

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

important source of social identity. This changed today as more and more religious people do not live anymore in monocultural, monoreligious, monolingual nation-states but in societies where there are significant numbers of people of other religions. The first step in understanding how religion gets to be so regular a source of difficulty in political life is to see it as a form of social identity and to apply the general account of why social identities are important. The next step is to distinguish between religion, race, and ethnicity and make a further step to pluralism: to the view that people with different religions must still be equal as citizens – equal, that is, in the eyes of the state. This makes the integrative character of religion.

Pratup Bhanu Mehta, “On the Possibility of Religious Pluralism” (65–88), focuses on the fragile politics of national identity. The first section problematizes the concept (and definition) of religion, the second argues that even if what counts as a religious motive is indeterminate, and it is the source of religion’s potency in politics, the final section takes up the case of India in order to illustrate the complex relationship between religious pluralism, globalization, and world politics in the contemporary era. Similarly to Appiah, Mehta proposes ways of managing religious pluralism not by removing religion or religious claims from the public sphere but by cultivation within a religious tradition of a cosmopolitan ethos, centered on the dignity and freedom of all human beings. Mehta highlights four general lessons from the overall discussion: first, that the distinction between what is religious and what is not religious is not self-evident but it is regulated by state power; second, that much of the investment of modern states in the religious-secular dichotomy may exist because the focus on religion exempts secular movements like nationalism from political scrutiny; third, that in the contemporary era of globalization, marked by greater religious pluralism, all states have to operate with a regulative idea of religion, and consequently the boundaries within which it can operate are the function of state power.

Two next essays address the problem of proselytism, proselytizing, and freedom in the situation of religious pluralism and when a religion becomes a powerful source of individual and collective identity and grounds strong ethical commitments that inform particular actions. For Jean Bethke Elshtain, “Toleration, Proselytizing, and the Politics of Recognition” (89–104), freedom of religion and the freedom to proselytize are inseparable. She describes the proselytization as an action when someone knowingly and determinedly sets out to change someone else’s mind about something essential for his or her identity and self-definition, like religious belief and the toleration as an attitude to live with deep differences, even though someone may disagree profoundly with another’s beliefs and identity. The call to “preach the good word,” central to some religious traditions, seems to be compatible with the call to toleration in the Western democracies. But she sees also that centuries of Christian missionary activity in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America have been an enterprise often backed by state power and the force of arms.

John Witte Jr., “The Rights and Limits of Proselytism in the New Religious World Order” (105–121), calls for respect for religious dignity and autonomy of the other. At the same time, he points out that even if the right to enter and exit the religion of one’s choice was born in the West, this happened only after centuries of cruel experience, and in practice the Christian churches largely have been intolerant of each other. He puts the modern problem of proselytism in questions: How does the state balance one person’s right to exercise his or her faith versus another person’s right to liberty of conscience, one group’s right to religious expression and another group’s right to religious self-determination? How does the state protect the juxtaposed right of majority and minority religions, or of foreign and indigenous religions? How does the state balance its need to create national solidarity and peace with its duty to respect minority cultures and their need to dissent? How does the state craft a general rule to govern multiple theological understandings of conversion or change of religion? On the part of proselytizers in a missionary country it may require the knowing and appreciation of the history, culture, and language of the proselytizee, and avoiding Westernization of the gospel.

R. Scott Appleby, “Building Sustainable Peace. The Roles of Local and Transnational Religious Actors” (125–154), takes up the question of peace-building: the construction of a sustainable peace in societies divided or threatened by deadly conflict. He admits that “the hands of religion are bloody” and that internal disputes, purges, and civil wars are not unknown to the major religious traditions throughout their long histories. Contemporary globalization has seemed to intensify and accelerate the phenomenon, and at the same time strengthened the peace-building aspect of religions. He examines three cases spanning three religious traditions in three parts of the world, where religion is acting as a peacemaker under the aegis of globalization: the Catholic lay movement of Sant’Egidio’s engagement in Africa; Buddhist activism in support of human rights in Cambodia; religious engagement in both Sunni and Shiite Muslims across the Middle East.

By examining the universe of religious organizations and of nonstate religious actors involved in transitional justice, the essay of Leslie Vinjamuri and Aaron Boesenecker, “Religious Actors and Transitional Justice” (155–194), contributes essentially to our understanding of the role of religion in postconflict reconstruction and peace-building. It aims both at accounting for a range of nonstate actors in this arena and also to suggest the linkage between the beliefs these separate organizations embrace, the strategies they pursue, and the impact of these strategies on transitional justice. It demonstrates that religious actors form a pluralistic community of nonstate actors that diverge widely in their beliefs about the proper role of justice in conflict mediation (whether favoring retributive or restorative justice), and in their efforts to achieve justice, truth, peace, and democracy. They differ also in their worldview (cosmopolitan or communitarian), and whether they operate locally or transnationally.

Despite the diversity and the wide range of strategies they employ, religious actors do share one critical element: a logic of faith that underpins their overall approach to transitional justice.

The essay refers to five distinct frameworks, or “logics of action,” in which different beliefs are embodied, and presents a typology of nonstate actors engaged in transitional justice: capacity-builders, peace-builders, legalists, pragmatists, and traditionalists. The five “logics of action” outlined in this chapter include the “logic of faith,” “logic of legalism,” “logic of emotion,” “logic of custom,” and “logic of consequences.” As empirical examples, meant to be illustrative rather than exhaustive, and explored to illustrate distinctions among different categories of actors’ action, are: the local peace- and capacity-building work of the Mennonite Central Committee in Latin America, the mediation activities of the Catholic Community of Sant’Egidio in Mozambique, and the transnational engagement of the World Jewish Congress and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Several research agendas emerge from this analysis: that scholars should devote attention to more systematic comparative work between secular organizations (especially human rights organizations) and religious actors; that collaboration between secular and religious organizations should be more productive; that a more precise understanding of the particular conditions conducive to cooperation, or those conditions that might lead to conflicting strategies, is needed; that a more comprehensive understanding of the universe of religious actors, especially non-Christian actors, is needed.

In the essay “Religion and Global Development. Intersecting Paths” (195–228), Katherine Marshall focuses on religious involvement in the world of economic and social development. She explores a new terrain of faith development, engagement, and partnership, and focuses on the new trends and debates about these relationships. The essay introduces the major lines of controversy, setting out the historical developments that have brought faith and development institutions into closer contact in recent decades, and the major responses, positive and negative, that this produced. Marshall illustrates first the discussion with an account of the World Bank’s outreach to faith communities and then introduces four short case studies describing faith development institution partnerships: the interaction between the Community of Sant’Egidio and the World Bank; the Aga Khan Foundation and Early Education in the Muslim World; the Jesuit order and its education institutions and a private foundation whose focus is on social entrepreneurship and leadership – the Avina Foundation. Marshall notes that the first time in human history, a powerful consensus unites the global community in seeking to ensure that all people everywhere enjoy a minimally decent standard of living.

Thomas Michel, S. J., “Peaceful Movements in the Muslim World” (229–251), draws the attention to the peace-building resources in the Muslim tradition, referred to as “Qur’anic pacifism”. He analyzes three transnational Muslim movements and indicates the role

they are playing as agents of personal and social transformation in today’s globalized culture: the global network, some 9 million strong, of the students of the *Risale-i Nur*, authored by the twentieth-century Kurdish/Turkish thinker Said Nursi, the educational and cultural community centered about the person of the contemporary Turkish scholar Fethullah Gülen, the Asian Muslim Action Network (AMAN), an organization with members in more than eighteen Asian countries that is involved in a variety of social projects and causes. These examples of Muslim transnational movements are making their impact on the international Islamic *umma*. Michel explores these similarities and differences across the three movements, with particular attention to historical evolution, organizational structure, and concrete initiatives across development sectors, often in cooperation with secular states, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations. These transnational movements understand Islam as a religion that teaches peace, love, justice, cooperation, human rights, and equality of human dignity, and see the mission of the Islamic community in the world to be that of *rahmat lil-alamin*, to be a blessing to the universe.

John O. Voll’s essay, “Trans-State Muslim Movements and Militant Extremists in an Era of Soft Power” (253–273), concentrates on radical Muslim groupings within the contexts of the changing world of transnational activism and advocacy. It starts with a remark that the rise of religious pluralism amid globalization has also strengthened the hand of Muslim leaders, such as Osama Bin Laden, intent on destroying pluralism altogether. Globalization, not only for Islam, means the further decentralization of an already decentralized religious tradition. The author, somehow paradoxically, states that also the organizations of Islamic extremism should be studied alongside other transnational advocacy networks, and he highlights two of their most salient characteristics: their transnational nonstate character and their use of “soft power” to build constituencies and recruit militants. These aspects Voll examines after a somewhat more general description of the global contexts within which all groups of transnational activism and advocacy operate. A concluding section returns to the implications of the analysis for frameworks being put forward by scholars in a number of different fields, examining the dynamics of world politics at the start of the twenty-first century.

Thomas Banchoff, “Religious Pluralism and the Politics of a Global Cloning Ban” (275–296), explores the role religious institutions play in the life sciences’ revolutions, in the bioethical issues and in the global politics of embryo, stem cell, and cloning research, which raise important ethical questions. He sees in the global (transnational) politics of cloning the clearest example of the continued primacy of states and national identities in the context of religious pluralism, even if scientific and bioethical questions, by definition, have a universal and transnational impetus. Religion plays here a significant role, but only through interaction with other material and political forces. The essay proceeds in three sections: it first describes the international norms, national contro-

versies, and religious voices that served as a backdrop for the cloning controversy of 2001–2005; it traces and analyzes the 2001–2005 struggle that ended in a “General Assembly” deadlock, forcing the abandonment of efforts to establish a legally binding treaty and the recourse instead to the nonbinding “Declaration on Human Cloning,” passed by a slim majority in 2005, and in a final section draws conclusions from the cloning case for a better understanding of religious pluralism, globalization, and world politics. Banchoff sees the Catholic Church, within the Christian tradition, both the strictest opponent of embryo research and the best-organized and most influential political actor around the issue. Thus, how religious pluralism will shape the global governance of the life sciences in the future, remains an open question.

In “U. S. Foreign Policy and Global Religious Pluralism” (297–323), Elizabeth H. Prodromou analyzes the origins and implications of the relationship between religion and American foreign policy in a contemporary international system. Prodromou begins with the thesis that any effort to understand, much less to manage, the role of religion in world affairs must address a single, overarching reality: a historically unprecedented pluralism evident in national religious demographics, internally diverse faith traditions, and transnational religious actors and activities. The essay is divided into four sections: a brief historical overview of the influence of religion as an animating force in American foreign policy, and a discussion of two key historical junctures in U. S. policy: the “International Religious Freedom Act” (IRFA) of 1998 and of the proclamation of the “War on Terror” after the attacks of September 11, 2001. A concluding section argues that the religious turn threatens to isolate the United States and, paradoxically, undermines its efforts to combat global religious persecution and to counter international terrorism. Even if the U. S. foreign policy after the cold war has not been essentially and exclusively religious, it was widely perceived as an aggressive imperialism, mainly underpinned by a neoconservative ideology that has actually weakened America’s capacity to advance religious freedom, human rights, and peace in a religiously plural world. Prodromou ends her analysis on a hopeful note: despite its weakened moral authority, the United States possesses material resources that could serve to strengthen international law and global governance in a post-cold war order, marked by a resurgence of ethnic and religious differences and greater cultural and religious pluralism. On the other hand, this attitude will almost certainly provoke a defensive reaction against what will be seen as an arrogant effort to impose American beliefs on the rest of the world. Almost two decades since the end of the cold war, the idea of the United States as a benevolent hegemon and guarantor of world order, has alas lost adherents.

To whom then should appeal the discussed volume? Certainly to scholars interested in religion and to policymakers, as a useful book for courses in religion and politics and international relations. The essays reveal six interrelated dimensions of religious pluralism in world

affairs that will likely persist into the foreseeable future: fragile identity politics, strong ethical commitments, international-national-local linkages, interfaith and intrafaith dynamics, religious-secular interaction, and the centrality of the United States. The ambitions of the essays, stated in the “Introduction” by Banchoff, have been however modest – to define key concepts, including religious pluralism and globalization, and to explore their interaction with world politics across a variety of traditions, regions, and issue areas addressed in the volume. But even if the book does not provide a comprehensive overview of religious pluralism at the intersection of globalization and world politics, it shows the complexity of the topic called religious pluralism and some advantages and threats as well. Optimistically religious pluralism is defined by an absence of violence, as a peaceful interaction of religious actors with one another and secular actors in the public sphere.

Andrzej Bronk

Becker, Felicitas: *Becoming Muslim in Mainland Tanzania, 1890–2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 364 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-726427-0. Price: \$ 100.00

The title of this book is misleading. It is not about Islam in all of mainland Tanzania nor even those parts that are most prominent. It is about Islam in the southeastern part of the country. That area is 80 % Muslim but the least closely tied, of all coastal areas, to the major Muslim centers in Zanzibar, Dar es Salaam, Tanga, and further north. It is one of the least studied parts of the nation, at least by sociologists and anthropologists, perhaps because it is one of the most cut-off politically, economically, and culturally. This is important since it means that we cannot easily fit Becker’s materials in any solid supplementary ethnographic framework.

Becker’s study is based mainly on archival work and a large number of interviews with local inhabitants recalling their past experiences and local oral historical traditions. This is welcome material on a neglected area and topic, but it is difficult at times to get a real sense of just what social life on the ground was or is really like. The ideas and motives of Becker’s informants cannot easily be analyzed within any local structural framework of social organization, local economy, or landscape, though the author does attempt at times to do so in a general way. Such oral testimony has full meaning only when we can place the speaker in a social structure. It is clear, but unsurprising, that Islam and particular ideas and values of local societies and cultures would have complexly interacted in manifold ways over the past century and that the meanings of being Muslim, modern, and worthy of social note have been issues of contention. Presumably, Islam is “locally received.” We have extensive material on Arab/Swahili coastal culture in general, but we lack rich knowledge about the ethnic culture and societies in this part of Tanzania. Becker notes that in the past, contrasts between coastal (Swahili) and inland African groups were more pronounced. Then, dominance of coastal culture over inland African groups was more prominent than later. Indian Ocean trade declined and