

«THE ONE REMAINING PROBLEM» REMAINS.
THE RHETORIC OF AN ANGLO-SPANISH CONFLICT

Miguel Angel Martínez-Cabeza Lombardo
Universidad de Granada

In 1988 in a dinner speech addressed to her Spanish hosts, H.M. Queen Elizabeth II used the expression «the one remaining problem» to refer to the conflict between Spain and Britain over the sovereignty of Gibraltar. The problem not only still remains but also the announced implementation of a EU rule on passports and a Spanish offer of joint control threaten to aggravate it. At least this was the reading made by the British Press, which seemed to be putting pressure on the British Foreign Secretary in view of his imminent visit to his counterpart in Madrid to talk about the colony. Part of the problem lies in its rhetorical construction. An analysis of two editorials from *The Times* reveals how information and opinion are woven for persuasion. This confirms the general hypothesis that meanings are socially constructed, but more specifically the formulation of arguments in the news about Gibraltar shows ways in which the press has sought to persuade and influence rather than offer any basis for diplomatic solutions to the problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is not to solve the almost three-hundred year conflict between the United Kingdom and Spain. Thirty years of Resolutions by the United Nations Organization and fifteen years of bilateral talks have been unable to produce any move in the respective positions other than declarations of goodwill. Nor is it to add fuel to the fire. My modest contribution, then, will consist in pointing to some ways in which at least part of the British press is formulating the problem, and which are only successful in persuading nationals or influencing them against the other country but do not offer a basis for agreement and diplomatic solutions.

The study is prospective since only two articles from a single newspaper are examined but they represent a position which can be contrasted in the sixteen articles which appeared between January 15 and February 3, 1997, in *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times*¹. These articles can be matched with the contents of fifteen articles published by the Spanish newspaper *El País* over the same period. This comparison would be relevant since the actions which the newspapers report originated in Spain but I will only comment briefly on the headlines below. Although both *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times* have a conservative leaning—in fact the position of the British Government was anticipated by these newspapers—the question of Gibraltar seems to cut across Conservative and Labour policies. So the position stated by *The Times* illustrates what can be taken as a widely held view on the issue in Britain. The conclusions hinted at here have this limited validity. A comparative study with other «quality» newspaper such as *The Guardian* or *The Independent*, and

¹ The Appendix includes the list of headlines of articles about Gibraltar published by the British *The Times* and *The Daily Telegraph* and the Spanish *El País* in January and February 1997.

with some «popular» dailies such as *The Daily Mail* or *The Mirror* would give a clearer picture of the British press. A related issue is the «spread» of opinions in terms of readership. *The Daily Telegraph* has the largest circulation of the «quality» newspapers, selling more than a million newspapers a day and *The Times* comes second in the circulation figures with nearly 670.000 copies but they are far from the four million copies sold by *The Sun* or the 2.5 million of *The Mirror*². Together with this, at least *The Times* and *The Daily Telegraph* appear on the internet with a number of readers almost impossible to calculate.

The leading articles selected for analysis are: «Passport practices» (*The Times*, January 16), which is based on the «information» published in the same issue under the headline «Spain on course for clash on Gibraltar»; and «Stand by the Rock» (*The Times*, February 2) corresponding to «Gibraltar leader calls Spain's plan 'laughable'» in the same issue. These articles preceded and followed the visit to Madrid last January by the former Foreign Secretary, Mr Malcon Rifkind.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

When H.M. Queen Elizabeth II visited Spain in 1988, she delivered a speech at a state banquet in which she veiledly referred to the question of Gibraltar with the expression «the one remaining problem»³. The *problem* dates back to 1704 so it will soon be celebrating its third centenary and, if attitudes do not change, perhaps its fourth. Although it is difficult to put the question simply, some facts can be pointed to.

Gibraltar is British because it was so established by Article 10 in the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), which the French king, Louis XIV, negotiated representing his grandson Philip V of Spain, to put an end to the Spanish War of Succession. (Morris and Haigh 1992) As regards Gibraltar, the treaty sanctioned the conquest made in 1704 by Sir George Rooke commanding an Anglo-Dutch fleet in the name of Archduke Charles —rival of Philip for the Spanish Crown in the War of Succession. But after some deliberation Admiral Rooke raised the British flag. The British punished this treason to their ally by discharging the admiral but kept «the Rock». It is also necessary to remember that the treaty provided that territorial jurisdiction be excluded in the cession, communications with the mainland were precluded and in the case of Britain relinquishing possession of the city, it should be handed back to Spain.

During the 18th century Gibraltar was sieged by the Spanish without success and negotiations to retrieve it, bilateral or through third countries, failed as well. Sometimes Spain gave priority to other territorial claims and other times offers made by the British Crown met with Parliamentary opposition or demanded what Spain considered to be exaggerated compensations. Siege and war ended in 1783 with the Treaty of Versailles.

There were at least two offers by British governments to hand the Rock back, one made by Stanhope and another by Shelbourne, but both encountered fierce opposition. In fact

² Newspaper circulation figures in August, 1996, were: *The Sun*, 4,057,668, *The Mirror*, 2,484,238, *Daily Mail*, 2,049,100, *Daily Express*, 1,257,880, *The Daily Telegraph*, 1,040,316, *The Times*, 669,640, *The Guardian*, 398,661, *The Independent*, 281,588.

³ The state banquet was given by the Spanish King Juan Carlos I on September 17, 1988, and Her Majesty's actual words were: «We are confident that our growing mutual understanding will enable us to deal with the one remaining problem which exists between us». Martínez-Dueñas (1989) analysed part of this speech.

Stanhope almost lost his head, literally, on account of his offer, and the second contributed to the fall of Shelbourne's government. Not unlike the wave of opposition stirred three hundred years ago, the visit of the Foreign Secretary to Madrid last January was preceded and followed by a number of articles arguing against any sort of agreement with Spain, either on passports or on joint sovereignty.

3. ANALYSES

The following analyses are based upon the general hypothesis that language structures and patterns the world together with the assumption that language influences thought. From this, two paths can be pursued, the psycholinguistic and the sociolinguistic, that is, the connections between language and thought or between language and society. The approach adopted here is the second and looks for correlations between language and society in a Hallidayian vein.

If the theory is valid, like all instances of discourse, «News is a representation of the world in language... it is not a value-free reflection of 'facts'.» (Fowler 1991:4) Any article from those listed in Appendix I would have provided a good illustration to this effect since they are presented to readers as news reports, that is, as «information». Instead, I chose two leader articles, which present the newspaper's «opinion». Naturally, the claim is not that every article is pure information nor every leader is pure opinion, but rather there is a difference in emphasis. In particular, leading articles share elements of argumentative texts in that they derive evidence for a thesis from facts (Werlich 1976:40), so they are purported to combine information and opinion. In fact the two editorials analysed are based on information which was published the same day in the reports last January mentioned above. Thus, the reason for selecting these editorials was the explicit readings made by the newspaper of information given elsewhere. The construction of reality is perhaps less obvious, and less conscious, in news reports but is also present in leaders and with the same or an even stronger force since facts are given as presuppositions which are prior to and independent of subsequent interpretations. Trew (1979:132) makes an even stronger claim:

[in editorials] the call to action is so bound up with the interpretation and explanation, and so intrinsically linked to the original reports, that it is impossible to distinguish the reports from the editorials as fact, on the one hand, and comment, evaluation or prescription on the other.

The problem for analyses of this type is how to establish any facts which provide the objective referent of any language representation and which supply elements for validation of hypotheses. For this purpose, all possible written sources are biased: the news reports in different newspapers (both British and Spanish), history books, official documents and reports by the British and Spanish Governments, or my brief historical sketch above. Nevertheless, it could be questioned if the degree of bias is higher or lesser in all of them. However, for my purposes I have assumed that what they all have in common can be taken as referential information, eg. Gibraltar is British because Spain ceded it in the Treaty of Utrecht, Gibraltarians need a passport to cross the Spanish border, there is an airport in the isthmus, and the like.

3.1 Headlines

The first aspect to be considered in any news analysis is the news selection. From the thousands of events which take place every day only a few dozens are reported as news

and only three or four are commented on editorials. To begin with, the two newspapers examined gave exhaustive treatment to the issue, probably more than any other newspaper. In fact, the series of articles devoted to Gibraltar last January began right after the Spanish Foreign Ministry announced that it intended to apply an EU rule on passports with the effect of non-recognition of some 2000 passports; a new identity card issued by Gibraltar would not be considered valid as passport either. The first to publish this was the *Telegraph* («Spain 'set to reject Gibraltar passports'», 15/01/97), then followed *The Times* («Spain on course for clash on Gibraltar» and «Passport practices», 16/01/97), and only then it became news in Spain, mostly as a result of the articles in the British press and with a contrary «reading» of the measure. While the British newspapers stressed the negative effects («Gibraltarians» would be «locked in») the Spanish newspapers insisted that the measure would have only a limited effect for those Gibraltarians who do not have a full British passport.

Two weeks later, the Spanish Foreign Minister made a proposal of joint control of Gibraltar for a period up to 100 years after which the Rock would pass to Spanish sovereignty. The *Telegraph* reported the reactions in Gibraltar and Britain under the headlines «Spanish shoot themselves in the foot» (2/02/97) and «The colony that won't go away» (2/02/97) while the *Times* published two reports with the proposal and the reaction, «Spain seeking joint control of Gibraltar» (29/01/97), «Gibraltar leader calls Spain's plan 'laughable'» (3/02/97) and a leading article «Stand by the Rock» (3/02/97), the negative reaction to the offer given in the reports was elaborated as another «threat» which called for rejection and defence. The almost constant picture of Anglo-Spanish relations given by headlines is that of a «war». In fact there is a recurrent theme of «siege» which is used to summarize every Spanish action in this issue. Thus, in the first case, Spain was «on course for clash» and «threatened», Britain «won border tussle», and Spain «retreated». In the second, the project of joint sovereignty was in itself the «aggression».

3.2 *Passport Practices*

I have proceeded by selecting lexical and syntactic elements which are bound to have prominence in the expression of judgements, such as evaluative adjectives and adverbs, adverbial disjuncts, «epistemic» modals or intensive constructions; and exhortations: imperatives, conditionals, purpose clauses, or «deontic» modals.

A) *Vocabulary and syntax:*

- *Nouns* give a powerful description of (generally Spanish) actions and (British and/or Gibraltarian) reactions and effects produced eg.: *havoc*, *hardship*, *bewilderment*.
- *Evaluative adjectives* contribute to the same effect. Appreciatory adjectives generally qualify Gibraltarian actions and attitudes, eg. *the most conciliatory (in their history)*, *the best (chance)*. There are some appreciatory adjectives referred to the Spanish conservative Government —*good*, *refreshing (faith)*, *intelligent (policy)*— immediately counterbalanced by derogatory adjectives: *bad (habits)*, *darker (age)*, *less democratic (age)*, *considerable (havoc)*, *unlawful*.
- *Intensifiers* such as *only*, *even*, *absolutely*, *deeply*, *squarely* emphasize the appreciatory and depreciatory evaluation of actions and qualities.
- *Derogatory words* in the editorial directly target the Spanish Foreign Minister: *inept*, *bereft of ideas*, *squander*.

- *Negatives* are frequent and express denial, refusal or lack of positive qualities: *reject, fail, withdraw, unable, not goodwill, not diplomatic correctness, refuse, blame, make (absolutely) nothing, fears, distrust, alienating.*
- *Disjuncts* express evaluations of propositional content and give particular judgements a generic character, eg. *naturally, to an objective observer.*
- *Collocations*, that is, recurrent word combinations which have prominence in the editorial are also ascribed to Spain or Gibraltar according to their positive or negative value: *passport practices* (cf. unethical, illegal, unscrupulous practices); *platform of dialogue and cooperation; honour the passports; win hearts and minds; «perfidious España»; live in harmony; freedom of movement.* Although no attention has been paid to the newspapers layout (typography, position on the page, masthead), it is worth noticing the use of scare quotes. In cases such as «perfidious España» they are used to adopt others', i.e. Gibraltar's, words; while in other cases, eg. «co-sovereignty», they are used to reject them.

B) Modality:

Modality distinctions are concerned with the speaker's estimate of the possibility of something being true (epistemic) or something being done (deontic). Modal verbs will convey different degrees of possibility or obligation but since the modals for both scales are the same it is sometimes difficult to distinguish.

- *Epistemic modality: this (measure) would cause havoc; havoc would be considerable; (Spain) could withdraw (recognition); (Gibraltar's) could find themselves «shut in»; (effects) would be felt; (the British Government) could not allow (such a policy); (the Spanish Government) might soon refuse to honour (passports); (blame) must lie with Abel Matutes; the Spanish Government's attitude can generate (only bewilderment).*
- *Deontic modality: Britain must reject (threats), (passports) should not exist, the truths Malcom Rifkind must point out*

C) Text structure:

According to Werlich's text typology (Werlich 1976), the editorial is argumentative in that it communicates the assessment of relations among concepts. More particularly, it adopts the form of a comment in which «the encoder passes judgement by relating concepts of events, objects, and ideas to his private systems of thought, values and beliefs (Werlich 1976:107). In leading articles the writer states the major propositions which are favoured either as syllogistic or factual argument. In the first, «the encoder derives evidence for the favoured thesis from an accepted *general proposition* which is related to a *particular proposition*, so that the thesis can be deduced as a *conclusion* from them.» (*ibid* p.110) In the factual argument, the writer «derives the evidence for the favoured thesis from *particular facts* and then deduces a *conclusion* through a generalization from the listed particulars.» (*ibid* p.110-111).

In «Passport practices» the structure is apparently factual since some facts are given (the correspondent's report, Gibraltar's status in the EC, elections) but actual evidence for the thesis is provided by assertions and so argumentation shades into persuasion. At the end facts and judgements are all grouped as «truths».

Thesis: *there is one area in which [the Spanish] Government has consistently failed to adopt an intelligent policy... Gibraltar*

Evidence:

Particular facts: *The Spanish Government... could shortly withdraw all recognition from passports issued in Gibraltar.*

Particular facts: *[Spain is aware that] limitations [in the Treaty of Rome] did not affect the right of freedom for Gibraltarians within Europe.*

Conclusion: *By its threats to the Rock's passports, Spain confirms the fears of many Gibraltarians.*

The conclusion is indirectly drawn from the evidence through several propositions which interpret the measure announced by the Spanish Government. The first one is the reading of the announcement as a «threat». «Threats» may be speech acts which involve intention but «threaten» is not a speech act verb, that is, one cannot threaten by saying «I am threatening you». So if the intention is not unambiguously stated, «threatening» remains largely a perlocutionary effect, determined by the addressee—in this case the editorialist—but not necessarily by the addresser. Other propositions are:

Particular proposition: *Gibraltarians could find themselves «shut in»*

Particular proposition: *havoc, hardship and economic loss would be considerable*

General proposition: *[Anglo-Spanish relations] would feel the effects*

In a comment, the writer conveys new insights to the reader by suggesting a solution to a problem and at the same time the comment reveals how the writer links facts with systems of thought, thus giving insights into the writer's attitudes and beliefs (Werlich 1976:111). But in this editorial the second aspect seems to take over. In fact, rather than any form of solution to a diplomatic problem there is a generalization from «the threat to passports» to the long list of previous «threats». Naturally, the selection of evidence is dictated by the thesis. Other evidence can support a different thesis but it is noticeable that no reference is made to the limited scope of application of a measure (according to Spanish authorities no more than 2000 passports) or the reasons which the Spanish Foreign Ministry gave.

Together with the argumentative, the composition of leading articles characteristically includes elements of the instructive type with action-demanding sentences: imperatives, conditionals and purpose clauses. As has been shown, this editorial targets the reader's convictions offering an explanation rather than a solution. At the same time it expresses a very specific call to action: the Foreign Secretary must point out all these truths to his counterpart.

D) Style

Style is understood here as referential variety: the linguistic features which reflect the encoder's responses to factual or conceptual phenomena in a specific communication process. On the whole this leading article is persuasive, that is, it tries to get the reader's spontaneous consent to what is asserted. This can be seen in the conditionals and rhetorical questions. More particularly it tries to influence the addressee in favour of all that refers to Gibraltar by presenting it as better than it is and against the Spanish government by making a negative reading of any action or attitude.

- *Conditionals predict effects both in Gibraltar and in Britain: if Spain proceeds with the decision...thousands of Gibraltarians could find themselves «shut in»; if (this policy) is put into effect, the British Government could not allow it to go unchallenged.*

- *Rhetorical questions* have the effect of strong assertions of reversed polarity. Only one is used, *what has [the Chief Minister] got in return?* The intended answer is «He has got nothing in return», but he has got something worse: *not goodwill, not diplomatic correctness, hectoring, threats* and «probably» no recognition of passports.
- *Appreciatory/depreciatory*:

Gibraltar

- (has) the most conciliatory administration in their history
- Mr Caruana (leads) a platform of dialogue and co-operation
- Mr Caruana offers opportunities
- (Gibraltar) gives chances

Spain

- (has) a Government with bad habits
- (makes) unlawful moves
- (gives) not goodwill, not diplomatic correctness
- hectors, threatens
- Señor Matutes is inept
- Señor Matutes makes nothing of opportunities
- Señor Matutes squanders chances

In view of these actions and attitudes, the conclusion and call to action seem moderate.

E) *Speech situation*

Editorials give the newspapers opinion so there is no single source for the utterance but a collective *we* (eg. *our Madrid correspondent*). This pronoun lends itself to varying reference according to the purpose and for instance can include newspaper and readers (eg *when Edward Heath took us into the EU*) in an appeal to solidarity.

3.2 *Stand by the Rock*

This second analysis is presented more concisely.

A) *Vocabulary and syntax*:

- *Evaluative adjectives and adverbs*: stress the resolute British reaction in contrast with the Spanish lack of resolution: *firmly, robust, lengthy, moderate, absurd, laughable, correct, right, precise, illegal, easily, clear, closely, valid, surprising, bewildering, acceptable, stillborn, hotly-bargained, remarkable, blithely, disagreeable, abject, petty, exemplary*.
- *Intensifiers* such as *never, simply, even, so, really* emphasize the appreciatory and depreciatory evaluation of actions and qualities.
- *Negatives*: *against, reject, without, condemnation, failure, refusal, incapable*
- *Collocations*: *leaked proposal, cross-party consensus, fail to muster an iota of enthusiasm, illicit activities, exemplary firmness, in favour of dialogue*

B) *Modality*:

The frequent ambiguity between epistemic and deontic modality is played upon by the editorialist here since the overt claim to give information can be used to issue directives, express obligation or intention. (Ambiguity will be marked by '?')

- *Epistemic modality: The Government ?would never hand over sovereignty; the Colony would «revert to Spain»; anything less [than rejection] would have earned them condemnation; that weave cannot easily be unravelled, nor ?should attempts be made to do so; a Blair Government ?would respect the wishes of Gibraltarians; Britain can find no proposals... acceptable; Can Gibraltarians be expected to warm... and can they condone...? If [Spain] cannot [take account of Gibraltar's wishes], it will not secure the Rock even by the next millennium.*
- *Deontic modality: Britain must not compromise, (commitment) should not have been in any doubt, Spain must take account of Gibraltar's wishes*

C) Text structure

The argumentative evidence sustains the thesis: «Spain is not democratic (enough) because it will not recognise Gibraltar's right to self-determination» which in its turn is based upon the assumption that «self-determination is a question of wishes». The general commentary will come back to these theses.

D) Style:

- *Rhetorical questions: It is so remarkable that Gibraltarians should fail to muster even an iota of enthusiasm for Spain when its Foreign Minister blithely describes them as having «no standing» in the matter of their own future? Can Gibraltarians really be expected to warm to Spain when their daily experience at the border is frequently disagreeable? And can they be expected to condone such a petty harassment as the refusal by Spain even to recognise Gibraltar's international telephone code?*
- *Imperatives: stand by the rock.*
- *Appreciatory/depreciatory:*

Britain

- stands firmly by the Rock
- Mr Major asserts
- Mr Rifkind makes robust statements
- Mr Major & Mr Rifkind are right
- has made a commitment to Gibraltar

Gibraltar

- Mr Caruana is moderate, correct
- Mr Caruana is in favour of dialogue
- Mr Caruana addresses Spain's concerns with exemplary firmness

Spain

- promotes projects such as «co-sovereignty»
- Señor Matutes leaks proposals
- has a surprising and bewildering posture
- abjectly fails to understand
- has never recognised Gibraltarians

Spain

- for Mr Matutes Gibraltarians have «no standing»
- harasses Gibraltar
- promotes «co-sovereignty»

The last assertion in the list deserves some commentary. *The Times* deliberately presents Mr Caruana's firmness against tobacco smuggling and drug trafficking as one of his positive actions towards Spain which only meets Spain's negative and —worst of all— unjustified reactions. The curb on smuggling is indeed satisfactory to Spain but one may doubt if the reason is that given by the editorial. Of course only Mr Caruana knows his reasons but it must certainly have helped him decide the ultimatum that Mr Douglas Hurd gave to his predecessor, Mr Joe Bossano, over Gibraltar's failure to comply with EU law in banking and measures to end money—laundering, tobacco—and drug-smuggling⁴.

Now the British press acknowledges that the smuggling trade flourished under Joe Bossano. But in 1994 the *Telegraph's* correspondent in Gibraltar wrote «the restrictions [in border controls] are being enforced under the guise of stopping contraband tobacco and drug trafficking, despite the fact that the Royal Gibraltar Police plays a leading role in the international drive against drugs in this part of the world.» (*The Daily Telegraph*, November 29, 1994). A month later, the British government in effect gave Gibraltar an ultimatum to bring its laws into line with EU law or face action which might include revocation of Gibraltar's 1969 Constitution (a UK Act of Parliament), as section 86 of that Act permits.

4. GENERAL COMMENTARY

Perhaps disappointingly, one can conclude from the previous comment that actions do not speak louder than words. In fact words are not even independent of actions but *force* actions and phenomena into the addresser's perspective. On the other hand the addresser's beliefs and viewpoint also play a part. The debate about the degree to which language influences thought and thought influences language is still open. But consciousness of the importance of this debate is being raised, partly by approaches such as critical linguistics. The language of the press is one more case in this debate. Laws, which are texts of a less speculative nature are subject to the same processes as can be seen when both Gibraltar and Spain were ready to take each other to the EU courts for contradictory readings of the European passport regulations.

The role of the press in conflicts is never as mere commentator. It is expression and mediation of social practices. News reports background judgement but construct the news they purport to «report», from the very selection of topics, through the headlines, to the contents. The passport issue was not reported by the Spanish press because of its political impact but because of the reaction of the British press. Editorials foreground judgement but in fact weave information and opinion. The *Times* usually selects three news items to give the newspaper's opinion and prints them in a column under the well-known masthead which represents the newspaper so physically the three editorials are ranked in proximity to the newspaper's emblem. Gibraltar was devoted two leaders in two weeks, six in the last year. «Passport Practices» was printed the second and «Stand by the Rock» right under the masthead. The conspicuous place stressed the authority of the speaker addressing a reader.

The press speaks with a clearer voice but with darker words in editorials. Readers should approach what is written in newspapers more consciously and critically, and be aware that:

⁴ See *The Daily Telegraph* (May 17, 1995) «Hurd warns Gibraltar over smuggling laws».

The editorials are clearly not discrete and self-contained meditations on events—they are a continuation and expression of social processes in which the newspaper is engaged... The newspaper itself is not a self-contained institution, but a site at which the views of various combinations of social forces and practices are articulated, an organ which different forces have different degrees of access to and different degrees of influence or control in the determination of the terms in which information is formulated and social reality represented. (Trew 1979:140)

The Foreign Secretary did what the first editorial had predicted/suggested and the second editorial reaffirmed what the Government had declared. But more important than the coincidence in actions is the coincidence in views. Fowler (1991:6) has pointed out that part of the official discourse of the conservative Government and media in the 1980s was characterized by «the paradoxical ideology of conflict and consensus». Social and international relationships were theorized in terms of conflictual oppositions, virtually segregating threatening elements while discourse spoke of national unity of interests and purposes, of consensus. It remains to be seen whether the new Government shares or changes this conception but the problem of Gibraltar pictured by the press holds with this explanation. Obviously, all explanations simplify and this is no exception. There is a three-hundred year dispute and the press is not to blame. But siege and war ended in 1783 and the press insists on verbalizing, and so thinking about the problem as a *war*. The first step towards tackling this problem is to speak of it differently and so think of it differently, or is it the other way round?

REFERENCES

- Fowler, R. 1991: *Language in the News*. London: Routledge.
- Martínez-Dueñas, J.L. 1989: The rhetoric of royal discourses. PALA Conference 1989, University of Nottingham (Unpublished paper).
- Morris, D.S. and R.H. Haigh 1992: *Britain, Spain and Gibraltar, 1945-1990. The Eternal Triangle*. London: Routledge.
- Trew, T. 1979: «What the papers say»: linguistic variation and ideological difference, in R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew 1979: *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Werlich, E. 1976: *A Text Grammar of English*, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.

APPENDIX: HEADLINES

The Daily Telegraph

- «Spanish pressure puts Gibraltar under siege again» (29/11/94).
- «Spanish threat to Rock under Nato shake-up» (13/10/96).
- «Spain 'set to reject Gibraltar passports'» (15/01/97).
- «Rifkind wins border tussle with Spain over Gibraltar» (22/01/97).
- «Passport promise over Gibraltar» (23/01/97).
- «Gibraltar urges EC to fine Spain» (29/01/97).
- «Gibraltar protests to EU» (31/01/97).
- «Spanish hopes will ever be dashed on the Rock» (Opinions) (1/02/97).

«Spanish shoot themselves in the foot» (2/02/97).

«The colony that won't go away» (2/02/97).

The Times

«Spain on course for clash on Gibraltar» (16/01/97).

«Passport practices» (Leading article) (16/01/97).

«Spain retreats over Gibraltar» (23/01/97).

«Trip by Rock chief angers Spain» (28/01/97).

«Spain seeking joint control of Gibraltar» (29/01/97).

«Madrid misreads the Rock» (Opinion) (30/01/97).

«Gibraltar leader calls Spain's plan 'laughable'» (3/02/97).

«Stand by the Rock» (Leading article) (3/02/97).

El País

«España considera que la nueva norma de pasaportes no aislará a los gibraltareños» (17/01/97).

«Londres y Madrid reanudan el diálogo sobre Gibraltar sin expectativa de cambio» (22/01/97).

«España, dispuesta a acudir a los tribunales de la UE si prosperase el DNI de Gibraltar» (23/01/97).

«El Reino Unido rechaza compartir con España la soberanía de Gibraltar» (30/01/97).

«Major rechaza la cosoberanía del Peñón por respeto a los gibraltareños» (31/01/97).

«Tropiezo en el Peñón» (Editorial) (1/02/97).

«El Reino Unido pide a España que levante las restricciones a Gibraltar al integrarse en la OTAN» (16/02/97).

«Gibraltar seguirá siendo británico, afirma el primer gobernador no militar de la colonia» (25/02/97).

