

Williams, but also in line with Bourdieu and Foucault, Illouz demonstrates how cultural ideologies keep us in place and in line. Another down-side to the emotional revolution Illouz presents is an “extraordinary paradox”: “therapeutic culture—the primary vocation of which is to heal—must generate a narrative structure in which suffering and victimhood actually define the self” (p. 173). Healing can be conducted by the self; in fact, this becomes a cultural imperative, especially among the privileged classes. Therapeutic culture thus propels, rather than contradicts, the current American “ethos of self-reliance,” Illouz writes (p. 186).

I felt Illouz went overboard in rescuing Freud from past feminist critiques, almost vilifying feminist critics in her attempt to proclaim positive aspects and effects of his work. In her paean to Freud, she writes that, “By linking perversion and normality and placing them on a continuum, Freud destabilized a key cultural code regulating the boundary between normality and pathology” (p. 43); and “Freud . . . offered what no other sexologist of the time could provide, an all-encompassing narrative of self in which sexual pleasure was legitimized. . . . I would argue that what was new and appealing about Freud’s ideas was his treatment of gender and his legitimization of women’s sexuality” (p. 49). Perhaps I’m a misguided feminist; I’ve read writings of Freud that I felt were *mired* in misogyny and heterosexism (take, for example, my feminist favorite, his essay “On Femininity”). I would have preferred a more nuanced view of Freud—one that takes into account his destructive *and* liberatory ideas—one that doesn’t *only* resuscitate Freud as a charismatic pomo hero for our times. Even when I did not fully agree, I found Illouz’s skillfully crafted arguments compelling throughout the book.

Overall, *Saving the Modern Soul* is a thoughtful exploration of the ways in which self-help culture saturates capitalism (and vice versa), grounded in a comprehensive and impressive intellectual engagement with postmodern, Freudian, and classical sociological theories.

Democracy’s Dharma: Religious Renaissance and Political Development in Taiwan, by **Richard Madsen**. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007. 218 pp. \$21.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520252288.

FENGGANG YANG
 Purdue University
 fyang@purdue.edu

The modest title of the book does not fully convey its ambitious goal. It raises broad and large questions: what does it take to develop and sustain the institutional foundations of a liberal democracy? Does a secular liberalism, or critical rationality and autonomous individualism, as envisioned in the Enlightenment, form the adequate basis of a modern moral order? Given the seemingly never ending conflicts among religions in many parts of the world, given the militant attacks of Islamists and other religious extremists on modernity and modern societies, is it possible at all to imagine positive contributions of religion to a liberal democratic world order? What kind of religious institutions might play positive roles in a liberal democracy and how would they emerge, develop and operate?

Carrying these large questions, Richard Madsen looks in a marginalized society in the world today and finds hope in unlikely places—Buddhist and Daoist groups infused with Confucian morality in Taiwan. After they withdrew to Taiwan in 1949, the Nationalists (KMT) maintained for decades an authoritarian sociopolitical order, all the while losing formal diplomatic and international recognition to the People’s Republic of China. Against long odds, however, Taiwan’s economy began to develop rapidly in the 1960s, and its politics have been undergoing rapid changes toward democracy since the 1980s. Along with the political democratization, several religious groups have quickly expanded and metamorphosed into important social forces.

Through vivid descriptions based on fieldwork research and interviews, interwoven with engaging themes, Richard Madsen tells the fascinating histories and delightful stories of four religious groups, each case in a separate chapter. Tzu Chi has become the largest Buddhist charity organization in Tai-

wan that reaches out to many parts of the world, including disaster relief operations in the United States, Iraq, North Korea, and mainland China. Buddha's Light Mountain has become a Buddhist monastic and lay believers' denomination with temples built in many Asian and American cities. The abbot of Dharma Drum Mountain is a transnational who lives half of the year in Taiwan and half of the year in New York. The Enacting Heaven Temple is the most local group, but it manifests a hybrid modernity in its organization, operation, and ritual. Although these are Buddhist and Daoist groups, Madsen argues that they are also Confucian. Their social vision is largely based on classical neo-Confucian themes of familial duties and social responsibilities, instead of individual rights and autonomy. For decades, some social thinkers have tried hard to find alternative modernities that may avoid the problems of expressive individualism and the consequential irresponsibility and general disorientation. With this book, Richard Madsen suggests that we have found a successful example of alternative modernity in Taiwan, in which progressive religious groups have contributed positively to the modern, democratic society. And, surprisingly, these religious groups are of the Chinese tradition. These Buddhist and Daoist groups have developed and popularized forms of the Confucian tradition that not only tolerate democracy, but also actively support it. Thus, modernity is redeemed, and a hopeful sociology emerges, as Madsen claims.

Whereas the questions raised are important, the insights are appreciated, and the attempt to find alternative modernity is admirable, the reader is left with many doubts and questions. Richard Madsen argues that all of the four religious groups have become modernized. However, the book does not provide sufficient account for or satisfactory analysis of how the traditional religions became modernized. Are there other religious groups that are not so modernized? If the modernized religious groups have become dominant in society, what social forces have made it so? Besides, to what extent can these religious groups be regarded as being modern? How modern is it when the Buddhist nuns claim that Bud-

dhism was the "religion of my race" (p. 138)? Would not such a claim go against religious freedom in a modern, pluralistic society, and also against Buddhist globalization efforts? If all nations/races assert their own traditional religions as nationally/racially bound, would peace be possible in this globalized world? When such an archaic claim for tribal-based religion meets no critical reflection in the book, the reader is forced to wonder whether the author has been blinded by his wishful thinking in his attempt to search for an alternate modernity. The author argues that all four religious groups share some common characteristics of "progressive religions" that are conducive to a liberal democracy: lay-oriented and rationalized organization, demythologized traditional beliefs, and a devaluation of traditional ritual. However, with such changes, how much religion remains, or have they become only superficially religious? What roles do the theologically conservative groups play in a liberal democracy?

Also, what roles have the Christians played in the democratization of Taiwan? In the previous Nationalist Party (KMT) and during the transitional period of the 1980s, were not many influential officials Christian? Meanwhile, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) represented the liberal opposition to the one-party rule structure at the time, and eventually became the ruling party in 2000. Did not the DPP receive strong support from the Taiwanese Presbyterian Church? Moreover, the Buddhist and Daoist groups studied in this book appear to have adopted some essentially Christian elements as exemplified in Taiwanese society, including this-world oriented theology, the lay-oriented organizational form, charity practices, and establishing universities and hospitals. But the book provides only scant mention of Christianity.

In short, this book raises important questions and deserves to be read not only by China specialists and the sociologists of religion, but by anyone who is interested in or concerned about political philosophy, modernity, and the relationship between politics and religion. Reading it also makes the reader want more nuanced studies of these and other religious groups and their roles in Taiwan and other Chinese societies.