

The Journal of Religion

toward agent-relative obligations involving the well-being of others,” which includes being pained by others’ suffering, taking joy in their happiness, and acting out of differentiated love that begins with one’s parents and family; 247–57); righteousness (“a disposition to accord with agent-relative prohibitions involving the expression and preservation of one’s own ethical character,” which relates in complex ways to shame, moral convictions, and social expectations; 257–70); propriety (“the expression of respect [or reverence] through ritual activities”; 270–72); and wisdom (a grab bag of various parts, but not the master virtue it is for Aristotle; 273–77) all deserve extended engagement that I cannot offer here.

One particularly thought-provoking discussion in the text develops an abstract account of the various “spheres of action and experience” to provide a deep rationale for Mengzi’s scheme of four cardinal virtues: that is, humans are social, and thus require benevolence, but are also distinct individuals, and thus require righteousness or integrity; we express and appreciate beauty and meaning, and so require propriety or “refinement,” and we also face unending change and uncertainty, and so require wisdom (350–54). This raises again the question of abstraction raised above: what spheres of existence are the right ones to focus on, after all? It also allows Van Norden to show both the overlaps and distinctiveness of Ruist accounts of a flourishing existence when compared with Platonic, Aristotelian, or Thomistic accounts, in a way that resonates with the modern Western “affirmation of everyday life” discerned by Charles Taylor. Specifically, Van Norden makes it clear that he shares Ruist commitments to “artistic production and appreciation” (visible throughout the text in his thoughtful engagement with examples from literature and music) and to enjoying daily life with family and friends—as well as to the more contemplative life of the mind. Such a broadly learned and humane work of philosophical ethics deserves wide attention.

AARON STALNAKER, *Indiana University*.

LAWRENCE, JONATHAN, and VAISSE, JUSTIN. *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges in Contemporary France*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2006. 342 pp. \$52.95 (cloth); \$22.95 (paper).

Lawrence and Vaisse give an encyclopedic assessment of French policies toward the country’s Muslim minority and the social, economic, and political facts of integration. Their objective is to “fill the large gaps in common knowledge about Muslims living in France and how France has addressed the policy challenge of integrating Islam” (264). One imagines the book lying on the desks of graduate students and journalists who need a primer on the recent history and the facts. If so, we should all be happy.

In the book’s myth-busting discussion, French policy makers are described as struggling (with mixed effects) with a problem for which precedent is a poor guide, and France’s 5 million Muslims are portrayed as a diverse but increasingly well-defined ethnoreligious minority. The authors do not ask if integration is desirable; instead, they treat it as a fact of life. A chapter entitled “Steady Integration” talks about how French food has pushed away ethnic cuisines, about the predominance of the French language, and about the support for French values among Muslims. “Despite their ethnic and national diversity, what Muslims in France increasingly do have in common is the ‘lived experi-

ence,' which includes the bitterness of exclusion as well as successful efforts to integrate" (16).

By 1950, there were about three hundred thousand Muslims living in Western Europe. Today there are about 15 million, and about half can date their arrival to the 1980s and before, while the other half either came later or were born in Western Europe. Illegal immigration and migration within the enlarged European Union aside, restrictive immigration policies ensure that little new immigration takes place now. Muslims, in France and elsewhere in Western Europe, have already become "old" migrants and display the characteristics associated with settlement and acculturation.

Social scientists talk about "waves" of migration, and demographers talk about "booms" when migration turns into settlement and babies are born. But the demographers' metaphors are putty in the hands of the civilization warriors. It is now common to read in the papers that Europe is "flooding" with immigrants and that the Muslim minority is "exploding." Anti-Muslim agitation has successfully turned public debates into a distorted house of mirrors, where Muslims' civic and political engagement signifies rising "Islamism" and governments' belated efforts to produce policies for the integration of Islam become "appeasement."

The reality is that governments turned their attention to accommodation only as part of policies for community-based counterterrorism. The clouds of September 11, 2001, and even more so the March 2004 and July 2005 train bombings in Madrid and London, hang over much-needed initiatives to facilitate the normalization of Muslim faith communities in Europe. France, however, had an early start. French antiterrorism policies have changed little since the pre-al-Qaeda days in the 1990s, when France was dealing with displaced political radicalism spilling over from the Algerian civil war. The French Council of the Muslim Faith (*Conseil Français du Culte Musulman*, CFCM) was established in 2002 by then Minister of the Interior, Nicolas Sarkozy, to facilitate the creation of a civic structure for "Islam of France." Today, similar efforts are ongoing in Germany and the United Kingdom.

Muslim clerics and civic leaders struggle to make their voices heard within the framework allowed by the state for Muslims to seek representation qua Muslims. Lawrence and Vaisse are not overly critical of the French commitment to public secularism. Nevertheless, they are attuned to the perverse politics that results and dryly observe that the CFCM is a highly visible institution hampered by paradox: "it has sometimes appeared to be the only game in town for Muslim leaders, and yet the government has insisted that the CFCM's purpose is restricted to handling narrowly defined religious issues" (161). The French castigate Muslim leaders as "communitarian" separatists when they speak about religion, yet the only opportunity Muslims are given to speak with the government is in the context of religion.

Angry vocabulary about "fundamentalism" and "parallel societies" is found nowhere in this book. Lawrence and Vaisse describe "re-Islamization"—"the increased religious consciousness among the younger generations" (90)—as a many-faceted response to the need to define, from the ground up, what it means to be a French Muslim. Women read the Koran to decide "for themselves" what the faith requires of them, while native-born young people who are uncomfortable with the inherited practices of their parents' generation turn to the scripture to redefine what it means to be Muslim in France today. According to the authors, survey responses showing high rates of mosque at-

The Journal of Religion

tendance by young Muslim men reflect “idealized answers” intended to project an image of Muslim solidarity rather than actual rates of observance (97). Mosques remain for the most part the province of old men, but young people assume the mantle of the faith to create their own identity.

There has been much discussion about growing anti-Semitism among France’s Muslims. It is sometimes argued that what critics see as anti-Semitism is instead justifiable anger at Israel’s actions toward Palestinians. But Lawrence and Vaisse do not go in for political piety. The evidence is weighed, and they conclude that anti-Semitic sentiment is not just impolitic political criticism: religiously observant Muslims are more likely to express anti-Semitic views than nonobservant people, and young people are also inclined to express hostility to Jews. Lawrence and Vaisse suggest that Muslims compare themselves to Jews and find themselves lacking in status and influence. Muslims are discriminated against and marginalized, while Jews are influential and protected by norms that limit criticism. Sometimes it is hard to see where religion ends and politics begin.

JYTTE KLAUSEN, *Brandeis University*.

LEE, JONGSOO. *The Allure of Nezahualcoyotl: Pre-Hispanic History, Religion, and Nahua Poetics*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008. xii+282 pp. \$34.95 (cloth).

Nezahualcoyotl was a fifteenth-century Nahua ruler, known among modern scholars for his poetry and the comparative prominence he gave to his local city-state (*altepetl*) of Texcoco, situated on the eastern edge of Mexico’s wide central valley. Also, as Jongsoo Lee points out, Nezahualcoyotl is similarly the heir of more legendary ascriptions of him dating from the Spanish colonial period as a monotheist, a prophetic visionary, and a religious dissenter, invoking the one “Lord of the Near and Close” and protesting the most egregious barbarities of neighboring Tenochtitlan, the capital of the Mexica (Aztec) empire. Lee’s recent book takes aim at these expressions of colonial wish fulfillment, seeking particularly to show Nezahualcoyotl as a participant and upholder of local political and religious practices and ideologies, in particular, the propagation of the Mexica pantheon and the imperial spectacle of human sacrifice.

Using available pictorial and documentary sources, primarily from the early colonial period, and focusing particularly on a long and formative period of Nezahualcoyotl’s young manhood spent in exile with his maternal aunts among the nobility of Tenochtitlan, Lee argues that Nezahualcoyotl is inseparable from the wider context of Mexica imperialism. Lee sees Nezahualcoyotl as a paragon of the Mexica order instead of a dissident. Particularly in the realm of imperial religious practice—where domination, spectacle, and awe played significant roles, and which were often used as shows of ruling power as much as public acts of ceremony—Lee makes an important revisionist contribution, showing the ways in which Nezahualcoyotl transformed local Texcocan religious practice into a more imperial form. Nezahualcoyotl attempted to centralize scattered neighborhood religious practice in the ceremonial center of the city, he erected or expanded temples to Tlaloc (the enduring Mesoamerican rain god) and Huizilopochtli (the Mexica tutelary deity) following Ten-