

The New Europe and the Third World

Francis McDonagh

Introduction

During this conference, I suggest, we have taken part in a process of demystification of various illusions about the spiritual or moral roots of the new Europe.

Garrett Fitzgerald suggested that the European Community had brought about a revolution in consciousness in three areas: it had abandoned war as a means of settling internal disputes; it had produced a Convention on Human Rights enforceable by the European Court; and it had recognised Europe's duty towards the Third World both in the Lomé Convention and other Community structures and in individual country aid programmes. Dr Fitzgerald anticipated criticism, and backtracked a little to say that these were all revolutions in principle. With regard to the church, he was much less positive. He said that in Ireland there was an underground church, waiting for the day when the values of Vatican II would be proclaimed anew. This note was struck in all the other reports from local churches. From France and Italy too we heard of an institutional church failing to meet the needs and aspirations of many of its members, who were turning to a variety of small groups, often viewed with concern by the hierarchy. George Vass, too, discussing Eastern Europe, questioned the assumption implicit in many discussions of *lux ex Oriente*. The light shining in the East is less a beacon than scattered sparks. Even the small communities which have carried the weight of renewal, he suggested, may not survive emerging from the cosy excitement of the underground into the cold wind of a pluralist society.

On the positive side, however, if there is no-one who has the answer, we can be united in a common search, following a common Lord whose mission was to bring good news to the poor.

Fergus Kerr suggested, in introducing Garrett Fitzgerald, that Europe is best defined from the periphery. If that is true, describing it from the perspective of the Third World should give us an even sharper focus, and that is what I shall try to do. The question I shall try to answer is 'What difference does a Third World perspective make to our thinking about the new Europe?' In one sense, the answer is simple. There is a great danger that the Third World will be relegated even more to the margins of the world economy by the 'investment opportunities' of the new Europe, and our task is to be allies and advocates for the Third World and its peoples. But I think there are other implications flowing from our partnership with the Third World for our actions within Europe, and I want to reflect on these as well.

Our conference takes place on the eve of what in Latin America is called, 'the 500 years', the anniversary of Columbus' landfall on the American continent. I want to argue that the anniversary forces us to ask fundamental questions about both the new Europe and the old Europe. At the very least, the anniversary helps us to contextualise the overthrow of totalitarianism in Eastern Europe. As we marvel at the courage and commitment of Poles, Czechs and Russians, and speculate about the possibilities of the new Europe, the anniversary of Columbus reminds us that what we are witnessing is a mere episode in world history, three-quarters of a century in the case of the Soviet Union, fifty years or less in the case of the other Eastern European countries. The structures of domination set up over the Third World go back five centuries, and if we are daunted by the prospect of achieving economic and social development in a greater Europe, how much more difficult is the creation of a new world economic order?

Is the end of communist domination in Europe in fact a step towards a more just world order? I find a suggestive parallel in the fact that the 15th century *conquista* followed the rout of the infidel on the Iberian peninsula,¹ and that the springboard for the new Europe is presented as the rout of the Marxist materialists in eastern Europe. It is important to remember that one of the processes which Columbus initiated was the incorporation of the Latin American periphery into the world capitalist system. Similarly, while 1989 may have been the 'year of liberty' in Eastern Europe, it is also part of the reorganisation of world capitalism in which the United States is trying to maintain political leadership despite its growing dependence on Japanese, German and Saudi economic power. One of the first signs of this new world order, in my view, was the Gulf War, in which the United Nations was brought back firmly under the control of the United States. From many parts of the Third World, the last year has looked not like progress towards world community but towards a world made even safer for transnational corporations.

Part of the enterprise of liberation theology in Latin America, and its parallel movements in Southern Africa and Asia, has been to reassess the history of evangelisation. Before we talk about the contribution of the 'new Europe' to the world, we need to come to terms with that reassessment. There is a danger that the church in the new Europe will become an uncritical partner of the new capitalism in the same way that it was harnessed to the colonial enterprise of earlier centuries.

Last December's issue of *Concilium*, devoted to a reflection on the 500 years, is a useful starting point for this reassessment.² Although it is specifically concerned with Latin America, many of the points have more general relevance. Perhaps the first point to be made is that the reflection on the past is directed towards the present and the future. It is not a fixation on the past, whether out of guilt or pride, although it might be a collective historical repentance, involving a desire to make amends and change. Nonetheless, we cannot escape our inheritance, the fact that the indigenous population of Latin America and the Caribbean seems to have been reduced

from 100 million in 1492 to 10–12 million in 1570, a genocide of 85% to 90%, and the number of Africans transported into slavery in the colonial period is put at 10 million.³ If we skip five centuries we find that the peoples of Latin America are still what Jon Sobrino calls ‘crucified peoples’: perhaps a quarter of a million victims of war and repression in Central America and an estimated 340 million Latin Americans living in life-threatening poverty by the end of the century.⁴ And these are only a small part of the ‘crucified peoples’ of the world. The United Nations Development Programme’s *Human Development Report 1991* picks out the following features of developing countries today:

- * *Poverty* — Over one billion people live in absolute poverty.
 - * *Nutrition* — Some 180 million children, one in three, suffer from serious malnutrition.
 - * *Health* — One and a half billion people are deprived of primary health care. Nearly three million children die each year from immunizable diseases. About half a million women die each year from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth.
 - * *Education* — About a billion adults cannot read or write. Well over 100 million children of primary school age are not in school.
 - * *Gender* — Disparities between men and women remain wide, with female literacy still only two-thirds that of males. Girls’ primary enrolment rates are little over half that of boys, and much of women’s work still remains underpaid and undervalued...
- For many countries, external debt now exceeds their total GNP — including Laos, Egypt, Bolivia and Mozambique. Debt repayments take a large share of government budgets. The Philippines spends 36% of its central budget on debt servicing— compared with 22% for social services. Jordan devotes 39% to debt service and 18% to social services. Mexico spends 20% on debt service and 18% on social services.⁵

The deprivation in this catalogue is not for the most part due to natural causes, but the result of political and economic inequality, national and international: inequality in the distribution of land and income, unequal access to productive resources and political power. In maintaining international inequality Europe plays a central role. European banks profit from Third World debt, and are reluctant to consider meaningful debt relief. European political leaders allow banks to let Third World countries export 5% of their GDP to enrich bank shareholders. Europe plays a major part in designing structural adjustment policies geared to the needs of Western banks rather than the needs of Third World populations. European agricultural policies are undermining Third World food systems and peasant production. All this is not accidental, but the result of human actions, even if it is so woven into the structures of our world that we think of it as natural. To highlight the extent to which this is the result of human choices, and so a subject for moral judgments, is the point of terms

such as 'structures of sin' and 'social sin'.⁶

Responsibility is Jon Sobrino's point in using the term 'crucified people'—which he takes from his martyred Jesuit brother Ignacio Ellacuría. He wants to stress that this situation is not accidental, but in fact sinful: 'To die crucified does not mean simply to die, but to be put to death; it means that there are victims and there are executioners. It means that there is a very grave sin.'⁷ We have moved 500 years, but the justification for that is that the process is basically the same, an economic system that exploits the majority of the world for the benefit of a minority.

Europe's role

Europe is an important actor in economic relations with the Third World.⁸ The European Community is the world's largest trading bloc, with an internal market of 323 million people and accounting for 19% of world trade.

Europe also has a historic responsibility towards the Third World since, apart from the Chinese mainland, almost all today's developing countries were once under European colonial rule. With the possible exceptions of Afghanistan and Haiti, all the 42 countries listed today as Least Developed Countries were once European colonies.

The European Community, as Garrett Fitzgerald pointed out, has acknowledged its responsibilities to some extent in the systems of preferential access to Community markets, especially the Lomé Convention, which gives preferential terms to imports into the Community from 66 countries in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The whole of Africa is now covered by the Lomé Convention, giving Europe a direct link with the world's poorest region. These systems do embody an important principle that access to markets can promote development, but the concessions are small and hedged around by restrictions, especially in the case of commodities which require Europe to change, such as sugar and beef. Third World products can also be excluded by an arbitrary raising of quality or health standards.

The value of these concessions, moreover, is being reduced by the general trend of trade. Since the Second World War the share of developing country trade with Europe has fallen from 20% to 15%. Investment from the USA, the EC and Japan in developing countries fell in the 1980s as a proportion of total foreign investment from 25% to 18%. In other words, the industrialised countries may be increasing their international trade, but the increase is among themselves. The Southern Asian 'tigers' and Malaysia are gradually closing the gap with the North, but in the case of Latin America the gap is widening, and Africa is out of the game. Europe itself is today less dependent on the underdeveloped world than at any time in the last hundred years, as synthetic substitutes have been developed for many tropical products and the Community has promoted the domestic cultivation of crops which once had to be imported. The clock can't be turned back, and Third World countries will have to adapt in cases where their products are no longer required, but to enable them to make the transition Europe should provide more generous aid for diversification. And under no circumstances should Third World countries

have to cope with the irresponsibility of sugar dumping or tariffs on processed foods which mainly protect food conglomerates.

The current negotiations for a new agreement for the GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, put European attitudes in a rather different light. The negotiations are usually portrayed as a battle between the US and the EC over agricultural subsidies, but in fact the US and the EC are united on proposals which would force developing countries to open their markets to subsidised American and European food, so reducing their food security. Tariff reductions under the new GATT may also erode the preferences currently enjoyed by the countries covered by the Lomé Convention. It has taken Europe and the United States many years of subsidy to achieve self-sufficiency in food production. Africa should not be expected to compete with European treasuries. There is a European Social Charter to guarantee domestic social provision, but Europe has social responsibilities abroad as well, in particular a duty to protect its weaker trading partners. So far it has largely ignored this responsibility. The British government, representing a country which imports the largest quantities of some of the most threatened commodities, such as Caribbean sugar and bananas, has failed to propose adequate safeguards for their producers.

The logic of domination

This situation is well enough known, but I presume that what we as Christians should be doing is looking at its causes, and seeing what repentance—if we accept Sobrino's view—might mean in practical terms. Pablo Richard, in the same issue of *Concilium*, quotes the condemned 16th-century theologian Sepúlveda as exposing the logic of the conquest. Richard says that Sepúlveda was condemned because he articulated too clearly the logic of the practice. Sepúlveda justifies the subjugation of the original inhabitants of the continent in terms of a version of natural law: he says that they can be oppressed because 'they are as much inferior to the Spaniards as children to adults and women to men'. The difference, he suggests, with only a half-apology, is as great as that between 'apes and men'. If we are tempted to smile, we need only think of the racism so prevalent in our own time in Europe.

Political and economic democracy

The fall of communist tyranny in Eastern Europe gives us a chance to engage in a common venture to build the good society based on a renewed commitment to individual freedom and human rights. It is impossible not to be moved by the testimonies of courage and heroically borne suffering emerging from the Gulag, and the symbol of the popular defence of the Russian parliament against the August coup resonated deeply wherever liberty is cherished. Can we indeed imagine similar enthusiasm for democratic institutions in Western Europe? There was no popular defence of the Greater London Council. The poll tax was defeated, true, but probably almost as much by its inherent difficulties as by popular opposition. In Britain we live with an establishment both secretive and unaccountable. Think of our

intelligence services, the limited democratic control over the armed forces and the police. But there are also ironies in this situation. The Yeltsinite Soviet deputy from Leningrad who appeared for several nights running on *Newsnight* during the Soviet coup revealed that she had spent time with Mrs Thatcher, and, when asked how the West could support the democratic forces, said that 'Winston Churchill would have known what to do.' These are strange allies for any sort of popular—as opposed to populist movement.

Connected with the enthusiasm for Mrs Thatcher among liberal circles in Eastern Europe is an idolisation of the market. Maybe the information which reaches us from Eastern Europe is filtered, but it is remarkable that there is not more talk about defending the welfare state, free health care and education as well as about freeing industry from the dead hand of state bureaucracy. In practice, perhaps, the economy has declined to such an extent in eastern Europe that the existing provisions don't seem worth preserving, but it seems to me urgent that there should be a dialogue between people in Eastern and Western Europe on the relation between the private and public in the economy. The Eastern European churches, particularly some of the East German Protestants, seem ready to investigate such a dialogue.

There is a danger that in our haste to dance on the grave of Marxism we become totally uncritical of our dominant social and economic structures. This attitude seems to have infected even the recent encyclical, *Centesimus Annus*. Despite Pope John Paul's criticism of 'a radical capitalistic ideology ... which refuses even to consider these problems [of poverty], in the *a priori* belief that any attempt to solve them is doomed to failure, and which blindly entrusts their solution to the free development of market forces', when he analyses the relation of the state and individuals, we seem to run into a set of abstractions. There is an air of unreality about the descriptions of a society inhabited by the State and 'individuals and ... the various groups and associations which make up society' (48). We seem to be dealing with an abstract model of perfect competition between free and equal agents, with no reference to such phenomena as multinationals or monopolies. In this encyclical, the State, too, is always over and against the citizens, distinct from at least, if not against. Except in the case of totalitarian regimes, the concept of power doesn't seem to come in. This can be understood against the Eastern European experience, but it seems to leave no room for the democratic socialist project of working people gradually taking control of the state through increasingly active participation, this despite the frequent references to active participation by citizens. The weakness of this approach appears most starkly in the discussion of what the Pope says is often called 'the Social Assistance State':

By intervening directly and depriving society of its responsibility, the Social Assistance State leads to a loss of human energies and an inordinate increase in public agencies, which are dominated more by bureaucratic ways of thinking than by concern for serving their clients, and which are accompanied by an enormous increase in spending. In fact, it would appear that needs are best understood and

satisfied by people who are closest to them and who act as neighbours to those in need [48].

Once again there is no middle term: either dehumanising handouts from self-interested bureaucracies or good neighbours, certainly no sense that citizens—let alone claimants—might organise to adapt this system to their needs and wishes. Nor is there any sense of the context which makes an increasing number of citizens welfare-dependent. It is a familiar tendency in pre-Vatican II Catholic social teaching to oppose the individual and the family to the social, but it is disturbing to find it in this context and so apparently vulnerable to right-wing clichés.⁹

There have been years of discussion in Europe and the United States among community movements and welfare specialists about ways of making welfare not demoralising or dehumanising, and in many popular movements in Latin America opposition to wildcat capitalism goes with an emphasis on self-help. This is an important dimension, for example, of Christian base communities. It is urgent for these issues to be brought into the dialogue with Eastern Europe on social and economic models.

One of the difficulties here for the institutional church is that the formulation of Catholic social teaching at the Vatican level is shrouded in secrecy. In particular, there is no obvious means of feeding in the experience and reflection of the poor themselves. Perhaps there is a role here for the Catholic Theological Association, drawing on bodies like Church Action on Poverty. In sharing experiences between West, East and South, Pax Christi Netherlands made an important contribution with its conference in September 1991.

By way of postscript to this section, it is worth noting that the same page of the UN *Human Development Report 1991* which lists the needs of the Third World has the following comment on the 'developed' world:

... the analyses for the industrial countries and the developing countries show many points of similarity, although the extent and character of deprivation are different:

Poverty — Over 100 million people live below the poverty line in the industrial market economies. If the USSR and Eastern Europe are included, the number is at least 200 million.

Unemployment — In ten industrial countries, the rate is between 6% and 10%, and in another three it is beyond 10%.

Gender — Female wages are, on average, only two-thirds those of men, and women's parliamentary representation is but a seventh that of men.¹⁰

Racism

An ugly feature of Europe, old and new, East and West, seems to be racism. After the slightly arcane debate about a single European currency and ecus of varying hardness, it was something of a comedown to find that a dominant theme of the July 1991 European summit was the need to control

immigration. It seemed that, from having been a mainly British obsession, it is now a concern of the French and Germans as well. This seems to bode ill for the hopes of a Europe which will be a beacon of freedom and prosperity for the rest of the world.

There are also disturbing reports from Eastern Europe that the fall of the Communist regimes has brought to the surface strong hostility to the Third World in general and to black students and workers in Eastern Europe in particular. We heard this both from a British academic who visits Eastern Europe and from a Nicaraguan student studying in Leningrad. In the Soviet Union, we have been told people from the Third World are commonly seen as parasites, and identified with the corruption of the communist regimes. If this phenomenon is widespread, it is indeed depressing for our Third World partners, who had come to value Eastern European aid as a counter-force against capitalist domination, often a vital lifeline, as in the case of the ANC in South Africa and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. Perhaps also, it is one more European legacy shared between East and West, a contempt for the people of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Racial factors will surely become more important in Europe as the attempt by the major European powers to absorb both Eastern Europe and North Africa into their sphere of influence puts the existing economic structures under strain. Economic collapse in the Soviet Union is already creating a flow of emigrants into Poland, and this process is likely to continue, if not expand.

Race, religion and imperialism

This presents a special challenge to the churches, because at the core of the identity of the largest of our ethnic minorities are other great world religions, Hinduism and a newly vital Islam. It is a challenge also because we now see that racism contradicts in a uniquely direct way the core Christian doctrine that God so loved the world that he sent his Son to become a human being, in whom there can be no discrimination on grounds of race, class or gender. But Christians didn't always see this, any more than they saw that Christianity excludes slavery: I think it undeniable that the abuses our societies have committed against Africans, Asians and native Americans were facilitated by a Christian conviction of possessing the truth, which had to be transmitted to these 'pagans', by force if necessary. We would no doubt want to argue that this first evangelisation was corrupted by its alliance with nascent imperialism, but we cannot deny the connection. I think it is important also to be aware of the connection between racism and imperialism. Our attitudes to the peoples of other continents, and even to Ireland, are conditioned by our colonial inheritance. Fr Michael Lapsley, expelled from South Africa and maimed by a South African letter bomb sent to him in Harare, made this point recently in relation to the publicity given in the past month to South African government funding of Inkatha. This information, he said, and we at CIIR can bear this out, was available about a year ago in South Africa, but was largely ignored by the mainstream media, which preferred to run stories on 'black on black violence'. But when Catholics fight Protestants in Northern Ireland, or

Flemings Walloons in Belgium, or Basques Spanish, this isn't seen as 'white on white violence'.

I think two sets of conclusions follow from this: if we are to fight racism, we cannot just preach goodwill; we have to tackle the structures which breed it: the economic system which sucks whole communities away from the periphery and forces them to become cheap labour in the centres of our economic system, and its corollary after the end of the postwar boom, immigration controls and the inhuman treatment of migrants.

There is a practical dimension to this question, and the appointment of a Refugee Officer by the bishops' conference of England and Wales is a welcome move. The discussions on the creation of a sort of domestic CAFOD are a hopeful sign. The Columban Fathers' project to compare the responses of Christians and Moslems in Britain to social injustice and the forthcoming European Church conference on Islam in Europe are also important signs. Translating this into practice at home is more difficult. For too long people like Ann Dummert have been voices in the wilderness condemning the poison of racism in British society. It is worth mentioning that Ann Dummert has produced a pamphlet on the implications for racial justice of the European Single Market, *Europe and 1992: Focus on Racial Issues*.¹¹ The role of Catholic schools in areas with large non-Christian communities is in urgent need of redefinition. And the recognition of black Catholics is only just beginning.

But there is a more fundamental challenge to the churches here which has to be mentioned at a theology conference: the continuing vitality of non-Christian religions after five centuries of evangelisation challenges the Christian claim to bear the name in which alone there is salvation. The questions of the 15th and 16th centuries are on our agenda again, and not simply as questions for the foreign missions, but as crucial to the life of the church in Europe. I have no professional competence in these matters, but I was encouraged to come across similar views in a recent article by Claude Geffré. He says:

The real challenge for European theology as we approach the end of the 20th century is the vitality of non-Christian religions. European societies are not only multi-cultural societies, but multi-faith societies. And whereas atheism has been the overriding context for work in European theology since the 19th century, today the plurality of religious faiths brings new responsibilities for theological thinking and leads it to look afresh at some key topics such as salvation and mission.¹²

And towards the end of his article he draws some of the implications:

We need to learn to distinguish better between the universality of Christianity as a historical religion (this is a relative universality) and the universality of Christ as the one mediator between God and human beings (this is an absolute universality).¹³

There is striking coincidence between the dilemmas of the 15th century with regard to alien peoples and our own today. Gustavo Gutiérrez tells a story on

this theme which I cannot resist repeating: Las Casas, he says, left us an important route by which to explore our past today. He told the European theologians (in particular John Major, a Scottish professor in Paris at the beginning of the sixteenth century) who had not set foot in these countries but were justifying the deeds being done in them: 'If we were Indian we should see things differently.'¹⁴

An agenda

When he invited CIIR to be involved in this conference, Brian Wicker said it would be helpful to set out an agenda. So what agenda do we have from the Third World?

In theological terms, Jon Sobrino has described it as 'bringing the crucified peoples down from the cross'. In other words, we have to continue to support the peoples of the Third World against their crucifixion by the international economic order, notably the foreign debt and unequal terms of trade, and oppose our governments' support of murderous regimes such as that in El Salvador. This is an agenda which is largely led by the development agencies, in Britain Oxfam, Christian Aid, CAFOD, SCIAF, Trócaire and our European colleagues. As well as relief and development projects, these agencies support projects through which the people of the South educate and organise to improve their own lives, and echo their views here. This side of their work, and potentially most of CIIR's work, is under attack in Britain from a minority of ideological conservatives who invoke charity law in an attempt to end the advocacy role of charities. The Charity Commissioners' criticisms of Oxfam show the effect of this pressure. It is very important that the supporters of Third World development should be alive to the dangers of this attack, and be prepared to resist it.

A second agenda item we have been given by our Third World partners is to expose the limits of the market economy currently being idolised. Here there is a bundle of issues related to the economic basis of individual liberty, ways of increasing democratic participation to make it more than just a five-yearly ritual. Here there is an urgent need for dialogue between reformers in Eastern Europe and popular movements and welfare rights campaigners from the Third World and from Western Europe. The third item is the fight against racism, structurally and ideologically, which involves the treatment of immigrants, refugees and migrants in our own countries. Related to this is the human task of dialogue with non-Christian religious communities here and the theological task of reflecting on the implications for evangelisation of religious pluralism.

There is a final item, which I have not explicitly discussed, but which is also a strong demand from our Latin American partners, whose theology and pastoral practice is so often misrepresented in Rome. Must we not work for a church which allows more scope for the diversity of local churches and their theologies? If the gospel commits us, in ways we cannot fully explain except in trusting acceptance of a God who is greater than us and our definitions and institutions, to accepting and rejoicing in a plural world, should not the church

be an image of that diversity? If we are to learn to listen to the unfamiliar experience of Moslems, Hindus and Buddhists, should we not start with a serious attempt at dialogue between the theologies of local churches?

The point goes further than the intellectual level. In the issue of *Concilium* commemorating the 500th anniversary of Columbus, from which I quoted before, J.B. Metz suggests that colonialism had a damaging effect on human relations in Western society:

All features which did not contribute to domination — friendliness and gratitude, a capacity for suffering and sympathy, mourning and tenderness, faded into the background and were cognitively depotentiated or at all events entrusted to the world of women in a treacherous division of labour.¹⁵

Western secular society is perhaps beginning to come to terms with this problem, under pressure from the feminist movement and subsequently from the lesbian and gay movement, but I would suggest that in the Catholic Church the process has barely begun. If we are to look, as Pope John Paul suggests, for economic and social relationships which transcend both capitalism and socialism, must we not have new structures in the church which reflect a more equal relationship between hierarchy and laity, women and men?

- 1 See Enrique Dussell, 'The Real Motives for the Conquest', *Concilium* 1990/6, pp. 30–46, esp. p. 35: 'Hispanic Christendom ... threw itself into the activity of the "Conquest" as an immediate continuation of the "Reconquest": the one ended in January 1492 and the other began in October of the same year.'
- 2 *Concilium* 1990/6, 1492–1992: *The Voice of the Victims*
- 3 Pablo Richard, *Concilium* 1990/6, pp. 59–60.
- 4 Jon Sobrino, 'The Crucified Peoples: Yahweh's Suffering Servant Today', *Concilium* 1990/6, pp. 120–29, quotation from pp. 120–21.
- 5 United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1991*, Oxford University Press, New York & Oxford 1991, pp. 2, 5.
- 6 Cf John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 36, paras 2ff.
- 7 Sobrino, p. 121.
- 8 Much of the material in this section comes from Edward Mayo, *Beyond 1992*, World Development Movement Occasional Paper 1, London 1989. See also Michael Barratt Brown, 'Europe and the Third World', *European Labour Forum* 5, pp. 35–38.
- 9 See Frank Turner's comments in *The Month*, August 1991, pp. 344–49.
- 10 United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1991*, p. 2.
- 11 Available from the Catholic Association for Racial Justice, St Vincent's Community Centre, Talma Road, London SW2 1AS, price £1.50.
- 12 Geffré, 'La théologie européenne à la fin de l'eurocentrisme', *Bulletin of the European Society for Catholic Theology*, pp. 50–51.
- 13 Geffré, p. 60.
- 14 *Concilium* 1990/6, p. 3.
- 15 Metz, *Concilium*, p. 116.