Andrew Canessa
Editor

Bordering on Britishness

National Identity in Gibraltar from the Spanish Civil
War to Brexit

palgrave
macmillan

CONTENTS

Governing Through the Border: (Post)colonial Governmentality in Gibraltar

Giacomo Orsini, Andrew Canessa,
and Luis G. Martínez Del Campo

> *A Spaniard is different. He's a different animal*
> *A 73-years-old Gibraltarian retired man, born in French Morocco*

Although colonialism is a rather varied phenomenon, it usually consists of a specific form of power that emerged in the heart of the European metropolis and was then imposed on the rest of the world, with its heyday in the nineteenth century. As such, pre-existing social, political, economic, and cultural structures in the territories of the colonies were replaced with

G. Orsini (✉)
Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: giacomo.orsini@uclouvain.be

A. Canessa
University of Essex, Colchester, UK
e-mail: canessa@essex.ac.uk

L. G. Martínez Del Campo
University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Vizcaya, Spain

195

the introduction of, for instance, strict racial and/or ethnic hierarchies (Scott 2005; Chatterjee 1993). However, if at first colonisation materialised through the imposition of new governmental strategies—often, violent ones—across time, these new forms of social, political, and economic control came to be internalised by the colonised subjects (Fanon 1952; Stocking 1968). In other words, colonial governance was not simply imposed. In order for colonial empires to endure, colonial governance had to be absorbed and reproduced by colonised peoples as well. Therefore, colonial institutions as well as governing practices and tactics begun to organise sociopolitical life in the colonies not only by framing the individual behaviours of colonisers but also those of indigenous people. This means that, in the colonised territories, new rationalities of government—colonial governmentalities (Foucault 1979; Pels 1997)—rephrased precolonial social, cultural, and political fabrics so that colonial structures of power could perpetuate. After all, colonialism was an intimate project as much as it was a political one (McClintock 1995; Stoler 2002).

Over the course of the twentieth century, however, the old colonial empires started to disintegrate as a series of wars of independence lead to the birth of new national communities in the territories of the former colonies (Mignolo 2000; Herbst 1989). If colonial governmentalities had worked until then to produce and reproduce colonial governance, alternative rationalities of self-government had led to decolonisation. It was a set of governing practices what made it possible to reconfigure the world's geopolitical map during the second half of the twentieth century. Similar to the ways in which the definition of ethnic and racial distinctions and boundaries was essential for the functioning of the colonies, national borders that proliferated throughout decolonisation are at the foundation of new political identities.

Moving from this angle, this chapter analyses the complex relationships between decolonisation, the establishment of new post-colonial nations and their national borders, and the 'governmentalities' that allowed colonised people to achieve self-government. To do so, we concentrate on Gibraltar where, despite many Spanish attempts to regain control of the Rock, the decolonisation of this tiny enclave occurred only partially. In contrast to what happened in other former colonies, the population of Gibraltar—which is formed mainly by people of Maltese, Genoese, Spanish, Portuguese, Jewish, and Moroccan descent—has never really challenged the colonial power. On the contrary, in the context of a tense international dispute between the British and Spanish governments, since

the second half of the last century, the inhabitants of the small enclave have shown their desire to remain as part of Britain—overwhelmingly so in the two referendums of 1967 and 2002 (Gold 2010).

Gibraltar thus offers an intriguing counterexample to the more common pattern of decolonisation where subject peoples distance themselves from their colonial masters, as in Gibraltar the opposite appears to be the case. As we discuss here, through the partial decolonisation of Gibraltar, it is as if Gibraltarians moved from a border geography where cross-border relations structured socio-cultural life in the area—Gibraltarian had lived for centuries in an osmotic relation with their Spanish neighbours—to a bordered geography where Gibraltarians isolated themselves from their Spanish neighbours. Here, the border dividing the enclave from Spain plays a key role in this complex and seemingly contradictory framework. Although the frontier has always been marked on maps, the border between Gibraltar and Spain remained permeable up until the early twentieth century (Jackson 1990; Lincoln 1994). However, from the mid-1950s, that border crossing became increasingly complicated because of the restrictions imposed by the Spanish government; a series of limitations that culminated with the complete closure of the border between 1969 and its partial opening to pedestrians in 1982, being only fully reopened in 1985 (Grocott and Stockey 2012).

Even though the border had always played a key role structuring economic and social life in the small enclave, as we discuss in the first section of this chapter, it is only since the 1960s that the border turned into a major security apparatus whose existence and management were fundamental for the self-government of Gibraltar. It is precisely through the border that Gibraltarians imagine themselves as a distinct nation from neighbouring Spain. As discussed in the second part of this chapter, today, Gibraltarians claim a national identity that is distinct from that of their Spanish neighbours as they increasingly identify with the culture of the colonial power. A key socio-cultural and political feature of everyday life in the enclave, that stays at the core of the contemporary government of this dependent microstate.

From an empirical point of view, this chapter draws on the *Bordering on Britishness* interviews. In the following pages, we discuss significant excerpts from these interviews as part of an historical reconstruction that concentrates on both the major transformations of border management and the development of a Gibraltar that never completely achieved self-government. The goal is to bring to the surface the many ways in which

the border generated a Gibraltarian national(istic) feeling that is, in turn, central to the functioning of (post)colonial self-government in the enclave.

Colonial Government and the Permeable Border

In the early twentieth century, there was virtually no physical limitation to mark the perimeter of the territory of Gibraltar. Located about one kilometre south of where the current border is placed, the heavy doors of Gibraltar's fortifications were closed at night and open in the morning to regulate the entrance and the residence in the city (Burke and Sawchuk 2001).

The economic opportunities present in the enclave undoubtedly facilitated cross-border exchanges and mobility in the region (Brotón 2015). In general, the small peninsula has prospered economically in comparison to the surrounding areas, which is one of the poorest areas of Spain (Pujolar 2011). In addition to military activities, shipbuilding and the port have traditionally accounted for the bulk of the economy of the tiny colony (Lancaster and Taulbee 1985).

Due to its geopolitical position, Gibraltar was a nodal commercial hub of the British colonial empire. As the border demarcated the exclusive territory of British sovereignty—than differentiating it from the rest of Spain—the frontier secured additional benefits for those goods that were unloaded in the port of Gibraltar. Due to the availability of products that could not be found on the Iberian Peninsula and the lower cost of what was unloaded in Gibraltar—that has been a free zone since 1706 (Fawcett 1967)—many of the goods found in the enclave fed a vigorous smuggling industry with Spain. Joseph,[1] a 90-year-old tobacco businessman from Gibraltar, described the role that smuggling played in the local economy.

> Spain did us the great favour, of prohibiting the movement of tobacco **towards the country**. That made us […] to the point that Gibraltar lives today on […] one thing: forget wine, forget cars, [we] live on tobacco![2]

[1] All names are pseudonyms.

[2] The parts in bold corresponds to those sections of the interviews when interviewees spoke to us in Spanish. As is typical in Gibraltar, many people mixed Spanish and English in the same conversation and even in the same sentence.

Marking the boundaries of the Spanish and British tax jurisdictions, the border has always been the basis of one of the most important economic activities of the enclave—trade. Yet, the border also generated other differentials that were central to government and social control in Gibraltar.

For instance, crossing the border offered numerous social opportunities which were, in themselves, aspects of the governance of Gibraltar: the border made it easier to deal with the strict military discipline with which the British had organised daily life—thereby reducing social tensions in the garrison (Betham-Edwards 1868). When the colonial authorities began closing brothels in Gibraltar at the beginning of the twentieth century as, in 1922, the then local governor 'Smith-Dorrien promptly closed down the entire brothel quarter' (Howell 2004), most of this activity transferred to La Línea (See Stockey, this volume). Brothels moved to *la Calle Gibraltar*, a street that runs perpendicular to the border, at the core of the Spanish town. It was lined with brothels for officers, men, civilians, and so forth. British authorities were thus interested in maintaining a porous border not only for economic reasons but also in order to enhance social control and, in this case, to ensure that vice was kept outside the colony.

Moreover, as for the rest of British colonies (Chatterjee 1993), the coexistence among different ethnic groups inside the enclave was mediated through a differentiated access to civil, social, and economic rights. Michelle, a Gibraltarian, remembers what her father told her about the ways in which ethnic discrimination structured life in the enclave:

> My father worked in the dockyard and at the time, the English worker had one pay scale and the Gibraltarian had another pay scale. [He told me that] they wanted parity with English workers because they felt it was very unfair. They were doing the same job and they were second class citizens. In the dockyard, there was a bathroom for the English and there was a bathroom for the Gibraltarians.

The border contributed to institutionalise this distinction, as it pushed Spanish frontier workers to the margins of Gibraltarian society (Low 2001). For instance, the three sets of toilets in use at the dockyard—British, Gibraltarian, and Spanish/other. The issue of the Dockyard toilets is widely mentioned as emblematic of the humiliating social difference between English workers and Gibraltarians. However, there was a tripartite hierarchy with Gibraltarians occupying an intermediate position between Spaniards and British people from the UK. Gibraltarians were

British subjects and had certain rights that Spaniards did not; in practical terms, they occupied supervisory positions because they could communicate with both the English and the Spanish. It was difficult for Spanish workers to move up the hierarchy without English, but nor was it in anyone's interest to let them do so (Díaz Martínez 2011). Here, we report the words of a Gibraltarian retired hotelier in his 80s, as they provide an insight of how this colonial hierarchy used to work on the Rock.

> Once a year the military would remind us who […] was the boss in Gibraltar and that Gibraltar […] was [a] military zone. […] Once a year, you would go for example […] to Sandpits [and] at the very beginning there was a ribbon and two soldiers with a sort of baseball. […] A rough thing, and you were not allowed in. […] If you said: "look, I'm going to the Sandpits", then they would allow you [in] but [they were there] to remind you that they were the bosses. And that was all over Gibraltar. I remember Wednesdays in the army was a recreational day, in the afternoon, and an officer just recently arrived from England. […] We were down at the lecture room and this officer came and said: […] "My name is so and so; I am a British officer with the Queen's commission. Now we're going to have an hour of general knowledge because […] the education that I possess… I want to pass a little to you people". [He did] not [know] that some of the people there had just come from studying in the UK. […] The poor man came under the miscomprehension that we were little more than savages, no? That we had no school and education. [All] that was discovered, and they got to learn about us and to respect us. But there was a time, I remember being told when I was young by old people, that when a Gibraltarian had to get off the pavement if an Englishman was passing by. […] We were colonials and we accepted being colonials and we were humble.

While Gibraltarians experienced first-hand colonial exploitation and discrimination, the fragmentation of the labour force into different groups made it more difficult for workers to organise into unions (Bonacich 1972). Again, to maintain a border that was at the same time permeable to human cross-border mobility but virtually impossible to cross from an administrative point of view, was in keeping with the British colonial elite's economic and social aims (Constantine 2008).

We must not forget that, for centuries, Gibraltar was one of the most strategic colonies of the British Empire as both a military base and a commercial hub—even more after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 (Truver 1980). Obviously, then, the colonial government was very

interested in maintaining a dynamic economy, a relatively cheap labour force, and tight control over the local population (Grocott and Stockey 2012). The border was one of the main instruments in the hands of local authorities to achieve such aims. This was an institutional apparatus whose functioning becomes increasingly relevant to the Government of Gibraltar, since people's mobility across the border became increasingly curtailed from the middle of the twentieth century—as we discuss in the following pages.

(De)colonisation and the Tangible Frontier

As the crossing of the border became more problematic in the second half of the twentieth century, a consequent and profound transformation in cross-border relations between Gibraltar and La Línea took place. This change in cross-border relations developed parallel to the partial decolonisation of the enclave.

As discussed in the previous section, for centuries, Gibraltarians formed a unique community with their Spanish neighbours of the Campo de Gibraltar. Not only did most of the Spaniards residing within Gibraltar's fortifications come from the neighbouring region, but there were important cultural and kinship ties with the Campo. Many Gibraltarians resided in Spain because of the shortage of accommodation in the colony (Grocott and Stockey 2012). There is no question that, for long decades of British Gibraltar, Spanish was the most spoken language in the homes and streets of Gibraltar (Fernandez Martín 2001; Moyer 1998; Kramer 1986, see also Chap. 6 in this book).

This situation remained largely unchanged until the twentieth century, as it was only at the beginning of the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) that the crossing of the border started being limited and regulated (Fawcett 1967). As violence erupted in Spain, the border was initially closed by the British and so commenced its transformation into an increasingly relevant security apparatus for Gibraltarians. For the civilian population, the border protected them from the violence of the Spanish Civil War and the repression that lasted until the mid-1970s. The extreme violence of this period was mentioned by many of our interviewees, some of them in harrowing tales of relatives being imprisoned and killed. Many of our other, older respondents who didn't have a direct experience of violence themselves remembered the refugees that their families housed. Yet, the most significant restrictions to crossing the border were not introduced during the

Spanish Civil War; rather, they were imposed later and by the Spanish government in response to a series of changes in the political relations between the inhabitants of the small colony and the British colonial authorities.

In 1940, corresponding to the initial phases of World War II, Gibraltarians where evacuated from the Rock, this caused considerable resentment (Finlayson 1991). Antonio, in his 90s, remembered the tensions characterising this period.

> **The Governor did not want us to remain because he did not want any more people here...** [as he] couldn't defend the place with a lot of people to feed and to look after. **That is why we were held there in the bay, on board the ferry that had just taken us back from Tangier and Casablanca. And there was almost a revolution... For the first time, those who had remained here** [in Gibraltar] **started protesting loudly** [against British authorities]**. And then,** [they] **started to repair the ferries a bit … as they wanted us to leave with the same boats that we used to come** [back from Casablanca]**. And the ferries that we used were, frankly speaking – you know?** We were on the deck, **and there was space for nothing** […] And then [we travelled for] fourteen days with practically no food. All the bread was thrown overboard two days after we left, because it was mouldy.

After an initial evacuation to Morocco, soon Gibraltarians were displaced to either the UK, the island of Madeira, or Jamaica (Dunthorn 2000). Travel and residence conditions depended on social class. Mercedes was a teenager when she travelled to Madeira.

> **In Madeira, there were three different classes: there was the class A that was like... you went by yourself as if you were a tourist**. [It was for] **the moneyed people. Then, there was the... class B, that was for people like us.** [This] **was arranged on a 'fifty-fifty' basis: half was paid by the government, and the other half by my father. And then there was the class C, that was** [made for those from] Catalan Bay as, having room left on the boat then they thought: "Look the people from Catalan Bay". [In Madeira] they accommodated them in a place that was called 'the Lazaret'… as in the past it was… an isolation hospital. [But, for] **them, the government covered all costs**.

After all, the relationship of the time between British colonial rulers and Gibraltarians is summarised in the words of the then local governor,

Colonel Sir Clive Gerard Liddell. In an official communication to the British government of 1945, he described the civilian inhabitants of the enclave as 'useless mouths' (Garcia 1994: 15), referring to both the need to feed them and to meet their demands. After centuries of colonial hierarchy and negation of the most basic civil, social, and political rights, the relations between the colonial government and Gibraltarians deteriorated significantly during the evacuation. Gibraltarians began demanding greater self-government (Garcia 1994) and, through the unions, the recognition of equal rights with their British work colleagues (Jeffries 2008). These major transformations of political and social life in the enclave developed parallel to the shifting geopolitical value of Gibraltar for both Britain and Spain and, more interestingly, alongside major changes in the management of the border dividing the Rock from the rest of the Campo de Gibraltar.

In mid-twentieth century, Gibraltar had still had great geopolitical value for the UK. Yet, from the 1950s, the enclave became increasingly important also for the Spanish government of General Franco—as Spanish sovereignty claims over the enclave became frequent and loud (Constantine 2006). Meanwhile, in 1950, the Gibraltar Legislative Council was constituted, including a minority of elected Gibraltarian members, thereby involving locals more intimately in the governance of the enclave (Heasman 1967). Yet, in 1954, the Queen of England made her first official visit to Gibraltar, so reaffirming the importance that the tiny colony still had for the British Empire. In response to this royal visit, the Franco regime radically changed the management of the border with Gibraltar, as an increasing number of restrictions to free circulation were introduced. A change in border relations that culminated with the total closure of the frontier in June 1969, a few days after the approval of the first Gibraltarian Constitution (Grocott and Stockey 2012; Hills 1974; Doods et al. 2007).

In this sense, we observe how the partial decolonisation of Gibraltar took place almost in parallel to the progressive closure of the border. A severing of cross-border relations that deeply affected the Gibraltarian socio-cultural fabric, given that it thrust the population much more into the arms of the coloniser—as an increasing number of Gibraltarians started to identify themselves with the British. In the 1960s, when Spain was moving towards the closure of the border, Gibraltar erupted in a vigorous display of pro-British feeling with Union Jacks appearing in windows and painted on walls across the territory. This very public display of British identity, although less fervent than in 1969, has continued to the present

day where Union Jacks are much more evident in Gibraltar than in any comparably sized town in the UK. Family, friendship, economic, and business ties that had formed through centuries of cross-border interactions were quickly interrupted both physically and symbolically, when the border closed.

It is as if, because of the impossibility of crossing the border, Gibraltarians had embraced a new geography where Spain turned into a distant land. With the border closed until 1985 (although partially opened in 1982), Gibraltar had become virtually an island. While Spain became progressively the main threat to the existence of Gibraltar, Spaniards quickly began to be perceived as the alter egos of Gibraltarians. Here, a Gibraltarian psychologist describes how the closure of the frontier profoundly changed her father's attitudes towards Spain, when he refused to go to Spain even after the border opened: 'my dad refused to go to Spain from the time the frontier shut… He refused, not me… No, I could distinguish between the Spanish government and what it did, and Spain'. In fact, this was not an isolated incident: another of our interviewees reported that his Spanish-born grandmother refused to return to the land of her birth, and where she had a brother, right until her death in 1993.

It is important to note that, not only did many Gibraltarians turn against Spain but so did many Spanish-born people who had settled in Gibraltar. Antonio who was born in Spain in 1949 and then moved to Gibraltar before the border closed remembers what the closure of the border meant for his mother.

> **My dad used to work here in Gibraltar** [so that he spent his] **days** commuting **across the frontier.** […] **There was no frontier then; it was enough to show… It wasn't even a passport; it was a pass for 40 visits. There was another one valid for 80 visits. Thus, I remember that even though we lived in Spain, he applied here to receive a house, as we were meant to move to Gibraltar.** […] **So, he started saying that they gave him a house in a new block that they were building.** […] **My mother, as everyone else, was very happy.** […] **However, the thing** [with the frontier] **started deteriorating** [and] **they took my mother's family away. She remained here alone… unable to see her family again. In 1968, although… the frontier was still open, you had to go through with your pass. My mother had always used her pass, the one for 80 visits. When my uncle died of a car crash, she tried to go… They called us that he had just died, she tried to go, but they did not allow her to.** […] **She could not go even to the funeral… She couldn't.**

As the border shut, so did communications across it. Families were torn apart and such profound rupture transformed also Spaniards' sense of belonging to the Spanish nation—and national community.

A new sense of Gibraltarian national subjectivity developed in contrast to the Spaniard and Spain: paradoxically, as the enclave was progressively decolonised, Gibraltarians started identifying more—both culturally and politically—with the British colonisers (Alvarez 2000). Here is how Eddie, a Gibraltarian in his 70s, describes what it means to be Gibraltarian:

Well it seems that the British influence is what has, I think, has been the pillar of success here. Because wherever they, they have gone, they, they've installed… the justice system, rules of law, respect and discipline… And it was very evident in people of my age and further back. […] So, I think Gibraltar should be indebted, heavily indebted to the way of life, British way of life. […] Because here we tend to look at things. This is the discipline people have here. I think it's a discipline. You don't do certain things. Here, we have a certain amount of ethics or morals and we don't go beyond that. So, we don't want to upset the system. But when you go across the border, you don't mind the system being topsy-turvy and you allow for that. This is the way I see it. You have a certain amount of criteria here. And you wouldn't want to be seen doing certain things.

After operating for centuries as a bridge capable of unifying the people of the Campo de Gibraltar and Gibraltarians into a single community, the border thus became an essential device for Gibraltarians to secure social, economic, and political life in the enclave against Spain.

One of the most notable effects of the border closure was the fact that for the first time in centuries, Gibraltarian labour could not be undercut by cheaper Spanish workers. The unions immediately recognised this and began a series of strikes in the early 1970s aimed at parity of wages with the UK. The demand was not simply parity of wages with English workers but parity with UK salaries. Miguel, a retired Gibraltarian nurse during the late 1950s participated in the union struggles of the time and recalls here what Gibraltarians were fighting for.

[In the 1960s, there were many strikes.] **The** […] **great battle of the Union,** […] **the great struggle for parity of salaries with the British workers.** […] **Even though** […] **the strike of 1962 was a** productivity **strike, while the strikes for parity came between 1964 and 1968,** [that strike] **was the prelude of all the problem with parity, because differences**

were already there. [You] **had two persons doing the same job** […] **or three persons, correct?** […] **There was a salary gap, where the Englishman** [earned the most]**, the Gibraltarian a little less, and then the Spaniard.** [The logic was that] **the Spaniard** […] **lived in Spain and** […] **from an economic perspective, there things were cheaper.** […] **However, certainly the same logic didn't apply for the Englishman: he earned as if he was in England, but here he was** […] **and** [he lived buying] **those same goods** […] **bought by the Gibraltarian.** […] **It was the same as locals.** [For this reason,] **at the time the Gibraltarian was becoming increasingly aware.** [The] **closure of the frontier helped to enhance the Unions' ability to organize.**

After years of repeated strikes, local workers' demands were finally met leading to a very rapid rise in wages for Gibraltarians across all classes as this not only affected labourers but professionals as well.

After years of isolation from Spain and a simultaneous rapprochement to the UK, even Spanish that had served for centuries as a lingua franca in Gibraltar was progressively abandoned (see Chap. 6 in this volume for more details). Through the process, people who had used English mainly to deal with the colonial system started speaking it as their main—if not only—language. Johnny, a 70-year-old Gibraltarian businessman born in La Línea, expressed his view of how such a language shift occurred.

[Today] **everyone speaks English.** […] **This happened because of the isolation of when the border was closed.** […] **Before there were thousands of workers coming over and you could not avoid mixing with them.** [If today there are grandparents unable to speak a common language with their grandchildren, it is because] **they are different generations trying to speak to each other.** […] **Our generation was bilingual, perfectly bilingual.** [But the parents of today's kids grew up with the frontier closed] **and their contact with Spain practically came down** to zero, […] there was no exchange. [And then] **outside the families… in the schools… basically everything is in English.**

A series of reforms were launched in the Gibraltarian education system so that English—and Englishness—would gain prominence in daily life and permeate the Rock's society, making locals feel increasingly connected with the British metropolis (Picardo 2012). In a way, the decolonisation of Gibraltar took place, while Gibraltarian culture and society were being simultaneously colonised by Britishness. Although the border was

reopened in 1985, the frontier as an apparatus of control has never left the centre of local public debate—as emphasised by many of our interviewees, including Angela, a Gibraltarian in her 90s.

> **Every time this gets worse. Unless the government changes or something like that… We queue a lot** [at the border. And] **all those girls who come after working, being tired… and have to go there and wait to cross!**

Today, Gibraltarian national identity is the result of several components. In order to mark the difference with the Spanish neighbours, Gibraltarians often refer to their attachment to liberal values—and, in particular, to democracy and multiculturalism—as markers of the difference between them and Spaniards—as exemplified by this 90-year-old Gibraltarian: 'I don't think the Spaniards […] are truly democratic, I don't think so. I don't think so. [...] I don't think that [there] the same law touches everybody'. The words of Nancy, a Gibraltarian teacher born in 1958, are equally explicit:

> I think a lot of the way that we think is very British as well, very English as well, our politics and our ideas of democracy, our ideas of freedom of speech, our ideas of tolerance as well do come from the British. You know the Spanish tend to be very intolerant and very racist.

One Gibraltarian pushed himself to the point of making a parallel between Spain and Hitler's Germany:

> **Last year.** […] Last summer… **Spain** […] **started a campaign very…** Hitler couldn't have done it better. […] **Seriously,** […] they still control the system. **Spain is not a democracy, that is a lie.** […] **The press is completely controlled, and it says what they tell them to say.**

The geographical proximity of the inhabitants of the Campo de Gibraltar is today counteracted by a perceived social, cultural, and political distance that divide the peoples of the two sides of the border. We have thus seen how Gibraltarian society's perceived geography has changed dramatically over a few decades. It is as if Gibraltarians moved from a border geography—characterised by the centrality of cross-border relations—to a bordered geography—as Gibraltarians isolated themselves from their Spanish neighbours. While, thus, the decolonisation of the enclave

advanced, locals moved more or less symbolically and physically closer to their British colonisers.

As such, the border constitutes that key institutional apparatus—or, governing technology (Nadesan 2008)—framing everyday political, cultural, and social life in the enclave and thus producing a specific and nationalist governmentality allowing Gibraltar to prosper economically in a relatively safe international environment.

(Post)colonial 'Governmentality' and the Border

The concept of 'governmentality' (Foucault 1979) explains modern sovereign power in terms of population control as opposed to the territorial control typical of pre-modern monarchies. With the emergence of European nation states, and of colonial and post-colonial states as well, individuals who were before passive objects of the coercive power of the monarchs became agentic citizens whose actions started constituting government in itself (Lemke 2001). From this perspective, 'governmentality' describes that complex set of rationalities that discipline the actions of the members of contemporary national communities. The concept refers thus to a series of tactics and speeches produce and reproduced by both the rulers and the ruled ones to enhance government, and which in the territories of the former colonies are configured as specific post-colonial 'governmentalities' (Kalpagam 2000).

When Gibraltarians became full British citizens in 1983 under the Immigration Act of 1981 (Gold 1994), the social control of the enclave's population could no longer be achieved by means of a strict colonial hierarchy and military discipline (Parama 1998). The border became, therefore, a key governing device to maintain the political destiny of the enclave unequivocally intertwined with the British motherland. Today, in fact, the UK still controls most of the small overseas territory's foreign affairs, not exactly a marginal aspect for a microstate whose survival depends entirely on its relations with the outside world (Browning and Joenniemi 2007). Indeed, Gibraltar is constitutionally prevented from conducting foreign affairs: that role being unequivocally taken up by the UK.

We must also consider that after the opening of the NATO naval base in Rota in 1953—located at less than 150 kilometres from the Rock—the military importance of the enclave began to decline (Ponce 2009). At the same time, due to the gradual disintegration of the British colonial empire, the commercial value of Gibraltar for the UK decreased significantly (Scott

2005). On top of this, the Spanish claims on Gibraltar in a period of decolonisation had disproportionately increased the political costs that Britain had to face to maintain direct control of the enclave. In this context, an anti-Spanish and pro-British Gibraltarian national identity became necessary for local elites to maintain some kind of political and social control on the Rock (Constantine 2006; Gold 2005). On the one hand, we must remember that British colonial elites were masters in 'exacerbating' ethnic identities in order to organise social and political life in their colonies—as demonstrated, for instance, in territories such as Malaysia and Singapore (Gwen Chi 2003). On the other hand, in the 1960s, very few Gibraltarians aspired integration as citizens of a fascist country—Spain— whose economy did not guarantee better prospects than those available in colonial Gibraltar at the time. Therefore, the construction of a Gibraltarian national identity opposed to Spain and explicitly British was necessary to ensure international protection from Spain while developing a local government relatively independent from the UK.

This helps explaining how, contrary to what happened in most colonies, Gibraltarian post-colonial nationalism developed in opposition to the indigenous peoples of the area of the Campo de Gibraltar—rather than being framed in opposition to the colonial rulers (Loomba 2007). Such a socio-cultural construction was based on the border and its closure between 1969 and 1985 and allowed Gibraltarians to produce and reproduce an historical and cultural separation with their Spanish neighbours. As it developed very quickly, Gibraltarian national identity reveals its multiple internal contradictions quite clearly, thus exposing its basic use and need as a tool.

As mentioned above, many Gibraltarians emphasise the liberal and cosmopolitan character of Gibraltarian society and politics in contrast to the undemocratic and intolerant spirit of Spain. However, such a vision clashes with the experiences that were told to us by many of our interviewees. When, after the closure of the border, Spanish workers were not available anymore in Gibraltar, a growing number of Moroccan workers were invited to move to the enclave (Stanton 1991). One of our interviewees with a keen interest in local history described the relationships with newcomers in very positive terms:

> The Jews came here because they were needed. [The same happened with Moroccans,] and it was good. […] Once they were here […] they were given the same rights and the same protection as everybody else.

Many of our interviewees cited tolerance as the defining characteristic of Gibraltar often adding that it was an 'example to the world'. One of our interviewees did not hesitate, asking where else 'would you find such peaceful coexistence?' Nevertheless, this idyllic description contrasts with the experience of a Moroccan woman who came to Gibraltar in the 1970s:

> **Well, here in Gibraltar** […] **there were job opportunities but without the papers you could not work. None could get the documents.** […] **And there was no house available neither.** […] **We were living eight persons in one room. Eight persons!** […] **There was one room, the kitchen and a toilet for** [all] **those living around there.** […] **Also, the shower** [was] **outside: in the patio.** […] **Do you understand? In the past, it was really difficult!** […] **And, one more thing… When I remained here to work** […] **I met another Moroccan guy from Tetouan and married him… We started our life, but I was not allowed to have a baby. I will never forget this…** [I was] **four months** [pregnant, and I was stopped by] **a policeman in the street.** […] **I can never forget this!** […] **I did not know it at the time,** [and] **that is why I decided to have a walk outside when I was in my fourth month… And** [the policeman] **told me: "Come with me". And they took me to the hospital, and** [then to the ferry] **as if** [I had committed] **a crime.** [Thus, I went to Morocco] **to give birth,** [and] **then came back: they wanted me to leave my baby with my sister** [across the Strait in Morocco]**, while I was here.**

The coexistence of different cultures and religions is hardly exceptional for a Mediterranean port city—historical examples of Thessaloniki and Alexandria are but two examples, and, after all, Gibraltar served for centuries as a major commercial hub of the British Empire (Driessen 2005; Goffman 1999; Haller 2004) so a certain amount of comingling was inevitable. The peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups established in Gibraltar does not seem to correspond to social inclusion and equality. Rather, the opposite, since it was underwritten by a colonial order that excluded most non-UK-born civilians. If, however, individual rights and duties had been distributed according to a strict colonial hierarchy based on ethnicity, in a (de)colonised Gibraltar, the border becomes the main instrument of allocating power.

Today, Gibraltarians have achieved equal rights with British colonisers, but Moroccans still live on the margins of local society (Stanton 1991). It is not only the people from Morocco who tend to have a different language, religion, and culture that are excluded but also the nearly 11,000

workers who enter Gibraltar daily through the land border and who tend to have lower-paid jobs, and see their rights often denied (Oda Ángel 2007; Fletcher et al. 2015). Gibraltarians today have a very high standard of living partly because menial and service jobs are done by cross-border workers residing in Spain (Norrie 2003).

Marking a cultural difference that did not exist before, the border then functions as a self-fulfilling prophecy (Aleinikoff and Rumbaut 1998). We are talking here of a population—the one of Gibraltar—whose members did not hesitate to welcome Spanish republican refugees during the Civil War while the British colonial elite supported Franco's coup (Ponce 2009). They are the same Gibraltarian workers who shared with their Spanish colleagues many common struggles against the injustices of British colonial exploitation (Jeffries 2008). Like any other nationalism, Gibraltar's own nationhood rests on a number of 'myths' (Anderson 1983). A series of (mis-)perceptions that, built through and across the border, are pivotal in structuring the actual governance of the (post-)colonial enclave.

If the border is the device through which the cultural diversity between Gibraltar and the rest of the Campo de Gibraltar is generated, it is exactly by imagining such diversity that Gibraltarian self-government has become possible—for example, with the two referendums of 1967 and 2002. In this framework, the closure of the border between 1969 and 1982 works as the main ingredient of the Gibraltarian national dish. It is, therefore, no surprise that many Gibraltarians born after 1985 have a softer anti-Spanish feeling than that present in the collective imagination of older generations of Gibraltarians. What follows is what Andrea—a 25-year-old Gibraltarian—told us about her relationship with Spanish and British cultures and societies:

> I am familiar with crossing the border […] and I frequent certain regions of Spain, especially Andalusia. So, I don't feel like an outsider [there]. However, if I am talking to a tourist in Andalusia, of course I feel more expert and more at home than he or she does. […] I think [that] you can be fat, you can be white, you can be slim, you can be fast, you can be Spanish-speaking, you can be Italian-speaking, you can be Gibraltarian-speaking, you might be illiterate. But that doesn't – I think – make you more Gibraltarian or less Gibraltarian. […] I think [that] culturally, we're more similar to the Mediterranean – so that would include Italy and Spain. [With Britain, instead,] there's a distance. I frequent [the] UK, England, because I've got family there […] but I think Gibraltarians feel probably more foreign in the UK than crossing over the border to Spain. Again, because it's not something you do daily.

If, then, the hard border has led to the production and reproduction of a 'border governmentality' (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013) in Gibraltar, the experience of crossing the border that many young Gibraltarians do frequently seems to resist the logic of differentiation with people from the Campo de Gibraltar.

Conclusions

The study of governmentality in a post-colonial borderland has shown how nationalism is 'a strategically organised illusion or imaginary' (Hesse 1997: 89) and is a key technology of government. Here, decolonisation worked as a 'crisis [of] the traditional alignments [making it] possible, on the very ground of this break, to construct the people into a populist political subject: with, not against, the power bloc [then represented by the British colonizers]' (Hall 1983: 30–31). For the specific and unique case of the British Overseas Territory of Gibraltar, the border with Spain and the diverse border management strategies deployed across the twentieth century played a key role in allowing the British to maintain direct or indirect control of the strategic enclave—while ensuring economic prosperity, as well as real or perceived security for the Gibraltarians.

The Brexit vote of 23 June 2016 provides an example of how such apparently paradoxical (post-)colonial Gibraltarian nationalism is mediated by the border and operates to maintain the enclave's population within the British sphere of control. 96% of the Gibraltarians voted to remain in the European Union. One factor in the referendum result in Gibraltar was undoubtedly a concern to keep the border with Spain open and flowing, as up to 11,000 people cross it every day. This constitutes 40% of the local workforce. Yet, despite the huge stakes, Spanish government's repeated proposals on shared sovereignty and the lifting of the border that followed Brexit are stridently repulsed by the majority of locals—and the entirety of local political class—who profess themselves ready to face years of border closure and thereby remain part of Britain than have any sort of association with Spain. So, it would seem that this recently created Gibraltarian nationalism pushes Gibraltarians to pursue strategies of self-government that would seem to go against the most obvious economic, social, and cultural logic.

Nevertheless, while we have shown the many means by which post-colonial governmentality works and operates through, and thanks to, specific border managements, here, we have also exposed the very limits of

governmental strategies. That is to say that nationalism as a form of 'post-colonial governmentality' collides with the experience—intended here in the Foucauldian way as 'something that one comes out of transformed' (Foucault 2000)—of those who frequently cross real or symbolic international borders. In this sense, the many young Gibraltarians who have not experienced the border closure but, rather, frequent border crossing, perceive themselves much closer to Spain and Spanish culture than the older generations of Gibraltarians.

Bibliography

Aleinikoff, T. A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1998). Terms of Belonging: Are Models of Membership Self-Fulfilling Prophecies? *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal, 13*(1), 1–24.

Alvarez, D. (2000). Colonial Relic: Gibraltar in the Age of Decolonization. *Gran Valley Review, 21*(1), 4–26.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Betham-Edwards, M. (1868). *Through Spain to the Sahara*. London: Hurst and Blackett.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bonacich, E. (1972). A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market. *American Sociological Review, 37*(5), 547–559.

Brotón, A. R. (2015). *Estudios. Gibraltar*. Cuadernos de Gibraltar/Gibraltar Reports 01, pp. 13–24.

Browning, C., & Joenniemi, P. (2007). *Gibraltar, Jerusalem, Kaliningrad: Peripherality, Marginality, Hybridity*. Report from the Åland Islands Peace Institute 1, pp. 1–20.

Burke, S. D. A., & Sawchuk, L. A. (2001). Alien Encounters. The *jus soli* and Reproductive Politics in the 19th-Century Fortress and Colony of Gibraltar. *History of the Family, 6*, 531–561.

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Constantine, S. (2006). Monarchy and Constructing Identity in 'British' Gibraltar, c.1800 to the Present. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 34*(1), 23–44.

Constantine, S. (2008). The Pirate, the Governor and the Secretary of State: Aliens, Police and Surveillance in Early Nineteenth-Century Gibraltar. *The English Historical Review, 123*(504), 1166–1192.

Constantine, S. (2009). *Community and Identity. The Making of Modern Gibraltar Since 1704*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Díaz Martínez, B. (2011). *Camino de Gibraltar: dependencia y sustento en La Línea y Gibraltar*. Cádiz: Delegación Provincial de la Consejería de Salud.

Doods, K., Lambert, D., & Robinson, B. (2007). Loyalty and Royalty: Gibraltar, the 1953–54 Royal Tour and the Geopolitics of the Iberian Peninsula. *Twentieth Century British History, 18*(3), 365–390.

Driessen, H. (2005). Mediterranean Port Cities: Cosmopolitanism Reconsidered. *History and Anthropology, 16*(1), 129–141.

Dunthorn, D. J. (2000). *Britain and the Spanish Anti-Franco Opposition, 1940–1950.* New York: Palgrave.

Fanon, F. (1986 [1952]). *Black Skin, White Masks.* London: Pluto Press.

Fawcett, J. E. S. (1967). Gibraltar: The Legal Issues. *International Affairs, 43*(2), 236–251.

Fernández Martín, C. (2001). Incorporación léxica y actitudes lingüísticas en el Campo de Gibraltar. *Pragmalingüística, 8*, 99–112.

Finlayson, T. J. (1991). *The Fortress Came First.* Gibraltar: Gibraltar Books Ltd.

Fletcher, J., et al. (2015). *An Economic Impact Study and Analysis of the Economies of Gibraltar and the Campo de Gibraltar.* Gibraltar: The Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce.

Foucault, M. (1979). On Governmentality. *Ideology & Consciousness – Governing the Present, 7*, 5–21.

Foucault, M. (2000). Interview with Michel Foucault. In M. Foucault, J. Power, & D. Faubion (Eds.), *Essential Works of Foucault* (Vol. III). London: Penguin.

Garcia, J. J. (1994). *Gibraltar. The Making of a People. The Modern Political History of Gibraltar and Its People.* Gibraltar: Mediterranean SUN Publishing Ltd.

Goffman, D. (1999). Izmir: From Village to Colonial Port City. In E. Eldem, D. Goffman, & B. Masters (Eds.), *The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul* (pp. 79–135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gold, P. (1994). *A Stone in Spain's Shoe. The Search for a Solution to the Problem of Gibraltar.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Gold, P. (2005). *Gibraltar. British or Spanish?* London: Routledge.

Gold, P. (2010). Identity Formation in Gibraltar: Geopolitical, Historical and Cultural Factors. *Geopolitics, 15*(2), 367–384.

Government of Gibraltar. (2015). *Employment Survey Report.* Gibraltar: Statistics Office. HM Government of Gibraltar.

Grant, J., & Mittelsteadt, L. (2004). Types of Gated Communities. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 31*, 913–930.

Grocott, C., & Stockey, G. (2012). *Gibraltar: A Modern History.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Gwen Chi, J. K. (2003). National-Ethnic Identity Negotiation in Malaysia and Singapore: A State-Society Interaction Perspective. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 47*(55), 49–75.

Hall, S. (1983). The Great Moving Right Show. In S. Hall & M. Jacques (Eds.), *The Politics of Thatcherism*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Haller, D. (2004). The Cosmopolitan Mediterranean: Myth and Reality. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, 129*(1), 29–47.

Heasman, D. J. (1967). The Gibraltar Affair. *International Journal, 22*(2), 265–277.

Herbst, J. (1989). The Creation and Maintenance of National Boundaries in Africa. *International Organization, 43*(4), 673–692.

Hesse, B. (1997). White Governmentality. Urbanism, Nationalism, Racism. In S. Westwood & J. Williams (Eds.), *Imagining Cities. Scripts, Signs, Memories*. London: Routledge.

Hills, G. (1974). *Rock of Contention: A History of Gibraltar*. London: Robert Hale.

Howell, P. (2004). Sexuality, Sovereignty and Space: Law, Government and the Geography of Prostitution in Colonial Gibraltar. *Social History, 29*(4), 444–464.

Jackson, W. (1990). *The Rock of the Gibraltarians. A History of Gibraltar*. Grendon: Gibraltar books.

Jeffries, J. (2008). The Wrongful Deportation of Albert Fava: The Indisputable Champion of Workers' Rights. *Gibraltar Heritage Journal, 15*, 47–60.

Kalpagam, U. (2000). Colonial Governmentality and the 'Economy'. *Economy and Society, 29*(3), 418–438.

Kramer, J. (1986). *English and Spanish in Gibraltar*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Lancaster, T. D., & Taulbee, J. L. (1985). Britain, Spain, and the Gibraltar Question. *The Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics, 23*(3), 251–266.

Lemke, T. (2001). The Birth of Bio-politics': Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-liberal Governmentality. *Economy and Society, 30*(2), 190–2007.

Lincoln, S. (1994). The Legal Status of Gibraltar: Whose Rock Is It Anyway? *Fordham International Law Journal, 18*(1), 285–331.

Loomba, A. (2007). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism (Special Indian Edition)*. Oxon: Routledge.

Low, S. M. (2001). The Edge and the Center: Gated Communities and the Discourse of Urban Fear. *American Anthropologist, 103*(1), 45–58.

McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. London: Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local Histories/Global Design. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Moyer, M. (1998). Bilingual Conversation Strategies in Gibraltar. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity* (pp. 215–234). London: Routledge.

Nadesan, M. H. (2008). *Governmentality, Biopower and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.

Norrie, C. (2003). The Last Rock in the Empire: Evacuation, Identity and Myth in Gibraltar. *Oral History, 31*(1), 73–84.

Oda-Ángel, F. (2007). Gibraltar a un año de la Declaración de Córdoba: la recuperación de la confianza. *Documento de Trabajo, 45*, 1–23.

Orsini, G. (2015). Lampedusa: From a Fishing Island in the Middle of the Sea to a Tourist Destination in the Middle of Europe's External Border. *Italian Studies, 70*(4), 521–536.

Parama, R. (1998). *Indian Traffic: Identities in Question in Colonial and Postcolonial India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pels, P. (1997). The Anthropology of Colonialism: Culture, History, and the Emergence of Western Governmentality. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 26*, 163–183.

Picardo, E. N. (2012). *The War and Siege: Language Policy and Practice in Gibraltar, 1940–1985*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham, Birmingham.

Ponce, A. J. (2009). *Gibraltar and the Spanish Civil War, 1936–39: Local, National and International Perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury.

Pujolar, A. E. (2011). *Sobremortalidad por cáncer en El Campo de Gibraltar. El medio social, la piedra clave*. Cádiz: Delegación Provincial de la Consejería de Salud, Junta de Andalucía.

Sawchuk, L. A. (1992). Historical Intervention, Tradition, and Change: A Study of the Age at Marriage in Gibraltar, 1909–1983. *Journal of Family History, 17*(1), 69–91.

Scott, D. (2005). Colonial Governmentality. In J. X. Inda (Ed.), *Anthropologies of Modernity. Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics* (pp. 23–49). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Stanton, G. (1991). Guests in the Dock'. Moroccan Workers on Trial in the Colony of Gibraltar. *Critique of Anthropology, 11*(4), 361–379.

Stanton, G. (2006). Military Rock: A Mis-anthropology. *Cultural Studies, 10*, 270–287.

Stocking, W. (1968). *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Stoler, A. N. (2002). Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance. *Archival Science, 2*, 87–109.

Truver, S. C. (1980). *The Strait of Gibraltar and the Mediterranean*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Sijthoff and Noordhoff International Publisher.