As far as I can tell, the majority of the Remain campaign is centred around (1) Economics: how prices will rise/the economy will suffer/we can never make it on our own, (2) Security: exit will endanger British, European and global security, and (3) Immigration: open immigration is good for the UK. I find this all rather hard to swallow.

Firstly, we are the fifth largest economy in the world. Our economy may be effected by exit in the short term, say 2 to 5 years (who can really tell?). But this will be offset once we can renegotiate our own trade deals with the USA, China, India, EU member states, and other global partners. We should not be fooled into thinking that EU membership is the sole guarantor of our prosperity. Trade with the EU is of great importance, but it works two ways. Would Brexit really result in countries like Germany permanently shutting the door on the third largest market for its exports?

Furthermore, is what we get in return from the EU worth the £8.5 billion hole it burns in our pockets every year? Is giving more to the EU than we receive worth it? According to the WTO, average trade tariffs between nations stand around 4%. This is hardly excessive. Whilst Brexiters are accused of being parochial, we should take note that Canada and Australia, both independent sovereign states, are not exactly struggling. Are we really expected to believe that leaving the EU will result in the UK becoming a second or third world country overnight?

Secondly, the EU does not guarantee UK security. NATO, a completely different body, does. In terms of expenditure, the UK is NATO's second biggest contributor. This will not change. Our security will not be jeopardised. Are we going to be cast out because of an unrelated breakup? Most of our intelligence, in what is the world's most powerful intelligence gathering alliance (dubbed 'Five Eyes'), is shared with the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, a vestige of British heritage, and independent of the EU.

Thirdly, a great deal has been made of immigration. The UK should always do what it can to help others in times of need. But first and foremost, it should look after its own people and be proud of its heritage. I believe immigration is a positive thing, provided that a number of important considerations are taken into account. We should have the final say on who can and cannot enter into our country, and in what numbers. Priority should be given to nationals from nations with common cultural traits and an understanding of British institutions. The policy should also be extended to the educated. Thinning social cohesion is a dangerous thing, as a look at the ethnic fissures and cracks appearing in US society demonstrates. The open door policy of immigration that the EU provides is suicidal. Our power to let who we want (and don't want) into our country is being completely subverted. And the proposed Turkish entry into the EU is a direct threat to the social cohesion of Europe.

If it happens, 80 million Turks with no common cultural heritage with Europe will flood the richer EU states. The face of Europe and what made Europe, its Christian heritage and institutions, will be diluted even further by people who have no prior understanding of it and openly defy it. The greater the numbers, the less the desire to assimilate. Is Molenbeek today a bastion of European values? Immigrants will retain their close knit identities (as is the case with the majority of the 3 million Muslims in Britain, the 4 million in Germany, and some 6 million in France). Although we are not encouraged to think about it now, this will only get worse in 10 years' time once the 2 million Muslim migrants, Mrs. Merkel invited in, become EU citizens. This is not to disparage Muslims or those fleeing from conflict. Just a statement of fact that, in 20 years' time there will be a population of 50-60 million Muslims living in Europe who although 'European' will not share any cultural heritage, identity, and values with the indigenous European population.

Crucially, Brussels (the EU), either directly or indirectly, makes 60% of our laws. What does this mean? It means that having a vote in the UK doesn't count for much. We can't vote against new laws bureaucrats in Brussels make. In the same way we can't vote them out of a job. Growing up we trust our parents, who we believe have our best interests at heart, to make important decisions. The EU has 27 other children to worry about. Do we trust it to have our best interests at heart with so many vying for attention?

I prefer the idea that laws enforced in the UK actually originate in the UK. If we want to change the law, as an electorate, at the next election we can vote against the party that introduced it. The power would rest with us. But it is the suggestion that remaining in the EU does not mean surrendering more of our sovereignty that worries me the most. The EU wants to create a supranational state (read the treaty of Rome if you don't believe me). That is its ultimate goal.

The EU was never made for deep waters. It is floundering, and to secure its precarious position it will continue to advocate further and closer union. This will be a disaster. The ship is listing – a glance at the continuing Eurozone crisis, illegal migration, and a reckless foreign policy are warning enough. I believe we would be better off placing faith in our island home. Brexit is an opportunity to do just that. Geography and common interest will ensure that we never abandon Europe and that Europe never abandons us. All I ask for is a return to a UK governed by UK laws and elected UK representatives. A country that has the power to engage with the world on its own terms. This is something we simply cannot have if we are in the EU.