Canterbury
Christ Church
University

Crossing through the Frontier

Theological perspectives on potential political dialogue between Gibraltar and Spain

by

Jeremy Gomez

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis submitted
for the degree of MA by Research

2016

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude as within writing this dissertation I have been blessed with advice and encouragement of many. My first supervisor Dr. Ivan Khovacs who has helped bring this work to fruition and whose advice, whether in academic matters or outside, have always been invaluable. My second supervisor, Prof. Robert Beckford has also been a great source of advice and encouragement, especially in thinking through how the Church should encourage social change, in which this study hopes to do.

Gratitude is also due to the other staff members in the Theology and Religious Studies department in Canterbury Christ Church University. Beyond their tutoring in my undergraduate, which fostered my desire to do postgraduate work, they have also been a fundamental source of knowledge, guidance, and encouragement during and prior to this study.

Finally, thanks is due to my family and friends who have been a persistent source of support and advice. Particularly, my parents who have supported me in a multitude of ways, their encouragement, love and generosity have been persistent throughout this degree.

Also a special thank you to those, outside of the department, who have spent time reading my work and assisting in editing. Both your advice and your observations to improve the work in any way have been a blessing.

Soli Deo Gloria

Abstract

This thesis undertakes a theological analysis of the socio-political tensions between Gibraltarian and Spanish communities. Discussions are focused around the themes of; Identity and Otherness, Church and State relations, and Power. Using these themes, the thesis develops a political theology for the Churches and begins working upon a public theology for the engagement between the Church and the secular world. Since the Spanish Civil war, tensions between the two communities have created a persistent feeling of animosity. This situation creates a new epoch that the Church needs to navigate itself through. The problems expressed in each chapter are analysed in order to consider what *orthopraxy* would be and what needs to be considered for reconciliation to take place. Outside of its immediate focus, this study aims to present a theological reflection of issues that are encountered worldwide. In concluding, this dissertation expresses the importance of history for political theology and that a theological analysis can be a fruitful lens, in which to engage intra- and international issues.

Contents

Introduction

As creatures, God is "wholly other" in a multitude of ways, but there are two keys attributes in

which we are different to God. God, being beyond space and time, is eternally present and

omnipresent. In his being, eternal and omnipresent, his judgments in creation are perfect as the

totality of space and time is present to him. As creatures, we are constrained by our geographical

locality and our place in history. We are not eternal and we are not brought into being from a

vacuous moment, rather we are subject to the history preceding[1] us and the provincial place where

we live. For us, there is, as the American philosopher Thomas Nagel states: "no view from

nowhere[2]" (Nagel,1986, pg.62). There is only a view from somewhere and that place is informed by

history and geography. Ignorance of the context that we inhabit can lead to poor deliberation as a

judgment needs to take into account the reality of the situation that the deliberated action will enter.

A biblical example of ignoring history can be expressed in the story of King Rehoboam, King

Solomon's son. Rehoboam falls into folly during his reign, because "he disregarded the advice that

the older men gave him, and consulted with the young men who had grown up with him and now

attended him" (1 Kings 12:8). What is interesting about Rehoboam's case is that he is not only the

best claimant to the throne, he is also desired as king by the Israelites[3] (12:1) but in disregarding the

advice of the elders, Rehoboam causes Israel to rebel against the House of David. This discord,

between Israel and the House of David, originates in not taking seriously the history of the people.

Whereas in listening to his peers, he only took into account his desire for the present, and by only

looking at the imminent moment Rehoboam treats the present as if it had no history. The present, of

course, is not devoid of meaning but that meaning is informed from moments and generations

before it. This study aims to take into account the wisdom of the elders, by investigating the history

of communities in particular places. Observing the histories of communities does justice to their

past in making present ethical deliberations and in doing that will hopefully lead to a practice and

rather than creating discord it will ideally create reconciled communities. The communities in focus in this study are those of Gibraltar and Spain.

The political decisions that divided the people of Israel from the House of David can be perceived as a model of how ignorance of the historical can divide in the present, which is similar to what we find in the division between Gibraltar and Spain. Interestingly, as will be expressed in the first chapter, the social divisions between these two communities is not derived from the building of a physical border but from the political. After the Spanish Civil war with the rise to power of General Franco, these two communities became divided and have had socio-political tensions because of this. Between these two separate communities, which were previously becoming increasingly harmonious neighbours, division was created. From solidarity expressed linguistically, economically and politically across the border, the relationship was harshly reversed; linguistically, the Gibraltarian community began using English as their predominant language instead of Spanish. Economically, Gibraltar became more dependant on Morocco for trade as opposed to the preceding years where the Gibraltar-Spain border flourished as a trading post. Finally from a political perspective, solidarity was no longer shared along political lines but rather Spanish politics became threatening to Gibraltar through Franco's anti-Gibraltarian policies. In light of Rehoboam's folly, the first chapter surveys the history of these two communities. First, a historical survey depicts the narrative of both communities and the development of their relationship through the 20th Century. Through taking into account themes that pervade the entirety of Gibraltarian and Spanish history, particular attention is given to the watershed moment of Franco's regime obtaining power. The survey then begins focusing upon the ecclesiastical history of the two communities. The ecclesiastical history is the priority of this study as it takes seriously the historical witness of the elders within the Church, observing the actions and sentiments of the church led in the past. In doing this, we can deliberate what is *orthopraxy* in dealing with particular people with particular histories.

The present study aims to address this division by establishing a political and public theology, starting from and for the Church community but also aiming to address actors and structures in the secular world. The political theology of the Church should be an outworking of its true being. To explain this, former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams defines one key aspect of the Christian life as bridge building: "It is a life that looks towards reconciliation, building bridges, repairing shattered relationships" (Williams, 2014, pg.16). The role of the Church is towards partaking in the reconciliation between God and humanity, and between humans (whether individually or collectively), because its true being is of those being reconciled, in Christ, with God (Romans 5:10). In being bridge builders, the Church community must take difference seriously and where possible view difference in a positive way in order to reconcile without diminishing difference. In taking difference and reconciliation seriously, the process of bridge building should hold precedent in the Church's deliberations. In order to do bridge building without diminishing difference the Church needs to be bilingual. Being bilingual means being able to be comprehensible to both sides and to form a relationship across the chasm of difference. In this study, being bilingual and doing it theologically takes a twofold manner; firstly, the Church will need to speak within the their national community to those outside and seek to be reconciled in Christ (Ephesians 2:16). In meeting at the gospel of Christ, we first do an outworking of that gospel message into our actions. This represents the political theology of this project. Secondly, in order to partake in the "ministry of reconciliation" (2 Corinthians 5:18) we will need to speak outside of the Church community; this is where the relevance of public theology is clear. Even within a single community, in order to speak to the national community, the Church needs to do carry out a theological practice in a bilingual fashion. The public theologian Elaine Graham explains the goal of public theology in light of this: "Public theology speaks of itself as 'bilingual' in drawing from resources of its own tradition while listening to, and being comprehensible by, non-theological disciplines" (Graham, 2013, pg.99). Public theology aims to engage the non-theological world despite the differences of

ontology, as ethical and political conceptions are conceived in a worldview, therefore needing a process of translation to communicate. By attempting this twofold ministry, the Church aims to reverse the effects of Rehoboam's folly and reconcile the divided and bring peace to discord. The complex nature of attempting reconciliation in a world of differences is addressed in the second chapter, working in respect of the history expressed in the first chapter.

In the context of ancient Israel, the goal of the king is to order and justice society in light of God's commandments. Throughout the book of 1 Kings, those who govern are assessed as good or bad kings based upon the criteria of God's word. King Rehoboam's time is viewed negatively in the biblical depiction of his life, and the moment described earlier is the defining point of his reign. The Church, likewise, is subject to God's word and aims to outwork order and justice in faithfulness to it. For reasons expressed in Chapter One, the question of Church and state is of importance to the Spanish-Gibraltarian ecclesiastical history. The relationship between Church and state is the focus of chapter four. In respect to the narrative of King Rehoboam, the question of how the Church rules, if it even should, plays a role in comprehending *orthopraxy,* good practice. Regardless, whether established or separated from the state, the Church has a kingly disposition at its core. As Williams explains, the kingly nature of the Church is, "how we freely engaged shaping our lives and our human environment in the direction of God's justice" (Williams, 2014, pg. 16). There is an intrinsic goal that the Church, in its actions and decisions, should seek to order and bring forth justice, even when Church and state are separate, Chapter Three therefore aims to contrast how the two are different in their *praxis* [practice]. Therefore the Church, in this respect, acknowledges the role of the current political system in a liberal, nation-state based society. It sees the state in a pluralistic society as a neutral actor attempting to provide justice to individuals of diverse backgrounds and ethical dispositions. A critical theology for Gibraltar and Spain needs to understand itself as needing to be comprehensible to the neutral state and if it is in an established relationship, such as in the U.K., how it needs to be comprehensible and just to all citizens. In the Spanish Church, we find a

particular type of relationship between Church and state. It is in assessing this relationship that we

find a foundation to discuss what is a faithful place for the Church, when dealing with the state.

King Rehoboam demanded that the Israelites were to work even harder than they had done under

his father, Solomon (1 Kings 12:14). In rebelling, the Israelites "went away to their tents[4]" (1 Kings

12:14). Rehoboam demanded a state of affairs, but the "turn of affairs brought about by the Lord" (1

Kings 12:15) was completely contrary to his will. The Church aims to bring about a state of affairs,

as Rehoboam aimed, but what Rehoboam represents is a forceful demand for a state of affairs to

change. Rehoboam ignores the authority of wisdom and purely asserts his will by force dependent

on the authority of his throne. Conversely, for the Church community an end achieved through force

appears contrary to the very nature of the Christian community, "Blessed are the meek, for they will

inherit the earth." (Matthew 5:5). Additionally, the impression of the humble and meek expresses a

means of change in total opposition to how Rehoboam uses power. Rehoboam demands a state of

affairs derived solely from the authority of his throne, whereas humility is exemplified by Christ

who gives up power (Philippians 2:6-7) and appeals to the authority of the good, true and beautiful.

A paradox appears between the goals of the Church and the means used to achieve the goals, to a

point that it seems counterintuitive. This focus of Chapter Four is on the Church's tension between

power and the call to change societies, when it is called to humility and waiting in hope. The

question of power arises from the Spanish and Gibraltarian churches actions, whether aiming to

achieve states of affairs through means which appears to contradict what faithfulness to Christ

demands, or by attempting to change society from the top down (whether the wealthy and

influential or the state) to those in humble places. The aim of Chapter Four is to explain; where does

power come from for the Church; how can it be accumulated; and how should it be used? First of

all, it explicates where power upon authority can be misinterpreted as power by force and how do

we practice faithfulness in light of that issue. Likewise, it aims to be prophetic speaking to a state of

affairs outside of the Church community, in order to change it. As Williams explains, the prophetic

nature of the Church "is always to be challenging the community to be what it is meant to be, to live out the gift that God has given to it" (Williams, 2014, pg.13). He notes how in order to do that the Church must first realise if there are contradicting elements to the state of affairs it desires to bring about. In this case, the desired aim would be that state of affairs, which has a reconciled community; therefore, it asks if the Church truly is a reconciled community.

The Church community must seek a counter-model to the model of Rehoboam, in order to avoid his folly. But in performing this model in reality, the context is key. As virtue theorist Alasdair MacIntyre states, actions are only intelligible in their context (MacIntyre, 2007, pg.50-1). If we consider the biblical witness, there are polar opposite actions that can be considered a faithful guide to practice. These actions are only intelligible in the context of the narrative. Prophecy or humility, or just retribution or mercy, can be faithful, but only when they are in the context appropriate to those responses. Hence, in beginning this project we begin with the history that has built up to the present moment and from that point of departure analyse what is faithful in light of it. This dissertation aims to contemplate a number of avenues in each chapter in order to be of value to different contexts beyond Gibraltar and Spain. In starting from this point it aims to take seriously that "I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known." (1 Corinthians 13:12). Therefore, from knowing in part through this place and through this moment in time, there is a perspective from which to encounter what it means to be the Church community in history and in faithfulness towards Christ.

Theatrum gloriae Dei

Thematic reflections on Secular and Ecclesiastical history regarding the relationship between Gibraltar and Spain

1. Introduction:

In his book, *The Rock under a Cloud,* the late Bishop of Gibraltar, Charles Caruana suggests:

"the Church understands herself better by seeing herself in history; discovering in the events God's action and pointers to her mission in the world. And thus, each period, in its lights and shadows, will allow us to know the Church and its mission. That's why, by observing history, we are not to remain on the external surface, but are to endeavour to discover what God has manifested at each moment" (Caruana,1989, pg.143).

Each moment of history provides a possibility of new insight into the divine, allowing a new reflection on how to live in light of the Gospel. This reflection on the necessity of analysing history for the well-being of the Church and its mission provides the foundation to this study. In order to continue faithfully in its praxis, the church must 'interpret the present time' (Luke 12:56) in light of sacred and secular history.

2. A Thematic Reading of History:

This is where our first dilemma will arise. Within the trajectory of time, the Church will find itself in new situations, with new questions and new problems, which may not have clear comparisons in the life and teachings of Christ on which to judge the right response or position on a certain subject. In order to ascertain a method that will help to overcome this dilemma, we must present this historical analysis in such a way that best enables us to work out a way to compare history and moral theology. For this reason, we will be using a thematic reading of the historical data as

7

opposed to a chronological reading. The reasons for this are twofold; firstly, it allows the grouping

of historical events into motifs, bringing us into dialogue the themes derived from this history with

a theological standpoint of God's revelation to man (whether explicit or implicit[5]); and secondly, a

thematic reading of history against a chronological one enables us to draw parallels within the

narrative of history rather than investigating events as isolated occurrences.

3. A Theology of History:

The next dilemma to overcome is whether this dialogue between theology and history is a valid

one. Questions such as the relevance of general history to theology, and whether theology can

justifiably provide a reading of history, arise. The Swiss Roman Catholic theologian Hans urs von

Balthasar in his book, *A Theology of History*, provides numerous examples of the important

relationship between the two fields. In his investigation of this subject, von Balthasar pays close

attention to the intricacies of the divide between sacred and secular history; whilst drawing from the

biblical scriptures his theology of history. The presupposition of history to Christian theology is a

fundamental claim to Christianity as God participates in our shared history and Christ lived, died

and rose again in history. Christ enters into history and it is the reality of his historical claim on

which Christianity depends. If it did not happen in our shared history, the apostle Paul states, "our

proclamation has been in vain and your faith has been in vain" (1 Corinthian 15:14). Von Balthasar

reflects this in his own writing, stating, "the sense in which history in general, and salvation history

in particular, is a necessary 'presupposition' making possible the historical character of Christ" (Von

Balthasar, 1994, pg.26). For Von Balthasar, if the Christ of faith is abstracted in any way from the

Christ of History, the validity of the Christian faith is in jeopardy. This is a steep contrast to other

theologians such as the Swiss Reformed theologians Emil Brunner and Karl Barth who suggest,

"These saving events have occurred on a different plan of history from that which secular historical

method can investigate, and consequently the activities of Jesus during his earthly life have at best

only a marginal bearing upon the faith of Christians" (Richardson, 1964, pg.131). This

interpretation of their work gives the impression that their conception of divine action is ahistorical,

but this perceived neglect of divine action within history can become problematic as the historical

nature of Christ is a necessity for doctrines such as the Incarnation, Atonement, and Redemption. If

Christ were anything less than fully present in his historical birth, death and resurrection this would

be problematic theologically.[6] Whereas Barth would differentiate between the Christ of history and

the Christ of faith, as for him, "The incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ merely declare

what has happened eternally" (McGrath, 1986, pg.110). Paul's proclamation appears to disallow

that differentiation. In light of this, Von Balthasar provides a better vision of history and theology.

   Within scripture, examples of God working through other nations expresses general history as the

context for sacred history: "Did I not bring Israel up from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines

from Caphtor and the Arameans from Kir?"[7] (Amos 9:7). Von Balthasar gives three examples of

this relationship between theology and history; the Incarnation, the Sacraments, and the Mission of

the Saints. In focusing on the latter example, Von Balthasar notes for two reasons the necessity of

world history for two reasons in regards to the Saints as they partake in the mission God has set

within history, "For whether praying or acting he is sent with Christ to the world, and he is on his

way, engaged in his mission. This is what distinguishes him radically from the mystic and monk of

the Asian religions, who turns his back on history" (Von Balthasar, 1994, pg.126). By partaking in

history we begin to comprehend further the depth of divine revelation, "The *good* which God does

to us can only be experienced as the *truth* if we share in *performing* it (Jn 7:17; 8:31f)" (Von

Balthasar, 1983, pg.20). In performing in the good that God does, our understanding and even our

ethical character are sanctified. To only limit the revelatory experience to the intellectual and not to

the participatory stunts the saint's ability to see the divine from different historical moments and

places. Rowan Williams, in reference to Von Balthasar's theology, states that, "…knowledge is

essentially participatory not in the sense of a transcendental pre-conscious union of subject and

object, but as recognition of a praxis" (Riches, 1986, pg. 26). This point accentuates Bishop

Caruana's point on history being useful for the self-understanding of the Church as studying the

experiences of previous generations in the Church helps deduce the best form of *praxis*.

4. Theology and History:

We must also look at the relationship between theology and history from the other side, at the

theological reading of history. There are specific elements to the Christian religion which can be

reflected on when looking at history; Christ as the normative person and judge of history; the

teleological nature of history; a biblical understanding of providence and the *eschaton*, the end and

culmination, of history; and the relation between sacred and secular history from a biblical

standpoint. Firstly, the New Testament sets Christ as both the normative person and judge of all

people and history. Von Balthasar expresses this clearly:

> "This relationship as norm can, once again, be regarded from two sides: first as a quality of
>
> him who is the norm, that is Christ, in his universal relation to everything in history, which
>
> is something inherent in himself and in his own personal historicity. Secondly, as a quality
>
> of that which is governed by the norm of Christ: a quality of the Christian and the Church,
>
> and finally of man and of history as a whole" (von Balthasar, 1994, pg.26-7).

Biblical examples of this can be found in the Pauline expression of how Christians are being made

into the image of Christ (2 Corinthians 3:18) and are to live as Christ did (1 John 2:6; 1 Corinthians

11:1; 1 Peter 2:21; Eph. 5:12; John 13:13-17; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 8:29; Matt. 11:29).[8] Another aspect

of Christ participation in history is in his role as Judge[9] and a specific biblical example of is the

doctrine of the Session of Christ. The phrase on being 'seated at the right hand of the father' is a

continual theme throughout the New Testament in reference to Jesus of Nazareth after his

Ascension, both in the Gospels (Matt. 26:64; Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69.) and in the Epistles (Eph.

1:20[10]; Col. 3:1; Heb 8:1, 12:2). Having received all authority to judge the earth (Rev. 19:11),

creation is assessed and justified by Christ's word. Therefore, in acknowledging the doctrine of the

Session of Christ we see that history is under his authority. Von Balthasar also describes how the

saints' participation in God's will in history allows them to be a part of the "measure of judgement",

which Christ is. "In the measure in which his saints have been a force that has shaped history, they

will join with him in being the measure of judgement" (von Balthasar, 1994, pg.79). By being in

Christ, the saints partake in the judgement of history. Prior to any eschatological judgement, the

saints are to join in the redemptive movement, established in history by the Christ event.

   Another aspect of the relationship between theology and history, is how the New Testament points

to a *telos* in history. British theologian Ben Quash, in his book on the relationship of theology and

history, states;

"All history ripples out from (just as its meaning converges *on*) his decisive act in the incarnation

of Jesus Christ... Revelation has a form (Christ's form), part of which is an historical *Tendenz*

(Christ's history). And all things, *all* things, are made sense of in relation to this form" (Quash,

2005, pg.15).

As earlier stated, Christ is the standard and judge of Creation but he is also the goal to which

history progresses, culminating in all things being reconciled in him and by him. This strong

Christological focus in history is also expressed in von Balthasar's work, "It was in view of him that

the venture of having any such thing as a world and world history could be made at all; in view of

him and his Church that such a thing as the creation of man and woman could take place (Eph

5:31-32)" (von Balthasar, 1994, pg.65). Therefore it is in Christ that the Church finds the purpose

for its participation in history.

Penultimately, we must contemplate the question of providence and the last judgement in history. As previously mentioned, throughout the Bible the claim is made that God is working and ordering through and around all historical events. Historian Herbert Butterfield claims in, *Christianity and History*, "when we are discussing Christianity and history; judgement, cataclysm, progress, and tragic conflict, must be a commentary on the ways of Providence" (Butterfield, 1950, pg.93). In seeing history as a commentary on the ways of providence, the theologian brings history into the arena of theological reflection, as done with the natural sciences in natural theology. In light of these rationales for historical reflection in theological discourses we can see how the Bible provides a thorough philosophy of history with its focus on Creation, Fall, Redemption, Promise, and Fulfilment. Interestingly, its eschatological understanding of time also brings purpose and meaning to the relationship of theology and history. Quash argues that:

"According to Christian belief, this relationship with the ultimate is indeed what *constitutes* the historical realm of events, processes and agents. Christianity's belief in a final judgement is a belief that the real value of historical phenomena will ultimately and necessarily be made apparent in the disclosure of their relationship to God's ordering, intention and love. Viewed with this expectation, and talked about in the light of such hope, history takes on a different aspect for Christian thought and Christian theology narrates and explicates history differently as a consequence" (Quash, 2005, pg.3).

The narrative of scripture determines that in being *theatrum gloriae Dei,*[11] history becomes objectively meaningful in a way that humanity cannot thwart and, as Quash states, any moments perceived to be devoid of meaning are disclosed with their real value at the *Eschaton.*

5. Sacred and Secular History:

Finally, the biblical conception of sacred and secular history needs to be detailed, in order to

ascertain its own depiction of the relationship. We have previously demonstrated how sacred history

works within the context of world history. From a theological standpoint this can be expressed in a

more particular way than the doctrine of Providence, as Von Balthasar, again utilising a

Christological focus, demonstrates how the 'wall of partition' between sacred and secular history is

dispensed within Christ, "The "breaking down of the wall of partition" is the annulment of the

distinctions between a particular ("historical") salvation history, and universal secular history. Since

Christ, all history is essentially "sacred" , not least because of the Church's presence and testimony

within that one all-inclusive world history." (von Balthasar, 1994, pg.143). The apostle Paul

describes in Romans 11:19, how the gentiles have been 'grafted' into the New Covenant; von

Balthasar follows the same logic here in regards to history, as the general history of the nations joins

the particular history of Israel in its promise from God, making all of history sacred.

6. A Lens Through Which to Interpret the Historiography:

In order to interpret the Gibraltar-Spanish relationship in history it is necessary to use a lens that

does not reduce history to the process of structures or purely to the agency of individuals. Both

German Idealist philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and von Balthasar[12] depict a dramatic

reading in their works on history. A dramatic reading, as Quash expresses:

"draws theology's attention to three central concerns. These concerns are with the character of

agency (the *people* dimension); its necessary conditions (or 'context', roughly equivalent to the

place dimension); and the way in which such agency may or may not be related to (and narratable

in the form of) a wide 'plot' (the *time* dimension)" (Quash, 2005, pg. 4).

In using a dramatic reading of history, the freedom of humanity is not reduced simply to the influences of its social environments nor is the importance of how these structures influence and determine the socio-political attitudes forgotten.[13] As the historical reading will seek to depict, history is not solely determined by agents or structures, but rather a dramatic interplay between the two. As such, in the Gibraltar-Spain history, a drama is being acted out.

7. A Historical Survey of the Two Communities:

7a. Positive Themes:

The drama enacted in the history between Gibraltar and Spain contains a number of themes that appear to have influenced the relationship as it is today. The first and most important theme to look at is identity, and the development of a distinct but similar Gibraltarian identity in contrast to a Spanish and British identities. The study of identity is foundational in beginning this critical theology as it begins identifying the actors and how translation between them will need to take place. The development of the Gibraltarian identity is fundamental as its similarities and differences from the Spanish and British identity has caused tension. The Gibraltarian identity, with its similarities to the Spanish, is one aspect that even today continues to be an argument used by those who support the Spanish claim to the Rock.[14] The historian of Gibraltarian history Gareth Stockey, whose work specifically focuses on Gibraltarian history, notes how the distinctiveness of the Gibraltarian identity over and against a British or Spanish identity can be perceived:

> "It is clear that Gibraltar and its people could strike the outsider as unexpected. Those who arrived in the colony, be they traveller, tourist, or imported colonial official, with preconceived ideas about this 'British' Rock were often unprepared for the scenes that greeted them upon arrival. It could, and often did, lead some to the conclusion that Gibraltar had a 'half-Spanish' feel to it; that the civilian population was Spanish in all but name.

Other visitors, however, could have precisely the opposite reaction to Gibraltar and its

people. In particular, travellers who arrived at Gibraltar from Spain, rather than Britain,

often left very different accounts of their impressions of the Rock" (Stockey, 2009, pg.19).

Early on in its history, the civilian population of Gibraltar was made up of a number of different

communities mainly from within the Mediterranean and British Isles as well as immigrants from

France and the Netherlands (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.14-5). The difference made on Gibraltar

in its transition from Spanish to British sovereignty led Spanish Historian Ignacio López de Ayala to

remark that, " The changes and alterations it had undergone during this period, in buildings,

fortifications, religion, manners and customs, rendered it impossible to be recognised as the city that

was lost in 1704'" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.18). The variety of ethnic and religious groups in

early British Gibraltar are still observable today, but have led to a specific Gibraltarian identity that

regardless of ancestry or religion, all can identify with. Particularly interesting is the recognisable

Spanish influence that still remains today. The Spanish influence on the Gibraltarian identity is of

importance for this study as a certain trajectory of the two communities gradually diverging is often

focused upon by historians and expected by both communities. Stockey suggests that, "This

analysis of the frontier, as a process which could blur the identities and loyalties of the communities

on either side of it, runs counter to traditional historiographical interpretations of Gibraltar and the

Campo in this period" (Stockey, 2009, pg.227).

Though the implementation of the frontier may not be the cause of the socio-political divide found

in the 20th century, Stockey does point to two historical moments that provide explanation for the

divide. The first point is the evacuation during the Second World War. Partially due to the departure

from Gibraltar and separation from their Spanish neighbours for an extensive period of time, but

also as a result of the evacuation there "has been identified by historians… an increased use in the

English language by Gibraltarians after 1945" (Stockey, 2009, pg.182). The anglicising of the

Gibraltarian community, in this period of the evacuation, is clearly a divergence from the Spanish

influence especially as the civilian lower-class population spoke almost entirely in Spanish. The

linguistic transition in the Gibraltarian community appears to be evidence of a moment of clear

divergence. However it must be noted that this apparent "irreversible process of

'Anglicisation'" (Stockey, 2009, pg.183) is too simplistic an explanation as Chris Grocott and

Gareth Stockey state: "Indeed, as late as 1951, fewer than 65 per cent of Gibraltarians could speak

English" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.90). The clearer source of social divergence is the closing of

the Gibraltar-Spain frontier by the Franco regime: "attempts to define Gibraltarian identity against a

Spanish 'other' are a relatively new feature dating back to the closure of the frontier between 1969

and 1985[15]" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.3). The closure of the frontier was not only a physical

separation between communities, but also between families.[16] It is significant too that this was only

the culmination of Franco's anti-Gibraltarian policy; for years prior to this moment anti-Gibraltarian

propaganda was being circulated through the media and schools. This persisted throughout the

Second World War but became more virulent after the Queen's visit in 1954.[17]

In recent years, there has also been a move to make the Gibraltarian identity distinctive against a

British identity.[18] This occurred due to fears that Britain would supersede its sovereignty on

Gibraltar to the Spanish, despite the overwhelming voice of Gibraltar's population (Grocott &

Stockey, 2012, pg.104), and in part due to the economic independence Gibraltar has been

developing (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.117).

The Spanish influence on the Gibraltarian identity prior to the 1950s expresses how the two

communities were closely-knit for the time prior to the frontier closure. The ties that bound these

two communities were birthed from a reciprocal dependency not in spite of tensions but rather as a

foundation for the social, cultural, political and familial ties between the two communities. The

depth of this dependency will become more apparent when we look at the social and political ties,

but here we will focus primarily on economic dependency as well as examples of support of

refugees or against mutual foes.

Firstly, the economic relationship has been clear from the beginning of the two separate

communities' relationship. The size and landscape of Gibraltar necessitated outside help in terms of

resources[19] and, in return Gibraltar offered both a place of employment (Grocott & Stockey, 2012,

pg.55) to be found and a trading post (both legal and illegal[20]). Stockey comments on the latter:

"Economic difference, and the subsequent legal and illegal economic interaction between the two

communities, served as a stimulus for other forms of interaction, and made the relationship,[21]which

crossed the frontier, an intimate, and increasingly intimate one"(Stockey, 2009, pg.4). The cross-

border cooperation can also be observed on a political scale, such as in the case of Spanish political

refugees. Spaniards using Gibraltar as a political refuge is noted in the Historian Raymond Carr's

'*Spain: A History*' describing the early 20th century, "Thousands of liberal refugees now lived in

Gibraltar, London, and Paris" (Carr, 2000, pg.204). In fact, refugee camps were established on the

isthmus between Gibraltar and Spain. Gibraltar was also used as a refuge by those on the opposing

side of the political spectrum, especially during the early months of the Civil War, as the Campo

was one of the first areas to fall to counter-revolutionary forces. Military support was also provided

in the case of General Castaños[22] who sought help from Gibraltar when fighting against Napoleon's

forces (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.31).

On this bedrock of dependency close ties formed between the two communities. A strong

presentation of this was the high level of intermarriage.[23] [24] The level of social interaction was high

throughout the period between Gibraltar's first century under British sovereignty and the frontier

closure. As the British journalist and historian George Hills notes an example of a tradition that

developed known as the Calpe Hunt established in the early 1800s, between British officers and

Spanish landowners, expressing the cordial nature between the Colonial authorities and the Spanish

upper classes (Hill, 1974, pg. 370). There is also evidence of British influence in the Campo: " the

permeation of British influences across the frontier was demonstrated by the many Georgian-style residences built for the Gibraltar moneyed class in the Campo" (Stockey, 2009, pg.226). Likewise there was a strong Spanish influence in Gibraltar's cultural events, particularly in theatre and literature enjoyed by the civilian community. It is also possible to argue that prior to the end of the Civil War, allegiance was stronger in terms of ideology rather than nationality. There is plenty of evidence, specifically in the 20th century, that highlights cooperation between political comrades across the border. As Stockey states, "Shared 'identities' based upon social class began to override ethnic and nationalistic concerns," (Stockey, 2009, pg.6-7) expressing a strong level of empathy for the situations of those on both sides of the frontier. Of particular interest is how during and after the Spanish Civil War these ties only grew stronger.[25] As mentioned previously, political refugees were protected in Gibraltar, but interestingly a large portion of the refugees were given shelter in the homes of Gibraltarians of the same ideological views. Even Gibraltar's politics were framed in the language of Spain's politics, for instance: "the campaigns for the 1936 city council election was couched in terms of the ideological struggle in Spain"[26] (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.67).

7b. Negative Themes:

So far, we have depicted historical moments, where the two communities have a clear, established, mutual affection, but in taking the historical effect on the present moment seriously we cannot ignore the antagonistic elements between the two communities and argue to return to these optimistic moments. Therefore, in order to outline a theology that will do justice we must look at the negative themes that appear in the Gibraltar-Spanish history.

The first of these themes, uniformity and nationalism, expressed particularly a narrative or rhetoric that is followed when looking at developing a 'true' Spanish identity by the Franco regime. This concept of the *recuperación*[27] is of utmost importance, a regaining of what was lost territorially and a recovery from the effects that this has had. An example of this mentality is a statement by

Franco's Minster of the Interior, Ramón Serrano Suñer, on Gibraltar: "Franco's Spain intends to solve the problem of Gibraltar; as long as the British flag flies on Gibraltar, Spain will not be a free and completely sovereign nation. The Youth of Spain lives in the desire and hope of pushing Britain into the sea, and is getting ready to do so" (Stockey, 2009, pg.135). In fact, from 1704 onwards there has always been a concern that with the British sovereignty of Gibraltar, there would be an influx of Protestants and Freemasons bringing both spiritual and moral corruption to Catholic Spain.[28] This has long been a concern for the Spanish authorities as exemplified in the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 acknowledging the British sovereignty of Gibraltar. Article X states: "And Her Britannic Majesty, at the request of the Catholic King, does consent and agree, that no leave shall be given under any pretence whatsoever, either to Jews or Moors, to reside or have their dwellings in the said town of Gibraltar" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.165). Specifically religious uniformity as expressed in the Treaty was sought after not only in relation to Gibraltar but throughout Spain[29] and this persisted during Franco's regime's desire of seeking a 'true' Spain:

> "The overt objective of the repression was to rid Spain of the systems and ideologies that had 'corrupted' her 'true identity'. Among these were democracy, atheism, and, at least in the early years of the regimes, capitalism as a liberal market system... The most immediate enemies were the communists, Jews, and freemasons who had been feeding on the decaying body of Spain. The true Spain was to be sought in the imperial and hierarchal traditions of the Catholic Kings" (Carr, 2000, pg. 265-6).

Gibraltar, in contrast, has from early on in its British history been extremely diverse in its ethnic and religious groups[30] not necessarily due to a liberal attitude but rather out of necessity.[31] In fact, it could be argued that the British attitude to difference was similar to that of Spain.[32]

The pragmatic attitude that developed the multi-cultural foundation of Gibraltar is one example of how the negative themes expressed are not intrinsically negative. The theme of pragmatism will also be discussed in the ecclesiastical history of Gibraltar and Spain; but Franco was an exemplar of this, as professor of contemporary Spanish studies, Sebastian Balfour states: "Franco's own ideology was deeply conservative but it was subordinate to the perpetuation of his own power" (Carr, 2000, pg.265). Franco's political pragmatism can be clearly seen in his neutral stance during the Second World War (Spain's weakness due to the Civil War was another reason for Spain's neutrality, but Franco's loyalties appear to depend on who the winning side was and what could be gained from his loyalty). After moving from a position of neutrality to a new policy of non-belligerence (June 12th, 1940) showing solidarity with the Axis, only to later change, "In a subsequent phase of weakened Axis power, Franco would insist that this merely expressed Spain's sympathy for Germany without changing the actual terms of neutrality" (Payne, 1987, pg.267-8). Historian of the Franco era, Stanley Payne also notes some of the goals Franco's regime had in mind during WWII included: "overcoming international dependency through autarchist economic development, but also at regaining Gibraltar from Britain and possibly maintaining the modest Spanish possessions in northwest Africa at the expense of France"[33] (Payne, 1987, pg.267).

Franco's Gibraltar policy was a fundamental reason for why these tensions between Gibraltar and Spain continue. According to Grocott and Stockey, "it is nonetheless possible to argue that Spanish governments since 1975 have followed many of the policy tracks laid down by Franco in regards to Gibraltar" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.117). This is most likely due to Franco's propaganda campaign, through education and the media, to establish Franco's Gibraltar policy as a conservative Spanish position (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.118). Therefore, the determining factors between the earlier themes of mutual respect and reciprocity and the later antagonism are founded upon the Franco regime's policies.

4. Spanish Ecclesiastical History:

The ecclesiastical history of Gibraltar and Spain presents interesting themes within both

Gibraltarian and Spanish churches that permeate both sides. An interesting aspect of Spanish church

history is how, as the French journalist Edouard de Blaye states, within the last century there have

been two Roman Catholic churches in Spain. Writing in 1976 he mentions: "The Catholic Church,

which is the other principle pillar of the régime besides the army, has undergone such a radical

transformation in the last ten years or so that one can without hesitation speak today of there being

two Churches in Spain: the official Church, and the parallel one" (de Blaye, 1976, pg.407). The

parallel church is so distinct from the first in regards to its political engagement that de Blaye

describes it as a *'volte-face'* (de Blaye, 1976, pg.418), and Balfour describes it from General

Franco's position as a 'stab in the back' (Carr, 2000, pg.270). De Blaye's 'official church' can be

observed to have a strong collusion with the Nationalist counter-revolution and then the regime that

followed. The reasons for the Church's support of the Nationalists derives mainly from one main

factor; during the time of the Republican government a violent concentration of anticlericalism

occurred. Spanish historian José María Sánchez describes the anticlerical violence during the Civil

War as "the greatest clerical bloodletting in the entire history of the Christian church" (Sánchez,

1987, pg.8). The Nationalists perhaps looked like a refuge for the clergy.[34] In light of this

possibility, Historian Maria Thomas' article on the construction of anticlerical collective identities

provides a sobering analysis on why anticlerical sentiments were so strong in Spain; "anticlerical

sentiment was widespread among urban workers, many of whom associated the Church with the

reactionary politics of the previous monarchial regime,[35] and with ethically reprehensible

characteristics like dishonesty and corruption"[36] (Thomas, 2013, pg.74). Anticlericalism appears to

be a force in the Church's support of the Nationalists, but it is necessary to point out how

anticlerical sentiments arose because of the Church's clear collusion with a repressive state in the

first place. This is a pattern that continued prior to the restoration monarchy (1874-1923) and even

during the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera (1923-1930). It is clear here that anticlericalism, rather

than being a cause that led to collusion between Church and state, was rather a consequence of this

collusion.[37]

Thomas' study also highlights the level of influence the Church exercised during times of a strong

relationship between Church and state in Spain. Here we find a link between themes of pragmatism

in hope of power and influence, by using a repressive state to broaden its influence. A clear

expression of this is the Concordat of 1953 signed between the Church and Franco:

> "In the first place, the Church was recognised as possessing the status of a 'perfect
>
> society', which meant that 'the Church is in itself a society whose existence is
>
> acknowledged by the state on a footing of complete equality. To my knowledge never
>
> before or since has a Church been accorded such a status within a state.' The second
>
> advantage was this: 'The Church is endowed with many privileges, financial, fiscal and also
>
> jurisdictional, thus, its clergy are exempted from military service and its publications from
>
> censorship', the latter being a most remarkable exemption in a country where censorship of
>
> the press is used as a political weapon. The third advantage was the granting to the Church
>
> of 'direct control over the youth through the medium of education[38]'". (In the immediate
>
> post-war years, 80 per cent of secondary pupils were attending religious schools) (de Blaye,
>
> 1976, pg.412).

In return Franco received the 'right of presentation' of Bishops[39] (Article 7). This was not the only

benefit Franco gained from the relationship, as it also allowed him to interfere in ecclesiastical

matters for his advantage. One example is the forbidding of the Papal Encyclical, *Mit brennender

Sorge,* which condemned the actions of his Nazi allies.[40] This intrusion into Church life was also

seen in regards to his Gibraltar policy, "children in the Campo were taught to pray each day for the

return of Gibraltar to Spain" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.100). This relationship between Church

and state is still embodied in the Catholic movements such as Opus Dei, where the members are

encouraged to take up positions of power and influence. The Catholic Church in general has

increased in its influence in recent times specifically with the *Partido Popular* (Popular Party), who

are currently in power. The relationship is mainly observed on laws regarding moral or educational

issues (Cala, 2013).

The 'parallel church', as described by de Blaye, expresses clear changes in thought and practice. It

is arguable that the defining point in the Church's *metanoia* was the Second Vatican Council.

Balfour depicts these differences: "From the most ardent defender of the regime, the church became

an outspoken critic from within, spurred on not just by the change in world Catholicism after the

Second Vatican Council but also by the radicalisation of its lay organisations and urban priests. In

1971 the church voted to ask forgiveness from the Spanish people for its role in the Civil War, and

in 1973 the bishops asked for the separation of the church and the state" (Carr, 2000, pg.270). The

1953 Concordat[41] was rescinded and the state's injustices were condemned in sermons across the

nation. Sermons across Spain began taking on a prophetic approach to social and political issues;

this progression finds its origins among young Spanish priests but later is evident in the sermons

and writings of Spanish bishops.[42]

5. Gibraltarian Ecclesiastical History:

In British Gibraltar, we no longer find a monolithic ecclesiastical history as Anglicans and

Methodists appear in Gibraltar with the colonial authorities. However there are similarities within

the Roman Catholic hierarchy, particularly with Bishop Fitzgerald. The Gibraltarian church had a

close relationship with those situated in privilege and influence,[43] the Colonial authorities and the

moneyed class. We find evidence of a nurturing attitude to the poorer members of society in

Caruana's book, such as Bishop Hughes' fight to remove a marriage fee for those marrying

individuals from outside of Gibraltar, or Bishop Scandella's educational and customs reforms.[44]

Support can also be seen for the Nationalist cause in Spain where, "a steady flow of propaganda

[came] from the pulpit against the new Spanish government. Originally, this took the form of

sermons from visiting Spanish clergymen and prelates, such as the Bishop of Málaga after the

anticlerical disturbances, who were residing with members of the local church. Increasingly,

throughout the following years, the Gibraltarian Roman Catholic Church, particularly through the

Bishop of Gibraltar John FitzGerald,[45] showed its own hostility to the Republic from the

pulpit[46]" (Stockey, 2009, pg.74). It must be noted that within the Christian denominations present in

Gibraltar, the Roman Catholic Church was not alone in its support for the Nationalist cause; the

Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar was known by the Nationalist movement for his support of their cause

in the press and was noted by the movement to have "always been favourable to our

movement" (Stockey, 2009, pg.100). The Methodist minister at the time of the Spanish Civil War,

Padre Brown, appears to have been more sympathetic to the Republic, or at least to have remained

more neutral than his counterparts and this was considered to be due to his having been "blacklisted

by the Campo authorities and subjected to intimidation and threats throughout the Spanish Civil

War, merely for having assisted a number of republican refugees in the colony" (Stockey, 2009, pg.

100).

6. When the Frontier Re-Opened:

After the frontier re-opened in February 1985, we can find reconciliation movements among the

clergy within the Catholic Church on both sides of the border during the leadership of Bishop

Bernard Devlin.[47] In a similar vain, the congregations of Gibraltar and Spain have sought to work

together to lessen political tensions between the two communities. In a local newspaper, it was

perceived that in recent attempts to join communities at the Frontier, the Spanish Church's lack of

participation, after agreeing to a particular procession, was perceived to be the result of its fear of

making a political statement (Olivero, 2013).

6. Conclusion:

This chapter has demonstrated that the shared history of these two communities, which contains

both positive and negative themes, contains both mutual dependency and, occasionally, mutual

affection. A history containing mutual dependency and, occasionally, mutual affection. It is also a

history with strong antagonisms, which have led to social and physical divisions. The Churches

within these communities had a variety of responses to the socio-political situations and these

responses are not only designated by denominational differences, but are affected by their

environments and times. From the themes found and investigated in this chapter, we can begin

reflecting upon a political theology for these communities and to see whether this *praxis* is

orthopraxis within a biblical conception of ethics.

Patria Mori

<u>National identity and otherness</u>

1. Introduction:

After surveying the history of the two communities and the relationship between them, we must

begin engaging with themes prevalent to this specific case. The question of identity, and more

specifically national identity, is an important facet of the socio-political tensions between the

Gibraltarian and Spanish communities. Furthermore, issues of our identity and otherness demand

theological reflection. The Croatian Protestant theologian Miroslav Volf in his study on identity and

otherness, *Exclusion and Embrace*, reflects upon the ethnic cleansing of recent times: "Various

kinds of cultural 'cleansings' demand of us *to place identity and otherness at the centre of

theological reflection on social realities*" (Volf, 1996, pg.17). In global history where violence

grounded upon racial and national lines is recurring, theologians cannot ignore the issue of identity

and otherness especially if we aim to engage with society from a theological perspective. However,

the question of identity and otherness does not simply approach the theologian due to history but

rather the question of identity and relationships confronts us from the biblical text.

2.Theological and Philosophical Surveys of the Concepts of Nationhood, Identity and Otherness:

Beginning with the creation accounts in Genesis stating that humanity was made in the image of

God, and that in respect of mankind's existence, 'It is not good that the man should be alone' (Gen

2:18), God creates Eve for Adam to be in a relationship with and this relationship is a gift from

God. The understanding that humanity was made in *Imago Dei* has spawned a number of reflections

on what this actually means; one influential perspective is the relational view of the *Imago Dei*

theologian Marc Cortez explains in his book on theological anthropology: "the true meaning of the

Imago is to be found in 'relations.' That is, human persons are fundamentally relational beings —

related to God, to other humans, and to creation — and it is this relationality that truly images a

God who is himself a relational being[48]" (Cortez, 2010, pg.24). The Trinitarian God, in the image

of whom Christians believe man is made, is a perfect community of the Father, Son, and Holy

Spirit; this suggests that a disruption in relationships between human beings is inherently

problematic from an ontological perspective. This explicit notion derived from the *Imago Dei* about

the importance of good relationships is implicit throughout scripture, as German Lutheran

theologian Eberhard Jüngel points out; "In the Old Testament, man's life is determined by his

relationships laid down in the law: relationships to one's neighbour, to the nation, to oneself, and to

God. Men may seek to obscure and dissolve the simplicity of these relationships. The attempt to do

this is what the Old Testament calls sin" (Nelson, 2011, pg.62-3). In Job 35:8, Elihu reflects upon

the consequences of our ethical disposition, "Your wickedness affects others like you, and your

righteousness, other human beings[49]". The Judeo-Christian commandment of loving one's

neighbour (Levi 19:18; Mark 12:31; Matt 22:39) is another reflection of this and a misapplication of

this notion can rupture relations at all levels of the global community. Historian of Spanish religious

culture, Frances Lannon, in her study of the Spanish church, notes how "In the most exhaustive

compilation of data made in the 1970s, researchers estimated that 36% of believing Catholics

rejected the idea that love of neighbour should be a fundamental norm governing the daily

behaviour" (Lannon, 1987, pg.35). The neglect of a daily observance to the precept of loving one's

neighbour can, expectedly, affect the construction of individual and a collective identity. Social

psychologist Karina Korostenlina, whose work focuses social identity and memory, depicts the

importance relationships have on identity formation:

"Research shows that social identity, rather than being primordially intrinsic and inherent, is

socially constructed and influenced by the processes of existing social structures. Postmodern

27

theories have radically challenged the traditional conceptions of identity by arguing that the idea of

the immutable and invariable person in the liberal humanistic approach is anachronistic and

incomplete. Conceptions of the person should be expanded to acknowledge that identity is socially

determined and in an evolving state of flux"[50] (Korostenlina, 2007, pg.15).

This permits us to postulate that current social climates are not merely present constructions but

rather are also reflections of past conceptions of the relationship between one's identity and those

who are Other to us, and conceptions that may feed future generations ideas of this relationship.[51]

The eminent American theologian and philosopher Reinhold Niebuhr impresses the importance of a

community's ethical standard on the individual's moral growth further, by stating in *The Self and*

the Dramas of History that, "The community in which he lives sets the standard by which he judges

himself[52]" (Niebuhr, 1956, pg.26). Therefore, the social environment created by the community

informs the individual on his ethical deliberation.

In reflecting more acutely on this matter of ethics within relationships, we have so far looked at the

negative repercussions of unethical relationships, but, according to French philosopher Emmanuel

Levinas, there is an intrinsic virtue in doing good (the Work) to the Other: in his philosophical study

on otherness, Levinas writes: "The Other concerns me despite myself" (Levinas, 2006, pg.57). In

understanding the relationship between one's identity and the Other in the Gibraltar-Spain context,

it is necessary to look at how the patriotism of the two communities affects this relationship with

the Other. In order to do this we must look at what it means, theologically, to be patriotic. The

relationship between particularism and universalistic tendencies within the Bible is reflected upon

by the professor of religion, Steven Grosby, in his book *Biblical Ideas of Nationality*: "The problem

of what it means to be chosen within the context of reorganising one God of all of humanity,

monotheism or as Jacob Talmon formulated the tension-filled relation, 'the unique and the

universal' is, perhaps, the problem *par excellence* of the Hebrew Bible"(Grosby, 2002, pg.5). In

observing this tension within the history of Israel, what does it mean for people in current times to be patriotic? Has the current cultural *zeitgeist* of seeking to dissolve differences proven that loyalty to a particular nation is a foundation for conflict? Are our borders social constructs, which create dichotomies of 'Us' and 'Them'? Is love of country an idolatrous love?

Political scientist Benedict Anderson in his book on origins of nationalism, *Imagined Communities*, states that nations are social solidarities created through linguistic homogeneity: "The most important thing about language is its capacity for generating imagined communities, building in effect *particular solidarities*" (Anderson, 1991, pg.133). Political philosopher Steven Grosby's book on nationalism, he becomes more specific about what creates nations: "The nation is a social relation with both temporal depth[53] and bounded territory" (Grosby, 2005, pg.11). This particular solidarity instead of a universal solidarity is very significant in regards to international relations; "Above all, the very idea of 'nation' is now nestled firmly in virtually all print-languages; and nation-ness is inseparable from political consciousness" (Anderson, 1991, pg.135). According to Anderson, the concept of the nation state is a modern construction; therefore reflecting biblically on this issue would be difficult as there is not an equivalent in the scriptures. This perspective has been disputed; according to Grosby, Israel can justifiably be considered a nation. In fact, "At some point in their history, the ancient Israelites evidently understood themselves to have been an *'am* and a *gôy*. The Hebrew terms *'am* and *gôy* which appear repeatedly throughout the Old Testament have been translated respectively as 'people' and 'nation'" (Grosby, 2002, pg.15). To this we can include 'temporal depth' in seeing themselves as descendants of Abraham, as well as the celebration of historical events such as the Exodus, and we can include bounded territory, "Note that the term 'Israel' applies both to the 'people' and to the 'land.' This terminological 'conflation' represents a 'conjoining' of a people to a land" (Grosby, 2002, pg.24).

3. An Investigation into the Concept of Nationalism:

3a. The Dangers of Nationalism:

In light of ascertaining that the Bible account has evidence of nationalism, we can begin bringing

into engagement concepts of love of country and identity within the Biblical canon and the history

of the Gibraltarian-Spanish relationship. In both communities there is a preservationist quality in

their patriotism, whether it is the Gibraltarian development of an identity that is both Other to a

Spanish identity and an British identity, thus unique to Gibraltar; or the historical persistence of

seeking a homogeneity within Spain's borders.[54] This preservationist quality is identifiable in the

Hebrew Bible such as, in God's call for Israel to be Holy and set apart (Exodus 19-24[55]) or in Ezra

and Nehemiah's postexilic call for Jewish men to divorce their non-Jewish wives, there appears to

be a biblical precedent in preserving identity. Naturally, in light of the violent nationalisms of the

last century and the growing globalisation of the world's communities, this concept of preserving a

nation's identity can seem dangerous. In describing the thesis of her book, *The Curse of Cain*,

professor of literature and religion Regina Schwartz substantiates the concern that national

identities, and the boundaries they formulate, are not only the foundations of violence but are

intrinsically an act of violence. Schwartz states: "It locates in identity formation, arguing that

imaginary identity as an act of distinguishing and separating from others, of boundary making and

line drawing, is the most frequent and fundamental act of violence we commit" (Schwartz, 1997,

pg.5). Perpetuating a separate identity in the first place and maintaining it, for Schwartz, is the root

of violence. In perpetuating a separate identity we thus construct an oppositional Other and this

Other is a perceived threat to our survival. Schwartz finds the reason for the danger of preserving

identities and constructing Others in a principle of scarcity; "When everything is in short supply, it

must all be competed for — land, prosperity, power, favor, even identity itself" (Schwartz, 1997, pg.

xi) and the principle of scarcity drives these imagined identities to violence.[56] Scarcity as a cause of

violence is well-reasoned, especially in terms of the Darwinian notion of 'natural selection' where a struggle[57] may come about in order to survive: "Two canine animals, in a time of dearth, may be truly said to struggle with each other which shall get food and live" (Bates & Humphrey, 1957, pg. 137). Thus in creating collective identities, violence occurs between groups in the battle over land and resources. Though there is no such violence between Gibraltar and Spain, the antagonism is there and in reading the situation through Schwartz, it is possible that the patriotism and the preservationist quality of the collective identities is the cause of antagonism. Schwartz's work is fundamentally theological and thus stipulates that the principle of scarcity can be found in the Bible in terms of the scarcity of God's love, and thus why God had to choose Abel over Cain (Schwartz, 1997, pg.3). Drawing from this, Schwartz proceeds to suggest that God's election of Israel is an explanation of violence (feelings of election are not solely found in Israel,[58] and are suggested in Spanish history[59]). Another threat from nationalism and the aspiration to preserve identity is that it may heighten the issue of dualisms that are implicitly plausible when creating difference and establishing boundaries: "F. Barth (1981) defines social identity as a product of the process of border formation: it is articulated at the boundary and is defined and moderated by the contrast between 'them' and 'us'[60]" (Korostenlina, 2007, pg.16). This issue of dualism, arising at the establishment of borders, creates a binary of *us* and *them*. It can be perceived as a breaking of solidarity, but more problematic is how a dualism of *good* and *evil* can be read onto the binary of *us* and *them*. This dualism depicts those who are in the opposition as pure evil and the cause of problems encountered, in contrast to our pure goodness. This boundary does not have to be a literal territorial boundary but can also be perceived within many forms of difference; whether political, social or racial differences. This can be exemplified within the 20th century Spanish Church that tended to read this dualism between themselves and their political opponents; "There was no political uniformity, but the Manichean divide between right and wrong, truth and error, was absolute, and it matched precisely the military divide between victors and vanquished" (Lannon,

1987, pg.223). On the level of international relations between Gibraltar and Spain these dualisms appear both from the Gibraltarian perspective seeing the Spanish as irrational and corrupt as opposed to their rationality or innocence,[61] and Spain's reading of internal problems as due to the existence of Gibraltar. Stockey provides an example during Franco's regime, explaining that "Articles and broadcasts attempted to demonstrate that the Rock represented and facilitated the economic, political and moral corruption of the Spanish nation" (Stockey, 2009, pg.215). This issue, though less ferociously, is still recurring within the Spanish media.[62] This provides an important point to reflect upon, for placing the blame on those who are other to us is known as scapegoating, which derives its name from the account of the day of atonement in Leviticus 16:21: "confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat". The French philosopher and anthropologist René Girard's conception of scapegoating explains the reason for placing the blame on a third party; applying the fault for a mimetic crisis (a crisis when within a collective a desire is imitated and the desire is fought over) onto a third party, so that the crisis is extinguished[63] (Depoortere, 2008, pg.42). During Franco's regime, placing the blame for all crises that may arise within Spain outside of Spain and onto Gibraltar, responsibility and blame could be expiated. This is evidently a rationale to use those who are other to us as a means to preserving our selves, which is a steep contrast to the pervasive ethic, within scripture, of loving our neighbour and those who are other to us despite ourselves. In using those who are other to us as means to our end, we place our collective as the ultimate when considering our ethical deliberation. In *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture,* theologian H. Richard Niebuhr depicts the danger of this:

"The doctrine of supremacy of a special group is a faith, too, in the sense that it expresses loyalty to a cause and a community. The accompaniment of the denigration of other groups is always the call of solidarity in the supposedly superior group" (Niebuhr, 1960, pg.76)

The absolutising of one group in ethical deliberations, for Niebuhr, is a deification of the collective and is a pagan interpretation of the group[64] as the group becomes a god among other gods. It becomes paganism as it holds the supremacy of the particular over and against the universality of monotheism. Inevitably, holding one group supreme can be a potentially dangerous notion for the individual even within the collective as the group's vitality is held against the individual's, or even morality in general becomes subservient to the vitality of the nation.[65] Attesting to this critique leaves Ezra's policy on inter-marriage questionable (Ezra 9-10) as individuals were left behind or called to leave their spouses for the sake of the collective, as Judaism scholar Robert Eisen suggests, in his study of peace and violence in the Hebrew tradition: "This action could easily be classified as structural and psychological violence" (Eisen, 2011, pg.31). This places the individual within the collective in a similar place as other nations that are used as scapegoats as both become means to the deified collective. By making those inside and around the collective means to the deified collective, we find an analogy to a conception of sin prevalent in Christian theology, which depicts the individual self as self-seeking and supreme against all relations and neighbours.[66]

3b. The Reality and Benefits of National Identity:

Though collectives being self-seeking, *Incurvatus in Se*, they are not a necessary factor of collective identities. What is problematic for Schwartz's thesis on collective identities is that she assumes that because national identity is a social construction and are therefore unnecessary. However, one does not necessarily lead to the other, since as Grosby states, "The nation is a social relation of collective self-consciousness," (Grosby, 2005, pg.10) and though it is formulated through social constructions, "It has acquired reality"(Grosby, 2002, pg.198). It is a social construction built from social relations among those who share attributes in common and are constructed in interaction with those who do not share those attributes[67] (Volf, 1996, pg.30-33). Moreover, the

principle of scarcity is not merely a problem for collective identities but also for individual identities. The removal of collective identities does not lead to an upheaval of the principle of scarcity and among individual identities the Darwinian struggle would persist. As a matter of fact, the opposite could be argued, as by establishing a collective identity, a kinship is formed establishing peace intra-nationally.; but the issue among groups still remains on an international level. One way of repudiating this issue (and the problem of dualism found in the binary of *us* and *them*) is by looking at one of the end goals of the Abrahamic Covenant, Genesis 12:3, which stipulates that "in you [Abraham] all the families of the earth shall be blessed." The focus of the Abrahamic Covenant is beyond itself, it seeks the blessing of all families and through this Abraham's descendants will be blessed. This is in contrast to the collective seeking its blessing at the expense of others. Proceeding from the Abrahamic Covenant, God then establishes the Mosaic Covenant after the Exodus of the Hebrews. The preservationist attribute, found in the Gibraltar-Spain history, is apparent in the election of the Hebrews, as they are called to be set apart and made distinct. However, according to the Old Testament scholar Michael A. Grisanti, the preservationist goal is not an end in itself; "From the very outset, this divinely-intended distinctiveness carried with it worldwide implications. By conducting their lives in conformity with the demands of the Law, the nation of Israel would have been able to function as God's servant nation, representing God and His character before the surrounding nations of the world" (Grisanti, 1998, pg.40). The Hebrew community preserves itself according to God's law for the sake of the world. Therefore, the preservation of the collective is not an end in itself. According to Grisanti this notion is persistent throughout the Hebrew Bible; drawing from Isaiah 40-55 Grisanti states, "It is as God's chosen people that Israel serves as His agent of blessing upon the nations[68]" (Grisanti, 1998, pg.40). In the New Testament the exemplar of this ethic is found in Christ. Christ is both depicted as 'without sin' (2 Cor. 5:21) yet being among and 'eating with sinners' (Mark 2:15), a combination that culminates with, as St.Paul depicts: "Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 5:6). In the Gospels this is

juxtaposed with the Pharisees who aim to preserve their holiness, sometimes to the detriment of others.[69] In Christ though, we find an exemplar of the tension between preserving and giving,[70] as one who, following Volf, embraces that which is Other[71] to him, yet does not lose his identity. Notice that what Volf is stipulating in his concept of 'embrace[72]' does not call for the loss of identity into the other, or even a loss of both identities into one; rather that the two separate identities are necessary presuppositions for the embrace.

Likewise the bible depicts identity and togetherness in a similar vein. Old Testament scholar John C. Nugent, discussing the Mennonite theologian and ethicist John Howard Yoder's Old Testament ethics, points to Genesis 11. In this passage God 'punishes' the people by making them speak different languages and scattering them, but Nugent notes that Yoder's reading of the text points out that creation of linguistic difference should not be conceived as a 'punishment' *contra* our goal of 'monolingual centralised existence', " It is only punishment if one presumes that monolingual centralised existence is in the people's best interests. Yet it was God's good intention, as stated in the beginning (Gen 1:28) and reaffirmed in the flood (Gen 9:7), that humans would scatter and fill the earth" (Nugent, 2011,pg.38). Therefore, in respect to Volf's 'embrace' and Yoder's reading of Gen. 11, we can argue that differences are not necessarily meant to be deconstructed or melded,[73] but rather covenanted.[74]

4. Otherness as an Intrinsic Attribute of the Human Condition:

Understanding Otherness as intrinsic to the creative order is identifiable in our creaturely disposition; systematic theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg posits that Otherness is implicit in our finiteness and our limitedness.[75] Due to our limitedness and finiteness, Christian ethicist Nigel Biggar, in his study of international relations, argues that difference is good for a number of reasons: "I want to contend that the creaturely quality of the human condition also implies that a diversity of communities, including nations, is a natural necessity that is also good[76]... differences

between constitutions, institutions, customs, wisdom, or outlook, if taken seriously, should provoke not merely wonder but reflective engagement[77]" (Biggar, 2014, pg.10). Precisely because individuals and cultures are limited in their epistemological scope, other cultures with other perspectives can be good from ethical, aesthetic, and intellectual standpoints. The 'Other,' therefore, challenges the 'Self' to draw its focus beyond itself, as the theologian Stanley Hauerwas writes, "The "otherness" of another's character not only invites me to an always imperfect imitation, but challenges me to recognise the way my vision is restricted by my own self-preoccupation"[78] (Hauerwas, 1983, pg.45).

4a. Otherness and the Bible:

In reference to the Holiness code of the Mosaic Covenant, however, we have seen that Israel found its goal in the blessing of the world: being set apart implies that its neighbours were considered of no help. This could imply a self-righteous hero mentality, but, as Hebrew bible scholar Robin C. McCall states, the 'set apart' nature of the Covenant does not mean Israel was isolated: "Israel's social and historical circumstances demanded that a definition of holiness include a strong measure of exclusivism. This does not mean that Israel was isolated from its ancient Near Eastern neighbours; they interacted with their neighbours and shared many aspects of culture with the nations around them. But the Holiness Code seeks to develop and codify Israel's theology and ethics in ways that are uniquely Israelite, distinctively different from those of their neighbours" (Green & Lapsley, 2013, pg.54). This is coherent when considering the limited epistemological nature of creatures, whether as individuals or collectives, especially if we consider that the uniquely Israelite ethics and theology assumes the creaturely disposition by depending on God. The important distinction in this case is of the special revelation given to the Israelites; in tying themselves to this revelation are 'set apart' but are not isolated. The issue of Ezra 9-10 carries a similar assumption, though it must be noted that in respect to the whole canon of the Hebrew

Bible, we can see this not a precept to be enforced in all situations. The book of Ruth's narrative has

a focus on Ruth, a Moabite, who enters into relationship with Boaz, a Hebrew.[79] This marriage is

even included in the genealogy of Christ, but would have been expected to be separated if it were

during the time of Ezra. Former Chief Rabbi of the Commonwealth, Lord Jonathan Sacks explains

the logic in this postexilic text by noting the tensions between intermarriage and preserving national

identity in Diaspora: "Since the days of Ezra and before, intermarriage has been the critical index of

the disintegration of the Jews as a distinctive group" (Sacks,1992, pg.89). The historical context is

of utmost important in interpreting and acting, as in this case intermarriage is a problem for those

with no territorial setting to establish their identity, the importance of land with identity is

commented on by Grosby: "Separated from its land, the nation will die (Deut 29:27-28; Jer 9:19-19;

Lev 26:27-42). That is why the territory of the nation is held to be sacred"(Grosby, 2002, pg.27).

5. The Tension between the Individual and the Ethical Climate of the Collective:

A tension occurs as there appears to be times when the collective takes precedent over the

individual and times when the collective is put ahead of other nations, therefore is God's

commandment to 'love your neighbour as yourself' (Leviticus 19:18) only applicable on the

individual level? Volf states that he believes we should focus on the individual for theological

action: "theologians should concentrate less on social arrangements and more *on fostering the kind*

of social agents capable of envisioning and creating just, truthful, and peaceful societies, and on

shaping a cultural climate in which such agents will thrive" (Volf, 1996, pg.21). Though this is

problematic as individual social agents are not formed in a vacuum. In order to bring about Volf's

social agents, the 'ethical climate[80]' (Blackburn, 2001, pg.3) in a collective must be examined and

critiqued.[81]

Therefore in considering the view of sin as *Incurvatus in Se,* can this criticism be made against

nation-states as it is against individuals? In brief, yes it can; but the critique requires some

reservations. Those leading a nation need to give priority to those who, they lead. For instance, it is

not morally wrong, from a Christian perspective, that Primo de Rivera, during the time of his

regime, attempted to strangle the contraband trade between Gibraltar and La Liñea, placing stricter

checks on the Frontier (Stockey, 2009, pg.62). Nor was the Republic's restriction on British citizens

obtaining property in the *Campo* necessarily against those individuals (Stockey, 2009, pg.76).

Likewise, attitudes about employment expressed by The Gibraltar Worker's Union (1920's), e.g.

that preference should be given to Gibraltarian workers over Spanish workers (Stockey 2009, pg.

50) are not anti-Spanish, but express the typical dilemmas of a community with limited employment

opportunities.

6. John Howard Yoder and H. Richard Niebuhr: Contrasting Views on Ethical Deliberation:

In light of this, a dichotomy is found among political theologians that can be represented by the

works of Yoder and H.Richard Niebuhr. Yoder and the Niebuhr brothers can be seen as both

authoritative in the development of political theology; though influential, are typically depicted as

having extremely contrasting views. Yoder states that the ethic of the Son of God is commanded of

all, individuals and structures, "That Christ is Lord, a proclamation to which only individuals can

respond, is nonetheless a social, political, *structural* fact which constitutes a challenge to the

Powers" (Yoder, 1994, pg.156-7). This suggests that because Christ is Lord of all, his ethic is a

challenge and a calling, not only to individuals, but to all spheres of human sociality. Niebuhr, in

contrast, states in his essay, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Unity of the Church,* that we should

not evoke a "unitarianism of the Son" (Niebuhr, 1996, pg.53-54) when participating in the Christian

life. We should judge our ethical practice not only by the ethic of Christ, but also, the ethic of the

Father, which Niebuhr associates with reason and the laws of nature, and the ethic of the Spirit,

focusing on conscience (Niebuhr, 1996, pg.62). So in contrast to the self-denial exhibited in the

Sermon of the Mount, Niebuhr suggests that we need to contrast it with reason and the laws of

nature. Romans 13 expresses this sentiment, stating that Christians should not exact vengeance on those who have wronged them, but the state has a duty to carry out the requirements for punishment (Romans 13:4).[82] Yoder assumes that Niebuhr's thesis would lead Christians to exhibit a different ethic in the different spheres of sociality (Yoder, 1994, pg.144). Biggar appears to hold to Niebuhr's view of the need to balance international ethics in a Trinitarian fashion, whilst stating that borders need to be regulated and immigration be conditional: "The Christian view also implies that the autonomy a nation enjoyed within its borders are not absolute. It does not have the right simply to do with its resources whatever it please, but only to manage them responsibly; and where it has resources surplus to its own needs, it has a duty to devote them to the good of others[83]" (Biggar, 2014, pg.19). In order to take seriously the rationale of both sides, it appears noteworthy that Christ should always be held as a standard with which to judge governments, but, as is apparent in Romans 13, in order to govern faithfully a difference in ethical deliberation is assumed.[84] So the Biblical mandate of loving your neighbour as yourself implies duties of love and care on an international basis as well, but, as mentioned, leaders have a duty to make sure their own population is well-maintained. To abbreviate, one's nation has precedence but one's nation is not ultimate. Karl Barth notes disillusionment with taking one's nation as ultimate, "Peoples with their distinctive characteristics come and go, rise, live and extend and then reach they goal and end as such. However great their name may have been, they lose it" (Barth, 1961, pg.301). It is the transient nature of nations, and even empires, that Barth points to as the prime reason for not treating nations as the ultimate, even recent history attests to this in regards to the demise of countries such as Yugoslavia. With the denial of calling one's nation the ultimate, we deal with with Richard Niebuhr's concern of the 'paganism' of making our nation ultimate. He suggests:

"no relative power, be it that of nation or its people as well as that of tyrants, can claim absolute sovereignty or total loyalty. The power that has brought a nation into being has also elected into

existence its companion nations; and the rights of such nations to life, liberty, and the pursuit of

their well-being are equal in the universal commonwealth of being. Relying on the ultimate source

of being and the ultimate power that conserves being, men will accept the relativity of all their

judgements and continue in their striving to make political decisions that express universal faith.

The question of henotheistic and monotheistic democracy is not the question of national egoism or

national altruism; it is not a question about our loves but about our faiths, about our ultimate

confidence and our ultimate fidelity" (Niebuhr, 1960, pg.77).

7. Loving Neighbours - Apparent Dualisms Analysed:

Christianity (and the other monotheistic religions) provide a number of theological doctrines that

draw one's loyalty beyond our nation. Niebuhr points to the fact that in a monotheistic ontology the

same Creator God that elected one's nation's existence has elected the existence of all other nations.

Does monotheism overcome the issue of dualisms? In his lecture 'Confronting Religious Violence

in the name of God', Jonathan Sacks states that dualisms found in religious violence are repudiated

by a stronger affirmation of monotheism (Sacks, 2014). In the relationship of God and man, all

groups are created by this one God.[85] Admittedly, even within this view there are dualisms that can

be attached, such as found in the critique of John's Gospel, where some are the 'children of light'

against the 'children of darkness' or the 'world'. Surely, in relation to Gibraltar and Spain, the

dualism can be appropriated by each side to justify overly negative perceptions of the Other? Volf

states that the supposed dualism in John's Gospel is not an argument against a plurality, that the 'us'

and 'them' binary does not encourage hostility towards the Other; Firstly, because " We see in fact

shades of grey on both the white and black sides of the divide, which is to say that John's

oppositional dualities are more open to inner differentiation, and therefore to plurality, than

advocates of the sectarian thesis allow" (Volf, 2005, pg.204). From the perspective of the

Community of the Beloved Disciple, not all non-Christians within the text are portrayed negatively

or in opposition to the Kingdom of God (Volf, 2005, pg.206). Moreso, the 'Children of light' were

once the 'Children of Darkness'; the possibility of transition undermines sectarianism. Rowan

Williams in his discussion on baptism notes, "What softens and 'unsettles' such exclusiveness is the

constant possibility of transition and the essential independence of this transition from any human

corporate policy" (Brown & Loades, 1996, pg. 93). Secondly, Volf notes that the dualisms found are

oppositional dualisms in relation to issues of truth and falsehood, good and evil. The dualism of

good and evil should not separate humanity, as no human can be perfectly assumed in to either of

the concepts, and, to deconstruct this dualism would require the denial of moral absolutes (Volf,

2005, pg.199). In regards of Gibraltar and Spain, the binary of 'us' and 'them' cannot be placed

within the polarities of good and evil, truth and falsehood. As in relation to God, we find that certain

universal attributes are shared with all humanity.

8. Introducing Universal Concepts that Bind us Together:

The creative order of the Judaeo-Christian worldview states that not only are we equal as human

creatures but within that creative order each human being is intrinsically valuable. Marc Cortez

notes the Bible's depiction of human value: "The Bible clearly affirms that both males and females

are in the image of God (Gen. 1.27) and uses this as the basis for treating all human persons with

dignity (Gen. 9.6; Jas. 3.9)" (Cortez, 2010, pg.16). Proceeding from this we find that all humanity is

bound to obey God's command. We find in Genesis, God commanding Adam and Eve to procreate

and to have dominion over the earth (1:28), to work the land (2:15), and not to eat the forbidden

fruit (2:17). Focusing on Gen. 2:17, Pope John Paul II notes in *Veritatis Splendor*, on the issue of

morality: "And he possesses an extremely far-reaching freedom, since he can eat 'of every tree of

the garden'. But his freedom is not unlimited: it must halt before the 'tree of the knowledge of good

and evil', for he is called to accept the moral law given by God[86]" (John Paul II, 1993). Drawing on

Gen. 2:18, French Reformer John Calvin notes God's disapproval of man being alone and surmises

that "The natural impulse toward the formation of society included people to care for the human race as a whole[87]" (Cromartie, 1997, pg.69). This depiction of God's judgement on the matter of sociality leads us to the next covenant. The Noahide Covenant (Genesis 9: 8,15) is also an example of God's covenant and commandment upon all of mankind. The commandment found in Gen. 9:6 states that the most intense manner of revolting against the natural impulse towards sociality requires judgement, regardless of cultural differences. Old Testament scholar Walter Brueggemann commentating on this verse states: "In the post-flood decree of creation, the sanctity of human life is established against every ideology and every force which would cheapen or diminish life" (Brueggemann, 1982, pg. 83). Human life is given the utmost value by declaring that the murder of a human life deserves punishment by death, it cannot be compensated financially or atoned for as other sins are.

In light of this conception of universal laws, the Judaeo-Christian worldview affirms an objective morality and one expression of this is the dignity of all human life that is binding on all cultures.

9. Concerns about Universalising - Imperialism:

The thinkers behind the Enlightenment also affirmed this approach. Eisen expresses a valid criticism to the universalism of the Enlightenment when he states: "We have now entered an age in which the universalistic claims of the Enlightenment are being criticised as imperialistic, and there is greater appreciation for particularism" (Eisen, 2011, pg.46). Sacks notes that Judaism was problematic for Enlightenment thinkers such as Immanuel Kant as it suggested that, in some sense, morality, like language, is shared within communities (Sacks, 1992, pg.261). But in the tension between particularity and universality, Sacks defines Judaism's relationship to the universality of monotheism: "Morality, then, is grounded in formally binding relationships, some of which are universal, but not all" (Sacks, 1992, pg.264). Christianity, on the other hand, does make clearer universal commandments for all people, Matthew 28 describes the Great Commission, in which

Christ commands the apostles to "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations" (v.19). We

therefore need to investigate the question of how Christianity, with its universal claims, deals with

particular customs and ethics that are held by different national or ethnic groups.

10. Early Christianity and the Tensions between the Universal and the Particular:

 The first council among the Christian communities, in Acts 15, begins exploring the tensions

between universal and particular tensions within Christianity. The issue begins with the question of

circumcision. One side states the necessity of circumcision, as commanded in 'the custom of

Moses' (v.1). This issue was the point of contention and debate (v.7). The council concluded, siding

with Paul and Barnabas, that God 'in cleaning their hearts by faith he has made no distinction

between them and us' (v.8). Continuing from this we find Galatians 3:28 states, "There is no longer

Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male or female; for all of you are in

Christ." This does not mean and has not historically meant, that nationality, gender and genealogy

are discarded; rather that none are made supreme, or more valuable, over others. Volf expands on

this noting, "Paul's solution to the tension between universality and particularity is ingenious. Its

logic is simple: the oneness of God requires God's universality; God's universality entails human

equality; human equality implies equal access by all to the blessings of the one God; equal access is

incompatible with ascription of religious significance to genealogy; Christ, the seed of Abraham, is

both the fulfilment of the genealogical promise to Abraham and the end of genealogy as a privileged

locus of access to God"(Volf, 1996, pg.45). Moreso, conscience is not negated. In Romans 14, Paul

states that the conscience of some leads to moral emphasis on certain issues; he focuses upon

dietary laws[88] (14:2) and days of observance (14:5). These differences are to be respected, but one

cannot judge the other. Difference, for Paul, is acceptable as long as it is subject to the command

and person of Christ (14:7). This tension between the particular (in this case the conscience of the

individual) and the universal at this point appears not to be a problem to be solved but rather as the

moral grounding of Christian ethics. Christians need to be subject to their cultural and conscience's

moral codes but these codes need to subjected to God first. Volf reflects on this departure from

particular to the universal, "Departure is part and parcel of Christian identity"(Volf, 1996, pg.39). It

is this tension that Levinas notes is necessary for ethical thought and in regards to the universal he

states: "Morality does not belong to culture; it allows us to judge culture, to evaluate the dimension

of its elevation" (Levinas, 2006, pg.36). The danger of imperialism in not ignored in the defence of

universalism, as Levinas notes that it can be "a pretext for exploitation and violence" (Levinas,

2006, pg.37). This is a necessary concern for theology as it demands respect for the Other and, as

with Volf's embrace, sees the Other with value and not one to be confirmed in our image. This

danger arises out of the limits of our reason, and its ability to comprehend the Good. However the

danger does not erase that there is an absolute moral standard. Difference within the Kingdom of

God is not problematic,[89] but each culture is not the definer of moral values.[90]

11. The Universals in Human Nature:

In regards to our relation to the moral absolute of God, we find another universal that connect the

'us' and the 'Other', namely our inability to hold to moral perfection, as expressed in the doctrine of

Original Sin or within scripture, that we have all succumbed to breaking God's law (Psalm. 14:3;

Isa. 53:6; Rom. 3:23). Theologian and historian Derek Nelson, in his introduction to the doctrine of

sin, notes the universal range of the doctrine of original sin: "Perhaps the single most important

assertion made by the doctrine of original sin is the fellowship of humanity that it

assumes" (Nelson, 2011, pg.50). It is this doctrine that contradicts dualistic perceptions and rhetoric

of siding 'ourselves' with the good and placing all evil on the 'Other' (Gray, 2014). Even in the case

of victims and violators, original sin pervades both. The process theologian Marjorie Hewitt

Suchocki, in her study of original sin in relational theology, presents this view clearly: "This

recognises that for good or for ill, there is an entwining of victim and violator through the very

nature of violation" (Suchocki, 1994, pg.147). This is not to purport that the victim and violator are

as guilty in a moment of violence; this view is as untrue as it is abhorrent. Rather, both are by their

'nature of violation' able to succumb to the weakness of sinning against another. Held in collusion

with the doctrine of *Imago Dei*, both 'us' and the 'Other' are able to reflect the goodness of God and

both express the waywardness of humanity. Finally, upon expressing "the confraternity of the

human type" (Nelson, 2011, pg.52), we need to explore the universal offer of the redemption

through Christ. Opening with the apostle Paul, we find God's desire in regards to redemption:

"desires everyone to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." (1 Tim. 2:4). It is for all

the world that "God gave up his only Son" (John 3:16). It is 'all nations[91]', which the disciples are

meant to disciple (Matt 28:19). It culminates with members of 'all nations' being present in the

eschatological fulfilling of the Kingdom of God (Rev. 21:24), thus creating citizens of heaven

(Philippians 3:20) from all nations, all of whom are equal and imbued with rights and dignity.

12. Christianity and the Nation-State:

At this point we encounter another issue, from the perspective of different nation-states. The

Christian movement is a trans-national movement, transcending borders and differences. In the

Letter to Diognetus, it is succinctly put, "though they are residents at home in their own countries,

their behaviour there is more like that of transients; they take their full part as citizens, but they also

submit to anything and everything as if they were aliens. For them, any foreign country is a

motherland, and any motherland is a foreign country" (Staniforth, 1968, pg.176). Notably, the Swiss

Enlightenment philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau points to an issue in attempting to express what

a good citizen is. In *The Social Contract,* he perceives a problem of allegiance: "It was in these

circumstances that Jesus came to establish a spiritual kingdom on earth; this kingdom, by separating

the theological system from the political, meant that the state ceased to be a unity" (Rousseau,1968,

pg.178). Catholic theologian William Cavanaugh in critiquing Rousseau's problem of unity

expresses the clear issue that Rousseau finds, "Christianity produces division within the state body precisely because it pretends to be a body which transcends state boundaries" (Milbank, Pickstock, & Ward, 1999, pg.189). He explains further the challenge the Church gives to the state, most clearly depicted in the celebration of the Eucharist: "Fortunately, in the making of the Body of Christ, Christians participate in a practice which envisions a proper 'anarchy,' not in the sense that it proposes chaos, but in that it challenges the false order of the state" (Milbank, Pickstock, & Ward, 1999, pg.194). The 'false order of the state' is one of unity, specifically in its promise of overcoming the divisions caused by the 'War of Religions[92]'. The issue for Rousseau is in having ultimate allegiances to God, national allegiances become superfluous[93] and may leave division between Christians and non-Christians within the state.

13. Faith Among the Faiths :

This leaves us with one final hurdle in regards to our political theology, that of religious plurality. As noted in the previous chapter there has been a tension throughout Spanish history with religious plurality, whether between the Christian churches or in regards of, other faiths. The Gibraltar-Spain relationship is not an issue of religious intolerance but in light of Spain's concerns of Gibraltar being a point of entry for religious dissension (Stockey, 2009, pg.215), it is a necessary discussion. Also it is evident that post-Second Vatican Council, we find the Spanish churches being more tolerant of co-existing among other worldviews and those of different political persuasions. Pope Benedict XVI, in reflecting on the goals of the Council, states one of its aims was on "a question that required a new definition of the relationship between the Christian faith and the world religions" (Pope Benedict XVI, 2005). This matter is of the utmost importance, as politics and ethics must be deliberated within a worldview and that worldview will influence our conceptions of the good, which will inform our politics and ethics. In respect of this issue, one way to express the relevance of ontological conceptions is in expressing the logic behind Spain's desire for religious

uniformity in its history. A uniformity of religion or worldview, or to be more specific uniformity of interpretation of a religion,[94] should equate to a consensus on ethical values or the Good, thus reducing conflict and dissension against those that lead.

14. The Challenge of Ecumenism:

Problems arise when we take into account that due to our creaturely nature difference of opinion and consensus are inevitable even within a faith.[95] Is acknowledging the creaturely condition a solution to the divisions and an avenue to reconciliation? Only partially, unlike the discussion that will proceed among differing ontologies, divisions within Christianity have a 'common language' as Von Balthasar notes that, "we are *able* to understand each other" (Von Balthasar, 1992, pg.10). There is a common language between all denominations that can be found in the early Church creeds that define what constitutes orthodoxy. Though awareness of this common language is not enough, Reformed theologian G.C. Berkouwer, who was an observer during the Second Vatican Council, wisely notes that "common denominator ecumenicity is a fruitless way to seek unity" (Echeverria, 2014). French theologian Louis Bouyer expresses the lived implications of the perpetual divisions even with acknowledgement of this common language in highlighting the experience of Ignatius of Antioch: "The point is that the Christian, wherever he goes, like Ignatius going from church to church: from Syria, where he was bishop, to Rome, where he was to die; in churches where no one knew him and where others are received as if he were home and still finds the same Church" (Bouyer, 2011, pg.8). The familial nature of the Kingdom of God (Romans 8: 12-15) is repudiated with a weak ecumenism. But moreso, the earlier call to covenanting identities is contradicted by a broken Church, and in a different sense, though covenanted, our distinction within the Church must not mean a plurality (Eph, 4:5). The multiplicity of churches is harshly described by Karl Barth: "We should not try to *explain* the multiplicity of churches at all. We should create the way we treat our own sin and those of others: *as sin* "[96] (quoted by Von Balthasar, 1992,

pg.4). So how do we deal with difference in side the Church? Within the Roman Catholic Church, the upholding principle of catholicity can be expressed in different rites: *"In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas"*. The particular and the universal, the local and the global are reconciled without dissolution of one or the other. Cavanaugh explicates the foundation to the diversity in unity: "Only in the Incarnation can an individual be universal and the universal be individual" (Cavanaugh, 2008, pg. 76). It is this individual, Christ, who is present within the Church and in every particular part of the Church. Cavanaugh explains that, through the Eucharist, the universal is brought into the particular and the particular is brought into the universal, "in its entirety the event and person of Christ is eucharistic, given and poured out to be consumed by others... in consuming the Eucharist we become the body of Christ" (Cavanaugh, 2008, pg.84). This understanding embodies St. Paul's notion of unity and diversity (1 Corinthians 12:12-31). The Roman Catholic Church is a good example of unity and diversity within one church, but our current state of multiple churches remains and we must seek an approach to bridging this divide.

The vastness of this problem is beyond the scope of this dissertation, more so it appears to be beyond the scope of what has been previously accomplished in the last century. Von Balthasar goes as far as to say that it, "can only be [by] the grace of the Church's founder; this is no human product" (Von Balthasar, 1992, pg. 7). Nevertheless, we must also live in the light of knowing that the will of God calls us to work towards reconciliation even if we cannot achieve it on our own. Therefore we must present a posture that acknowledges this, one document from Vatican II, *Unitatis redintegratio,* notes the need for repentance, "quite large communities came to be separated from full communion with the Catholic Church for which, often enough, men of both sides were to blame" (Vatican II, 1964). Secondly, there is the issue of truth and compromise. Pope John Paul II, in his encyclical, *Ut Unum Sint,* states, "The unity willed by God can be attained only by the adherence of all to the content of revealed faith in its entirety. In matters of faith, compromise is in contradiction with God who is Truth." (John Paul II, 1995 Ch 1.18) Therefore the Roman Catholic

Church in understanding itself as the embodiment of a tradition passed down in succession

"received from the apostles, who received it from Christ, who received it from the Father" (Bouyer,

2011, pg.13) should not circumvent this self-understanding. Likewise, the Protestant's protest

should not be ignored.[97] Otherwise, an ecumenism that denies differences and disagreement[98] not

only ignores the reality of the situation, but more so drains the division of meaning and the

disagreements of any truth. The division is sinful, but it is not meaningless. The reconciliation

among the divided can be a epistemically, fruitful endeavour to have gone through, a model for

reconciliation can be found in the narrative of Joseph and his brothers (Genesis 37-50) in which the

sinful separation was used by God for good, "Even though you intended to do harm to me, God

intended it for good" (Genesis 50:19). Thirdly, the need for humility is not solely in repentance, but

also due to our creaturely disposition, our understanding of the meaning and implications of

orthodox theology must be aware of the possibilities for new understandings. Reformed theologian

and minister Peter Leithart expresses this notion when describing Derrida's concept of *'differance'*:

"The ultimate meaning of any utterance is deferred until history is done, until the last word is

spoken, until context is closed off once and for all" (Leithart, 2009, pg.94). This leads, to the

acknowledgement that only in the Messianic moment in the *Eschaton* can complete knowledge be

assumed.[99] In this even the Messiah, the founder and perfecter of our faith (Hebrews 12:2) can only

be known, in his totality, by himself as he is the Alpha and the Omega (Rev. 1:18). Thus, in this side

of history there is room for increasing knowledge and perspective through different times and

contexts. Lastly, after seeing this division as in some ways helpful epistemically, we can theorise the

basis of communion for the churches: "Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and

mother." (Mark 3:35) The familial bond in the Church community is centred around seeking and

doing the will of God. Lutheran theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer notes: "the essence of community

is not 'commonality', although formally every community has this. Rather, reciprocal will

constitutes community" (Bonhoeffer, 2009, pg.83). In finding this 'reciprocal will', friendship can

begin to be fostered. C.S. Lewis writes in *The Four Loves:* "It is when two such persons discover one another, when, whether with immense difficulties and semi-articulate rumblings or with what would seem to us amazing and elliptical speed, they share their vision - it is then that Friendship is born" (Lewis, 1960, pg.78-9). Founding an ecumenical ethic on friendship (in seeking God's will[100]) can be a strong basis for a persisting goal of reconciliation. Thomist theologian Fergus Kerr, writing on Aquinas' commentary on Aristotle, sets out some ethical points within friendship: "Friendship is a kind of loving that respects and fosters the independent worth of the other person. Secondly, for there to be friendship of the relevant kind, the parties have to have this attitude to one another: each has to let the other be, so to speak. Thirdly, they have to have something in common which gives rise to and sustains this relationship" (Davies,1987, pg.7). Aquinas' understanding of friendship appears to be a strong foundation to start from, whether at a local church or denominational level. The difference between denominations should not surprise us where there are differences of degree but not ontology. Differing ethical and political strategies can arise from within uniform ontologies, but are more apparent between ontologies.

15. The Challenges of Plurality for the Nation-State - Liberal and Post-Nitzschean Theories:

The question of worldview is unavoidable and this is clearly evidenced with the work of political theorists such as John Rawls.[101] Rawls' work on Liberal theory is perhaps the most influential in recent times, especially in dealing with the challenge of plurality. Rawls realises the difficulties that arise out of conflicting ontologies and his solution to this issue was in grounding political discourse in terms of what is rational from a neutral perspective or what common sense dictates. Rawls explains: "Moreover, the argument does not rely on any special metaphysical or philosophical doctrine...The appeal is indeed to common sense, to generally shared ways of reasoning and plain facts accessible to all, but it is framed in such a way as to avoid these larger presumptions" (Rawls, 1999, pg.188). The aim here is to not answer the question of the Good but what is fair. Conceptions

of the Good and anything that is not shared in common sense should be demarcated to the private

realm. Theologian Kristen Deede Johnson describes this well: "The way to ensure the fairness of

the original position is to insist that the principles of justice be chosen behind a 'veil of ignorance,'

which means that no knowledge is allowed of one's place in society, social or class status, natural

assets and abilities, intelligence, strength, psychological propensities, or conceptions of the good. In

this way no one will be influenced to choose principles that would favour his or her particular

position, talents or beliefs" (Johnson, 2007, pg.32). Rawls' comes in for criticism for his conception

of rationality that is not metaphysical, as it becomes clear that he believes that through reason we

can come to a commonly agreed view of what is fair. The problem is that his theory is derived from

an ontology based on enlightenment thinking and values. For instance, his conception of what is

rational, believing that rationality can be universally grasped and therefore agreed upon. Johnson

notes that the most influential critiques are by those depicted as communitarians: "Despite the

differences in the emphases and nuances of their thought, what unites them is the common belief

that liberalism, in its classical and its Rawlsian expression, inadequately accounts for the role of

community and society in constituting human beings and their conceptions" (Johnson, 2007, pg.36).

Later works by Rawls in light of the response to his earlier work focus more on the issue of

tolerance and differentiates between the rational and the reasonable.[102] Rationality can be found

within different ontologies, but because rationalities can be different, we must seek a political

discourse that is reasonable[103] (Rawls, 1993, pg.58). The reasonable is that which can be held, as

Rawls describes it, in an 'overlapping consensus[104]' (Rawls, 1995, pg.143). Yet the issue arises

again in his conception of what is reasonable, which is again grounded in his interpretation of

reasonableness and of which, he believes should be universally grasped. Johnson summarises Alex

Murphy's criticism of Rawls' *Political Liberalism:* "In short, he accuses Rawls of having developed

a theory that, in its exclusions of unreasonable comprehensive doctrines, is far more repressive than

many legal prohibitions" (Johnson, 2007, pg.57). The inescapable nature of politics from ontology

have led post-Nietzschean political theorists to admit the impossibility of containing all diverse

groups into a unified ontology. Johnson states, "In contrast, then, to liberal theorists, who are

concerned to find ways to fit difference into a unified political community, these theorists prioritise

diversity over unity" (Johnson, 2007, pg.84). Leading agnostic political theorist William Connolly's

work is a clear example of this, "He believes that incorporating 'a deep plurality of religious/

metaphysical perspectives' into a public discourse is a crucial component in the quest to develop a

positive ethos of engagement out of the pluralism in contemporary life, but these perspectives need

to recognise 'the shakiness of the ground upon which they themselves stand' for such an ethos to

emerge" (Johnson, 2007, pg.122). Post-Nitzschean theorists seek to overcome power-plays that

absolutise some identities and undermine the participation of other identities. But problems occur in

this perspective, especially from a religious angle, as in order to accept this vision for plurality we

need to accept that there are no objective truths: whether that be in regard of questions of God,

morality, purpose or fundamental law. While allowing for all theistic ontologies to be a part of the

public square; Connolly's theory requires that we distance ourselves from truth claims and allow the

conflict between ontologies to bring new forms of identity to fruition.

16. Augustine and the *Civitas Dei*:

In contrast, to both liberal and post-Nietzchean theories, Johnson and the public theologian

Charles T. Mathewes believe Augustine of Hippo can provide a good vision for political discourse

in the age of plurality. Intrinsic to Augustine's thought is the identification of two cities, an earthly

city and a heavenly city. The earthly city is identified with its power struggles: "For Augustine, the

lust for domination and the contingency of worldly power provide all the more reason to

acknowledge the insufficiency of the 'earthly city,' the city and political society of this

saeculum" (Johnson, 2007, pg.142). In a sense holding the inevitability of conflict that the post-

Nietzschean theorists point to, whilst the heavenly city is marked by peace, harmony and unity.

Much like the harmony and unity that the liberal theorists strive for, Augustine notes that harmony

is possible in the earthly city but domination of some sort is a foundation for this earthly peace.

What is specific to Augustine's thought is the realisation of our current predicament in the earthly

city, the aim of striving for the ethics of the heavenly city, and the understanding of how to arrive in

the heavenly city. Plurality was as much part of Augustine's world as it is presently. In fact,

historian Charles Norris Cochrane goes as far as to say that, "Augustine was born into a world the

perplexities of which have probably never been exceeded by any period, before or since, in human

history" (Cochrane, 1940, pg.380). Otherness is something that Augustine believes is intrinsic to

our own identity, Mathewes writes; " because in his own work, Augustine responded to both

pluralism and otherness simultaneously, both anthropologically because the sinful self is broken

into plurality and thus other to itself[105] and theologically because God is theologically the absolute

Other" (Mathewes, 1998, pg.88). The brokenness within ourselves and the absolute otherness of

God bid us into conversation to realise the truth. This understanding encourages the humility

needed in our relation to God and those to whom we have religious or ontological differences, "no

one is wholly separated from the love of God, just as no one is wholly conformed to it" (Mathewes,

1998, pg.88). For this dialogue is necessary in our seeking for the true conception of the Good. This

allows theologians such as Yoder to acknowledge that, "From the Gospel prospective, modern

pluralism is not a setback but a providential occasion for clarification" (Yoder, 1996, pg.135). In

this understanding of difference, we can find agreement in scripture: "Iron sharpens iron, and one

person sharpens the wits of another" (Proverbs 27:17). Though in the current earthly city, Augustine

notes that we must live as citizens of heaven (Philippians 3:20). For Augustine this predominantly

means reordering our loves. By placing the love of God and neighbour in proper relation to love of

self, the urge for dominance should be circumvented (Johnson, 2007, pg.153-4). However,

establishing this on our own is not possible. We must be converted by God,[106] Johnson notes and,

"According to Augustine, Jesus Christ[107] is the means by which the lost harmony of God's created

world is restored" (Johnson, 2007, pg.158). This undermines the problem we earlier associated with

universal truth claims, that the problem is not with universal truth claims but rather with utopianism

appropriated by humanity's work. In establishing that the heavenly city cannot be actualised by our

work or held back by those who do not conform, we find a specific understanding of reality that

allows for difference but does not accept that harmony and unity are impossible. Johnson states that,

even for Augustine, the possibility of Christian leaders using their power to make the political

Christian is dangerous: "Neither does this mean that a Christian ruler is called to make the political

Christian. Indeed, such a task would be impossible because of the injustice and *libido dominance*

that always marks the earthly city and the individuals of which it is comprised" (Johnson, 2007, pg.

171). Indeed, it is this issue of domination that becomes problematic and must be analysed next.

Yoder believes the issue of Constantianism, a collusion of Church and state, to be the cause of

seeing plurality as a problem to be repudiated: "Only the Constantinian detour has made the

plurality of communities seem to some like a modern problem, or one which a biblically oriented

community would not rejoice to face" (Yoder, 1996, pg.138). Yoder appears to put too much

emphasis on the Constantinian detour being the cause for our difficulties with difference as it

appears throughout history, even prior to the detour, but what is notable is the possibility that the

detour has aggravated the issue further.

17. Conclusion:

Throughout this chapter we have aimed to detail the concepts of identity and otherness, and how

they have related to theology and other disciplines. It has been found to present a number of

challenges to the biblical canon, but not without response. The question of identity and otherness

has brought forward the issues of violence, epistemology, ethical and political deliberation,

ecumenism, and the relationship of the universal and the particular. These matters have been

attempted to be brought together, through a theological lens, to express that difference is not only a

given of the human condition but an aim to be desired. The chapter culminated in Johnson and

Mathewes' portrayal of St. Augustine as a significant theologian, who has thought through a

conception of plurality that seeks a humble harmony. Finally, this led to a critique of Yoder's

understanding that the collusion of Church and state, inevitably, leads to seeing difference as a

problem. It is from this criticism that we move to examine deeper the relationship of Church and

state, in which, the evidence from the relationship between Gibraltar and Spain requires our

investigation.

Kissing Caesar, Nodding to Jesus

The relationship between Church and state

1. Introduction:

In the previous chapter, we found John Howard Yoder's assertion in regards to Constantianism being the root issue in dealing with issues of difference and otherness. According to Yoder, the establishment of Church and state is an unhealthy relationship for the church to be in. In the case of the Spanish churches, we find an unhealthy relationship. A relationship for which the Roman Catholic Church in Spain apologised and withdrew from certain elements of that relationship, but is the appropriate response to this problem a complete separation of Church and state?

2. The Church and the State - A History:

The relationship of religion and state has a vast historical aspect to it, even preceding Christianity. Renowned social theorist Jürgen Habermas notes in his discussion on 'The Political', that religion and governing bodies had a strong and necessary relationship:

"It is not a given that one person, or handful of persons, can make decisions that are collectively binding on all. They must be legitimated to do so. Only by establishing a convincing connection between law and political power with religious beliefs and practices could rulers be assured that the people followed their orders. While the legal system is stabilised by the sanctioning power of the state, political authority in turn depends on the legitimising force of a law, which has a sacred origin. "Religion" owes its legitimising force to the fact that it draws its power to convince from its roots. It is rooted, *independently of politics,* in notions of salvation and calamity (*Heil und Unheil)* and in corresponding practices of coping with redemptive and menacing forces" (Mendieta & Vanantwerpen, 2011, pg.17).

One key example of this is David's attitude to Saul, when given the chance to slay his pursuer and claim kingship: "The LORD forbid that I should do this thing to my lord, the LORD's anointed, to raise my hand against him; for he is the LORD's anointed" (1 Samuel 24:6).[108] Romans 13, equally, suggests an independent divine ordaining of authorities "for there is no authority except from God, and those authorities that exist have been instituted by God" (Romans 13:1). Jesus likewise expresses this sentiment in his dialogue with Pilate in the Gospel of John: "You would have no power over me unless it had been given from above" (19:11). But the Biblical narratives perspective on this matter ranges beyond the question of legitimation, so much so that New Testament scholar Oscar Cullmann states: "It is so closely bound up with the Gospel itself that they emerge together" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.11).

3. Government in the Hebrew Bible:

However we do find the question of political authority arising early on in the Hebrew Bible, beginning with Genesis 1-2. The anthropology of Genesis 1-2 can suggest two things; firstly, one theory defining the *Imago Dei* is that humans, in being an Image of God, stand as a representation of the divine presence and sovereign authority. Marc Cortez states: "In the ancient near east, a divine image was understood to be far more than a merely symbolic depiction of the divine reality. Instead, an image was identified with a particular manifestation of the divine being's presence and sovereign authority" (Cortez, 2010, pg.31-2). Likewise, kings of the ancient near east, would do the same to establish areas of which they reigned: "The physical image of a king (e.g., a statue) was not a mere symbol of the king, but it was actually a manifestation of the king's presence" (Cortez, 2010, pg.32). Secondly, dominion of the earth is given to humanity: "let them have dominion" (Genesis 1:26, similarly 1:28). This contrast between divine rule and delegation of divine rule to humans is an antinomy that fuels the rest of the narrative in regards to political

authority. This is a dual theme that persists throughout the Hebrew Bible; Moses is delegated

authority as a mediator (Exodus 20:19) but Yahweh is clearly King.[109] Anglican political theologian

and ethicist, Oliver O'Donovan reflects upon Jewish liturgy during the First Temple period: "When

the Jews of the First Temple period used to sing the refrain *Yhwh Mālak*, 'Yhwh is king', a liturgical

act in which political and religious meanings were totally fused" (O'Donovan, 1996, pg.32). For

Yoder, the two antinomies of authority solely in Yahweh's kingship and the delegation of authority

are the clearest ways of God's kingship being expressed: "Such decentralised leadership, in Yoder's

estimation, served as a foil to human kingship and as a pointer to Yahweh's reign" (Nugent, 2011,

pg.49). Within the Pentateuch, we do find examples of God giving legitimacy to monarchy and

centralised authority, as long as certain criteria are met including a continual reading of the Law and

a fear of God (Deuteronomy 17). According to Nugent, Yoder finds this chapter to undermine

monarchy as this criteria is never fully actualised (Nugent, 2011, pg.58). Whereas the opposite

could also be suggested; a failure to achieve a criterion does not undermine the monarchy but rather

provides a function of humbly constraining the role of the monarchy and gives an objective,

independent source of legitimation to the benevolence of the throne. Interestingly, legitimation of

the throne's benevolence is revoked from the throne, in stark contrast to theocratic monarchies in

the ancient world. Jonathan Sacks explains: "One of the key biblical projects is to demythologise

and secularise power" (Sacks, 2012, pg.130). The seat of political authority is not the origin of its

own benevolence, it must cohere with God's law and submit itself to God's authority. During the

pre-monarchial period depicted in the book of Judges, we begin to see a rejection of Yahweh's

kingship, four times the phrase 'In those days Israel had no king' (Judges 17:6, 18:1, 19:1, 21:25).

Old Testament scholar Robert G. Boling in his commentary states: "what is lamented is the lack of

acknowledgement of Yahweh's kingship in Israel" (Boling, 1975, pg.258). Twice following this

statement written is " all the people did what was right in their own eyes" (17:6, 21:15). Moral

decline and injustice incurs at the rejection of God as king and even those whom he delegates

authority (the Judges) are ignored. Likewise in 1 Samuel 8, the prophet Samuel bids on behalf of

the Israelites for a human king, rejecting God as king. "but they have rejected me as being king over

them" (1 Sam. 8:7). O'Donovan suggests at this point, that what is perceived as an anti-Monarchial

text is actually in favour of monarchy: "Even the narrative of 1 Samuel 8 is in fact an apologia for

the monarchy addressed to its natural antagonists; it intends to leave no doubt that the monarchy

came to existence by Yhwh's decisions." (O'Donovan, 1996, pg.61). This is an interesting, but

problematic, take on the passage; firstly, it is a delegation of authority birthed out of dismissing

Yahweh as king. Secondly, the connotations the text of giving humanity what it asks is lamented in

very much the same way that St. Paul depicts God doing: 'God gave them up in the lusts of their

hearts to impurity" (Romans 1:24); it is God's decision to 'give them up' but it is not a text in

favour of what they are given up into.

In briefly depicting the Hebrew Bible's relation with authority and monarchy, we find suggestions

of what is God's intention in regards to the state. Firstly, though Yoder's thesis that Yahweh's

kingship can be best served with a decentralised leadership coheres with the previous chapter's

epistemology, the Hebrew Bible does not limit itself to this form of government. Secondly, the

emphasis is on having Yahweh as LORD above all authority (decentralised government in Judges or

monarchy in 1 & 2 Kings). What we do explicitly find throughout the Hebrew Bible is that God's

Kingship, though it permits human kingship, always stands against the power of the king. The

influential Jewish theologian and philosopher Martin Buber gives an intense expression of this:

"JHWH does not want, like the other kingly gods, to be sovereign and guarantor of a human

monarch. He wants Himself to be the Leader and the Prince" (Buber, 1967, pg.136).

4. Government in the Gospels:

The New Testament reflects deeply on the matter of political authority and its relation to the

Church. Jesus clearly comes into conflict with authority, but in a manner different to the two options

perceived by those around him. The tension in which Jesus abides is between his promulgation of his Kingship as Messiah and LORD[110], as well as his rejection of the theocratic ideal. New Testament scholar Craig A. Evans, in reflecting on Jesus' kingly entrance into Jerusalem (Mark 11:1-10) states: "Such an event suggested in unmistakeable terms that Israel's king was Jesus, not Caesar. Thus, from the very moment of entry into Jerusalem, Jesus was set on a collision course with Roman authority" (Miller, 2008, pg.6). Whilst Oscar Cullmann carefully depicts Jesus' rejection of the theocratic ideal "as satanic — we need only recall the temptation stories in the Gospel" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.14). This theocratic ideal is most clearly expressed by the Zealot movement, which Jesus and his followers were often accused of being: "Thus to outsiders, at least, Jesus and the Zealot leaders appeared to have something in common. According to Acts 21.38, the Roman tribune before whom Paul was hauled considered him a Zealot. In fact he thinks Paul may be the Egyptian Zealot leader whose insurrection is also recorded by Josephus. 'Are you the Egyptian who caused an insurrection of four thousand Zealots?'" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.17). In fact, "Jesus was condemned to death on the cross by the Romans as a Zealot" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.16). The accusation of Jesus being a Zealot is still perpetuated today, in works such as Reza Aslan's *Zealot* which states: "The memory of the revolutionary zealot who walked across Galilee gathering an army of disciples with the goal of establishing the Kingdom of God on earth, the magnetic preacher who defied the authority of the Temple priesthood in Jerusalem, the radical Jewish nationalist who challenged the Roman occupation and lost, has been almost completely lost to history" (Aslan, 2014, pg.216). Aslan's thesis falters on a number of points but he does provide a clear example of how kingship and the Messianic movement was perceived. What he falters on is the radical reevaluation of 'Messiah' by Jesus. Firstly, reading against the text, he depicts the Gospels as unhistorical, ignoring research such as that of N.T. Wright and many others, who have stated "there is no better evidence available" (Wright, 1992, pg.469), when researching Jesus and the early Christian movement. Secondly, the mythologising of a failed messianic movement, does

not appear to show any clear benefit, especially if it is to cohere with Aslan's thesis that it was later

to comply with the Romans, thus completely betraying Jesus the Zealot's intention, rather perhaps

Jesus the Zealot is one of the most inconvenient persons to make a Jewish-rooted faith appeal to the

Romans. Moreso, certain key aspects of Jesus' conversations in the Gospels suggest an active

rejection of the Zealot movement's means to its goal: "The Evangelist has preserved the recollection

that Jesus did not apply the title messiah to himself, because it was too heavily weighted with the

ideal of political kingship and could lead to Zealot misunderstandings" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.27).

   If Jesus was not a Zealot, was he a collaborationist with the state? His rejection of Zealot means

does not equate to collaborating with the Roman state: what we find in Jesus' self-conciousness as

King and Messiah is a challenge to those in authority in and of itself. The challenge is against the

overreach of the state's sovereignty. As we find in Mark 12:17; "Give to the emperor the things that

are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's". Cullmann expresses further the contrast

between the insurrectionist option and the collaborationist option: "He merely recognises that

within its sphere the state can demand what belongs to it: money, taxes. But it is not placed on the

same level as God. Give God what is his! That means: your life, your entire person" (Cullmann,

1963, pg.32). Cullmann, later, points to the direct challenge of Mark 12:13: "In the background we

hear the challenge: if ever the State demands what belongs to God, if ever it hinders in the

proclamation of the Kingdom of God, then resist it" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.33). Other scriptural

examples of resistance can include the Hebrew midwives (Exodus 1:17) who resisted Pharaoh

because they 'feared God'. As well as the example of Daniel, who "promotes an ethic of nonviolent

resistance and civil disobedience. Its politics is theopolitics, viewing all human rule in the light of

divine rule" (Green & Lapsley, 2013, pg.120). This is more clearly expressed in Daniel 6:10, where

Daniel clearly ignores King Darius' edict. As Jesus' claim to kingship, as well his concern of being

misunderstood on what the implications of his kingship are, can be found in Pilate's trial of Jesus in

the Gospel of John. Having not withdrawn his claim to kingship, he gives a specific expression of

the nature of the Kingdom of God; "My kingdom is not from this world. If my kingdom were from this world, my followers would be fighting to keep me from being handed over to the Jews. But as it is, my kingdom is not from here" (John 18:36). Cullmann's assessment of this passage is depicted as being non-political (Cullmann, 1963, pg. 29), but that definition appears inadequate (especially in regards to the overall thesis). Jesus' kingship is one of nonviolent mission and martyrdom. However in regards of being apolitical, the opposite appears to clearer. O'Donovan distinguishes two frontiers of the Christian Gentile mission one addressed to *society*, and one addressed to *rulers:* "Society and rulers have different destinies: the former is one transformed, shaped in conformity to God's purpose; the latter are to disappear, renouncing their sovereignty in the face of his" (O'Donovan, 1996, pg.193). In regards of this mission, it humbly confronts two levels of political relationships, rejecting and encouraging aspects of both. In fact as R. David Kaylor states in *Jesus the Prophet:* "Jesus preached and taught a message that was thoroughly political, a message that demanded a social and political revolution" (Kaylor, 1994, pg.3).

5. Government in the Pauline Epistles:

St. Paul, in relation to Jesus' challenge, appears to be in contradiction. Romans 13 opens with stating "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities" (13:1). Interestingly, if we are to understand this passage as a contradiction of Paul against Christ, we must also understand it as a contradiction of Paul against Paul. Throughout Acts and within Paul's letters, we find numerous times when he was brought in front of courts and placed in jail (at one point appearing to be in prison for two years - Acts 24:27). So how are we to understand this text? Is it overly idealistic? In Romans 12, we find the context for our understanding of how the state acts. Paul calls on Christians to not avenge themselves, "Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave room for the wrath of God; for it is written, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord'" (Romans 12:19). The question of vengeance and of how God repays an individual's vengeance is enacted by the state "for it is God's

servant for your good. But if you do what is wrong, you should be afraid, for the authority does not

bear the sword in vain! It is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer" (Romans 13:4).

Thus the state needs to be obeyed as the dispenser of God's judgement against the wrongdoer, and

the Christian is in no way to act as a wrongdoer. Cullmann makes the interesting note of the context

of the letter's recipients: "We must not forget that the readers found themselves in the very capital

of the Roman Empire, and that precisely among the Christians there it was possible for a temper of

animosity toward the state to arise similar to that of the Jewish Zealots. This renders Paul's

command more understandable" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.48). In light of Paul's mandate, how do we

understand Jesus' critical response to the state overreaching and being given its due? A similar verse

is found in Paul's section on obeying authorities; "Pay to all what is due them—taxes to whom

taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honour to whom

honour is due" (Romans 13:7). Christians must obey the state in what is due to the state, obedience

for the good of the community, taxes, legal system, and so on. Paul's response to the things that are

not due to the state gives a clear impression that, "His own condemnation however proves that he

does not recommend subjection in these things" (Cullmann, 1963, pg.49). Rather it is the law of

love to the individuals, who wield the power of the state and not so much the abstract concept of the

State that needs to be given their due, Emil Brunner puts this succinctly: "To confront the

representatives of political power with the intention of giving them their due, is an outworking of

love" (Brunner, 1959, pg.110). Obedience is also given to the state in respect to the mission of the

Church (as pointed to by O' Donovan). So what is the response to the state when evil is done

against Christians obeying God rather than human authority?

6. Church and State in Conflict - Saints and Prophets:

John Howard Yoder, in *The Christian Witness to the State,* points to Revelation as a source for a

model on this issue: "The task of Christians in Revelation 13 is not to rebel in any politically

relevant way; it is suffering submission, 'the patience and faithfulness of the saints'"(Yoder, 1992, pg.76). However, enduring and not compromising with a persecuting or evil state is not the only way of faithfully dealing with this issue. The state, being legitimated by God, includes the state being under the authority of God. The prophetic element in Scripture is prevalent in both Testaments, especially in regards to those in authority and their relation to God, whether they are being faithful or not. Reverend and activist, Raphael Gamaliel Warnock in his essay *Preaching and Prophetic Witness*, states of Martin Luther King Jr's commitment to a prophetic witness: "Authentic Christian witness required deep social consciousness and broad moral continuity, even if it meant the questioning of his patriotism and the alienating of a civil rights president" (Jenkins & McBride, 2010, pg.154). It is this witness, which is essential to Christian mission as noted by O'Donovan. Yoder disputes this understanding of prophecy: "In both Old and New Testaments, the prophet speaks not to the world but to the people of God" (Yoder, 1992, pg.36).Within the Scriptures, we find examples both with leaders of other groups and with other people groups. Noteworthy is the case of Moses confrontation with Pharaoh, (Exodus 5:1), which Walter Brueggemann believes is paradigmatic of the prophetic activity. For Brueggemann, it is not only the Pharaoh, but the social order (royal consciousness) that the Prophet comes in to confront: "The Exodus symbol, above all, is turned to show for all would-be Pharaohs that Exodus is a catastrophic ending of what had seemed forever" (Brueggemann, 1985, pg.50). The prophet, for Brueggemann, grieves the current predicament and energises the listener's imagination of God's intention. Can we consider the prophetic approach, the critical evaluation of the state, to be the only mode of relationship between Church and state? According to Yoder it is, this is predominantly due to the activity that the state necessarily has to apply, that of the Sword.

7. The Christian in the State - An Analysis:

The conception of the Sword[111] is derived from Romans 13, where Paul states that the state carries out the dispensing of justice. For Yoder: "The wielding of the sword is always an expression of a degree of unbelief, and the church that blesses this undertaking is always marked by a measure of apostasy" (Yoder, 1992, pg.77). Thus beyond a critical distancing, the Church has no other option; otherwise, we contradict the pacifist teachings of Christ.[112] In Yoder's thought there is no role beyond the conception of the sword for the state: "Yoder has a mostly negative, frequently ambiguous and at best modest view of political authority. To him standard authority is the attempt to order communities by means of domination, which includes the use of force and violence" (Bertschmann, 2015, pg.426). Though, admittedly, within the Christian tradition, the state is not always looked at in a harsh manner. For example, even when presented as a dichotomy of optimism versus pessimism, Church Doctors St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine of Hippo both give positive views of the state's action, "Augustine does consider government to be a necessity due to the fall,[113] while Aquinas considers government to be an inherent feature of God's created order and human nature created in God's image" (Phillips, 2013, pg.36). A positive perception of the state continues in the thought of Reformers, such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, who also suggest it is good for Christians to be a part of the state. Luther applies his understanding in reference to 'love of neighbour': "Although you yourself do not need your enemy to be punished, your weak neighbour does, and you are to help him to enjoy peace and to see to it that his enemies are kept in check[114]" (Höpfl, 1998, pg.14). Calvin, moreso, stresses the value of this vocation: "Hence there can be no doubt that in the sight of God civil authority is not merely a holy and legitimate vocation, but by far the most sacred and honourable of all human vocations" (Höpfl, 1998, pg.52).

8. Assimilation or Competition:

Despite the trend of thought that establishes the possibility of a positive relationship between Church and state, Yoder's criticisms should not be ignored. As his work embodies the ultimacy of Christ's call that should be heeded. One of the key issues that the Spanish Church struggled with was its persistence in holding to the Franco regime's ideology. Yoder's writing expresses the influence of Neo-Orthodoxy from his studies under Karl Barth in this critique. Barth states that the Church should only be obedient to one Lord, once we submit to an 'also' we necessarily "gravitated into 'only'" (Barth, 1961, pg.55) therefore we submit to Christ and also to another ideology, Lord, movement. That movement eventually becomes the 'only' thus ignoring Christ; "The concept of revelation and that of reason, history or humanity were usually linked by the copulative "and," and the most superficial provisos were regarded as sufficient against the all the possible dangers of such combinations. Happy little hyphens were used between, say, the words "modern" and "positive" or "religious" and "social," or "German" and "Evangelical," as if the meaning then became self evident" (Barth, 1961, pg.56). Beyond assimilation, there is competition. As mentioned in the previous chapter the state can be in competition for the Church's loyalties, or as William Cavanaugh notes: "the nation competes with the church on the same "religious" grounds" (Cavanaugh, 2007, pg.26). In regards to individual citizenship, the apostle Paul states that "our citizenship is in heaven" (Philippians 3:20). In this regard, the Reformer Richard Hooker suggests we should be citizens of heaven and in relation to the state: "This is because the Christian Church is at one and the same time both a 'politic society', existing at the human level, and a 'society supernatural' which holds fellowship with 'God, angels and holy men'" (Avis, 2001, pg.47). Is this coherent with the apostle Paul? In Acts 16:37, we find evidence of Paul appealing to his Roman citizenship for his protection; thus for the sake of mission our temporal citizenship can be of use when needed.

9. The Church in Government - Problems and Possibilities:

  Though acceptable for the individual Christian, we must ask; what about the Church? If we can

make an argument for Christian individuals collaborating with the state, can the Church work in

establishment with the state? The history of Church and state relations on the Spanish side of the

frontier would suggest that separation of two entities is perhaps best for both. However as the

Anglican theologian Paul Avis explains: "But in the Christian theological economy, abuse does not

destroy use. Not all the historical expressions of an integral relationship between Church and state

can be condemned as corrupt, though no doubt all have been imperfect" (Avis, 2001, pg.viii). In

order to deal with this question appropriately, we must first interact with arguments against

establishment. Predominately, in a liberal modern democracy, we must first deal with critiques

against establishment for the sake of state. By starting at this point, we can establish whether there

is space for the Church to pursue establishment. Potentially, the greatest argument for the nature of

the state in religious matters, is that it should be neutral. Especially in our present period of

globalisation, which has led to a greater diversity within nation-states. In light of this establishment

it, "assumes a correspondence between national and religious identity which marginalises non-

established churches, and especially non-Christians as only partial members of the British national

collectivity[115]" (Donald & Rattansi, 1992, pg.283). Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor expresses

the rationale behind the concern with marginalising other Christian churches and non-Christians:

"the point of state neutrality is precisely to avoid favouring or disfavouring not just religious

positions but any basic position, religious or nonreligious" (Mendieta & VanAntwerpen, 2011, pg.

37). Does this necessarily deny the possibility of establishment? Political conceptions by their

nature work within ontologies, within which may be more than one understanding of ethical

implications of that ontology. Nigel Biggar explains further: "It seems, then, that a liberal point of

view is *not* neutral. It is not a view from nowhere. Liberal space is not indefinite. It is bounded by

certain moral convictions, which are expressive of a certain understanding of human

beings" (Biggar, 2014, pg. 33). Social and public policy expert Tariq Modood wisely notes that,

"Even if it could be shown that a liberal regime was not morally, ethically or, indeed, religiously

neutral in its effect, this would be considered by the liberal theories to be of no consequence. It

would not impinge upon the claim to neutrality presented by the liberal regime. Since any

regulatory regime will affect diverse groups differently, what is important to the liberal theorist is

the neutrality of the procedure to decide between the various individuals and groups within society,

not the neutrality of the outcomes" (Modood, 2007, pg.85). Modood goes on to suggest that in

holding neutrality in terms of procedure, the aim of the state should be inclusiveness rather than

neutrality (Modood, 2007, pg.92). The question is clearly, what type of establishment is possible?

The Spanish establishment of the first half of the 20th century contradicted the principle of

inclusiveness.Which type of establishment is then compatible and good? Political philosopher

Daniel Brudney suggests that modest non-coercive establishment is compatible within a liberal

democracy, where state preference of a certain religion is possible but with certain limitations

(Brudney, 2005, pg. 817). Even if we consider the state as non-coercive, state preference of a

religion may discomfort non-adherents of that faith, or will it? According to Biggar:

"*Prima facie* evidence that the Anglican establishment is compatible with religious freedom is

furnished by the support that many members of minority faiths give it. Indeed, Tariq Madood

claimed in 1994 that it is "a brute fact" that not a single article or speech by any non-Christian faith

in favour of disestablishment, its proven openness to other denominations and faiths seeking public

space, and the fact that its very existence is an ongoing acknowledgment of the public character of

religion, are all reasons why it may be far less intimidating to the minority faiths that a triumphal

secularism" (Biggar, 2014, pg.44).

Having dealt with the key issues from the perspective of the state, we must ask whether it is

establishment is a good relationship for the Church. According to liberal theologian Theo Hobson

establishment restricts the Church's 'communicative power': "the Church should admit that its

communicative power is limited by its implication in constitutional tradition; in particular it is cut

off from a sector of liberal opinion, which might be open to a less politically burdened

evangelism" (Hobson, 2012, pg.173). We see this in the Spanish situation until the 1960's where the

Church began to critique the state, but this brings up an example of how establishment can be

restrictive, but it depends of the response of the Church. For instance, Biggar notes in the UK

establishment: "Establishment did not prevent the Church of England from making head-on

criticism of the Thatcher Government in *Faith in the City* in 1985. Nor did it prevent the

Archbishop of Canterbury (Rowan Williams) from publicly dissenting from Prime Minister Blair's

decision to go to war against Iraq in 2003. Nor did it stop him from warning the current Coalition

Government against using the "Big Society" as a fig-leaf for dismantling welfare

provision" (Biggar, 2014, pg. 32). Likewise historically, in stark contradiction of Yoder's thesis of

'Constantianism'; even during the reign of Constantine, we find examples of bishops criticising the

emperor: "Athanasius had a clean conscience about defying the emperor, just as he defied councils

that were stacked against him. His relations with Constantine's successor, Constantius, were even

sharper[116]" (Leithart, 2010, pg.184). O'Donovan contributes more examples, in referring to St.

Ambrose, he states: "The Church expected the emperor to act like a Christian, and when he failed to

do so it claimed the right to censure him" (O'Donovan, 1996, pg.200). In terms of the mission of

the Church, establishment could work in its favour, as having a Christian government gives the

ability to critique authority using a particular ethical standard shared by Church and state. Even if

the state is secular, whilst maintaining establishment this option is open to the Church as expressed

in Biggar's quote above. However, we could argue that establishment is not necessary for this to

occur, a key example is the situation in the USA, where church leaders from all-denominations have

spoken against or in support of state policies. Perhaps the biggest concern of the anti-establishment view is that of assimilating the goal of the state with the Kingdom of God. Peter Leithart explains this criticism: "Constantianism simply *is* the identification of nation or empire with the purposes of God" (Leithart, 2010, pg.252). This becomes not only a misapplication of the Church's mission but can provide a dangerous legitimation of state misconduct, as Volf explains, "because it can transmute what is in fact a murder into an act of piety" (Volf, 1996, pg.37).

10. Conclusion:

Thus we come to the conclusion that in the multiple conceptions in which establishment could appear, the Church must always have a critical distance from the state. The Church must never settle with the status-quo either, always invoking the state and society to seek improvement, lamenting that which does not correspond with the Kingdom of God and encouraging all virtuous activity. As Brueggemann states: "The task of prophetic ministry is to nurture, nourish, and evoke a consciousness and perception alternative to the consciousness and perception of the dominant culture around us" (Brueggemann, 1985, pg.13). The Church's relationship with the state should never be simplistic, uncritical, or silent. Establishment between Church and state can be useful as long as the Church remains faithful to its essence as a collective loyal to Christ's kingdom and as pilgrims only treating the Kingdom of God in the *Eschaton* as ultimate and satisfactory. This discussion about how the Church's relationship with the state should, inevitably, include questions that needs to be investigated further; that of the church's relation to power and how that power should be used.

¿El Poder y la Gloria?

A study on the definition, accumulation, and use of Power in Christian political ethics

1. Introduction:

British philosopher Bertrand Russell once stated that: "Of the infinite desires of man, the chief are

the desires for power and glory" (Russell, 2005, pg.3). Power is one inevitable aspect of social life,

in social interactions a person can assert their identity, needs, or desires on to another or in reverse

be impressed upon by the power of others. The existentialist theologian Paul Tillich in his book,

Love, Power, and Justice contends that: "Every encounter of the somebody who represents a power

of being with somebody else who represents of being leads to a decision about the amount of power

embodied in each of them" (Tillich, 1960, pg.41). Likewise on the political level, power and power

relations is an inevitable discussion. Firstly, questions of authority and how authority is centralised

in our current system of political interactions. It appears that people, organisations, or nations are

most effective when led by a smaller group or person within the community. Secondly, it is a natural

and unavoidable, as John Howard Yoder wisely notes: "There is no such thing as

anarchy[117]" (Yoder, 1992, pg.39).

2. The Necessity of Power:

Power, according to Russell, is intrinsic to the interpretation of social affairs (Russell, 2005, pg.4).

Therefore, in understanding the Gibraltar-Spanish predicament, power appears to be an important

interpretative lens as well as a concept to be analysed. In Tillich's aforementioned thesis, he

attempts to express the concept of power as an ontological concept. For Tillich, power is intrinsic to

being in our affirmation of self against non-being which he largely derives from Nietzsche's 'will to

power': "The will to power is not the will of men to attain power over men, but it is the self-

affirmation of life in its self-transcending dynamics, overcoming internal and external resistance.

71

This interpretation of Nietzsche's 'will to power' easily leads to a systematic ontology of power" (Tillich, 1960, pg.36). Theologian and philosopher James P. Mackey expresses a similar view in his defining of the 'anatomy of power'; "Power is one of the original features or factors in this universe, so named because it effects things, or, more mildly put, because it enables states of affairs to come about" (Mackey, 2005, pg.13).

3. The Christian and Power:

If Tillich and Mackey are right to define power as an aspect intrinsic to Being, how does the Christian relate to it? Political theologian James E. Wood, Jr. focuses upon a common sentiment among Christians in regards to power, "There is a tendency on the part of many Christians to assume that any proclivity for power is, in and of itself, evil" (Wood, 1972, pg.107). This perspective can be largely drawn from God's humbling of those in power and uplifting the humble. Mary's *Magnificat* depicts this well, "He has brought down the powerful from their thrones, and lifted up the lowly" (Luke 1:52); likewise Jesus' statement: "the last will be first, and the first will be last" (Matthew 20:16). However, Wood wisely points out: "Power is a morally neutral concept and therefore ought not to be thought of as some negative or immoral force" (Wood, 1972, pg. 107-8). Is he here contradicting a scriptural paradigm for power? Not necessarily, the emphasised concept of these passages is humility and the accentuation of the humble being. Firstly, if the 'self-affirmation to life' is contingent, then there would be no created life without the necessary Creator. Volf explains: "our very being is in need of the power to be" (Volf, 2005, pg.73). Not only is life brought into being from non-being, but the gospels speak about the Kingdom of God, a 'state of affairs' to be created. The Kingdom of God 'wills to power' in the sense that the ontology of this Kingdom desires to extend itself. "Your Kingdom come, Your will be done" (Matthew 6:10). Russell notes this well: "Nietzsche accused Christianity of inculcating a slave-morality, but ultimate triumph was always the goal. 'Blessed are the meek, *for they shall inherit the earth*'" (Russell,

2005, pg.7). Russell's reference to Matthew 5:5, expresses one key concept concerning inheriting

the earth or advancing the Kingdom of God and that is through meekness. To borrow Stanley

Hauerwas' phrase, meekness and humility follows the "grain of the universe"[118] (Hauerwas, 2001,

pg.17). New Testament scholar R.T. France commenting on this passage states: "God will give them

the high place for they would not seize for themselves"[119] (France, 2008, pg.115).

4. Gaining Power and the Use of Power:

Therefore after first dealing with a prevalent misconception of power within churches, we must

move on to how it is to be accumulated. In being a collective unit, the Church in both its universal

form and each smaller unit holds a position of power or authority. Within the Church, teaching and

the sacraments facilitate worldview and liturgy (thus creating a specific and distinct identity, in

contrast to those outside of the Church). Specifically in teaching, the Church finds its power from

God and ultimately belonging to him. Wood notes: "According to the Bible power is identified with

God, who is omnipotent, the Almighty One, and therefore the ultimate source of all power. Power is

bound up with the very essence of God" (Wood, 1972, pg.109). Specifically in receiving power and

authority from God, the Church is accountable to God.[120] It is accountable to God in representing

within its sphere of power, God's will and kingdom; as Wood explains: "The church's power in the

world is never an end in itself but is an instrument or means of establishing God's kingdom in the

world" (Wood, 1972, pg.114). In relation to the world outside the Church, how does the Church

accumulate power? Firstly, it needs to retain its essence and stand in obedience to Christ's

commandments; to do otherwise is both a betrayal and self-defeating. Thus it cannot take the

warning of the Florentine Renaissance thinker Niccoló Machiavelli to those in power: "The fact is

that a man who wants to act virtuously in every way necessarily comes to grief among so many who

are not virtuous" (Machiavelli, 1963, pg.91). The means for the goal of the Christian community is

as important as the end. Bonhoeffer embodies this notion in depicting God's faithfulness, rather

than success, as the determining factor in Christian action, "His concern is neither success nor failure but willing acceptance of the judgement of God" (Bonhoeffer, 2009, pg.90). In the question of means the Church is bound to a specific ethic that is good, just and loving; thus accumulating power by force is problematic.

5. The Continuum of Power - Force and Authority:

Mackey points out that all power is on a continuum between two poles: "It is possible for it to appear as pure force or pure authority, although it is more normally in our experience located somewhere on the continuum between these extremes, and its precise locations on this continuum can be plotted by the relative presence or absence of the properly moral factor" (Mackey, 2005, pg. 7). On this continuum, due to its specific nature the Church should aim for the pole of authority, though inevitably navigating this aim is difficult and never fully achievable. To do the opposite and accumulate power through force contradicts a number of ethical theories grounded on doctrines such as *Imago Dei* and the biblical understanding of conversion as a spiritual regeneration of the human being brought about by grace of God. Likewise this upholds the role of human conscience explicated in Romans 14. As Martin Luther points out: "There is truth in the saying: Thought is free" (Höpfl, 1998, pg.26). The ethical benefit of appealing to authority in the accumulation of power is the didactic moral component in which, the person is won over rather than forced to obey a commandment. This is intrinsic to Christ's Great Commission to 'make disciples of all nations' (Matthew 28:19) and, as France comments, "The description of the mission in terms of *making disciples* emphasises this personal allegiance" (France, 2008, pg.420). In contrast to an enforced convert, a disciple sees Christ as a morally desirous authority. His commandment for the Christian is not an abstract proposition to be merely upheld, but it is seen as good and desirous (Psalm 19). The beauty of this understanding is clear, but so is the difficulty. Firstly, does not God assert his power by force as well as authority? The whole concept of Old Testament law is of a law

not to be discussed but obeyed. Likewise there are examples of capital punishment, thus ultimate

examples of applying force in respect to moral issues. Mackey notes how even appeals to divine

revelation can be considered power by force: "human society claiming to be sole judge of any

teaching which purports to put before us the content of such revelation, is itself one which places

the power of that structure closer to force than authority" (Mackey, 2005, pg.30). Whereas God as

the creator and foundation of justice and power, surely has the clearest right to delegate moral

responses to injustice. The numerous examples of capital punishment in the Old Testament and one

case in the New Testament (Acts 5) point to the repercussions of all sin on the social framework and

how the penalty of it is death (Rom. 6:23). The punishment of sin by force appears to be a necessity

in a fallen world; firstly, of justice. For an injustice not to be punished would itself be an injustice.

Such as found in the concept of *lex talionis*, vividly expressed in the Old Testament law (Lev.

24:19–2). Moreso, in the New Testament the administration of force to deal with sin being left to

God (and delegated to governmental states) as well allows for Christians to employ an ideal of

withholding vengeance (Romans 12 -13). Secondly, the difficulty is clear, as a pure assertion of

power by authority is idealistic and impossible in a world that is postlapsarian and prior to the

parousia. This is impossible, as within this period, humanity struggles not only with its creaturely

epistemic limitations, hence not be able to make absolute appeals to authority, but its struggle with

sin. The apostle Paul notes in the first letter to the Corinthians, "And we speak of these things in

words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those

who are spiritual" (2:13). In noting the epistemic differences between those who believe and those

who do not, we realise that the Holy Spirit is needed to see and understand God, therefore there is a

distinction between those who can see God as an authority and those that do not. Moreso, even

within the Church, Paul admits: "For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to

face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known" (1 Cor.

13:12). Thus within and outside of the Church, pure appeals to authority are limited since due to our

limited epistemology there will be disagreement and rebellion, thus even laws built on a precedent

of authority can be perceived as one of force.

6. The Church and Law:

In light of this understanding, examples of rules or canon law can be found within the Church

throughout history. Church historian Robert L. Wilken notes: "From its beginning, the Christian

Church was a rule-making community. Even when the churches were very small, Saint Paul laid

down guidelines for the ordering of their common life" (Wilken, 2012, pg.174). As found within 1

Corinthians, Paul applies a means of excommunication for not only the sake of the Church, but for

the individual offender (1 Cor. 5:15). Paul applies power by force by punishing the individual with

expulsion, though it is backed by moral argument based on authority. Likewise in regards to outside

the Church, the Church has been a force in implementing legislative changes. Theological reasoning

in support of changing laws has occurred throughout Church history as in the example of

Constantine, as mentioned by Peter Leithart: "Constantine did reform the law in a Christian

direction in several respects" (Leithart,2010, pg.201). In his book *Law and Revolution,* acclaimed

legal scholar Harold Berman goes as far as to say that the Western legal system is "a secular residue

of religious attitudes and assumptions which historically first found expression in the liturgy and

rituals and doctrine of the church, and thereafter in the institutions and concepts and values of the

law" (Berman, 1983, pg.166). This tradition of embodying Christian morality in law is not relegated

to pre-Enlightenment times as a positive, example can presented from the Southern Christian

Leadership Conference during the Civil Rights movement; Martin Luther King jr. writes in his

autobiography; "The ironic splendid result of the small Selma project was nothing less that the

Voting Rights Act of 1965" (King, 2004, pg.288). These are examples of good and necessary

embodiments of Christian morality in law, but embodying Christian morality (or morality in

general) can have discouraging effects. Mackey points to the debate on law and morality between

the judge, Lord Patrick Devlin and legal philosopher H.L.A. Hart. The 1959 debate contains a

specific issue of relevance for this point, by threatening punishment for breaking the morality

embodied in law, we may lose the developing of the moral character expressed in the concept of

discipleship and instead induce conformity rather than moral reformation. Moreso, in punishing

offenders there is a immoral act initiated on the guilty party via violence or a taking away of liberty.

Mackey points out: "Whatever good is done in the course of preventing by threat from harming

others, it cannot at any rate be moral good: for the threat in this case is as likely to induce

conformity rather than a truly moral response, as it would be in the case of social moral values in

general" (Mackey, 2005, pg.49). So where does this leave the Spanish and Gibraltarian Churches?

In recent years the political dimension of the Churches has been focused on the questions of

abortion and same-sex marriage. Susana Aguilar Fernández notes in her article, *El activismo

político de la Iglesia católica durante el gobierno de Zapatero*[121] *(2004-2010)*: "This role has been

chosen by the SCC [Spanish Catholic Church] in order to oppose two political reforms advocated

by the Socialist government of Zapatero: same-sex marriage and the liberalization of abortion… the

SCC has decisively involved itself in this political fight by means of campaigns and social

mobilisation against these reforms[122]" (Aguilar Fernàndez, 2010, pg.1130). Likewise, the

Evangelical Alliance in Gibraltar has focused on responding to letters written in regards to sexual

health issues (Evangelical Alliance of Gibraltar, March 2013). For the Catholic Church, its authority

on these issue is presented as 'the deposit of faith'.[123]

7. Power to Change the State of Affairs - Traditional Revolution:

   The Church's role and its application of the 'deposit of faith' in the public square can be authorised

by being, as according to Russell, a traditional power. A traditional power is an authority ascertained

by its historic longevity. Russell does however note, that originally it could be argued the early

Church was a revolutionary power; "So it was with the revolution that gave power to the

Church" (Russell, 2005, pg.87). In this we must ask, how does the Church use its power? To avoid

being 'devoid of prophetic witness' (Boff, 1985, pg.4) the Church must utilise its deposit of faith in

two ways. It must first, not aim specifically at changing national morality from the top down (as

represented by dealing primarily with the Government) but rather from the grassroots.[124] Otherwise,

as previously mentioned, its power is expressed through force, via the law, rather than authority.

However not only for this reason, in the Scriptures we not only see Christ remembering to include

those in the lower strata of society; we find him rather placing himself amongst, not only, those who

are poor or destitute, but also amongst the outsider and the sinner (Luke 5: 27-32). Moreso, during

Christ's earthly life, he did not merely act in solidarity but substituted his place of power for those

in poverty, "For you know the generous act of our Lord Jesus Christ, who though he was rich, yet

for your sakes he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich" (2 Cor. 8:9). As well,

the righteous one substitutes himself for the sake of the unrighteous[125] (2 Cor. 5:2). Influential

German theologian Jürgen Moltmann expresses the depths of Christ's substitution in noting that in

his crucifixion, God in Christ took the position of the blasphemer (Moltmann, 1977, pg.128), rebel

(Moltmann, 1977, pg.136), and godforsaken (Moltmann, 1977, pg.145). In death, Christ takes the

position of those who will die, going beyond all distinctions to humanity's universal experience.

Moltmann writes: "he lowers himself and accepts the whole of mankind without limits and

conditions, so that each man may participate in him with the whole of his life" (Moltmann, 1977,

pg.276). It also reflects a biblical model of praxis, following the kenotic quality of Christ's rise to

the "right hand of God" (Luke 22:69), "but emptied himself, taking the form of a

slave," (Philippians 2:7) and work from the bottom up. Theologian Rev. Stephen G. Ray Jr. depicts

this praxis as "cruciform communitarianism" (Jenkins & McBride, 2010, pg.164). Thus we must

consider the appeal to the moneyed-class in Gibraltar and the Church-state collusion in Spain as

lacking, unless the lower class and those not in positions of power are accounted for and walked

with in solidarity. Being *kenotic* and cruciform may include giving up certain privileges in the

future, and evidence of this understanding is echoed presently in Roman Catholic congregations in

Spain: "More than half of practicing Catholics in Spain believe that the institutional privileges

enjoyed by their Church should be ended" (Tejedor, 2013), but, more specifically, having its praxis

reflect the cruciform model of Christ's love expressed by Ray Jr. This cruciform model takes on a

more revolutionary than traditional way of establishing itself, giving up its power at times for the

sake of winning those not seated in places of power. Moreso in reflecting the cruciform it comes in

a position of humility. As the theologian and pastor, Brian Zahnd explains: "The cruciform is the

posture of love and forgiveness where retaliation is abandoned and and outcomes are entrusted to

the hands of God" (Zahnd, 2012, pg.6). Secondly, its public role must go beyond the place of

individual morality, as forefather of liberation theology, Gustavo Gutierréz attempts to establish in

his book, *A Theology of Liberation*: "The theology of liberation attempts to reflect on the

experience and meaning of the faith based on the commitment to abolish injustice and to build a

new society; this theology must be verified by the practice of that commitment, by active, effective

participation in the struggle which the exploited social classes have undertaken against their

oppressors" (Gutierréz,1974, pg.307). It must be impatient and speak against injustice, as the

theologian and civil rights campaigner James Cone notes in exploring the differences in preaching

between pre-[American] Civil war Black churches and post-Civil war Black churches. For the first

he notes: "Hope, then, as seen in the minds of the slave preachers, is not patience but impatience,

not calmness but protest" (Cone, 2008, pg. 102). In post-Civil war churches he notes: "The passion

for freedom was replaced with innocuous homilies against drinking, dancing, in favour of a

Kingdom beyond this world." (Cone, 2008, pg.105). The difference is specifically expressed in the

mentality that the public domain is a permanent aspect of reality and it is for the individual to

endure not to change. This outrightly denies one of the functions of the Kingdom of God to be salt

(Matt 5:13) and light[126] (Matt 5:14) to the culture around us. France comments: "Light, like salt,

affects its environment by being distinctive" (France, 2008, pg.118). Politically, the Church cannot

run the risk of allowing the secular distinction between private and public domain to restrict its impact on ethics to issues within the private domain. Therefore, what should our relation be to the current state of affairs?

8. The Church and the Current State of Affairs:

It should be a vision not determined by current states of affairs, and may in fact run counter to it. It should be a relationship embodied by a vision of the *Eschaton*. Tom Wright explains in his popular work *Simply Christian:* "We are called to be *part of* God's new creation, called to be *agents of* that new creation here and now. We are called to *model and display* that new creation in symphonies and family life, in restorative justice and poetry, in holiness and service to the poor, in politics and painting" (Wright, 2006, pg.202). The Church should aim to be a community representing a cognitive dissonance between what the world is and what it should be.[127] Beginning with the Church, the Church should do its best to reflect the ethic of the future by loving and seeking justice as if the just harmony of the new creation were actualised in the present.

9. Being Reconciled to Reconcile:

In aspiring to be a community of love it should seek reconciliation between divided groups both on an intra-denominational and inter-denominational level. Otherwise its aspirations to be a community in which national, ethical, or sexual opponents are reconciled, will appear hypocritical. It is here that in order to deal with the social divide between Gibraltarians and Spaniards, the Church must be ready to acknowledge its own internal divides. The essence of the gospel is of a just and holy God reconciling himself to his enemies: " For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life" (Romans 5:8). Therefore as the community of the reconciled, we should be reconciled within the Church, and aiming to bring about a state of affairs where reconciliation

outside of the Church is possible. If the Church embodies (even internally) a state of affairs, or a

reality in which reconciliation is sought and actualised, this too can affect the external world in

ways. Václav Havel expresses this sentiment as an effective ethic: "usually without any conscious

effort, living within the truth becomes the one natural point of departure for all activities that work

against the automatism of the system" (Havel, 1985, pg.44). By living in the truth of a reconciled

world that will be actualised in the *Eschaton*, we expose the lie mixed in with reality.

10. Kenotic Power:

In regards to the external state of affairs the means of change should follow the aforementioned

model of the cruciform, kenotic form. However this appears, at first sight, contradictory. Self-

abnegation and affecting a state of affairs that requires an assertion of one's being is

counterintuitive. Hence why Jesus, himself, depicts his kingdom as 'not from this world[128]' (John

18:36). Professor of New Testament theology Mark E. Moore in his book, *Kenotic Politics*, writes

on how Jesus' appears by coming to give of himself rather than take in contrast to other rulers: "The

juxtaposition of political rule and self abnegation sets Jesus apart from other known political figures

of the first-century Mediterranean world" (Moore, 2015, pg.1). Moore goes on to note that for Jesus

political rule and self-abnegation are not mutually exclusive or contradictory, but rather, "Jesus'

disinclination to power is not antithetical to his political nature; it **is** his political praxis. If God was

to reign in his kingdom, then he alone could make appointments and execute judgements. All of his

vassals were obliged to exercise their power on God's behalf in service and in suffering. Such

service and suffering was not a preclude to power; it was, in God's paradoxical intervention, the

exercise of power. Hence, it is inappropriate to say Jesus was disinclined to power, rather, he

reconfigured its exercise" (Moore, 2015, pg.152). Theologian Dorothy A. Lee-Pollard even goes as

far as to say: "it can be argued that Mark's basic theological intention is to be found not in the

human institutions of power but rather in those places where human beings experience

powerlessness as an oppressive and life-denying force" (Lee-Pollard,1987, pg. 174). Both Moore

and Lee-Pollard point to the interesting consequence that Jesus' most self-abnegating moment is

precisely the moment he is recognised as the Son of God by a Roman centurion (Matt. 27:54, Mark

15:39): "For some mysterious reason, the centurion recognises in that dying, departing man the

divine presence" (Lee-Pollard, 1987, pg.184). Is this a praxis his followers were expected to follow?

Clearly, it was. Jesus' call for his followers to 'take up their cross daily and follow me' (Luke 9:23;

also see Mark 8:34), losing their lives to save it (Mark 8:35). Christ's instruction regarding power is

clear for his followers, but more in the pastoral epistles the Church depicted as Christ's body is

called to follow this praxis. Lee-Pollard stresses the point further, "God's power operates to enable

disciples to relinquish power and to follow the way of the cross in openness and servanthood; if

necessary, all is to be relinquished for the sake of the kingdom" (Lee-Pollard, 1987, pg.185).

Though how is this possible? Christ's ethic is played out with an acute trust in the sovereignty of

God, thus self-abnegation is both a statement *contra* humanity's sense of control of the political

sphere and a keen sense that God has providential control of time. For Christ, a rejection of his ethic

is not only a rejection of one method of changing current states of affairs, but is in fact, idolatry.

Moore explains further; " Jesus appears to have operated under the belief that God has all power,

and our attempts to wield some of that power for self-aggrandisement or self-preservation is

ultimately self-defeating idolatry" (Moore, 2015, pg.78). Surely this should lead to the

abandonment of the Church attempting to change the current state of affairs?

11. Christians as Participants:

  New York Times columnist and author David Brooks mentions his struggle with the question of

agency in Christianity: "the thing I struggle with in Christian thought in general is the tension

between surrender and agency…In Christian thought, there's less emphasis on that [agency]. It's

more unique redemptive assistance from God. There's more surrender" (Bailey, 2015). A similar

critique of passivity is made of Barth's theology, Ben Quash notes how "there seems in Barth a

more narrow construal of the obedience of faith as a *passivity* without any genuinely active

dimension of creaturely cooperation (a kind of 'monergism')"[129] (Quash, 2005, pg. 122). Is Christ's

ethic a mere surrender? Clearly Christ's ethic of surrender to the divine will is not fatalistic. His

self-abnegation is a proactive form of agency in which a state of affairs is achieved via his surrender

to the divine will. It is a synergism,[130] in which Christ and the Father are one (John 10:30).

Likewise the Church's self-abnegation should not be considered an apathetic, resigning ethic,[131] but

a proactive entering into the divine will[132] (John 17:22).

12: Agents of the Cross:

Furthermore, Moltmann describes Christ's ethic as a liberation from the dehumanising pursuit of

power and domination:"The theology of the cross leads to criticism of the self-glorification of

dehumanised man and to his liberation, and is directly associated with the human way of life and

peacetime chosen by his congregation of the weak, lowly and despised persons, a way of life which

takes away the power of the social circumstances which bring about the aggression of dehumanised

man, and endeavours to overcome it" (Moltmann, 1977, pg.70). Attempts to avoid this ethic of *via

crucis,* through spiritualising the kenotic elements of Christ's politics into dealing with the

challenges of life or self-restraint ultimately abandons true Christian ethics from the Church. Thus

in abandoning the concept of what 'good fruits' are, we in fact lose our sense of type of tree the

Church is. Moltmann explains further: "A Christianity which does not measure itself in theology

and practice by this criterion loses its identity and becomes confused with the surrounding world; it

becomes the religious fulfilment of the prevailing social interests, or of the interests of those who

dominate society. It becomes a chameleon which can no longer be distinguished from the leaves of

the tree in which it sits" (Moltmann, 1977, pg.38). However, is this a realistic option? Creating

states of affairs by rejecting traditional forms of power and denying oneself for the sake of the other

sounds appealing but can is there evidence of its effectiveness? For the Christian church effectiveness is not to be ignored but rather should be subordinated under faithfulness to the Crucified God. Otherwise, if effectiveness takes precedent we run the risk of assimilating and reflecting what the current state of affairs is, making the Church superfluous. Historically there is evidence of the effectiveness of Christ's praxis. Moore gives three clear examples, the Korean and Thai churches under Japanese imperialism,[133] Former Czech prime minister and writer Václav Havel's dissident movement, and Mahatma Gandhi in India. The three examples all exhibit non-violent groups forming from those not in positions of power but rather the opposite, changing their current state of affairs against those repressively in power. He also goes on to mention Mother Teresa and Martin Luther King, Jr who both expressed Jesus ethic in their ministries.

13: Conclusion:

In conclusion, the Church's ethic includes changing current state of affairs, we are to be salt and light and reflect what it would look for the Father's "will to be done on earth as it is in heaven". The means to this goal is a specific ethic of kenotic politics and to challenge the uses of power. Rejecting how "rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them" (Mark 10:42). It has been examined that the Church should aspire to draw power on the basis of authority, not force. Although due to the limited nature of Christians and the Church, we found that power through some forms of force are inevitable. Finally, a challenge was presented as it was noted that in order to affect reconciliation in the world; the Church must be consistent, and thus be reconciled within itself.

Una Frontera Nueva
Walking towards a new heavens, and a new earth

1. Introduction - Criticism and Substance:

Criticism is typically easier to foster than to provide substance and in recounting doctrinal understandings of sin and the postlapsarian world this should not be surprising; for as sinful, limited beings in a fallen world we acknowledge that grace, justice, and reconciliation are gifts from God and have not been earned. As the British philosopher Simon Blackburn helpfully notes: "Another approach to what matters in living well is to consider what has to be avoided. It is much easier, to begin with, ... Hell was always easier to draw than heaven" (Blackburn, 2003, pg.80). Taking a stand on an ethical deliberation is far harder than criticising others as it is much easier to give voice to opposition or skepticism, as both have freedom to come from all angles. In contrast to this the etymology of the word religion presents a depiction of the religious life being bound to something.[134] The substantive argument desired has to itself be bound to what the Christian life is bound to. The Christian life is bound to God in Christ and in being bound to Christ, we are bound to others. This definition is founded upon the two greatest commandments; love of God and love of neighbour (Mark 12:30-31). Therefore it is after criticising King Rehoboam that we return to be bound to Christ as the substantive argument for what the Church should be and do.

2. The Church in History:

"Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures" (Luke 24:27). Christ in his earthly life was immersed in the history of God's people, whereas King Rehoboam in dismissing the elders and their advice, based upon past events, came to folly. To ignore the historical moments leading up to the present not only treats history as

insignificant, but causes us to fall short in deliberating the right course of action for present events. Christ, in stark contrast to Rehoboam, is the culmination of history as all history leads to him and all of history ends in him. In his teachings and parables (i.e., Matthew 21:33-41) reminded his listeners of their history and how God has acted within that history. In his actions, he represented that history and brought it upon himself. As he is the embodiment and culmination of that history, the Church should take hold of history and hold onto memory. Historically, the Church has done this whether in doctrine[135] or recalling, as examples, the lives of the saints. However in order to be the Church in history, it must take hold of the history that it is participating in. It needs to acknowledge the stage it is performing on, again as is exemplified in Christ who came "when the fullness of time had come" (Galatians 4:4).

3. The Church of Difference:

"and live in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God" (Ephesians 5:2). St. Paul recognises that in love Christ gave himself up for those who were other to him, even giving himself up in death for the sake of God's creatures. During his reign King Rehoboam was self-seeking and divisive, by intensifying the labour of his populace he ostracised them. They were used as means to an end rather than ends in themselves, as extensions to his desire. Christ, in word and deed, is a complete juxtaposition to the life of Rehoboam. Christ lived, died and rose for the sake of others and in doing that became the *way* for others (John 14:6) treating them as those desired by God (1 Timothy 2:4). It is this *praxis* that the Church needs to commit to and in binding ourselves to those who are other to us,[136] in Christ, we find our true freedom. For as Abraham was blessed in partaking in God's mission to bless the world, so will the Church be blessed. True freedom is seeking the sake of the Other, as Bonhoeffer states: "Being free means "being free for the other," because the other has bound me to him. Only in relationship with the other am I free" (Bonhoeffer, 1997, pg.40). It is for this goal of seeking the good of the other, that

the Church must persevere in faithfulness towards Christ as by being in Christ we let ourselves, "be

built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood" (1 Peter 2:5). It is by following Christ, who is

the great high priest (Hebrews 5:5), that we find our true identity as priests and by following him

we undertake our task of being bridge builders. In the building of bridges between different

identities and nations we participate in the reconciliation that God has made in Christ. In this

reconciliation, the identities of those "from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages"

(Revelation 7:9) are not lost but in contrast we find that difference, in Christ, is not a problem to be

solved but are part of the divine will to be in covenant with all peoples.

4. The Church of One Lord:

"You know the message he sent to the people of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ—he is Lord

of all" (Acts 10:36). Throughout the Gospel accounts, Christ takes upon himself kingly symbols,

such as his entrance into Jerusalem (Matthew 21:1-11). What is interesting though is at the same

time as portraying his regality symbolically he also waited upon the will of God. King Rehoboam

demanded obedience from his people based on the legitimacy of his throne. But, as depicted in the

third chapter, legitimation comes from God and it is not derived from the king's throne. In

legitimating the state as an authority (Romans 13), the state is then held to account to a criteria that

is beyond itself. A determination of the state's benevolence is contingent on God rather than itself

alone. Though the state is legitimated and held to account by God (Matthew 28:18), it can be

perceived to be outside the perfection of Christ, or a necessary evil in a fallen world due to its role

acting as the "sword", which "executes wrath on the wrongdoer" (Romans 13:4). In acknowledging

this we find not only could there be a positive outlook of the state from a scriptural standpoint

(Romans 13:4) but for the love of our neighbours, Christians can be partake in the state. Does this

mean, as Father Paissy in *The Brothers Karamazov,* suggests that the Church has a 'divine

promise' (Dostoevsky, 2010, pg.63) to rule? The Church can act as an established Church but must

analyse this relationship critically. The Spanish Church prior to the Second Vatican Council was an example of an unhealthy variation of the relationship between Church and state, though a bad example of this relationship does not necessarily mean that a relationship of this type is intrinsically wrong. It does, however, posit the question whether establishment is good for modern society. We found that non-coercive establishment and modern liberal societies are not mutually exclusive. Regardless, the Church has to engage the state whether it is good or bad; when the state abuses power (as King Rehoboam did), the Church is called to be a prophetic witness calling the state back to justice. As N.T. Wright states: " the main thrust that Jesus Christ is true *kyrios* of the world, so that of course Caesar is not" (Bartholomew et al., 2002, pg.178). Therefore there are limits of what is the domain and due of the State but all rule is subverted under Christ, the Church is to obey the state (Romans 13), but as long as Christ is obeyed as Lord of Lords. The Church has a true king and enacts out its own royal role in proclaiming and extending the reign of Christ.

5. The Church with the Power to Serve:

"For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve" (Mark 10:45). Christ, as expressed in Moore's thesis, revolutionises conceptions of power and expresses a form of power that takes the model of a servant. King Rehoboam, on the other hand, demanded (based upon power as force derived from his throne) for a state of affairs to occur. In utilising his power with force, as opposed to authority, he made his demand unquestionable and his will absolute, with no need for justification. It did not need to be justified in light of what is good and true, in other words justified by an authority beyond himself. Though this immoral use of power has been prevalent throughout history, the Church needs to be aware that power is a neutral force and is in fact inescapable, as Tillich noted it is ontologically present in our shared reality hence we all exercise power by 'willing to power'. It must also be aware that this power comes from God, in the Creator willing us to be power is an undeserved gift from God. Christ, in contrast to Rehoboam, though being God Incarnate

(John 1:1-14) who was good and true, in himself, did not come to demand a state of affairs by force, but rather came "to serve". The model of Christ is a complete polarity to Rehoboam's use of power. The Church as the Body of Christ in history (1 Corinthians 12:27) must follow Christ's example in service to the world. It must aim to bring a state of affairs through authority of what is good and true. In having Christ as *telos* for the state of affairs it desires to actualise, it recognises that means and ends need to be faithful to him. Though it notes that even power by authority can be experienced as power by force due to our limited epistemology, therefore it sees the importance of beginning from the grass roots as a cruciform community, that works from the bottom of society to the top. Important for the Church's ethic is having Christ as the criteria for how it uses power, therefore faithfulness supersedes effectiveness and this can lead the Church to be *kenotic*. The *kenotic* politics of Christ is a model for the Church as it shall see power as something not to be held on to, but must be willing to give up power and privilege in faithfulness to God. This is only possible with faith in the sovereignty of God and in trusting that God is going to act out his will. This is the humility that Christ calls us to embody in our individual and collective lives, and, as noted for Christ, this is true power. Though this is not to lead the Church into a passive attitude, but rather in seeking the will of God the Church becomes an active participant in the actualising of God's will. Finally, in order to change a state of affairs we must first live out that state of affairs inside the Church. Havel's concept of "living in the truth" is the revolutionary action of the Church and in order to partake in the actualising of God's Kingdom, which reconciles all of creation, we must be reconciled in ourselves. The need for reconciliation between denominations and individual churches is admired and reflected upon in the second and fourth chapters. Both sections express that it contradictory to the desired stated of affairs to have antagonistic divisions and, therefore, call for a renewal in the ecumenical movement in Gibraltar and Spain.

6. Conclusion - The Church in the Particular:

A theology for the Gibraltarian and Spanish communities aims to brings reconciliation without needing conformity. It allows and celebrates difference, but builds bridges across those differences. It speaks through and between different ontologies and takes seriously the need for translation. It understands that the historical and geographic context is of utmost importance in comprehending the history of a particular drama. In taking account of the context of the drama, it then aims to bring order and justice to it. Investigations in theology should seek practical wisdom and aims to give good judgments of ethical and political deliberation,[137] it must reflect God's perfect judgment that lives in harmony from all points of reference.[138] In all contexts it speaks truth and aims to bring about the structures and social agents that will be found in the Kingdom of God. In all of this the work of the theologian, within the Church, can participate in the reconciliation occurring in Christ between God and the world (2 Corinthians 5:19). They will take into account truth presented from all angles and to reconcile all of them with God and this is done by intellectually striving "with God and with humans" (Genesis 32:28), and being blessed in participating in the reconciliation between God and creation. In order for this to done faithfully, each generation will need to reproduce a theological analysis because, as history continues there will be an ever changing moment from which to observe. Thus, a theology that aims to depict a political theology for the Church and a public theology for the society must take into account that, for creatures like us, deliberation is always done from a particular place and a particular time. For, unlike God,[139] our perception of reality is perceived phenomenologically, thus the place where we perceive from needs to be acknowledged and investigated.

Bibliography

Aguilar Fernandez, S. (2010). El activismo político de la Iglesia católica durante el gobierno de Zapatero (2004-2010). *Papers: revista de sociologia*. 95 (4), pp. 1129-1155.

Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities*, (New York: Verso).

Archer, E.G. (2006) *Gibraltar, Identity and Empire*, (Oxfordshire: Routledge).

Arnold, C.E. (2010), *Exegetical Commentary or the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan).

Aslan, R. (2014) *Zealot: The Life and Times of Jesus of Nazareth*, (London: The Westbourne Press).

Atkin, N. & Tallett, F. (2003) *Priests, Prelates and People: A History of European Catholicism Since 1750*, (New York: Oxford University Press).

Austin, V.L. (2012) *Christian Ethics: A Guide for the Perplexed*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishers Plc).

Avis, P. (2001) *Church, State and Establishment*, (London: SPCK).

Bailey, S.P. (2015). *Interview: David Brooks on sin, Augustine and the state of his soul.* Available: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2015/05/01/interview-david-brooks-on-sin-augustine-and-the-state-of-his-soul/. Last accessed 20/10/2015.

Barth, K. (1961) *Church Dogmatics: Selections by Helmut Gollwitzer*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Barth, K. (1961) *Church Dogmatics Vol.4: The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Bash, A. (2007) *Forgiveness and Christian Ethics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Bates, M & Humphrey, P.S., (1957) *The Darwin Reader*, (London: MacMillan & Co LTD).

Bartholomew, C., Chaplin, J., Song, R., & Wolters, A. (2002) *A Royal Priesthood: A Dialogue with Oliver O'Donovan*, (Michigan: Zondervan).

Benedict XVI, (2005) *Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia Offering Them His Christmas Greetings*, Available at: http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia.html (Accessed 23 March 2015)

Benedict XVI. (2006) *Christianity and the Crisis of Cultures*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press).

Benjamin, W. (2007) *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, (New York: Schocken Books).

Berman, H. (1983) *Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition,* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Bertschmann, D. (2015). The Rule of Christ and Human Politics - Two Proposals: A Comparison of the Political Theology of Oliver O'Donovan and John Howard Yoder. *The Heythrop Journal.* 56.

Biggar, N. (2013) *In Defence of War,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Biggar, N. (2014) *Between Kin and Cosmopolis: An Ethic of the Nation,* (Oregon: Cascade Books).

Blackburn, S. (2001) *Ethics: A Very Short Introduction,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Boff, L. (1985) *Church: Charism & Power,* (London: SCM Press LTD).

Boling, R.G. (1969) *Judges: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary,* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.).

Bonhoeffer, D. (1997) *Creation and Fall/ Temptation: Two Biblical Studies,* (New York: First Touchstone Edition).

Bonhoeffer, D. (2009) *Ethics,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

Bonhoeffer, D. (2009) *Sanctorum Communio: A Theological Study of the Sociology of the Church,* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Bouyer, L. (2011) *The Church of God: Body of Christ and Temple of the Spirit,* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press).

Brown, D. & Loades, A (ed.) (1996) *Christ: The Sacramental Word: Incarnation, Sacrament and Poetry.* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge).

Brudney, D. (2005). On Noncoercive Establishment. *Political Theory.* 33 (6), 812-839.

Brueggemann, W. (1982), *Interpretation - A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching: Genesis,* (Atlanta: John Knox Press).

Brueggemann, W. (1985) *The Prophetic Imagination,* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

Brunner, E. (1959) *The Letter to the Romans: A Commentary,* (London: Lutterworth Press).

Buber, M. (1967) *Kingship of God,* (London: George Allen & Unwin LTD).

Butterfield, H. (1950) *Christianity and History,* (London & Southampton: The Camelot Press LTD).

Cala, A. (2013) *Christian Science Monitor,* Available at: http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Europe/2013/0618/As-Spain-s-people-drift-from-Catholic-Church-government-cozies-up (accessed on 05/12/14).

Calvin, J. (1965) *A Commentary on Genesis,*(London: The Banner of Truth Trust).

Carr, R. (ed.) (2000) *Spain: A History,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Caruana, C. (1989) *The Rock under a Cloud,* (Cambridge: Silent Books).

Cavanaugh, W.T. (2005) The Liturgies of Church and State. *Liturgy,* 20:1, 25-30.

Cavanaugh, W.T. (2008) *Being Consumed: Economics and Christian Desire,* (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company).

Cochrane, C.N., (1940) *Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine,* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Cone, J.H., (2008) *Black Theology & Black Power,* (New York: Orbis books).

Cortez, M. (2010) *Theological Anthropology: A Guide for the Perplexed,* (London: T&T Clark International).

Cromartie, M. (ed.)(1997) *A Preserving Grace: Protestants, Catholics, and Natural Law,* (Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.).

Crisp, O.D. (2009) *Book Reviews,* Journal of Reformed Theology 3 pg.109-122.

Cullmann, O. (1963) *The State In The New Testament,* (London: SCM Press LTD).

Davies, B., (ed.)(1987) *Language, Meaning and God: Essays in Honour of Herbert McCabe OP,* (London: Cassel Publishers limited).

Dawber, A. (2015). *'Gibraltar is British, and it is going to stay British forever' - the Rock's Chief Minister hits back at Spanish government's 'lies'.* Available: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/gibraltar-is-british-and-it-is-going-to-stay-british-forever-the-rocks-chief-minister-hits-back-at-10480139.html. Last accessed 07/03/2016.

de Blaye, E. (1976) *Franco and the Politics of Spain,* (London:Pelican Books).

de Graaff, G., (2012) 'To Judge or Not to Judge: Engaging with Oliver O'Donovan's Political Ethics. *Studies in Christian Ethics.* 25 (3) 295-311

Depoortere, F., (2008) *Christ in Postmodern Philosophy: Gianni Vattimo, René Girard and Slavoj Zizek,* (London: T&T Clark LTD).

Donadio, R.. (2009). *Spain Is a Battleground for Church's Future.* Available: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/06/world/europe/06church.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/B/Pope%20Benedict%20XVI&_r=1. Last accessed 16/10/2015.

Donald, J & Rattansi, A, (ed.)(1992) *'Race', Culture and Difference,* (London: Sage).

Dostoevsky, F.,(2010) *The Brothers Karamazov,* (Hertfordshire:Wordsworth Edition Limited).

Echeverria, E. (2014). *The Accidental Protestant.* Available: http://www.firstthings.com/article/2014/02/the-accidental-protestant. Last accessed 02/03/2016.

Eisen, R. (2011) *The Peace and Violence of Judaism: From the Bible to Modern Zionism,* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Evangelical Alliance of Gibraltar. (2013). *Letter to the Gibraltar Chronicle in response to Opinion piece on Sexual Health & HIV.*. Available: http://www.evangelicalsgibraltar.com/news/-letter-to-the-gibraltar-chronicle-in-response-to-opinion-piece-on-sexual-health-hiv#comments. Last accessed 20/10/2015.

France, R.T. (1985), *Matthew,* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press).

Georgel, J. (1970), *Le Franquisme,* (Paris: Seuil).

Govan, F., (2013). *Gibraltar dispute dominates Spanish newspapers.* Available: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/spain/10238608/Gibraltar-dispute-dominates-Spanish-newspapers.html. Last accessed 21/03/2016.

Graham, E., (2013) *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Public Theology in a Post-Secular Age,* (Norwich: SCM Press).

Gray, J. (2014). *The Truth about Evil.* Available: http://www.abc.net.au/religion/articles/2014/11/21/4133205.htm. Last accessed 10/12/2014

Green, J.B. & Lapsley, J.E. (ed.) (2013) *The Old Testament and Ethics: A Book by Book survey,* (Michigan: Baker Academic).

Grisanti, M.A., (1998) *'Israel's Mission to the Nations in Isaiah 40-55: An Update',* The Master's Seminary Journal 9/1 39-61.

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

Grosby, S., (2002) *Biblical Ideas of Nationality: Ancient and Modern,* (Indiana: Eisenbrauns).

Grosby, S. (2005) *Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction.* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Gutierrez, G., (1974) *A Theology of Liberation,* (New York: Orbis Books).
Habermas, J., et al. (2010) *An Awareness of What is Missing: Faith and Reason in a Post-Secular Age,* (Massachusetts: Polity Press).

Hanson, P.D. (2001) *The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible,* (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press).

Hauerwas, S. (1983) *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics.* (Indiana: Notre Dame Press).

Hauerwas, S., (2001) *With the Grain of the Universe: the Church's Witness and Natural Theology,* (Michigan: Baker Publishing Group).

Havel, V., & Wilson, P.. (1985-86). The Power of the Powerlessness. *International Journal of Politics.* 15 (3/4), pp. 23-96.

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

Hobson, T.. (2012). Establishment and Liberalism: A response to Nigel Biggar. *Theology.* 115 (3), 163-174.

Höpfl, H (ed.)(1998) *Luther and Calvin: On Secular Authority,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
John Paul II. (1993) *Holy See,* Available at: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_06081993_veritatis-splendor_en.html#$1 (accessed 01/12/14).

John Paul II., (1993) *Veritatis Splendor,* Available at: http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_06081993_veritatis-splendor.html (Accessed 26 March 2015).

Johnson, K.D., (2007) *Theology, Political Theory, and Pluralism: Beyond Tolerance and Difference,* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Jenkins, W. & McBride, J.M. (2010) *Bonhoeffer and King: Their Legacies and Import of Christian Social Thought,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

Kaylor, R.D., (1994) *Jesus the Prophet: His Vision of the Kingdom on Earth,* (Westminster: John Knox Press).

Keller, T., & Keller, K., (2011) *The Meaning of Marriage,* (London: Hodder & Stoughton LTD).

Korostelina, K.V., (2007) *Social Identity and Conflict: Structures, Dynamics, and Implications.* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

King Jr., M.L. (2004) *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, JR.* (London: Abacus).

Lannon, F. (1987) *Privilege, Persecution, and Prophecy: The Catholic Church in Spain 1875-1975,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Lee-Pollard, D.A.. (1987). Powerlessness as Power: A Key Emphasis in the Gospel of Mark. *Scottish Journal of Theology*. 40 (2), pp. 173-188.

Leitch, V.B., (ed.)(2010) *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism (Second Edition)*. (New York: W.W.Norton & Company).

Leithart, P.J., (2004) *A Cheer for Denominations*, Available at: http://www.firstthings.com/blogs/leithart/2004/06/a-cheer-for-denominations (Accessed 6 March 2015).

Leithart P.J. (2014) *Social Brain*, Available at: http://www.firstthings.com/blogs/leithart/2014/12/social-brain (Accessed 4 March 2015).

Leithart, P.J., (2009) *Solomon Among the Postmoderns*, (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press).

Leithart, P.J., (2010) *Defending Constantine: The Twilight of an Empire and the Dawn of Christendom*, (Illinois: InterVarsity Press).

Levinas, E., (2006) *Humanism of the Other*, (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press).

Lewis, C.S., (1960) *The Four Loves*, (London: HarperCollins Publishers).

Machiavelli, N., (1963) *The Prince*, (Middlesex: Penguin Classics).

MacIntyre, A., (2009) *God, Philosophy, Universities: A Selective History of the Catholic Philosophical Tradition*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group).

MacIntyre, A., (2011) *After Virtue*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishers Plc).

Mackay, J.P., (2005) *Power & Christian Ethics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Maddox, R. (1995) 'Revolutionary Anticlericalism and Hegemonic Processes in an Andalusian Town, August 1936', *American EthnologistI*, Vol.22 No.1, pp.125-143.

Mathewes, C.T., (1998) *Pluralism, Otherness, and the Augustinian Tradition*, Modern Theology 14:1.

McGrath. A.E., (1986) *The Making of Modern German Christology: From the Enlightenment to Pannenberg*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell LTD).

McGrath. A. E., (2007) *Christian Theology: An Introduction (fourth edition)* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing).

Meacham, J. (2006). *THE EDITOR'S DESK*. Available: http://europe.newsweek.com/editors-desk-106637?rm=eu. Last accessed 10/10/2015.

Metz, J.B., (1980) *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology*, (London: Burns & Oates).

Mendieta, E. & VanAntwerpen, J. (ed.) *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*, (New York: Columbia University Press).

Migilore, D. L., (2004) *Faith Seeking Understanding: An Introduction to Christian Theology (second edition)* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co).

Milbank, J., Pickstock, C., & Ward, G. (ed.) (1999) *Radical Orthodoxy*, (New York: Routledge).

Miller, T.A.(ed.) (2008) *Jesus, The Final Days*, (London: SPCK).

Modood, T.. (1998). Multiculturalism, Secularism, and the State,. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, . 1 (3), 79-97.

Moltmann, J., (1974) *The Crucified God*, (London: SCM Press LTD).

Montgomery, J.A., (1960) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Kings*, (Ediburgh:

T. & T. Clark).

Moore, M.E., (2015) *Kenotic Politics: The Reconfiguration of Power in Jesus' Political Praxis*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc).

Nagel, T., (1986) *The View From Nowhere*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Nelson, D.R., (2011) *Sin: A Guide for the Perplexed*, (London: T&T Clark International).

Neuhaus, R.J., (1997) *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America (2nd Edition)*, (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company).

Niebuhr, H.R., (1949) *Faith and History*, (London: Nisbet & Co., LTD).

Niebuhr, H. R., (1956) *The Self and the Dramas of History*, (London: Faber and Faber LTD).

Niebuhr, H.R., (1960) *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons).

Niebuhr, H.R., (1960) *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture: with supplementary essays*, (London: Faber and Faber).

Niebuhr, H.R., (1996) *Theology, History, and Culture: Major Unpublished Writings*, (New Haven: Yale University Press).

NRSV Translators (2001), *Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version With Apocrypha*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Nugent, J.C., (2011) *The Politics of Yahweh: John Howard Yoder, the Old Testament, and the People of God*, (Oregon: Cascade Books).

O'Donovan, O,. (1996) *The Desire of the Nations: Rediscovering the Roots of Political Theology,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Olivero, L. (2013) *Panorama,* Available at:http://www.panorama.gi/localnews/headlines.php?action=view_article&article=11098&offset=0 (Accessed 05/12/14).

Pannenberg, W. (2004) *Systematic Theology: Volume 2,* (London: T&T Clark International).

Payne, S.G., (1987) *The Franco Regime 1936-1975,* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press).

Phillips, E. (2012) *Political Theology:A Guide for the Perplexed,* (London: T&T Clark International).

Quash, B. (2005) *Theology and the Drama of History,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rawls, J. (1993) *Political Liberalism,* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Rawls, J. (1995). Political Liberalism: Reply to Habermas. *The Journal of Philosophy.* 92 (3), p. 132-180.

Rawls, J. (1999) *A Theory of Justice,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Reddie, A.G. (2009) *Is God Colour-Blind?: Insights from Black Theology for Christian Ministry,* (London: SPCK).

Richardson, A. (1964) *History, Sacred and Profane,* (Chatham: SCM Press LTD).

Riches, J. (1986) *The Analogy of Beauty: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar,* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Ricouer, P. (1992) *Oneself as Another,* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Robinson, J. (1972) *The First Book of Kings,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rousseau, J.J. (1968) *The Social Contract,* (London: Penguin Books LTD).

Russell, B. (2005) *Power,* (Oxon: Routledge).

Sacks, J. (1992) *Crisis and Covenant: Jewish Thought after the Holocaust,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Sacks, J. (2012) *The Great Partnership: God, Science and the Search for Meaning,* (London: Hodder & Stoughton).

Sacks, J. (2014) *Confronting Violence in the Name of God*, Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yS-7H4IQi9c (Accessed 26 October 2014).

Sánchez, J.M. (1987) *The Spanish Civil War as a Religious Tragedy*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press).

Schwartz, R.M. (1997) *The Curse of Cain*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Scott, P. & Cavanaugh, W.T. (2004) *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing).

Staniforth, M. (1968) *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books LTD).

Stockey, G. (2009) *Gibraltar: 'A Dagger in the Spine of Spain?'* (Sussex: Sussex Academic Press).

Suchocki, M.J. (1994) *The Fall to Violence: Original Sin in Relational Theology*, (New York: Continuum).

Thomas, M. (2013), 'The Faith and the Fury: The Construction of Anticlerical Collective Identities in Spain, 1874-1931', *European History Quarterly*, 43:1, pp.73-95.

Tillich, P. (1954) *Love, Power and Justice*, (London: Oxford University Press).

Tejedor, E. (2013). *Catholics believe in end to privileges*. Available: http://elpais.com/elpais/2013/11/13/inenglish/1384352259_041265.html. Last accessed 19/10/2015.

Understanding Gibraltar (2014) *Understanding Gibraltar*, Available at: http://understandinggibraltar.com/our-aims/ (Accessed 03/12/14).

Vatican II. (1964). *Unitatis Redintegratio*. Available: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html. Last accessed 02/03/2016.

Volf, M. (1996) *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press).

Volf, M. (2005) *Free of Charge: Giving and Forgiving in a Culture Stripped of Grace*, (Michigan: Zondervan).

Volf, M. (2005) '*Johannine Dualism and Contemporary Pluralism*', Modern Theology 21:2

von Balthasar, H.U. (1983) *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory (Volume I) Prolegomena*, (San Francisco Ignatius Press).

von Balthasar, H.U. (1992) *The Theology of Karl Barth*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press).

von Balthasar, H.U. (1994) *A Theology of History*. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press).

Waley, D. (1968) *Later Medieval Europe: From St. Louis to Luther*. (London:Butler & Tanner LTD).

Wenger, J.C. (trans.). (1945). The Schleitheim Confession of Faith. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*. 19 (4), 247-253.

Westen, D. (2008) *The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation*, (New York: PublicAffairs).

Wilken, R.L. (2012) *The First Thousand Year: A Global History of Christianity*, (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Williams, R. (2014) *Being Christian*, (London: SPCK).

Wood, J. (19 72). A Theology of Power. *A Journal of Church and State*, 14 (1), pp. 107-124.

Wright, N.T. (1992) *The New Testament and the People of God*, (London: SPCK).

Wright, N.T. (2006) *Simply Christian*, (London: SPCK).

Wright, N.T. (2014) *Surprised by Scripture: Engaging with Contemporary Issues*, (London: SPCK).

YGTV. (2015). *Aug 11 – Government Clarifies Gibraltar's Name To Spanish Media Read more: Aug 11 – Government Clarifies Gibraltar's Name To Spanish*. Available: http://www.yourgibraltartv.com/politics/9836-aug-11-government-clarifies-gibraltar-s-name-to-spanish-media. Last accessed 07/03/2016.

Yoder, J.H. (1992) *The Christian Witness to the State*, (Pennsylvania: Herald Press).

Yoder, J.H. (1994) *The Politics of Jesus*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.).

Yoder, J.H., (1996) '*Meaning after Babble: With Jeffrey Stout beyond Relativism*', The Journal of Religious *Ethics, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 125-139.*

Zahnd, B. (2012) *Beauty will Save the World: Rediscovering the Allure and Mystery of Christianity,* *(Florida: Charisma House Book Group).*

<u>Endnotes</u>

[1] A deeper discussion into this understanding could end up partaking in the debates between Traducianism, the idea that"the soul of the offspring find its origins in the particular parental souls" (Nelson, 2011, pg.37), and Creationism, the idea "that God creates a new soul for each conceived child, and that the body is "ensouled" at conception" (Nelson, 2011, pg.38). The intention is not to go this point though, but rather seeks to note the sociological affects on the individual.

[2] Thomas Nagel writes: "Suppose all the nerves feeding sensory data to my brain were cut but I were somehow kept breathing and nourished and conscious. And suppose auditory and visual experiences could be produced in me not by sound and light but by direct stimulation to the nerves, so that I could be fed information in words and images about what was going on in the world, what other people saw and heard, and so forth. Then I would have a conception of the world without having any perspective on it. Even if I pictured it to myself I would not be viewing it from where I was. It might even be said that in the sense in which I am now TN, I would under those circumstance be anyone." (Nagel, 1986, pg.62-3). This study takes the polar opposite view that this 'view from nowhere' is not achievable and assumes what Peter Leithart depicts as 'Postmodern provincialism' (Leithart, 2009, pg.71). Postmodern provincialism states that everything is viewed from somewhere and that somewhere is important to acknowledge.

[3] Old Testament scholar J.Robinson comments: "no hereditary right had as yet been established and he had to be accepted by the tribes." (Robinson, 1972, pg.151)

[4] Old Testament scholar James A. Montgomery expresses the passion in this statement: " "To tor tents: smacks of old Arabian life = English "Go home!" "See to thine own house" (cf. Gen. 39:23) is in modern English, "Look after your own business!" (Montgomery, 1960, pg.251)

[5] Explicit in terms of specific commandments, such as "You shall not murder." (Exodus 20:13) and implicit in the sense of how these commandments can be deduced throughout the biblical narrative, such as concepts of *Imago Dei*, Christ's call to 'love your enemies' (Matt. 5:44) and many more.

[6] Consider the warning in 2 John 6-8, "Many deceivers have gone out into the world, those who do not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; any such person is the deceiver and the antichrist! Be on your guard, so that you do not lose what we have worked for, but may receive a full reward." If Christ were not fully-human (to follow later descriptions of the Gospel) this would contradict the apostolic teaching.

[7] Other examples also include; Psalm 47:8, Daniel 2:21, 4:35, 2 Kings 18:9-12, Habakkuk 1:5-11, Acts 17:26-27.

[8] John Paul II in his encyclical, *Veritatis Splendor* states, "Each day the Church looks to Christ with unfailing love, fully aware that the true and final answer to the problem of morality lies in him alone."(John Paul II, 1993)

[9] John Howard Yoder also point to the attribute of Lordship of Christ as a proclamation is, "not limited to those who accepted it, nor is the significance of its judgement limited to those who have decided to listen to it." (Yoder, 1994, pg. 157). Thus elevating the role of Christ as Lord beyond the sacred history of the scriptures or the Church, to the general history of all men

[10] New Testament scholar Clint E. Arnold discusses the notion of sitting at the right hand of the Father in his commentary of Ephesians 1:20, "The right hand position symbolises the highest honor, closeness to Yahweh, and the received delegation of authority and power." (Arnold, 2010, pg.111)

[11] "History is thus *theatrum gloriae Dei*, the arena within which the glory of God may be discerned and recognized." (McGrath,1986, pg.108)

[12] von Balthasar was greatly influenced in Hegel's dramatic reading of history.

[13] Man is not merely acted upon by history in a cyclical never ending fashion as expressed in classical Greek view (Niebuhr, 1949, pg.18). Nor can man's freedom dominate nature, becoming purely creator and overcoming his limited creatureliness, as in the Modern view. Niebuhr writes "The final form of the modern error about history is the belief that man's ambiguous position as both a creature and a creator of history is gradually changed until he may, in the foreseeable future, become the unequivocal master of historical destiny." (Niebuhr, 1949, pg.79) Rather there is a drama being played out upon the historical stage. (Niebuhr, 1949, pg.39)

[14] " The Caudillo [Franco] himself dismissed the existence of a Gibraltarian voice in 1959:

There are no English people in the place except the families of the garrison and the employees of the administration and the warehouses. The Llanitos are entirely Spanish, though they take advantage of their British Citizenship, and the rest, the Jews and aliens, can live as well under one flag as another." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.98-99)

[15] "The frontier would remain closed for sixteen years, during which time the physical division of the two communities would be solidified by a profound, and quite possibly permanent, psychological divide. Nevertheless, a great deal of damage had already been done to the cross-frontier relationship in the fifteen years before the frontier closed." (Stockey, 2009, pg.224)

[16] In the next part of the chapter, evidence of the extent of intermarriage will be shown. Thus why the splitting of families due to the border closure conjures a lot of animosity towards the Spanish government, not purely due to emotional pain this would have caused but also because of the number of families this would have affected "On 1 October 1968, the date set by the United Nations for the decolonisation of Gibraltar, telephone and telegraph communications between the Rock and Spain were cut. The laying down of a total economic blockade from the Spanish side, often refereed to as the 'fifteenth siege' of Gibraltar, caused hardship on the Rock until the mid-1980s. The effects on life on the Rock were severe. The cross-frontier relationship…was broken off for the longest period since the eighteenth century. Cultural, social and familial ties were severely disrupted. Communication by phone was only permitted at the Easter and Christmas holidays, and many families had to rely on shouting at each other across the neutral ground in order to gain news of loved ones. Anyone who wished to go from Gibraltar to Spain had to make a tortuous route to Algeciras via Tangier. In short, the frontier closure separated Gibraltarians both physically and psychologically from Spain." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.114)

[17] "From the very start of the of the 'Gibraltar campaign' of the 1950s, the implicit (and often explicit) Spanish criticisms of the Rock and its people provoked animosity from within the colony. Even the unashamedly pro-Franco historian George Hills recognised that this practice was ultimately self-defeating, and did much to harm Gibraltarians; perceptions of their Spanish neighbours." (Stockey, 2009, pg.218) but 1954 brings a more aggressive stance in light of a developing centralised government in Gibraltar, "However, in Spain, General Franco took umbrage at the new constitutional arrangements which he saw as an affront to Spanish claims to the Rock. Spanish irritation was compounded in 1954 when Queen Elisabeth II visited Gibraltar on her coronation tour. While Joshua Hassan, then leader of the civilian membership of the legislative council and de factor Mayor of Gibraltar, was delighted to be able to escort Her Majesty on a tour of the Rock, across the frontier the Franco regime was so offended by the royal visit that it began to draw up plans for a considerably more confrontational stance towards Gibraltar's continued possession by Britain. Inevitably, it was the Gibraltarians and Spaniards on either side of the frontier who would suffer in this campaign." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.74)

[18] "Forms of identity such as class or ideological conviction were challenged and subsumed within a 'national' identity that was set apart first from Spain, and then from both Spain and Britain." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.105)

[19] This caused issue even throughout the last century during the Frontier closure, as George Hill notes, "Fresh meat, vegetables and fruit were scarce and expensive on the Rock; they had to come from Morocco not a lush agricultural land." (Hill, 1974, pg.468)

[20] Authorities on both sides of the frontier tried to control the smuggling that was taking place. Both sides struggled with the civilian communities as smuggling provided the needed finances to make ends. So much so that in the 1800's "As we shall see, even the Gibraltar contraband trade came to be seen as a sign of assistance, rather than embarrassment to Spain in this period." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.81) and on the Gibraltarian side, "The smuggling trade was the second advantage the Gibraltar economy enjoyed. As we shall see, despite attempts on both sides of the frontier to prevent the smuggling of goods from Gibraltar to Spain, trading in contraband accounted for a significant portion of the Rock's economic activity. Low-tax Gibraltar was simply too tempting a place for smugglers to resist making a fast profit in high-tax Spain." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.38)

[21] Stockey quotes poet Laurie Lee, (found in *A Rose for Winter*) "Do you know what the people of Algeciras are called?' asked Ramón, handing me some chewing gum. 'Los Especiales - the favoured ones. They talk a lot about "Our Gibraltar" and "the Spanish Rock". They cry and stick out their teeth. But I'll tell you something … They wouldn't have it back for the world, you know. It would be the ruin of them." (Stockey, 2009, pg.201)

[22] Interestingly, General Castaños sought help after participating in the Spanish siege of Gibraltar. Hill also notes, "In the following year, 1811, Gibraltar was momentary used by the allies as more than a supply point for Sapin's guerrilla warfare against the French … A force of 9,000 Spanish troops were brought round by sea and landed at Tarifa at the end of February. There they were joined by 5,000 British and German - mostly from the Gibraltar garrison." (Hill, 1974, pg. 368-9)

[23] "The frequency of intermarriage between Gibraltarians and Spaniards increased with each decade in the nineteenth century, and would only begin to decline after the 1940s". (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.84)

[24] "Writing a report on social conditions in Gibraltar's in 1944, the famous economist Friedrich Hayek noted that the practice of intermarriage had mainly been restricted to the working classes in pre-war years, but had since extended to Gibraltar's 'upper classes'." (Stockey, 2009, pg.173)

[25] "Contrary to the assertions of certain historians, therefore, the 1930s did not mark the start of a declining relationship between Gibraltar and its Campo. On the contrary, as we shall see, the pattern was on of *increased* involvement." (Stockey, 2009, pg.66) Stockey also argues *contra* Hills that the Civil War was the beginning of Gibraltar's decline of Spanish influence, "To begin with George Hills, who was, after all, the first to highlight the significance of the war in Spain for the future of cross-frontier relations, it is important to remember the context in which he was writing. Hill's book *Rock of Contention* was not only a justification for the Spanish claim to Gibraltar, but also, taken alongside his other scholarly works, a partial therefore, it was important to show that it had been the regrettable experiences o the Spanish Civil War, rather than any subsequent on the part of the Caudillo, which was responsible for the hardening of the Gibraltarian attitudes towards Spain." (Stockey, 2009, pg.89)

[26] The politics of Gibraltar was usually divided by class ideology, almost reflecting their Spanish counterparts,"The continuing influence of Spanish anarchism on Gibraltar's trade union activity was apparent until the end of the Great War." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.60) "By and large, Gibraltar's colonial authorities and the moneyed class looked to the Nationalists as a force for law and order, (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.67)

[27] "The *recuperación* had been a central theme of Spanish patriotic rhetoric ever since the Rock had fallen to Anglo-Dutch forces in 1704. Britain's occupation of the Rock served as a stark and lasting reminder of Spain's fall from imperial greatness. In economic terms, Gibraltar was taken to represent an enormous drain on the Spanish economy, owing to the enormous contraband trade operating fro the Rock for over two centuries. Meanwhile, British occupation of the Rock was seen as a morally corrupting influence: an entry-point for Protestantism and freemasonry and a threat to Spanish 'civilisation'" (Stockey, 2009, pg.140). Though this theme is at its most aggressive in Franco's regime, it must be stated that it was not isolated to his regime, "The *recuperación* had been a central theme of rightist thought in Spain since 1704. Gibraltar stood as a stark reminder of Spain's fall from imperial greatness. In economic terms, it represented a massive drain on the national finances, it represented a massive drain on the national finances through the smuggling trade; in moral terms it was seen as a dangerous entry point into Spain for freemasonry and Protestantism." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.96)

[28] From the beginning of Franco's media campaign against Gibraltar, "Articles and broadcasts attempted to demonstrate that the Rock represented and facilitated the economic, political and moral corruption of the Spanish nation." (Stockey, 2009, pg.215)

[29] We find examples both preceding and post 1704, The decree of Alhambra in 1492 decreed the exile of all Jews and Moors as part of the Spanish *reconquista* from the Moors. "Religious unification under the Crown implied not only the conquest of Granada but also the complete extirpation from Ferdinand and Isabella's kingdoms of both Mohammedanism and Judaism. The expulsion in 1492 of the Jews, who probably numbered some 150,000 - 200,000, was a religious and a political act, not an economic one," (Waley, 1968, pg.255) Also members of Catholic groups, such as the Jansenists were expelled. Another example before Franco was"In March 1812 the Cortes used the sovereignty they had assumed to proclaim a constitution. It declared that sovereignty resides in the Nation and defined the Nation as 'the union of all Spaniards in both hemispheres'. Spaniards would be Catholic, no other faith was permitted." "Carr, 2000, pg.199) The provisional government of the revolution attempted to Liberalise Spain in 1869, "Their constitution of 1869 gave the Democrats what were called 'the Liberal Conquests': universal suffrage, the jury system, and the recognition of freedom of religion, but retained the monarchy for some suitable king." (Carr, 2000, pg.220) This, in fact, intensified tensions as many claimed, "The freedom of religion of the constitution of 1869 had admitted 'heresy'. As the debates of the constitution had revealed, the battle lines were drawn between the proponents of an open, tolerant society and the Catholic church, for which Catholicism was the test of citizenship." (Carr, 2000, pg.221)

[30] The breaking of Article X is apparent in this discussion, it is interesting that this was actually part of the Spanish claim for Gibraltar's return to them, "there can be little doubt that these alleged British 'breaches' of Utrecht acted as powerful argument in favour of Spain seeking restitution by armed forces." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.23)

[31] With a small civilian community, the Colonial authorities needed the help of Jews and Muslims from Morocco for labour and economic growth of Gibraltar. This is not to say that this has not now developed into a community of mutual respect amongst different groups. A Gibraltarian think-tank known as 'Understanding Gibraltar' is looking at trying to investigate how the religious diversity of Gibraltar has remained both tolerant and cherished. (http://understandinggibraltar.com/our-aims/)

[32] "Once the need for a civilian population had been conceded, policy makers in Britain were keen to ensure that Gibraltar was repopulated by British *Protestant* settlers. This was due in part to a general religious intolerance in Britain in that period, when a variety of derogatory stereotypes were attributed to Jews, Catholics and Muslims. Catholics, in particular, were singled out as a potential security risk in Gibraltar during the first decades of British rule, not withstanding a specific guarantee in Article X of the Treaty of Utrecht to allow them free practice of their religion. The policy of encouraging British Protestant settlement was clearly a failure, however. By 1787, less that one-sixth of civilian population (512) was British Protestant, or of British origin; this compared with 23 per cent Jewish and 62 per cent Catholic." (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.17) This struggle with different religious groups can also be shown by the, "British writer John Stewart was rather less generous in his summary of the period, penned almost 200 years afterwards: 'In place of their convents, warehouses; in place of churches, whorehouses; in place of religious austerity, profligate greed; and the brutal British heretic with his accursed Jews and Moors treading the streets of this holiest part of Holy Spain!'" (Grocott & Stockey, 2012, pg.18-19)

[33] Stockey also expresses this point, "Spanish diplomacy from the start of the conflict was geared towards securing a place in the Axis club in the hope of bringing about the return of the Rock and the creation of a new empire for Spain across the Strait." (Stockey, 2009, pg.158)

[34] de Blaye describes the perception of the Second Republic from a clerical perspective, "For Spain's bishops the Second Republic seemed a sulphurous foretaste of Hell as described by Dante. The clergy paid dear for this attitude when the Civil War began: twelve bishops were murdered, together with 6,832 monks and nuns, while 150 churches, monasteries and covenants were destroyed and 4,850 others damaged to a greater or lesser extent." (de Blaye, 1976, pg. 409)

[35] On this point Bruce Lincoln believes anticlericalism is primarily anti-institutional, Richard Maddox describes Lincoln's proposition, "Lincoln, after developing a wide-ranging, comparative analysis of anticlerical violence as "iconoclastic rituals of collective obscenity and status inversion," concludes that anticlerical violence in Spain was anti-institutional rather than anti-religious and that it represented "the horrific foundation ritual of a new religion" inspired by a millenarian creed." (Maddox, 1995, pg.127). From Thomas' study this is clearly not the main reason, the Church's collusion with the state was a strong reason, but the Church's own corruption was another factor.

[36] Thomas' study into anticlericalism in Spain details the causes that this unorganised, but influential movement grew from; the Church's involvement in State executions, "In a situation where lists of suspects had been compiled by the Catholic *Asociación de Padres de Familia*, the Jesuits and other Catholic groups, and where Jesuit priests had been present at the executions, the Church's inculpation in the violence seemed beyond doubt." (Thomas, 2013, pg.78); There was economic reasons as the Church was exempt taxes it was allowed to sell products at lower price, crushing smaller businesses (Thomas, 2013, pg.80); the Church's hold on education also sought to maintain this repressive status-quo, "In charitable primary schools run by monks and nuns, workers' children were inculcated with the spiritual values which underpinned the monarchical order and reinforced their lowly position within it: obedience to authority and the acceptance of social inequality." (Thomas, 2013, pg. 80)

[37] It is worthwhile noting that the Vatican was not so eager to show support for the Franco regime, "Though the Vatican, like most Catholic opinion around the world, naturally favored those who defended Catholicism against one of the most severe persecutions in its history, Pius XI found it impolitic to have to take sides formally." (Payne, 1987,pg.201)

[38] This quotation is taken from the writings of Jacques Georgel, in his study of Franco, *Le Franquisme* (Georgel, 1970, pg.254 - 5). Stockey also notes that Franco "promoted a 'catholic doctrine' in the curriculum;" (Stockey, 2009, pg.215)

[39] "It is noteworthy that no other Head of State in a Catholic country - Italy, Portugal, etc. - enjoys a comparable privilege. Except in Spain the Vatican everywhere acts freely in appointing bishops, by virtue of Article 329 of Canon Law." (de Blaye, 1976, pg.413)

[40] It could be argued that the relationship between Church and State in Spain is best defined as a process known as Erastianism. Nicholas Atkin and Frank Tallett describe this process as,"The term derived from the Swiss theologian Thomas Erastus (1524-83) who argued that civil authorities ought to exercise jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters." (Atkin & Tallett, 2003,pg.9) Atkin and Tallett also note how this process was evident in Spain during the 18th century, "at one end of the spectrum stood the Iberian peninsula, where the state had always enjoyed superiority." (Atkin & Tallett, 2003, pg.10).

[41] De Blaye notes how Franco's regime held tightly to the 'right of presentation' of bishops, during the time the Church begun retracting the Concordat, "In reality, above and beyond the Concordat, it is the entire doctrine of the Church in the matter of relations with States that is in question, for many prelates consider that the very idea of a Concordat is an outworn concept, which should be replaced by a simple diplomatic arrangement. This was to the Caudillo's great chagrin: he was all the more firmly attached to his right of veto because, in his eyes, the Church in Spain has ceased to serve as the line of demarcation between Right and Left - in other words, between supporters and adversaries of the régime. The repeated statements issued by those bishops who are referred to as the 'conciliars' (inspired by the Second Vatican Council), regarding the 'Burgos trial', trade-union freedom, the repression of political offences, and so on, have left no room for doubt on this point." (de Blaye, 1976, pg.415-6)

[42] In the early 1970s evidence appears of sermons by; Mgr José Maria Larrauri, Auxiliary Bishop of Pamplona; Gabino Diaz Merchán and Elías Yánes Alvarez, respectively Archbishop and Auxiliary Bishop of Oviedo; Mgr Miguel Araújo, Bishop of El Ferrol; Bishop of Segovia, Mgr Antonio Palenzuela, condemning practices of repression or state violence, as well as calling for reforms for the sake of the lower classes. "But the most severe attack ever directed against the régime by the Catholic hierarchy came from the 'Justice and Peace' commission of the episcopate." with the (de Blaye, 1976, pg.416-7) The commission chairman, The Bishop of Huelva, Mgr Rafael González Moralejo stated that Frano-ist regime rendered peace impossible in Spain.

[43] Unlike Spain the Roman Catholic church did not have a monopoly on the education system, E.G. Archer notes, "For long periods Roman Catholic children, having no alternative, were obliged to attend Methodist or Anglican schools which could be unashamedly proselytising in their endeavours." (Archer, 2006, pg.95) The Catholic church did then grow influence, but 'conscience clauses' in the educational system would not have allowed similar practices to the Spanish Catholic church.

[44] It must be noted that by comparing accounts of Bishop Fitzgerald's political involvement in Caruana's and Stockey's work, Caruana's book does appear to be a rose-tinted account.

[45] Bishop Caruana in his book, appears to negate Fitzgerald's pro-nationalist sympathies and solely notes the political action of Spanish Jesuit priests that resided and worked with Fitzgerald. (Caruana, 1989, pg.128)

[46] Beyond the pulpit evidence of Bishop Fitzgerald's rightist sympathies can be seen in Stockey's study, "However, there is little difficulty in proving the pro-rebel credentials of Richard Fitzgerald, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Gibraltar. On more than one occasion in the two and a half years, complaints were sent to the Gibraltar authorities that Fitzgerald had been using the pulpit to proclaim the virtues of the Nationalist cause. In July 1937, the Bishop displayed his distaste for the Republic and its adherents when he pleaded with Colonial Secretary to refuse a request for naturalisation of a Spanish leftist refugee, on the grounds that the presence of all leftist refugees in the colony 'must have a subversive effect and will probably eventually lead to riot and bloodshed'. By contrast, in February 1939 Fitzgerald was prepared to intervene on behalf of three Gibraltarian dockyard workers who been sacked for their links to the Falange in La Línea. The admiral Superintendent, who, like most British officers on the Rock, certainly no supporter of the Republican cause, later stated that 'the Roman Catholic Bishop of Gibraltar has been taking an active part in the Nationalist cause since the beginning of the conflict.. he is a southern Irishman, soaked in intrigue and as untrustworthy, and in my opinion, as disloyal as can be.'" (Stockey, 2009, 99-100)

[47] "With the opening of the Spanish frontier in February 1984, the Bishop, even as the Diocesan Administrator, encouraged the development of reconciliatory meetings between the local clergy and the priests of the Camp Area and those of Malaga. These regular communications led to a closer relationships between the priests, and the local clergy was soon invited to attend retreats and in-service training projects on theology, Holy Scripture and Spirituality, organised for their own.
   The Bishop himself is invited to attend either the Andalusian Conference of Bishops or that had annually in Madrid at the National Conference of Bishops. This latter one often coincides with the English Conference of Bishops to which the Bishop is also invited. Hence Bishop Devlin availing himself of the generous opening offered to him, he alternates and goes to both on different occasions. In all cases everyone understand that the Bishop of Gibraltar attends these Conferences as mere "observer" since he does not belong to any of the mentioned Conferences of Bishops. It is very gratifying, however, that the Bishops both in the U.K. and in Spain welcome him with open arms." (Caruana, 1989, pg. 141)

[48] Cortez notes, "The fundamentally relational nature of human persons is seen most clearly in the male-female differentiation of humanity." (Cortez, 2010, pg.24)

[49] "To Elihu, ethics has consequences not for oneself, but for others in the human race. Just as one's wickedness affects others, so too one's righteousness affects others. Thus, Elihu advocates an ethic that is not self-interested: righteous conduct is not for one's own benefit, not is it even for God's sake. Rather, one acts ethically simply for the common good." (Green & Lapsley, 2013, pg.97)

[50] It is worth noting that this quote is used to stress the importance of the quality of relationships, when focusing on the formation of an individuals identity. Thinkers such as Judith Butler, make a strong point on the social construction of identity, a summarisation of her thought in *Norton's Anthology of Theory and Criticism,* states "Identity is not something planted in us to be discovered, but something is performatively produced by acts that 'effectively constitute the identity they are said to express or reveal.'" (Leitch (ed.),2010, pg.2538) This highlights the importance of the value of relationships in the constructions of identity. Taking this point seriously, the fluidity and salience within conceptions of formation of identity, I believe, is best depicted by Ricoeur, "To summarise, I employ a useful reduction formulated by Ricoeur scholar Bernard Dauenhauer, who boils down Ricoeur's relational self to four propositions.

1. Because my personal identity is a narrative identity, I can make sense of myself only in and through my involvement with others.
2. In my dealings with others, I do not simply enact a role or function that has been assigned to me. I can change myself trough my own efforts and can reasonably ask others to change as well.
3. Nonetheless, because I am bodily and have inherited both biological and psychological constraints, I cannot change everything about myself and others.
4. Though I can be evaluated in a number of ways, e.g. physical dexterity, verbal fluency skill, the ethical evaluation in the light of my responsiveness to others is, on the whole, the most important evaluation." (Nelson, 2011, pg.104) This interpretation of identity allows the social aspect of identity formation, yet holds that not all aspects are fluid. For instance, a Gibraltarian or a Spaniard, come from a specific geographical area, everything about what it means to be either nationality is affected by a number of factors other than sociality. Primordiality plays a role in identity formation.

[51] Peter Leithart, in reviewing Diane Ackerman's *The Human Age,* notes the level to which social interactions can even affect us biology, "however, our social interactions affect us at a deep level. They alter the biochemistry of our brains" (Leithart, 2014)

[52] It must be noted that Niebuhr stresses the moral relativism implied by this communities influence in moral and social development is not the full expression one's ethical standards, "That this is not the whole truth of the matter is proved by the frequency with which 'conscience' expresses itself in defiance of the community." (Niebuhr, 1956, pg.26)

[53] In referring to temporal depth, Grosby is highlighting that people feel a solidarity not just with those who presently within the bounded territory, but also those people and events from previous generations. "Whether historically accurate or not, these memories contribute to the understanding the present that distinguishes one nation from another. This component of time - when an understanding of the past forms part of the present - is characteristic of the nation and is called 'temporal depth'." (Grosby, 2005, pg.8)

[54] Freedom of Religion is assured legally guaranteed under the 1978 Constitution.

[55] Michael A. Grisanti reflects on the action that would proceed from the Mosaic Covenant, "In Exod 19:4-6, Yahweh presents Israel with a unique and sobering challenge (before revealing to them the Law, i.e., the Mosaic Covenant). Doubtless, their conformity to the Law would have caused them to be a distinct nation among the pagan nations of the world. " (Grisanti, 1998, pg.40)

[56] Psychological studies reflect this idea well. In the struggle for life, scarcity can lead to a hostile interpretation of the Other. Drew Westen's work, *The Political Brain,* explicates the psychological research of the political responses to death in general, "More than 250 experiments in over a dozen countries have demonstrated that reminding people of their mortality — activating networks about the fear of death — tends to tilt our brains to the right. Whether the reminder comes in the form of a questionnaire asking people whether they would prefer cremation or burial, gory pictures, interviews that "incidentally" take place in front of funeral parlours, or even subliminal exposure to the words *dead* or *death,* people across the world will cling tenaciously to the worldviews they hold dear. Except for people with strong progressive worldviews, who sometimes become polarised toward their own ideology in response to reminders of their mortality, this generally means clinging to more "traditional" cultural values. People who reminded of their mortality will become less tolerant toward people who differ from them in religion, more nationalistic, and harsher in the way they punish those who transgress traditional moral values." (Westen, 2008, pg.364)

[57] As a cautionary note, Darwin states in usage of the term struggle. 'I use this term in a large and metaphorical sense including dependence of one being on another, and including (which is more important) not only the life of the individual, but success in leaving progeny." (Bates & Humphrey, 1957, pg.137). In respect to this, the principle of scarcity is a component of the overall struggle rather than being negated by the larger metaphor.

[58] On Judaism's influence on the West "This influence consists of: 1) beliefs of other nations, for example the French during the Middle Ages, that they were 'chosen';" (Grosby, 2005, pg.93-4) The idea of covenant is also found in the history of the U.S.A. But is also found in other faiths, such as Sri Lanka's understanding of its importance declared by the Buddha. Nigel Biggar also notes that from a theological standpoint, "the notion of the chosen people as referring to a particular nation strictly belongs to the Old Testament, not the New; and one of the main pints on which early Christianity differentiated itself from Judaism was precisely its transnational character." (Biggar, 2014, pg.15)

[59] H. Richard Niebhur notes this about Spain's self-understanding in the 20th century, "In the case of Spain the national-state represented itself and was believed in as the servant of the true Catholic religion." (Niebuhr,1960,pg.66)

[60] As mentioned in the previous chapter, found in Stockey's research, this claim is not paradigmatic of the Gibraltar-Spain situation. Yet, it is a plausible consequence of border.

[61] My point here is not to undermine actions any grievances done to Gibraltar by Spain, but rather that there is a dualism in perception, and this dualism because of it's simplicity can be problematic. Chief Minister Fabian Picardo gives an expression of the Gibraltarian view of Spanish politics, It clearly rankles with the chief minister, who describes the comments as "pure and utter defamation moving into the area of demagoguery of the sort that we have seen in the Balkans and of the sort we saw just before the start of the Second World War, trying to cast the people of Gibraltar in a light that will create odium against us". (Dawber, 2015)

[62] Fiona Govan's report in *The Telegraph*, features a number of media outlets depiction of the Gibraltar-Spain dispute during a more intensive period within the last decade (Govan, 2013). Gibraltarian media, such as YourGibraltartv.com depict other Spanish newspapers in 2015 suggesting Gibraltar as a refuge for drug traffickers, "El PP dice que tendría que criticarse por qué narcotraficantes se resguardan en Gibraltar (the PP states that we should question why drug traffickers seek refuge in Gibraltar). (YGTV, 2015).

[63] Frederick Depoortere describes Girard's thesis: "Since any group of humans always runs the risk of being engulfed by a mimetic crisis, which sweeps away every individual in a spiral of rivalry, reciprocal violence and aggression, human culture can only last when the mimetic crisis is suppressed by killing a scapegoat" (Depoortere, 2008, pg.42). In this case the scapegoat is expiated rather than propitiated. Therefore the scapegoat is alive, but is elsewhere.

[64] Steven Grosby draws on this notion, "In the aftermath of Fascism and Communism, the term 'paganism' has sometimes been used to refer to the deification of the state, where nothing is held to be more important that the state. This is a reasonable usage, signifying the horrors unleashed upon humanity when, because the state is elevated about all other concerns and, thus, is is worshipped as if it were a god, the humane truths of monotheism - particularly that all of humanity is created in the image of god - are repudiated." (Grosby, 2005, pg.89)

[65] Richard Niebuhr reflects upon the problems of idealising the state, "When men's ultimate orientation is in their society, when it is there value-centre and cause, then the social mores can make anything right and anything wrong; then indeed conscience is the internalised voice of society or of its representatives." (Niebuhr,1960,pg.26)

[66] Theologian Oliver D. Crisp reviewing Matt Jenson's *The Gravity of Sin:* "Sin is a disruption of this relationality; it is the repudiation of this idea of persons-in-relation to one another, a turning in on oneself." (Crisp, 2009, pg.121 Jenson's thesis is pointing to Augustine's, Luther's and Barth's depiction of sin as *Homo Incurvatus in Se,* the man turned inwards on itself.

[67] This resonates with Ricoeur, "the selfhood of oneself implies otherness to such an intimate degree that one cannot be thought of without the other" (Ricoeur 1992, pg. 3)."

[68] Eisen expresses this sentiment further, "Kaminsky argues that particularism and universalism in the Bible are not polar opposites in constant tension with each other; instead, one grows out of the other. He points out that many of the biblical texts that speak of inclusion of gentiles are the very same ones that emphasise Israel's election, an observation which shows the weakness of interpretations that assume a sharp distinction between universalism and particularism in the Bible. On the basis of these observations, Kaminsky suggests that the Bible sees universalism and particularism as conjoined and that Israel's particularism is, in fact, a source of its universalism. As Israel contemplated its chosen in the biblical period, it also reflected on the implication of that status for the world around it. As Kaminsky puts it, "A deepening sense of Israel's own particularistic identity as God's elect gives rise to new thoughts about the wider implications of Israel's chosen status." (Eisen, 2011, pg.46)

[69] Commenting on the Pharisee's ethic, theologian Paul Hanson states, "As a minority group dedicated to maintaining ritual purity in a defiled world that seemed unlikely soon to pass away, they felt it their sacred duty to maintain strict separation from all that defiled, such as ordinary food and utensils, and sinners. This was a communal ideal with roots reaching all the way back to Haggai (cf. Hag. 2:11-14), and coming to expression especially in Ezra's strict separation of the Judahites from their foreign wives aimed at restoring the purity of the "holy seed" (Ezra 9-10). In contrast to this cautious posture resulting from centuries of experience as a righteous remnant in the midst of a defiled world, the eschatological faith of Paul fostered a daring enthusiasm." (Hanson, 2001, pg. 440)

[70] Commenting on this Volf states, "The central thesis of the chapter is that God's reception of hostile humanity into divine communion is a model for how human beings should relate to others." (Volf, 1996, pg.100) The self-giving of the embrace is, "modelled on Christ's self-sacrifice, which is nothing but the mutuality of Trinitarian self-giving in encounter with the enemy." (Volf, 1996, pg.146)

[71] From many theological perspectives, God is distinguished as being wholly Other. He is not fully comprehensible to human reason and therefore will always remain different to what us. John Milbanks describes it as, 'the radical otherness of God," (Milbank, Pickstock, & Ward, 1999, pg. 22) This relationship is not reversible though, we are other to God but we are fully comprehendible to him in his omniscience. In fact, as we will note later on this chapter it is clear that we are not fully comprehensible to ourselves like we are to God.

[72] Volf's embrace does not meld the 'I' and the 'Other' into one identity rather proceeding from the embrace there is a letting go, "At no point in the process may the self deny either the other or itself. The embrace itself depends on success in resisting the vortex of de-differentiation through active or passive assimilation, yet without retreating into self-insulation." (Volf, 1996, pg.143) This is not to say that the 'I' and the 'Other' remain unchanged, rather in our self-enclosed selves we are transformed,"a genuine embrace cannot leave both or either completely unchanged." (Volf, 1996, pg.147) The absorbing of identities into a singular identity can be suggested in Christ's action, in establishing the Body of Christ. Graham Ward reflects on this, "The body of Jesus Christ, the body of God, is permeable, transcorporeal, transpositional. Within it all other bodies are situated and given their significance." (Milbank, Pickstock, & Ward, 1999, pg.176) But this is another point in which we are Other to God, in that we cannot act like he does.

[73] Yoder differentiates between Babel and Babbel, the latter is one of melding all identities and languages. (Yoder, 1996)

[74] Much like the heterogeneity of the covenant of marriage in which, two individuals are distinct yet united.

[75] "This thesis not only describes the transition from the divine life to the existence of the finite but also offers a reason for the multiplicity of the finite inasmuch as everything finite has the characteristic of being other vis-à-vis the other. Otherness, then, may be seen as the generative principle of the multiplicity of creature reality. In place of the static cosmos of ideas that the traditional view of the divine ideas in the mind of God postulated as models of creation, we find here a productive principle behind the emergence of ever new distinctions and therefore of ever new and different forms of finite existence." (Pannenberg, 2004, pg.28)

[76] Biggar also states that the Christian affirmation of human diversity has doctrinal roots, "The Christian theological affirmation of human diversity finds further confirmation in the orthodox doctrine of God as a Trinity. In Christian eyes, as in Jewish and Muslim ones, God is certainly one; but the divine unity is not simple. God is more like community than a monad splendid in isolation. The divine Origin and Basis of the created world, then, is a unity that contains rather than abolishes difference — a unity *in* diversity, not *instead of* it." (Biggar, 2014, pg.12)

[77] Pope Benedict XVI likewise states, "No one knows everything, but all of us together know what it is necessary to know; faith constitutes a network of reciprocal dependence that at the same time is a network of mutual solidarity, where each one sustains the other and is sustained by him. This fundamental anthropological structure can also be seen in our relationship with God, where it finds its original form and its integrating centre. Our knowledge of God is essentially based on this reciprocity, on a trust that becomes participation and is subsequently verified in the experience of each individual's life." (Benedict XVI, 2006, pg.102)

[78] As Rowan William's explanation of revelation being participatory in my previous chapter suggests, engagements through different events and, specifically for this chapter, different 'Others' can impress on us with new revelatory insights.

[79] More so, historical evidence suggests that, "Despite the portrayal of a restricted Israelite kinship found in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah that went so far as to prohibit intermarriage, after the Judaean leader Hycranus I (125 BCE) conquered Idumea (Edom), the Idumeans became a part of the the Jewish nation." (Grosby, 2005, pg.71)

[80] Volf in later works acknowledges this, "Often the reason we don't forgive is that we live in an unforgiving culture, a culture in which it doesn't make sense to forgive... We are deeply social beings, shaped by our surroundings to an unfathomable degree." (Volf, 2005, pg.211).

[81] Tom Wright shows one example of this, "let me gently point out that the political spectrum in the United Kingdom, and indeed in Europe, is quite different from the spectrum in the United States. In Britain, issues are bundled up in different ways from those in America. What's more, over the last forty years, those in the United Kingdom who have to integrate faith and public life have mostly been on the left of the spectrum, while those who have done the same in the United have tended to be on the right." (Wright, 2014, pg.165) Even geographical divides are not a sufficient way to describe the 'ethical climate', consider the Catholic Church's 'volte-face' in Spain and, in America Democrat President Jimmy Carter being the reason for *Newsweek* calling 1976 'The Year of the Evangelical'. (Meacham, 2006) Volf's social agents need to comprehend and critique the ethical climate they are found in. It be a key in explaining how they understand, what a Christian social agent act like.

[82] Perhaps the clearest contrast is between Romans 12:19 and Romans 13:4, The individual Christian is not to administer vengeance, but the government is meant to act as 'avenger'.

[83] Understanding how property is perceived, theologically, is fundamental. William Cavanaugh gives a brief explanation of Catholic theology and property, "For much of the Catholic tradition on the subject of property, going back to Aquinas and beyond, the ownership of property is natural to human beings and allows them to develop their own capacities. As Belloc says, property is thus essential to human freedom. But he does not construe freedom negatively here. The ownership of property is not about power, and the wide distribution is not about a greater equilibrium of power. Rather, property has an end, which is to serve the common good. The universal destination of all material goods is n God. As Aquinas says, we should property as a gift from God, a gift that is only valid if we use it for the benefits of other." (Cavanaugh, 2008, pg.28-9). In regards to nations, property should be have primacy with maintaining and building up the population, as responsibility is due to the population. But those, a nation is capable of aiding should also be a responsibility due, when considering the use of capital.

[84] Consider, Reinhold Niebuhr in *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, notes "While no state can maintain its unity purely by coercion neither can it preserve itself without coercion." (Niebuhr, 1960, pg.3) That collective groups work differently in contrast to individuals is evident in other works. Anthony Bash notes the difference between groups and individuals in regards to the question of forgiveness. "One cannot therefore speak of groups 'forgiving' or 'being forgiven' because integral to forgiveness are ideas to do with personal moral agency and responsibility, such as 'intentional action', 'acknowledgment of responsibility', 'repentance' and so." (Bash,2007, pg.115) He goes on to say, "Since a group exists only metaphorically, is a metaphorical entity, and so inanimate." (Bash, 2007, pg.116).

[85] Jacob Neusner expands on this notion, "the great monotheist traditions insist upon the triviality of culture and ethnicity, forming trans-national, or trans-ethnic transcendental communities … Judaism, Christianity, and Islam mean to overcome diversity in the name of a single, commanding God, who bears a single message for a humanity that is one in Heaven's sight." (Quoted in Volf, 1996, pg.39)

[86] Commenting on this passage in his discussion of Tertullian's understanding of natural law based on Gen.2:17 , Russell Hittinger states, "The teaching is simple and familiar. Our first parents were given an unwritten law, expressing the rule of law itself: men govern sharing in divine governance. Adam and Eve, who understood the law *naturaliter* (naturally), did not keep it. But the patriarchs before Moses adhered to the unwritten law." (Cromartie, 1997, pg.3)

[87] In Calvin's own words, "Moses, now explains the design of God in creating the woman; namely, that there should be human beings on the earth who might cultivate mutual society between themselves." (Calvin, 1965, pg.128)

[88] In fact, the individual does need to follow their conscience on these issues, "But those who have doubts are condemned if they eat, because they do not act from faith; for whatever does not proceed from faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23)

[89] Theologian Anthony Reddie in answering the question, *Is God Colour-Blind?*, states "The kingdom of God is a diverse one. God who has inspired all people to be themselves has created this diversity." (Reddie, 2009, pg.11) Point to the incarnation of christian ministry across diverse cultures

[90] Virtue theorist Alasdair MacIntyre's depiction of Aquinas' understanding of natural law is useful, "So the secondary precepts of natural law vary from society to society and sometimes within societies, while the primary precepts are one and the same for everyone at all times." (MacIntyre, 2009, pg.89)

[91] The phrase is translated from the Greek, *panta ta ethnē*, commenting on this R.T. France, "This then is the culmination of the theme we have noted through the Gospel, the calling of a people of God far wider than that of the Old Testament, in which membership is based not on race but on a relationship with God through the Messiah." (France, 1985, pg.414) This again is not the denial of genealogy, but rather it's relevance in entering God's kingdom. Some scholars have been concerned that this is an interpolation by the Church, roughly 50 years after the life of Christ, due to the debates found in Acts 15. But France notes that the issue was not concerned about entry of gentiles into the Church, but rather specifically on circumcision.

[92] Cavanaugh states, "As I have argued at greater length elsewhere, the story told of the modern state's salvation of Europe from the violence of the 'Wars of Religion' is simply not true. Catholics and Protestants often found themselves fighting on the same sides in the so-called 'Wars of Religion,' and just as often co-religionists battled each other in the name of more significant loyalties. To cite a few example: in the French civil wards of the late sixteen century, the Catholic League was opposed not only by Huguenots, but by another Catholic party, the Politiques; in German territory, Catholic Habsburg wars against Lutherans in both 1547-1555 and 1618-1648 were opposed by the German Catholic nobility, and in both cases the French Catholic king came to the aid of the Lutherans; the 'Thirty Years' War- the most notorious of the 'Wars of Religion'- became a contest between the Habsburgs and the Bourbons, the two great Catholic dynasties of Europe." (Milbank, Pickstock, & Ward, 1999, pg.191)

[93] Rousseau believes that true Christians becomes indifferent to their duties towards the state, "The Christian does his duty, it is true, but he does it with profound indifference towards the good or ill success of his deeds." (Rousseau,1968, pg.183) More so, he believes that they would be too subservient to tyrannical regimes, "Christianity preaches only servitude and submission. Its spirit is too favourable to tyranny for tyranny not to take advantage of it. True Christians are made to be slaves; they know it and they hardly care this short life has too little value in their eyes." (Rousseau, 1968, p.184) (On this point, we will delve further in the next chapter) and finally, he believes them to be unreliable soldiers. "It is said that Christian troops are excellent. I deny it. Show me these Christian troops. Personally I know of none." (Rousseau, 1968, pg.184)

[94] Frances Lannon gives an expression of this sentiment in Spanish history, "With empire, orthodoxy, and the unity of the state so inextricably connected in its great age of expansion and conquest, it is not surprising that Spain has so often been regarded as necessarily and essentially Catholic, and that the notion of a non-confessional state has become generally acceptable only very recently, with the constitution of 1978." (Lannon, 1987,pg.9)

[95] Peter Leithart writes concerning Rex Koivisto's theory of denominationalism, "According to Rex Koivisto, the theory of denominationalism was formulated by the Dissenting Puritans who participated in the Westminster Assembly (1642-49), who rested their case on a number of basic points: Differences of opinion about how to apply the faith to outward order and liturgy are inevitable because of human fallibility and sin; these differences are matters of conscience, and conscience should not be bullied by ecclesiastical authorities; these differences can actually be mutually enriching, as Christians engage one another; no Christian body has a full grasp of the truth, and therefore the true church is never represented in any single denomination; there are godly Christians on both sides of every ecclesiastical and theological difference; and separation of Christian bodies from one another on grounds of conscience is not schism." (Leithart, 2004) This highlights the creaturely disposition to difference and the need to hold together, even amongst dissent.

[96] It is described by von Balthasar "as a constantly burning shame." (von Balthasar, 1992, pg.3) G.C. Berkouwer states bluntly, "the disunity of the Church stands under God's criticism!" (Echeverria, 2014)

[97] Eduardo Echeverria notes a fruitful understanding of the Protestant protest that makes room for true reconciliation in his depiction of G.C. Berkouwer as an 'accidental Protestant', "Using the categories coined by Catholic theologian Reinhard Hütter, I suggest that Berkouwer is an "accidental Protestant" rather than an "essential Protestant." The latter "requires for its identity Catholicism as the 'other,'" Hütter writes. It assumes that the Reformation rediscovered "the true Gospel" lost after Paul and that "virtually everything in-between, the few exceptions only affirming the rule, pertains to the aberration of Roman Catholicism. Essential Protestantism, therefore, in a large measure needs Roman Catholicism and especially the papacy to know itself, to have a hold of its identity as Protestantism."

In contrast, accidental Protestantism "sees itself as the result of a particular, specific protestation," and thus "to a large degree as a reform movement in the Church catholic." These Protestants tend to have "one fundamental difference— and it can be the Petrine office itself—that prevents them from being Catholic. This difference cannot be just any but must be one without which the truth of the Gospel is decisively distorted or even abandoned. Being Protestant in this vein amounts to an emergency position necessary for the sake of the Gospel's truth and the Church's faithfulness; in short, accidental Protestantism does not understand itself as ecclesial normalcy."" (Echeverria, 2014)

[98] More specifically, in order to bring reconciliation between the three major denominations within Christianity, each group must encounter the other. To ignore differences, is, for example, to ignore Roman Catholics as Roman Catholics, and Methodists as Methodists. Ignoring the differences will not bring reconciliation between Catholics and Methodists, but to a common denominator.

[99] Walter Benjamin expresses this sentiment, "Only the Messiah himself consummates all history, in the sense that he alone redeems, completes, creates its relation to the Messianic." (Benjamin, 2007, pg.312)

[100] Clearly, seeking God's will could be shared among different religions. Thus we could establish a grounds for inter-faith dialogue. The possibility for this ethic has great reaches, Victor Lee Austin writes on Aquinas' view on friendship, "Each human being is, potentially, a friend of God. So whenever one human being, a friend of God, is loving God, that love is naturally extended to all the other friends of God, that is, to all other people insofar as they are also friends or potential friends of God." (Austin, 2012, pg. 124). But in regards to Christian ecumenism, seeking God's will is one and the same as seeking the will of Christ. "Whoever has seen me has seen the Father." (John 14:9) Hence for true Christian ecumenism is found in seeking Christ as defined by scripture and creed.

[101] John Rawls' work has two differing positions, which political scientists usually define as early Rawls and later Rawls

[102] Johnson comments, "The rational refers to single, unified agents as they seek, adopt, and prioritise their own interests and ends, as well as the means to meet those ends. The reasonable, by contrast, is more of a public conception because it is related to the idea of society as a system of fair cooperation." (Johnson, 2007, pg.46)

[103] "reasonable persons see that the burdens of judgements set limits on what can be reasonably justified to others, and so they endorse some form of liberty of conscience and freedom of thought. It is unreasonable for us to use political power, should we possess it, or share it with others, to repress comprehensive views that are not unreasonable." (Rawls, 1993, pg.58)

[104] Johnson, agains expresses this sentiment clearly, "Political liberalism, according to Rawls, does not question the possibility of truth-claims, nor does it desire that adherence of different comprehensive doctrines will relinquish their convictions in the name of skepticism. Indeed, the goal of the overlapping consensus is to find a political conception of justice that can be accepted as reasonable or true by a variety of reasonable comprehensive doctrines that exist within a given society." (Johnson, 2007. pg48)

[105] Reinhold Niebuhr even notes, "The fact is that there are not two distinct selves in this internal dialogue. There are merely two foci of the same self." (Niebuhr, 1956, pg.18)

[106] Meaning, a reordering of loves cannot simply be demanded of the other. It cannot come without the grace of God.

[107] For Augustine, Christ is both the means and the perfect exemplar of good leadership. In being fully God, the humility of being limited and corrupted by sin is not necessary, yet this is exactly what we find in Christ's work. Deede notes "This passage from John [8:1-11], it is worth noting, is one Augustine often uses to examine the nature of judicial authority" (Johnson, 2007, pg.164)

[108] Anti-Monarchial traditions within the Bible will also be analysed later on this chapter. But for now, the key issue is the questions of legitimation.

[109] We also find cases of Moses delegating authority, "Two important Pentateuchal narratives (Exod. 18; Num.11) address the transmission of Moses' functions to others." (O'Donovan, 1996, pg.52) Interestingly in relation to Yahweh's kingship we find, as O'Donovan notes, "One of the most striking features of the narrative is it is use of the term 'princes' (sārim) to describe the officials to whom Moses is to delegate." (O'Donovan, 1996, pg.58)

[110] John Howard Yoder wisely comments on the reductionist understanding of Christ's Lordship, within areas of the Evangelical tradition, "Yet the usage distorts the biblical meaning of the term by implying that Christ's lordship depends on an individuals's belief." (Yoder, 1992, pg.11). Christ's Lordship goes beyond individuals towards structures as a challenge and promise of redemption.

[111] Elizabeth Phillips explains, "In the Reformation era, 'the sword' was shorthand not only for the use of violent force, but for the exercise of civil authority which is marked by the duty and ability to punish wrong." (Phillips, 2013, pg.76). For Yoder, he derives his conception of the sword from his Anabaptist tradition, specifically from the Schleitheim Confession, "The Schleitheim document included the 'Seven Articles', matters of doctrine and practice which the Swiss Anabaptist considered most distinctive, characteristic and important " adult baptism, the breaking of bread, the ban, separation from the world, shepherds of the church, refusal of the sword and not swearing oaths." (Phillips, 2013, pg. 76). According to the Confession, "The sword is ordained of God outside the perfection of Christ....Christ did not wish to decide or pass judgment between brother and brother in the case of the inheritance, but refused to do so. Therefore we should do likewise." (Wenger, 1945, pg.247-253).

[112] The pacifist reading isn't the only reading of Christ's teaching. Peter Leithart explains, "For several reasons, however, mine is not a pacifist narrative. First, unless one follows an almost Marcionite contrast of Old and New, the Old Testament remains normative for Christians. Though it is normative in a new covenant context, it is impossible to escape the fact that Yahweh carried out his wars through an Israel armed with swords, spears and smooth stones. That is part of our story, preserved "for our instruction." Second, the New Testament does not endorse anything like a Marcionite view of Old Testament wars. To the writer of Hebrews, Old Testament heroes were model of faith not only in their endurance but also in being "might in war" and putting "armies to flight" (Hebrews 11:34). Nor were the earliest Christians pacifists. Stephen — Christlike, full of the Spirit, the first martyr — through that Moses' killing was an act of just vengeance to protect the oppressed, the beginning of the liberation of Israel from captivity (Acts 7:23-24), and the Jews did not stone him for saying *that*." (Leithart, 2010, pg.335-6) Likewise Martin Luther notes, "And what is more, Christ too confirms it when he said to Peter in the garden [of Gethsemane, Matt. 26:52]: 'Whoever takes up the sword shall perish by the sword', which is to be understood in the same sense as Genesis 9[6]: 'Whoever sheds man's blood etc.'; there is no doubt that Christ is here invoking those words, and wishes to have this commandment introduced and confirmed [in the New Covenant]. John the Baptist teaches the same [Luke 3.14]. When the soldiers asked him what they were to do, he told them" 'Do no violence or injustice to anyone and be content with you pay.' If the Sword were not an occupation approved by God, John ought to have commanded them to cease to be soldiers, all the more since [his vocation] was to make the people perfect and to teach them in a true Christian manner." (Höpfl, 1998, pg.7)

[113] Augustine's view of the State could be considered positive due the understanding that it restrains humanity from being as bad as it could be.

[114] Nigel Biggar notes the problematic nature of withdrawing from punishing evil, "This is the dilemma: on the one hand going to war causes terrible evils, but on the other hand not going to war permits them. Whichever horn one chooses to sit on, the sitting should not be comfortable. Allowing evils to happen is not necessarily innocent, any more than causing them is necessarily culpable. Omission and commission are equally obliged to give an account of themselves. Both stand in need of moral justification." (Biggar, 2013, pg.7)

[115] Justice O'Connor, in the case of Lynch v Donnelly stated that establishment sends, "a message to non adherents that they are outsiders, not full members of the political community." Quoted in Brudney's '*On Noncoercive Establishment*' (Brudney, 2005, pg.818)

[116] Athanasius was but one example, "Yet even with a Christian on the imperial throne, the church had not lost the capacity to be critical." (Leithart, 2010, pg. 183)

[117] James Wood Jr. notes "Organisations of modern man are expressly constituted for the purpose of wielding power." (Wood, 1972, pg. 107)

[118] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, in his *Ethics*, writes, "If Christ is to come, all that is proud and high must bow." (Bonhoeffer, 2009, pg.161)

[119] This, in light of previous chapter, helps understand Jesus' rejection of the Zealot movement's methods.

[120] Wood strengthens this point in noting, "The power of God is the basis of his sovereignty. Because he is the ultimate source of all power, all power is subject to him." (Wood, 1972, pg.110)

[121] This translates, "*The political activism of the Catholic church during the Zapatero government*"

[122] In 2009, Rachel Donadio commented, "Indeed, many see the church as a reactionary force trying to hold the country back." (Donadio, 2009)

[123] On this notion, Leonardo Boff notes, "The deposit of faith is presented as complete and perfect; nothing can be added to it and nothing can be taken away." (Boff, 1985, pg.4)   In which, "All social practices must be derived from it." (Boff, 1985, pg.4)

[124] Mark E. Moore notes on Christ's commandments "However, these "laws" were in force only for those who "opted in." He did not force his agenda on outsiders . If one accepted Jesus' agenda, there were radically new rules of conduct, including such core issues as Sabbath regulations, open commensality, love of enemies, economic sharing, ritual cleansing, and their relation to the temple. *He reconfigured for his own followers the major tents of being the* polis *of Yahweh*. For those outside the movement, however, there was no "imposition."" (Moore, 2015, pg.59)

[125] Alister McGrath explains further, "Christ is here understood to be a substitute, the one who goes to the cross in our place. Sinners ought to have been crucified, on account of their sins. Christ is crucified in their place. God allows Christ to stand in our place, taking our guilt upon himself, so that his righteousness – won by obedience upon the cross – might become ours." (McGrath, 2007, pg. 340-1).

[127] Rowan Williams explains, "The prophet, therefore, is somebody whose role is always challenging the community to be what it is meant to be - to live out the gift that God has given." (Williams, 2014, pg.13)

[128] Lee-Pollard contrasts Peter's perspective on power prior to his rebuke by Jesus to Jesus' on view, " Peter's reaction is not at all surprising. He may represent Satan in his attempt to dissuade Jesus from the path of rejection and death, but he is only thinking as an human being would — his assumption about power are based on human experience." (Lee-Pollard, 1987, pg.178)

[129] It appears that this spawns of out of an over emphasis on the dialectic in Barth's theology. Being made in the Image of a God of freedom should thus leave us as the Object being acted upon by God as true subject, but still with some essence a subjective nature. Though understandably it will be limited by our creaturely nature and marred by sin.

[130] Christ and the early Church appear to have a strong external locus of control but not a purely external locus of control. Responsibilities and duties are commanded and acted on.

[131] A resignation and apathy may in fact lead to a collusion of accepting the current state of affairs as desired by God.

[132] Bonhoeffer's comment on the community created upon a reciprocal will, is also evident here.

[133] Moore writes, "Through a comparative analysis of the Korean Church and the Thai Church... it was the deliberate posture of suffering by the minjung in Korea that led to the contemporary strength of their church as compared to those in Thailand." (Moore, 2015, pg.152).

[134] Richard John Nehaus notes, "Religion [*religare* — to bind] deals with the ultimate meanings and obligations in the whole of life." (Nehaus, 1996, pg.131).

[135] "dogmas can be seen as formulae of dangerous memory." (Metz, 1980, pg. 184)

[136] "Rather, the divine You creates the human You. And since the human You is created and willed by God, it is a *real, absolute, and holy You,* like the divine You." (Bonhoeffer, 1997, pg.55)

[137] Guido de Graaff explains what ecclesial judgement would be, in response to O'Donovan's book *Ways of Judgement,* "The picture of ecclesial judgement confirms my earlier suggestion that the church's task of judgment is both different from and complementary to that of the secular authorities, in that it mediates the redemptive rather than condemnatory dimension of God's judgment. The focus here is on discovering 'what is good, acceptable and perfect' (Rom. 12:2), rather than condemning what is wrong."(de Graaff, 2012, pg. 309-10).Utilising O'Donovan's understanding of judgement, i.e., judging with God, there may be occasion where the Church needs to express God's condemnation. Such as in unjust killing, dehumanisation etc. de Graaff doesn't deny this, it is helpful to note in supplementing the above quote.

[138] To do this, the Church will need to do theology and, in that, a theological analysis from all points of reference i.e., sociology, psychology, history, economics, art, health, etc

[139] [139]Levinas explains, "For God, who is capable of unlimited perception, there would be no signification distinct from the perceived reality; understanding would be equivalent to perceiving." (Levinas, 2006, pg.9)