

What, then, is the shape of this radicalized pragmatism? It centers, for Unger, in four central themes. The first is 'agency' and focuses on the idea of the power of the agent to spill over so that everything in one's context can be changed, even if change is piecemeal. The second theme is 'contingency.' This involves the notion that some things are simply and unexplainably there; historical time becomes biographical time; even the most intimate and basic aspects of our experience are colored by dogmas of culture and institutions of society. And yet, asserts Unger, luck and grace play a role in human life. We do have a sense of being 'context-transcending, embodied spirits.' "Futurity" is the third theme. We as human beings are not exhausted by the social and cultural worlds that we inhabit and build; we see, think, build and connect in more ways than they can allow. 'Futurity' is, says Unger, a defining condition of personality. Finally, the fourth theme combines the first three and is 'experimentalism.' This is to understand how present affairs can be transformed and how we must arrange institutions and practices to multiply opportunities for their revision. Experimentalism is, notes Unger, "the idea of never being confined to the present context, the practice of using smaller variations that are at hand to produce the bigger variations that do not yet exist." (43)

Unger's concluding attack naturalized super science through an extended argument for the reality of time: "If time goes all the way down, there are no timeless laws of nature. Each law has a history, each changes." (82) Again, "We may be tempted to misinterpret our limited and distinctive success in scientific prediction and technological control as a sign that we see the world as it really is." (73)

As one who sees the great dangers of the dominance of scientism in contemporary philosophy as well as the embedding of individualistic-economic liberalism in social and political philosophy, I find Unger's view refreshing and worthy of deep reflection. I recommend this book for all concerned, as is Unger, for addressing critical human concerns with resources from a refocused, revitalized American pragmatic-philosophical tradition.

Jacqueline Kegley

Cal State Bakersfield

Lee, Chung Soon. *Alfred North Whitehead and Yi Yulgok: Toward a Process-Confucian Spirituality in Korea*. New York: University Press of America, 2006. Pp. 147.

In contrast to domestic trends, Alfred North Whitehead's process philosophy is quickly becoming one of the dominant areas of study in East Asia. Over the last half decade nearly a dozen centers for the study of process philosophy have opened in China alone. This may not be too surprising given Whitehead's claim that his work "seems to approximate more to some strains of Indian, or Chinese thought, than to western Asiatic, or European, thought. One side makes process ultimate; the other side makes fact ultimate" (*Process and Reality* 7). With its emphasis on interdependence and rejection of static substances, Whitehead's philosophy of organism finds deep avenues of

convergence with Buddhism, Daoism, and Neo-Confucianism. It is with this in mind that Chung Soon Lee has embarked on an ambitious project to create the basis for a Confucian-Christian dialogue within Korea's religiously pluralistic society. The ultimate aim of the project is to foster the emergence of "a new type of interreligious spirituality, a process-Confucian spirituality, as a desirable way of peaceful coexistence among religious believers in the global context of religious pluralism" (3).

According to the author, nearly half of all religious believers in Korea identify themselves as Christians (93). However, unlike the traditions imported from China (e.g., Confucianism and Buddhism), the conservative Protestant theology of the majority of Christian Koreans is not fully "indigenized" because it "does not fully understand or accept a religiously pluralistic culture, so it still regards other religions as heretical or ignores them altogether" (3). Lee is convinced that a necessary step in the creation of a more "mature" Christianity in Korea is the development of a more adequate cosmological framework that respects and draws from the traditional neo-Confucian cosmology that informs the worldview of most Koreans. Specifically, the task of Lee's short volume is to show that the most promising route to productive interreligious dialogue and spirituality is through meaningful connections between process cosmology and traditional neo-Confucian cosmology, especially as it is found in the work of Yi Yulgok (1536-1584).

One of Lee's basic assumptions is that cosmology plays a fundamental role in the character and formation of a religious tradition's spirituality and that, furthermore, the source of many of the conflicts between Korean Christians and other traditional religions can be traced to an attenuated western cosmology that was imported with Christianity (142). It is the author's contention that replacing the traditional substance cosmology of western Christianity with Whitehead's organic process cosmology, which deeply resonates with the neo-Confucian cosmology that informs most Koreans' worldview, will create a new interreligious spirituality among Korean Christians. Thus "not only do these cosmologies [Whitehead's and Yulgok's] propose creative suggestions for spiritual formation with regard to other traditional religions, but they also give way to the emergence of a new type of interreligious spirituality as a possible result of the Confucian-Christian dialogue in the global context of religious pluralism" (140).

Given the importance and value of this study it is most unfortunate that an otherwise promising project is plagued by significant shortcomings, both of execution and argumentation. Such a poorly edited manuscript – where missing words and incorrect punctuation pervade not only the author's own prose, but also the all-too-frequent quotations from other sources – should never have gone to press. Beyond these mechanical concerns, many substantive difficulties stem from the author's ill-advised decision to focus exclusively on the *similarities* between Yulgok and Whitehead (see 11, 81). An unintended consequence of this approach is that Lee does not always do justice to Whitehead's work. For instance, in his effort to show the similarity between Yulgok's notion of *li* (often translated as "principle") and Whitehead's "eternal objects," Lee not only over-emphasizes the significance of eternal objects, but makes them into an *active* principle that "determines the realization of actual entities" (82f.). While I am convinced by his argument that there are affinities between *li* and eternal objects, in his haste to

accentuate these affinities, Lee unfortunately over-exaggerates and distorts the role of eternal objects in Whitehead's work. A similar problem presents itself in his comparison of Yulgok's neo-Confucian concept of the "Great Ultimate" and Whitehead's dipolar conception of God. Here the author incorrectly assumes that "God as an ultimate being ... is called 'creativity'..." (86), while in Whitehead's work the category of creativity appears as a principle distinct from the divine life.

To be clear, this reviewer does not wish to dispute the author's general claim that Whitehead and Yulgok have very similar cosmologies – that they both see "the world as an interrelated organism in the process of change and becoming" (79). Rather, my the disappointment is with this text is the quality of the comparative analysis of these two cosmologies, which analysis is after all meant to provide the basis for the interreligious spirituality that is the aim of the project.

Though this reviewer is deeply sympathetic with and hopeful for the interreligious spirituality described by the author, and while there are many reasons to believe that Whitehead's philosophy of organism would be an ideal basis for such a dialogue, the current project falls short of its mark. Despite its serious shortcomings, this volume has started a conversation that will serve to inspire and challenge many scholars concerned with interreligious dialogue. Given the ever-increasing importance of East-West dialogue and the growing interest in Whitehead's work, a project such as this is both timely and important.

Brian G. Henning

Mount St. Mary's University, Emmetsburg, Maryland