to this ultimate victory – the only allied nation to fight Nazi Germany from first to last. Once again in their history they had won, as they had always assumed they would. On 8 May, Germany's unconditional surrender was formally announced by the Prime Minister to a House of Commons which had continued in free debate throughout the war.

Outside Buckingham Palace, citizens came together under a pale May sun to cheer their Sovereign, and to shout, "We want the King!". When George VI, in the uniform of an Admiral of the Fleet, appeared on the balcony with the Queen and the two princesses, his subjects responded by roaring out "For he's a jolly good fellow". Then, at about 5.30pm Winston Churchill joined the Royal Family in a fresh appearance on the balcony. The crowds roared again; and the film cameras recorded it all for the nation at large to see on the news reels – the first Minister of the Crown, who had brought the realm safely through the greatest peril in its history, standing in comradeship with a Royal Family bonded even more closely to the British people by

reason of their courage, humour and simplicity through the shared dangers and discomforts of war.

On Sunday 14 May, the King and Queen rode out in an open horse-drawn landau to St Paul's for the national service of thanksgiving just as Queen Anne had ridden out to St Paul's to give thanks for Marlborough's great victories two and a half centuries earlier.

In the Cathedral, where Wellington and Nelson lay in the crypt, the Archbishop of Canterbury preached the sermon; the anthem reverberated up into Sir Christopher Wren's majestic vaults.

It was no wonder that at such a time and in such a mood the British took it for granted that Great Britain was, and would always remain, a first-class world power. She alone of pre-war European great nations had never been reduced to impotence during the war by defeat and occupation. Her formidable armed forces ranked her with Soviet Russia and the United States in the "Big Three" that had waged and won the war against Nazi Germany. Her Prime Minister would attend a forthcoming tripartite summit to decide the future of Europe – (as we are in the Wellington room), the role played by Wellington and Castlereagh at the Congress of Vienna in 1814-15 and by Lloyd George at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

So what happened?

Since that summer day in 1945, British diplomacy's lack of Idealism left a void for Germany to fill.

Since then, the British Foreign Office response has been entirely pragmatic. If at the time it is best to 'go in', we will. If at the time it is better to 'come out', we will. No 'principles' are involved.

Who's to blame? It's always nice to have someone to blame. I blame the fine old Tory virtue of pragmatism.

I blame Edmund Burke, who advised Conservatives to concentrate on:

What is, not what should be

I blame Michael Oakeshott, when giving the inaugural address on assuming the Professorship of Political Science at the London School of Economics:

In political activity, men sail a boundless and bottomless sea. There is neither harbour for shelter, nor floor for anchorage; neither starting-place nor appointed destination. The enterprise is to keep afloat on an even keel.

Alan Bennett captured it best in his masterpiece, *An Englishman Abroad*:

Say what you like, the English are not interested in ideas.

You could shove a whole slice of the Communist Manifesto into the Queen's Speech and nobody would turn a hair. Least of all HMQ.

Meantime, German diplomacy made a plan and executed it with precision. They had *Weltanschauung*; a *World View*.

The result? Nightly TV News across Europe now reports:

Germany will decide. In the end, Mrs Merkel will decide.

For the Germans, reunification was emotional – as in the word Heimat, which means ‘Homeland’. It was also a question of power.

The German plan

Germany had a plan. And it stuck to it. And it worked.

In the original EU Steel and Coal Federation, there were six members. Voting was on the basis of:

One country. One vote.

But after reunification, Germany succeeded in persuading others that this was ‘undemocratic’. It would be more democratic if voting strength could be related to population:

One citizen. One vote.

France had a plan too, and stuck to it. And it worked. France heeded Chancellor Kohl’s warning. In a speech he gave in Louvain in 1996, the German Chancellor borrowed from Hamlet:

I have something in me dangerous which let thy wiseness fear.

Ask that question in France, and you get a straight answer: One million men lost in 1914-1918. Not one French family escaped.

That is why French President Mitterrand advised:

Nationalism is war.

German Chancellor Kohl always stressed the basic point of the EU:

Integration is a question of war and peace.

The French made the decision to create the Franco-German Alliance, which has been leading Europe ever since.

At first, the British Foreign Office was alarmed by the prospect of German domination of Europe.

Chancellor Kohl tried to reassure Mrs Thatcher. But she was unconvinced about German motives:

We want a European Germany. But we don't want a German Europe.

Just in case, the British Foreign Office developed a brilliant answer – ‘Enlargement’:

So Germany plans to run six countries. Let's see how they do with 26 countries!

But German officials saw that coming. Successive generations of German diplomats were much too smart for that. They took the plan forward. In three astounding manoeuvres, first the Reunification; then, the Treaty of Nice, and then the Treaty of Lisbon, Germany's plan unfolded:

- 1 The reunited Germany to have the biggest population in the EU
- 2 Voting to be changed to reflect population weight
- 3 EU voting threshold to pass EU law to be reduced

Three simple steps to effective control of Europe.

The British Foreign Office was asleep at the wheel.

When Britain joined the EU in 1973 it was on a One-Country-One-Vote basis. Britain was an equal partner and had an equal share of the votes.

The *EU Treaty of Nice*, as amended by the *EU Treaty of Lisbon*, ended that principle of equality. Now votes would depend on population. So, Germany would outvote Britain for the first time.

Berlin emerged as the biggest winner in the Union's internal power struggle. The long-held dream of German diplomacy had come true.

One expert on European politics in Brussels called Germany's new voting strength:

A major geopolitical development in the history of the Union.

Under the old Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) rules for the Council of the European Union, Germany, France, Italy and Britain all had the same voting power.

But under the new system, votes in the Council would be based on the population of the member state.

When EU leaders met in Nice in December 2000, a first attempt was made to reform the voting system for the growing Union. France's President Chirac caused consternation by insisting that Germany and France should still be given the same voting weight.

The result was a complex and somewhat arbitrary voting system where Germany's reunified 80 million people were significantly underrepresented. An obvious injustice, they said.

The majority required for a QMV was lowered. Previously, you required 62 votes out of 87 (about 70 percent) which had to include votes from 10 different countries. The Treaty enshrined a simple 60 percent vote.

Here are the figures:

- In 1973 Britain and Germany had an equal 17.2 percent of total votes. In 1973, Germany and Britain had an equal share of votes needed to block legislation, 55.6 percent each.
- In the proposed *EU Constitutional Treaty*, Britain would have been cut to 30 percent of votes needed to block legislation. Germany would have gone up to 42.6 percent of blocking votes. The Franco-German axis would have had 73.5 percent of votes needed to block legislation.

The abolition of the weighted vote system and its replacement with a system based on population size made it much harder for Britain to block EU legislation it opposed.

Under the QMV system agreed by the UK Government in Nice, effective from 2004, 74 percent of the votes held by member states were needed to pass legislation.

Under the new system, based on population sizes, only 65 percent of the total vote was needed to pass legislation. Research by economists at the University of Geneva said this dramatic reduction in the threshold would make it much easier to pass EU legislation under the new system.

Researchers at the Geneva Institute of International Affairs calculated the effect – there are three times as many ways of building a majority for any given piece of legislation, so gaining a majority is correspondingly easier.

When the UK joined the EEC in 1973 Britain controlled 56 percent of the total number of votes needed to block legislation. At Nice it was reduced to 33 percent. Under the Constitution our share would have fallen to 31 percent of the votes needed to block legislation.

The Franco-German axis would have 73.5 percent of votes needed to block legislation.

According to the European Parliamentary Research Conference, from 1 November 2014, decisions in the Council of the EU (Council of Ministers) requiring a 'qualified majority' are adopted by means of the new 'double majority'. The change lowers the threshold required for adoption by Council, and is intended to increase the speed and efficiency of Council decision-making and to make it more transparent and legitimate.

The voting system for Council decisions following the 2001 Nice Treaty was intended to adapt to the new weighting of votes which enlargement from 15 to 25 Member States would entail. QMV was redefined to introduce a combined threshold for votes to pass. The three criteria for decisions to be adopted were 74% of Member States' weighted votes, cast by a majority of Member States, and, optionally, a check that the majority represented 62% of the EU's total population.

In order to overcome these drawbacks, and increase legitimacy, in line with the 'One Citizen – One Vote' principle, the European Convention proposed moving to a double-majority method. The new voting method, included in the EU Constitutional Treaty, was confirmed in the Lisbon Treaty (Article 16 TEU/ Article 238 TFEU) although slightly modified. In contrast to the previous majority rules, which are said to have better protected smaller and medium-sized Member States, the new system focuses on the demographic weight of Member States.

The table overleaf shows the Member States' populations as of 1 November 2014, and their voting power under the old and new voting systems, in both the EU and the Euro area. The graph


illustrates the changes in Member States' voting power, in percentage points.

Table 1: Council Voting weights in the EU and euro area

Member State	Population (thousands)	Old voting system			New system based on share of population	
		votes	% of EU total	% of euro area	% of EU total	% of euro area
DE	80 523.7	29	8.2	13.3	15.93	24.2
FR	65 633.2	29	8.2	13.3	12.98	19.7
UK	63 730.1	29	8.2		12.61	
IT	59 685.2	29	8.2	13.3	11.81	17.9
ES	46 704.3	27	7.6	12.4	9.24	14.0
PL	38 533.3	27	7.6		7.62	
RO	20 057.5	14	3.9		3.97	
NL	16 779.6	13	3.6	5.9	3.32	5.3
BE	11 161.6	12	3.4	5.5	2.21	3.4
EL	11 062.5	12	3.4	5.5	2.19	3.3
CZ	10 516.1	12	3.4		2.08	
PT	10 487.3	12	3.4	5.5	2.07	3.1
HU	9 908.8	12	3.4		1.96	
SE	9 555.9	10	2.8		1.89	
AT	8 451.9	10	2.8	4.6	1.67	2.5
BG	7 284.6	10	2.8		1.44	
DK	5 602.6	7	1.9		1.11	
FI	5 426.7	7	1.9	3.2	1.07	1.6
SK	5 410.8	7	1.9	3.2	1.07	1.6
IE	4 591.1	7	1.9	3.2	0.91	1.4
HR	4 262.1	7	1.9		0.84	
LT	2 971.9	7	1.9		0.59	
SI	2 058.8	4	1.1	1.8	0.41	0.62
LV	2 023.8	4	1.1	1.8	0.40	0.61
EE	1 324.8	4	1.1	1.8	0.26	0.4
CY	865.9	4	1.1	1.8	0.17	0.26
LU	537.0	4	1.1	1.8	0.11	0.16
MT	421.4	3	0.8	1.3	0.08	0.13

Source: EPRS – European Parliamentary Research Service

Figure 1: Comparison of voting weights prior to and after 1 November 2014



Author: Conall Devaney and Eva-Maria Poptcheva, Member's Research Service

The two-pronged expansion in both the scope of majority voting and the reduction in the qualified majority threshold made a real difference to Britain's ability to control EU legislation. For decades, Britain and Germany spoke in Europe with an equal voice. Now, for the first time, Germany had more votes.

The whole point of the process, which led to the proposed new EU Constitution, was to reconnect the EU with its voters.

The first sentence of the Constitution begins:

Reflecting the will of the citizens.

It continues:

The Constitution shall have primacy over the law of the member states. Member states shall facilitate the achievement of the union's tasks and refrain from any measure which could jeopardise the attainment of the objectives set out in the constitution.

Article 13: The coordination of economic policies

The Union shall coordinate the economic policies of the Member States.

The Member States shall conduct their economic policies, so as to contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the union. Article 14 not only says what we will do, but the manner in which we will do it.

Article 14: The Common Foreign and Security Policy

Member states shall actively and unreservedly support the Union's common foreign and security policy in a spirit of

loyalty and mutual solidarity. They shall refrain from action contrary to the Union's interests.

Is that why they drafted Article 9?

Article 9: Application of Fundamental Principles

The Constitution shall have primacy over the Law of the Member States.

Member States shall facilitate the achievement of the Union's tasks and refrain from any measure which could jeopardise the attainment of the objectives set out in the Constitution.

Or was it the basis of Article 10? Article 10 introduces us to an unusual use of the English word, 'competence'; to mean, not ability, but jurisdiction, and helpfully sets out who will have jurisdiction over what.

Article 10: Categories of Competence

When the Constitution confers on the Union exclusive competence in specific areas, only the Union may legislate and adopt legally binding acts, the Member States being able to do so themselves only if so empowered by their Union.

The Member States shall exercise their competence only if and to the extent that the Union has not exercised its.

That is what French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing meant when he described his dream for Europe:

It will be respected and listened to as a political power that

Will speak as an equal with the largest powers on the planet.

Or Jean-Claude Trichet, the Governor of the Bank of France. He spelled it out for all to hear:

Monetary union is the essential precondition for political union.

The then President of the EU, said he wanted:

A single economic government for all countries who share the money.

He meant it.

For example, take financial services – apparently Britain's ace of trumps. The EU developed a *Financial Services Action Plan*. It had the objective of creating a single financial market.

Here were some of the actions in the *Action Plan*:

- *Two Directives on company prospectuses.*
- *The Directive on insider dealing and market manipulation.*
- *The Directive to upgrade the Investment Services Directive.*
- *Amendment to the 4th and 7th Company Law Directives.*
- *Modernisation of the accounting provisions of the 4th and 7th Company Law Directives.*
- *The implementation Settlement Directive.*
- *The Directive on take-over bids.*

- *The review of EU Corporate Governance Practices.*
- *The amendment of the 10th Company Law Directive.*
- *The 14th Company Law Directive.*
- *The two Directives on undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities.*
- *The Directive on the prudential supervision of supplementary pension funds.*
- *The Directive on the distance marketing of financial services.*
- *The amendment of the insurance intermediaries Directive.*
- *The amendment of the Directives governing the capital framework for banks and investment firms.*
- *The amendment to the solvency margin requirements in the insurance Directives.*
- *The Directive on prudential rules for financial conglomerates.*

Britain's pragmatic acceptance of Franco-German leadership

Faced throughout with that legislative and economic momentum, there have been only a series of short term decisions for the British people to make.

1975

Go in. Or stay out.

2016

Remain. Or leave.

Hardly the stuff that dreams are made on, is it?

The Foreign Office consistently underestimated Britain's power in Europe: respect for its culture, the arts, financial propriety, 'My Word is My Bond', an incorruptible criminal justice system, the police, the Royal Law Courts, MI5, MI6, GCHQ, non-violent protest, the history of the Empire, its present Commonwealth, a scientific, literary and medical legend, which stood alone against the might of Germany. Compared with that CV, everyone else might understandably feel second class.

Yet the British Foreign Office stuck to John Stuart Mill's view of what defines a nation:

It is in general a necessary condition of free institutions that the boundaries of government should coincide in the main with those of nationalities.

Of course, everyone wants to be in charge of their own fate. But nothing is completely sovereign. No man is an island.

Dante spelled it out 500 years ago. In 1459, he wrote:

Mankind at its best depends upon unity in the wills of its members. The Scythians, for instance, live outside the Seventh Circle, experience extreme inequalities of day and night and endure an almost intolerably piercing frost; they require a different rule from the Garamantes who live in the equinoctial zone, where the days and nights are of equal duration and where the excessive heat makes it unbearable to wear clothes. But our meaning is that mankind should be directed by a Common Law issuing from one supreme prince, and applied to those characteristics which are common to all men.

Big is best?

The British people, as diligent Dante scholars, understand very well that there are certain things in life you don't want, but to which you have to bow your head.

We know you have to bow your head to death, to illness, to failure, to humiliation, or perhaps, to the march of history. And we may be reasoning that this European Union is something we don't want but which we know we have to accept.

As usual, we the people are miles ahead of the politicians. We see the EU for what it is. Another symbol of global Capitalism. We see mega-mergers and global corporate alliances every day. We see jobs moving away to wherever it suits global corporations to employ people.

We don't need a Professor of Economics from LSE or a Chancellor of the Exchequer from Whitehall to teach us this. We know it all perfectly well.

Because our employers are teaching us every day that unity is strength.

E Pluribus Unum. The strong go forward. The weak go to the wall. Size is everything. Only a few will survive.

For good or ill, politics follows economics. If companies feel that their employees are safer and better off in a global organisation then politicians will follow suit, believing their citizens to be safer and better off in a regional alliance.

Like humans everywhere, the Englishman is patriotic. He rallies to his country's flag. He is distressed to see it at half-mast. He is overcome with feeling when it flutters to the sound of his national

anthem. It chokes his breath to see it draped over the coffin of a war hero or heroine.

As Stanley Baldwin put it:

These things strike down into the very depths of our nature...our innermost being.

Touching, isn't it?

So what are we supposed to do now?

Some say the EU is the arch-deceiver, a mind-altering substance on which more money is spent than all the drugs produced by the pharmaceutical industry put together.

They see the EU as the purveyor of romantic delusions, invented by the unscrupulous to prey upon the innocent widows and orphans of humanity; that its psychological distortion of objective reality has hypnotised people into, as Kenneth Tynan put it:

Selling our souls for a pot of message.

That it is a messenger for cultural imperialism, paving over precious national identities with a homogenised EU version of reality.

Must we accept it?

Some British Eurosceptics pin their hopes on America coming to our rescue. But this is a forlorn hope.

The last American President of the 20th Century did not mention the word 'Euro' once in any speech he made.

The latest American President of the 21st Century said:

Go to the back of the queue.

Why?

Why is America so in love with the EU? This US President knows perfectly well that Anti-Americanism has helped to create a unified European voice in which an increasingly assertive Europe will challenge the United States on every issue it can, Anti-Americanism helps Europeans gain respect in the rest of the world.

He heard the Governor of the European Central Bank point out that America accounts for only 30% of world trade; yet 70% of the world's business is transacted in dollars. This injustice to the new European superpower would be put right by the Euro, he said.

He understands that the French dislike the popular American view of France as:

A tourist destination.

And what made former French Foreign Minister Védrine condemn American 'hyper puissance':

The hectoring hegemon.

The French government now makes crystal clear – one must acknowledge its consistency – that its aim is to create a big country called Europe to rival a big country called the United States of America. When French President de Gaulle built an independent French nuclear force and began to construct the Franco-German alliance, President Kennedy expressed American concerns:

If the French and other European powers acquire a nuclear capability they would be in a position to be entirely independent and we might be on the outside looking in.

If the main point of the EU is to challenge America, the question arises: why does America go along with it?

Answer: realism. If we can stop all these countries fighting each other, that will save us money; no boots on the ground in Europe. Plus, as a bonus, they can pay for their own defence.

And as if that isn't sufficient, there is the question of commerce. American multinational corporations welcome the EU and campaign for it. Why wouldn't they? It is the last step in integrating their European units – a path they have been following for 30 years, along a continuum from loose coordination to complete integration.

This is the view of the US bosses:

In our European division, we have 300 million consumers. But in Europe we have all these different countries. All these different people. All with their different habits. Their own practices. All with their own little customs. How tedious they are. If only these people were more similar, you say, then, instead of having six factories in 10 countries, with 4 research and development facilities, producing 32 products in 62 package sizes, with 14 pack designs, we could have two plants, one R&D facility, and produce three standardised products for the whole of Europe. Think of the cost savings.

American CEOs concluded a long time ago that if you don't do things globally, someone else will. They determined to sell the same things in the same way everywhere.

But wait! Perhaps China will save us. That is unlikely. The Chinese government has said that it would prefer it if the EU were one

country with one government. Why? “More efficient”. In the EU, there are too many cooks.

Years ago, the *Harvard Business Review* noted that to embrace globalization would give you a decisive advantage over your competitors.

You would literally pave over those stuck in the old ‘country manager’, local ‘profit centre’ way of doing things. This would be the application to the whole planet of the logic of the first industrial revolution – economies of scale, mass production, the specialization and division of labour.

We the people don’t doubt the economic power of ‘globalisation’. But we find that the word has:

A menacing ring.

But we have accepted that, in the end, these global corporations are not driven by greed, but by fear.

In *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin noted the fierce competition between and within the species in nature. He observed that in birds, for example, the bones of the face, the curvature of the jaw, the number of ribs, the gape of the mouth, the length of the eyelids, the width of the nostrils, the size of the beak, the manner of flight, etc. all varied remarkably.

In what he called their ‘incessant struggle for survival’, he described the process of ‘natural selection’. Those with an advantage go forward. For the rest, extinction inevitably follows. The survival of the fittest.

The laws of Darwinism apply as inexorably and ruthlessly in commerce as they do in nature. That is why to oppose globalisation in economics is as futile as opposing Darwin in nature.

And by the way, this is not just about worship of the Golden Calf. It is in accordance with the deepest American philosophy of the world.

In his famous essay on President Franklin Roosevelt, Isaiah Berlin described the chasm that divides America from Europe:

The American vision is larger and more generous; its thought transcends, despite the parochialism of its means of expression, the barriers of nationality and race and differences of outlook, in a big, sweeping, single view. It notices things rather than persons, and sees the world (those who saw it in this fashion in the nineteenth century were considered utopian eccentrics) in terms of rich, infinitely mouldable raw material, waiting to be constructed and planned in order to satisfy a worldwide human craving for happiness or goodness or wisdom. And therefore, to it, the differences and conflicts which divide Europeans in so violent a fashion must seem petty, irrational, and sordid; not worthy of self-respecting, morally conscious individuals and nations; ready, in fact, to be swept away in favour of a simpler and grander view of the powers and tasks of modern man.

So now we have the European Union, with the full blessing of both the world's two Superpowers – America and China. For most global corporations doing 'the math', Britain is a rounding error.

You cannot defy economic Darwinism. So the only question now worth asking is:

Who's in charge?

We want more control. We deserve it. We must have it. Why? Because we're worth it.

At the moment, the only way anyone can think of to get it is to leave.

There is an alternative: the road to eutopia

But I bring joyous news. We are on the road to eutopia! CPS economists agree – Britain will be the leading economy in Europe.

The Prime Minister deserves to win this Referendum. And he will. On one condition; that on the morning after his victory on the 24 June, he calls in the Foreign Secretary to No.10 and asks to see his plan for Britain's leadership of Europe:

What are we going to do between now and then? What will we do when we get there?

He will insist that the Foreign Office plan has the following mandatory inclusions:

- *A consistent strategic focus*
- *A distinct reason for being*
- *A definite sense of direction*
- *A noble purpose*
- *A destination to be reached*
- *A marching tune people can respond to.*

When this Referendum ends, the Prime Minister's work begins. He tried with his 'renegotiation'. An honourable failure. But his heart was in the right place. He took the first step on a long journey.

This is not a job for pragmatism, or a whistle-stop tour of European fine dining tables. It is the work of a generation. Maybe several. It will take quite a while. Let him start now. See the future. Recognise it. Plan for it. Let him, his heirs and successors, show the people of Europe what Britain has to offer as the leader.

This is the very least we should expect to hear from the British Prime Minister on the TV news:

Today, the British Prime Minister changed the course of European history. Taking advantage of French economic and social weakness, the Prime Minister has forged the long-awaited and much-predicted Anglo-German alliance, which from today replaces the Franco-German alliance as the engine driver of Europe ...

That's only the start. Stay tuned...



SOME RECENT CPS PUBLICATIONS

How to Sell the Family Silver by John Chown

“Privatising the state-owned banks should be done through an old-fashioned tender process to ensure that taxpayers are not ripped off by the government’s advisers, a leading think tank has recommended”

– **The Times**

A Simple, Revenue Neutral Tax Code for Business by David Martin

“Osborne has [...] added enormously to the burden of small businesses by imposing numerous petty regulations. Indeed, a devastating pamphlet by the Centre for Policy Studies is expected to outline many examples.”

– **The Telegraph**

The Price of Law by Jim Diamond

“Partners at top City law firms are charging clients more than £1,000 an hour, according to a Conservative thinktank which condemns fee rises for restricting access to justice.”

– **The Guardian**

The Abolition of Deposit Insurance by Andreas Wesemann

“Insurance that covers depositors when a bank fails should be scrapped to change lenders’ practices and save taxpayers from having to cover the losses, according to a leading think tank.”

– **The Times**

LGPS 2018 by Michael Johnson

“Pooling UK local pension fund assets will not deliver much-needed improvements in infrastructure spending, says think-tank.”

– **The Financial Times**



ABOUT THE CENTRE FOR POLICY STUDIES

- One of the UK's leading think tanks, independent from all political parties and pressure groups.
- Founded by Margaret Thatcher and Sir Keith Joseph in 1974 to encourage vigorous support for the free market, liberty and a strong nation.
- Promotes policies for lower tax, smaller government, competitive markets, greater freedom and responsibility for individuals, business and civil society.
- Relies for funding entirely from individual and corporate supports.
- Chairman: Lord Saatchi.

The aim of the Centre for Policy Studies is to develop and promote policies that provide freedom and encouragement for individuals to pursue the aspirations they have for themselves and their families, within the security and obligations of a stable and law-abiding nation. The views expressed in our publications are, however, the sole responsibility of the authors. Contributions are chosen for their value in informing public debate and should not be taken as representing a corporate view of the CPS or of its Directors. The CPS values its independence and does not carry on activities with the intention of affecting public support for any registered political party or for candidates at election, or to influence voters in a referendum.



BECOME AN ASSOCIATE OF THE CENTRE FOR POLICY STUDIES

The Centre for Policy Studies is one of Britain's best-known and most respected think tanks. Independent from all political parties and pressure groups, it consistently advocates a distinctive case for smaller, less intrusive government, with greater freedom and responsibility for individuals, families, business and the voluntary sector.

Through our Associate Membership scheme, we welcome supporters who take an interest in our work. Associate Membership is available for £100 a year. Becoming an Associate will entitle you to:

- all major CPS reports produced in a 12-month period
- invitations to lectures and conferences
- advance notice by e-mail of our publications, briefing papers and invitations to special events

For more details, please write or telephone to:

Jenny Nicholson, Deputy Director of Fundraising
Centre for Policy Studies
57 Tufton Street, London SW1P 3QL
Tel: 020 7222 4488
Email: jenny@cps.org.uk
Website: www.cps.org.uk