Suffering and Salvation in Ciudad Juarez by Nancy Pineda-Madrid (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2011), + 200 pp.

Sociologists of crime have long drawn attention to the disconnect between penal regimes and crime rates, especially murder rates. Why is it, they ask, that some countries have vastly higher murder rates that others? Can we learn anything from looking at the differences? They are astonished that policy makers more or less totally ignore such differences, treating crime rates simply as a given of human nature. But one has to ask why murder rates in Jamaica, Mexico, Haiti, for example, are so high, and what might be learned by comparing such societies with other high density and multi-cultural societies such as the Netherlands, where murder rates are small to

vanishing. Much can be learned, as well, from comparing gender relations and attitudes to sexuality in different cultures. If, as Paul Lehmann used to say, the question is what we have to do to make and to keep human life human, then we can certainly learn from structures of civility, and negatively from structures of violence. Nancy Pineda-Madrid concerns herself with one very violent city, on the US–Mexican border, in which there are more than 3000 murders a year. The majority of those killed are men, but over a very long period—more than a quarter of a century—young women have been sadistically murdered and mutilated. These crimes bear the hallmarks of a psychotic serial killer, but they are carried out in face of the indifference of the authorities and the police. Prevailing sexual politics clearly play a major role in the killings and highlight a quite horrendous attitude to women, who are killed, not because they have got mixed up in drug wars, but because they are women. Feminist scholars writing about them have dubbed them "feminicide". Pineda-Madrid is surely right that analysis of the reasons behind the murders is complex, and she points to many different factors, pointing both to the role of economic liberalisation and to the role of the state, and to an underlying cultural trend which regards women as inferior to men. She rightly points out that if men had been treated in the same way (murdered and genitally mutilated) the authorities would have acted fast. Cultural attitudes expressed in Marian cults as well as in earlier South American religious myths emphasise the link between women and suffering. Even a sophisticated thinker like Octavio Paz unwittingly buys into this.

Comments by the Catholic hierarchy on the killings have sometimes been grotesquely unsympathetic—the "she was asking for it" response of some rape trials. By way of exploring the deep structures of such attitudes, Pineda-Madrid looks at prevailing accounts of the atonement, especially Anselm's, and like many others argues that satisfaction theory lends itself to violence. She therefore proposes an alternative, rooted in redemptive community. The questions she asks are important and ought to be the cause of much Christian soul searching, but in at least two ways they could have been pushed harder.

In her account of Anselm she bends over backwards to be fair. *Cur Deus Homo* is a much disputed text, and some scholars insist that Anselm's theory must be understood purely as an intra-divine event, as an account of grace. To this we have to reply that not all Anselm's contemporaries saw it like that. Abelard did not, Peter Lombard ignores satisfaction theory in his account of the atonement, and Aquinas only allows it as heavily qualified by other ways of understanding it. Quite apart from anything else, the argument of the second book about the treasury of merits makes suffering intrinsically valuable and many scholars have argued that this bears on the structure of affect of western culture, influencing our ideas of penality, as well as of gender. Briefly, would contemporary retributivism be the same without Anselm? Pineda-Madrid basically agrees with this, but in my view she could have stated her case more strongly.

More problematically, Pineda-Madrid looks for alternatives to the idea of a redemptive community but does not do so in an account of the church and in terms of developing an alternative ecclesiology. If one reads Paul, I would say, one cannot give an account of redemption, as Anselm does, and as was common throughout both the middle ages and the Reformation, simply in terms of what Christ did on the cross. For Paul, clearly, redemption was a movement which was focussed in the cross but which continued in the church, breaking down the barriers of class, gender and race, and inaugurating a new humanity. The key question, then, is how come such a movement turned into the hierarchical, patriarchical and often racist institution we now know as "the church", which could make concordats with fascism, which sanctified the Latin American death squads and which responds to feminicide with lectures about immodest clothing? Of course the answer is not far to seek, and Pineda-Madrid agrees

with Wink and others in pointing to the ways in which a redemptive movement can become co-opted by "the powers". The question is how we, as church, find our way out of this. As I read Pineda-Madrid, the redemptive community she outlines could be any progressive community. The Christian claim, as I understand it, is that the resources of hope we need to confront the powers require the overturning power of the narrative of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is a big and implausible claim, in the light of Christian history, but it seems to me where the gospel leads us. What I would like to have seen, in the final two chapters, is more reflection on pneumatology and on how we understand the church, specifically, as a redemptive community. Having said this, I agree with many of those who provide the book's blurb, that this is a book which should be on reading lists and which should force Christians to think what they really mean by terms like "salvation" and "redemption".

Tim Gorringe
College of Humanities
Amory Building
Exeter EX4 4RJ
UK
T.J.Gorringe@exeter.ac.uk
USA