

genossen. Die Anwendung des gefeierten Prinzips der Gewaltlosigkeit, so Bailey, hatte oft den Charakter einer Erpressung oder Selbstmordandrohung. Statt seine Gegner von der moralischen Wahrheit zu überzeugen, wie es sein vorgegebenes Ziel war, brachte Gandhi viele von ihnen durch dramatisch inszenierte Sturheit zum Nachgeben. Das funktionierte gut, solange sein persönliches Charisma auf Gegenüber wirkte, die zu Kompromissen bereit waren. Woran Gandhi allerdings scheiterte (und letzten Endes auch starb), war es, die fanatischen Anhänger der indischen Religionsgruppen von der Richtigkeit des Gewaltverzichts und der Notwendigkeit spiritueller Regeneration zu überzeugen.

Baileys Methode, in erster Linie Argumentationsweisen zu vergleichen und die vertretenen Inhalte hintanzustellen, führt unvermeidlich zu Provokationen: auf S. 37 erscheinen Gandhi und Selbstmordattentäter in einem Kontext, auf S. 50 George W. Bush und Hitler, auf S. 202 die Unfehlbarkeitsdoktrin und Hitlers Rassismus. Diese Stellen sind jedoch keine dumpfen Polemiken, sondern ergeben sich aus seiner rhetorischen Analyse, deren weiterreichendes, unbequemes Ergebnis ist, dass "die Guten" demagogische Techniken genauso brauchen und gebrauchen wie "die Bösen". Komplexitätsreduktion ist notwendig, wenn man Anhänger gewinnen und behalten will, da das differenzierte Argument nicht dazu taugt, die Massen zu bewegen – was Hitler und Gandhi gleichermaßen wussten.

Baileys frühere Werke haben stets belegt, wie real diese Notwendigkeit ist: auch in ganz alltäglichen Interaktionen sind Reduktion und Verallgemeinerung sowohl zur Einordnung von Situationen als auch zu deren Kommunikation unerlässlich. Moralisch problematisch wird es für ihn erst, wenn wir dieses Vorgehen grundlos übertreiben. Wenn wir auf unsere intellektuellen Kapazitäten verzichten, noch bevor wir sie ausgeschöpft haben, und wo wir andere dazu anleiten, blind zu glauben und zu folgen, dort handeln wir wider das von ihm hier vertretene humanistische Prinzip. Baileys Kritik zielt somit auf all jene Institutionen, die Verdummung fördern, entweder durch stures Verfolgen von Traditionen oder durch strategisch-politisches Vorgehen. Um den letzten Begründungen, die er nicht nur analysiert, sondern auch anprangert, etwas entgegenzusetzen, schlägt F. G. Bailey seinen eigenen kategorischen Imperativ vor: "Schreite bedachtsam!" (*Walk gently!*). Damit umreißt er, auch explizit im Rückblick auf die Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts, eine schlichte Selbstbeschränkung. Als Grundlage moralischen Handelns soll man doktrinären Aussagen entsagen (abgesehen von dieser) und Bescheidenheit pflegen; niemals jedoch soll man kritische Reflexion und intellektuelle Neugier aufgeben.

Angesichts Baileys klarer Sprache, der anschaulichen und stimulierenden Fälle und der zentralen Anliegen des Buches fiel mir als ideales Lesepublikum zunächst ein Oberstufen-Ethikkurs ein, oder eine Abschlussklasse Sozialkunde. Damit soll aber nicht der wissenschaftliche Wert des Buches heruntergespielt werden. Bailey verweist zwar nur in sehr geringem Maße auf aktuelle Diskussionen (mit zweieinhalb Seiten Literaturanga-

ben), knüpft aber ständig an grundlegende Fragen der Politikethnologie, Weltanschauung, Entscheidungstheorie und Rhetorik an, und spätestens auf den zweiten Blick erschließt sich die Geschlossenheit seines theoretischen Ansatzes. Seine Definition von Religion als jede dem kritischen Argument entzogene Überzeugung ist nicht beliebig, sondern methodologisch notwendig, da wir, wie er nicht müde wird zu betonen, nicht in die Köpfe von Menschen hineinblicken können. Die Frage, wie jemand an das Übernatürliche glauben kann, ist sozialwissenschaftlich nicht zu behandeln; wie Leute ihren Glauben aber öffentlich darlegen und argumentativ zur Grundlage ihrer Handlungen erklären, schon. Ohne seine früheren Werke auch nur einmal zu zitieren, aber in spürbarem Rückgriff auf sie, ist Baileys "God-Botherers" eine ungewohnte Mischung aus subtiler Analyse und milder Moralisierung. Felix Girke

*Ballads of the Lords of New Spain.* The Codex Romances de los Señores de la Nueva España. Transcr. and transl. from the Nahuatl by John Bierhorst. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009. 237 pp. ISBN 978-0-292-71852-4. Price: \$ 65.00

Almost a quarter of a century after the publication of his influential edition of the *Cantares Mexicanos*, Bierhorst has once again produced a masterpiece – a thorough edition, including palaeography, translation, commentary, of the second major collection of 16th-century Nahuatl (Aztec) poetry, the so-called "Romances de los Señores." No less than the *Cantares*, the *Romances* must be considered the most opaque collection of texts in the Nahuatl language that has survived down to the present day, with exception of some archaic hymns.

The *Romances* preserve some thirty-six songs in a variety of indigenous genres. Bierhorst argues for unity of composition with regard to the *Cantares* and *Romances*: that is, he sees both as part of the output of a single school, that of Tetzcoco (here misnamed "Texcoco," which along with "Montezuma" for Motecuhzoma, represents the most glaring instance of sloppiness in an otherwise immaculate work). Tetzcoco is often hailed as the cultural capital of Aztec Mexico, not surprisingly in the works of Tetzcoacan historians. Frequent mention of Tetzcoacan rulers is given as the main reason for coming to this conclusion, but such argumentation is weak – Mexican rulers and nobility are also highly prominent in the collection, although it must be conceded that Nezahualcoyotl, the famed poet-king of Tetzcoco, figures larger than life throughout. This, however, is hardly reason enough to ascribe the songs as a whole to a Tetzcoacan source. Regrettably, both here and in the question of genre, Bierhorst contents himself with generalities. No attempt is made to discuss which of the known Aztec genres (song types) are discernible in the material, an issue of no little importance in dealing with the Nahuatl poetry of this period.

Bierhorst continues pursuing his "ghost song" theme in the new edition. Put briefly, he views 16th-century Nahuatl poetry neither as impenetrable nor as "rumi-

nations of old kings,” but rather as instruments put to work by native leaders as a “mid-to-late-16th-century testament of nativism and defiance in the face of colonial authority” (viii), in which pre-Conquest figures are conjured up or summoned to earth as ghosts to be celebrated and invoked, as “incoming warriors from the other world” (12). There is something to be said for this, but the editor puts too many eggs in one basket. This time around, he acknowledges the possibility that genuine pre-Hispanic texts addressing contemporary or recently deceased kings and heroes may have passed into the collection with only minor revision and adaptation. Nevertheless, his studies remain permeated by his perception of Nahuatl poetry of this period as somehow parallel to the Ghost Dance and revitalization songs of North America and, thus, as fundamentally devoted to nativist ends. Perhaps this is (or was) a much-needed corrective to the tendency of many scholars in the past to accept the songs at face value, as inherited in largely intact form from Aztec-period poet-kings and heroes. But he overstates his case, despite some relaxing of his previously dogmatic stance.

If we look away from his broader perspectives, the *Ballads* can be seen as one more proof of Bierhorst’s remarkable skills as an exacting editor, whose palaeography can be relied upon without question. He has learned from previous critiques of his translations and commentaries, but certain *idées fixes* continue to occupy the middle ground, such as his persistence in rendering the high-profile verb *malina* as “whirl,” when it clearly means “twist,” simply because he is possessed by the image of whirling warrior ghosts descending from the sky. He knows better now (thus, “Whirl [lit. be twisted!], you princes” (61), yet he stubbornly retains the incorrect primary rendition.

Minor quibbles (and major disagreement) aside, there is much to be admired in Bierhorst’s scholarship. His editions will set the standard for Nahuatl text editions for a long time to come, just as his provocative and challenging thesis will again nudge specialists towards a detailed reevaluation of the message(s) behind the songs, no matter what conclusions are ultimately drawn. Those interested in exploring the Romances in greater depth will want to consult the online edition at <www.utdigital.org>, which Bierhorst has promised to set up as an enhancement of the book version.

Gordon Whittaker

**Banchoff, Thomas** (ed.): *Religious Pluralism, Globalization, and World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 348 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-532341-2. Price: € 13.99

The book “Religious Pluralism, Globalization, and World Politics” (2008) is the second one of two volumes that explore the dynamics of new religious pluralism in today’s world. It grows out of the conference “The New Religious Pluralism in World Politics,” held in 2006 in Washington, D.C., and sponsored by the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs at Georgetown

University. Both volumes have been edited by Thomas Banchoff, Director of the Berkley Center and Associate Professor in the Government Department and the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University.

The first book, “Democracy and the New Religious Pluralism” (Oxford 2007), focused on the transatlantic experience. In this second volume, social and legal theorists, historians, political scientists, and practitioners study from a variety of multiple disciplinary and analytical perspectives the religious pluralism in world affairs across traditions, regions, and issue areas, including peace-building, transitional justice, economic development, and bioethics. The essays point beyond interfaith dialogue to interfaith interaction of religious communities in society and politics to meet pressing policy challenges in the context of globalization. Global migration and modern communication technologies force religions to rethink their global world roles in new ways. Globalization involves today in the international dimensions and interreligious dialogues not only Abrahamic religions – they have always had global identities anchored in faith in one God and universal truth claims – but Hinduism and Buddhism as well. The authors explore those patterns of mobilization and engagement across regions and religious traditions. Together they point to six dimensions of religious pluralism in world affairs: fragile identity politics, strong ethical commitments, international-national-local linkages, interfaith and intrafaith dynamics, secular-religious interaction, and the centrality of the United States.

Interreligious competition among main religions leads to the question about the meaning and scope of religious freedom and the implications of this new religious pluralism for theory and practice of democracy. Does the involvement of religions in the public sphere – in such areas as abortion, capital punishment, stem cell, cloning, same-sex marriage – endorse the ideals of peace, human dignity, equality, freedom, and solidarity or, on the contrary, will it be a source of animosity, possible conflicts or even fight between religions, cultures, and nations? Even if the essays deepen our understanding of the constructive role played by religious actors in world affairs, they do not depict religions as inherently more peaceful than violent – either in theory or in practice.

The study has two parts: I. “Challenges of Religious Pluralism in a Global Era” (39–121) and II. “Religious Actors in World Politics” (123–323). Thomas Banchoff (Introduction. Religious Pluralism in World Affairs, 3–38) begins with an overview of the individual essays, compares their arguments, and sketches the overall contours of religious pluralism, globalization, and world politics in the contemporary era. Kwame Anthony Appiah, “Causes of Quarrel. What’s Special about Religious Disputes?” (41–64), starts with the question why domestic and international political disputes are so difficult to resolve once they have religious stakes. He focuses then on the centrality of religious identity, its role in integrating other aspects of personal identity and problems the religious identity poses. He observes that in places with one dominant religious tradition, religion as such was not an