

ROUTLEDGE STUDIES IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

Authenticity, Autonomy and Multiculturalism

Edited by
Geoffrey Brahm Levey



“In this extraordinarily rich collection of essays, Levey and colleagues examine the complex relationships in political theory and public policy between autonomy and authenticity, on the one hand, and liberalism and cultural rights, on the other. Of particular importance are the critical reflections throughout the volume on the costs and pay-offs of ideas of authenticity in confronting real-world dilemmas.”

John R. Bowen, Washington University in St. Louis

“This book is an important contribution to a topic that is of urgent significance. It brings together the leading authors on the topic who discuss the key theoretical and practical issues that are relevant in increasingly multicultural liberal democracies.”

Maleiha Malik, King's College London, UK

This page intentionally left blank

Authenticity, Autonomy and Multiculturalism

The concept of “authenticity” enters multicultural politics in three distinct but interrelated senses: as an ideal of individual and group identity that commands recognition by others; as a condition of individuals’ autonomy that bestows legitimacy on their values, beliefs and preferences as being their own; and as a form of cultural pedigree that bestows legitimacy on particular beliefs and practices (commonly called “cultural authenticity”). In each case, the authenticity idea is called on to anchor or legitimate claims to some kind of public recognition. The considerable work asked of this concept raises a number of vital questions: Should “authenticity” be accorded the importance it holds in multicultural politics? Do its pitfalls outweigh its utility? Is the notion of “authenticity” avoidable in making sense of and evaluating cultural claims? Or does it, perhaps, need to be rethought or recalibrated?

Geoffrey Brahm Levey and his distinguished group of philosophers, political theorists, and anthropologists challenge conventional assumptions about “authenticity” that inform liberal responses to minority cultural claims in modern Western democracies. Discussing a wide range of cases drawn from Britain and continental Europe, North America, Australia and the Middle East, they press beyond theories to consider also the practical and policy implications at stake. The book will be a helpful resource for scholars worldwide in Political and Social Theory, Political Philosophy, Legal Anthropology, Multiculturalism, and, more generally, of cultural identity and diversity in liberal democracies today.

Geoffrey Brahm Levey is an Australian Research Council Future Fellow and Associate Professor in Political Science at the University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Routledge Studies in Social and Political Thought

1 Hayek and After

Hayekian Liberalism as a
Research Programme

Jeremy Shearmur

2 Conflicts in Social Science

Edited by Anton van Harskamp

3 Political Thought of André Gorz

Adrian Little

4 Corruption, Capitalism and Democracy

John Girling

5 Freedom and Culture in Western Society

Hans Blokland

6 Freedom in Economics

New Perspectives in
Normative Analysis

*Edited by Jean-Francois Laslier,
Marc Fleurbaey, Nicolas Gravel
and Alain Trannoy*

7 Against Politics

On Government, Anarchy
and Order

Anthony de Jasay

8 Max Weber and Michel Foucault

Parallel Life Works

Arpad Szakolczai

9 The Political Economy of Civil Society and Human Rights

G.B. Madison

10 On Durkheim's Elementary Forms of Religious Life

*Edited by W. S. F. Pickering,
W. Watts Miller and N. J. Allen*

11 Classical Individualism

The Supreme Importance of Each
Human Being

Tibor R. Machan

12 The Age of Reasons

Quixotism, Sentimentalism and
Political Economy in
Eighteenth-Century Britain

Wendy Motooka

13 Individualism in Modern Thought

From Adam Smith to Hayek

Lorenzo Infantino

14 Property and Power in Social Theory

A Study in Intellectual Rivalry

Dick Pels

15 Wittgenstein and the Idea of a Critical Social Theory

A Critique of Giddens, Habermas
and Bhaskar

Nigel Pleasants

16 Marxism and Human Nature
Sean Sayers

**17 Goffman and
Social Organization**
Studies in a Sociological Legacy
Edited by Greg Smith

18 Situating Hayek
Phenomenology and the
Neo-liberal Project
Mark J. Smith

**19 The Reading of
Theoretical Texts**
Peter Ekegren

20 The Nature of Capital
Marx after Foucault
Richard Marsden

21 The Age of Chance
Gambling in Western Culture
Gerda Reith

22 Reflexive Historical Sociology
Arpad Szokolczai

23 Durkheim and Representations
Edited by W. S. F. Pickering

**24 The Social and Political
Thought of Noam Chomsky**
Alison Edgley

**25 Hayek's Liberalism and
Its Origins**
His Idea of Spontaneous Order and
the Scottish Enlightenment
Christina Petsoulas

**26 Metaphor and the Dynamics
of Knowledge**
Sabine Maasen and Peter Weingart

27 Living with Markets
Jeremy Shearmur

28 Durkheim's Suicide
A Century of Research and Debate
*Edited by W.S.F. Pickering and
Geoffrey Walford*

29 Post-Marxism
An Intellectual History
Stuart Sim

30 The Intellectual as Stranger
Studies in Spokespersonship
Dick Pels

**31 Hermeneutic Dialogue and
Social Science**
A Critique of Gadamer
and Habermas
Austin Harrington

32 Methodological Individualism
Background, History and Meaning
Lars Udehn

**33 John Stuart Mill and Freedom
of Expression**
The Genesis of a Theory
K.C. O'Rourke

**34 The Politics of Atrocity
and Reconciliation**
From Terror to Trauma
Michael Humphrey

35 Marx and Wittgenstein
Knowledge, Morality, Politics
*Edited by Gavin Kitching and
Nigel Pleasants*

36 The Genesis of Modernity
Arpad Szokolczai

37 Ignorance and Liberty

Lorenzo Infantino

38 Deleuze, Marx and Politics

Nicholas Thoburn

39 The Structure of Social Theory

Anthony King

40 Adorno, Habermas and the Search for a Rational Society

Deborah Cook

41 Tocqueville's Moral and Political Thought

New Liberalism

M.R.R. Ossewaarde

42 Adam Smith's Political Philosophy

The Invisible Hand and Spontaneous Order

Craig Smith

43 Social and Political Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi

Bidyut Chakrabarty

44 Counter-Enlightenments

From the Eighteenth Century to the Present

Graeme Garrard

45 The Social and Political Thought of George Orwell

A Reassessment

Stephen Ingle

46 Habermas

Rescuing the Public Sphere

Pauline Johnson

47 The Politics and Philosophy of Michael Oakeshott

Stuart Isaacs

48 Pareto and Political Theory

Joseph Femia

49 German Political Philosophy

The Metaphysics of Law

Chris Thornhill

50 The Sociology of Elites

Michael Hartmann

51 Deconstructing Habermas

Lasse Thomassen

52 Young Citizens and New Media

Learning for Democratic Participation

Edited by Peter Dahlgren

53 Gambling, Freedom and Democracy

Peter J. Adams

54 The Quest for Jewish Assimilation in Modern Social Science

Amos Morris-Reich

55 Frankfurt School Perspectives on Globalization, Democracy, and the Law

William E. Scheuerman

56 Hegemony

Studies in Consensus and Coercion

Edited by Richard Howson and Kylie Smith

57 Governmentality, Biopower, and Everyday Life

Majia Holmer Nadesan

**58 Sustainability and Security
within Liberal Societies**

Learning to Live with the Future
*Edited by Stephen Gough and
Andrew Stables*

**59 The Mythological State and
its Empire**

David Grant

60 Globalizing Dissent

Essays on Arundhati Roy
*Edited by Ranjan Ghosh and
Antonia Navarro-Tejero*

**61 The Political Philosophy of
Michel Foucault**

Mark G.E. Kelly

62 Democratic Legitimacy

Fabienne Peter

**63 Edward Said and the Literary,
Social, and Political World**

Edited by Ranjan Ghosh

64 Perspectives on Gramsci

Politics, Culture and Social Theory
Edited by Joseph Francese

**65 Enlightenment Political Thought
and Non-Western Societies**

Sultans and Savages
Frederick G. Whelan

**66 Liberalism, Neoliberalism,
Social Democracy**

Thin Communitarian Perspectives
on Political Philosophy and
Education
Mark Olssen

**67 Oppositional Discourses
and Democracies**

Edited by Michael Huspek

68 The Contemporary Goffman

Edited by Michael Hviid Jacobsen

**69 Hemingway on Politics
and Rebellion**

*Edited by Lauretta Conklin
Frederking*

**70 Social Theory in
Contemporary Asia**

Ann Brooks

71 Governmentality

Current Issues and
Future Challenges
*Edited by Ulrich Bröckling,
Susanne Krasmann and
Thomas Lemke*

**72 Gender, Emotions and
Labour Markets - Asian and
Western Perspectives**

*Ann Brooks and
Theresa Devasahayam*

**73 Alienation and the
Carnivalization of Society**

*Edited by Jerome Braun and
Lauren Langman*

**74 The Post-Colonial State in the
Era of Capitalist Globalization**

Historical, Political and Theoretical
Approaches to State Formation
Tariq Amin-Khan

75 The Psychology and Politics of the Collective

Groups, Crowds and Mass
Identifications

Edited by Ruth Parkin-Gounelas

76 Environmental Solidarity

How Religions Can
Sustain Sustainability

Pablo Martínez de Anguita

77 Comedy and the Public Sphere

The Rebirth of Theatre as Comedy
and the Genealogy of the Modern
Public Arena

Arpad Szokolczai

**78 Culture, Class, and
Critical Theory**

Between Bourdieu and the
Frankfurt School

David Gartman

**79 Environmental Apocalypse in
Science and Art**

Designing Nightmares

Sergio Fava

**80 Conspicuous and Inconspicuous
Discriminations in Everyday Life**

Victor N. Shaw

81 Understanding the Tacit

Stephen P. Turner

82 The Politics of Expertise

Stephen P. Turner

**83 Globalized Knowledge Flows
and Chinese Social Theory**

Xiaoying Qi

84 Reconstructing Social Justice

Lauretta Conklin Frederking

**85 The Dialectics of Inquiry Across
the Historical Social Sciences**

David Baronov

86 How Groups Matter

Challenges of Toleration in
Pluralistic Societies

*Edited by Gideon Calder, Magali
Bessone and Federico Zuolo*

87 The Politics of Rationality

Reason through Occidental History

Charles P. Webel

**88 Gramsci, Materialism,
and Philosophy**

Esteve Morera

89 Emotions and Social Change

Historical and Sociological
Perspectives

*Edited by David Lemmings and
Ann Brooks*

**90 John Rawls and the History of
Political Thought**

The Rousseauvian and Hegelian
Heritage of Justice as Fairness

Jeffrey Bercuson

**91 What Holism Can Do for
Social Theory**

Barbara Hanson

**92 The Sociology of Knowledge in
a Time of Crisis**

Challenging the Phantom of Liberty

Onofrio Romano

**93 Cosmopolitanism and the
Legacies of Dissent**

Tamara Caraus and

Camil-Alexandru Parvu

94 The Metaphysics of Technology
David Skrbina

**95 The Political Thought of Hume
and His Contemporaries**
Enlightenment Projects Vol 1
Frederick G. Whelan

**96 The Political Thought of Hume
and His Contemporaries**
Enlightenment Projects Vol 2
Frederick G. Whelan

**97 Rosa Luxemburg In Action: For
Revolution and Democracy**
Rosemary H. T. O'Kane

**98 Innovation Contested: The Idea
of Innovation Over the Centuries**
Benoît Godin

**99 Phenomenology of Youth
Cultures and Globalization**
Lifeworlds and Surplus Meaning in
Changing Times
*Edited by Stuart R. Poyntz and
Jacqueline Kennelly*

**100 Hannah Arendt and the Limits
Of Total Domination**
The Holocaust, Plurality,
and Resistance
Michal Aharony

**101 The History of Compulsory
Voting in Europe**
Democracy's Duty?
Anthoula Malkopoulou

102 The New Materialism
Althusser, Badiou, and Žižek
Geoff Pfeifer

**103 Authenticity, Autonomy
and Multiculturalism**
Geoffrey Brahm Levey

This page intentionally left blank

Authenticity, Autonomy and Multiculturalism

Geoffrey Brahm Levey

First published 2015
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Taylor & Francis

The right of the editor to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Authenticity, autonomy and multiculturalism / edited by Geoffrey Brahm Levey.

pages cm. – (Routledge studies in social and political thought ; 103)

1. Multiculturalism. 2. Group identity. 3. Identification (Religion) I.

Levey, Geoffrey Brahm, editor.

HM1271.A958 2015

305.8–dc23

2014043865

ISBN: 978-1-138-84521-3 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-72608-3 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Taylor & Francis Books

Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	xvi
1 Authenticity and the multiculturalism debates	1
GEOFFREY BRAHM LEVEY	
PART I	
Individual autonomy and cultural identity	25
2 Autonomy and social disorientation	27
JOHN CHRISTMAN	
3 Autonomy and multiculturalism	45
ANNA ELISABETTA GALEOTTI	
4 Belief, autonomy and responsibility: The case of indirect religious discrimination	66
PETER JONES	
PART II	
Debating preference and cultural authenticity	87
5 Against authenticity	89
ANNE PHILLIPS	
6 Individual or collective autonomy and/or cultural authenticity?: In defense of minimalism	104
VEIT BADER	
7 Authenticity and the third-person perspective	121
BEN COLBURN	

PART III

Pluralizing authenticity 143

- 8 What is wrong with a liberal assessment of religious authenticity? 145

AVIGAIL EISENBERG

- 9 Analyzing “authenticity” in the litigation of cultural claims: Reflections on the role of expertise 163

ALISON DUNDES RENTELN AND MARIE-CLAIRE FOBLETS

- 10 Authenticity and Jewish self-hatred 184

MARILYN FRIEDMAN

Index 203

Contributors

Veit Bader, Emeritus Professor of Sociology and Emeritus Professor of Social and Political Philosophy, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands.

John Christman, Professor of Philosophy, Political Science and Women's Studies, Pennsylvania State University, USA.

Ben Colburn, Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Glasgow, UK.

Avigail Eisenberg, Professor of Political Science, University of Victoria, Canada.

Marie-Claire Foblets, Professor and Director, Department of Law and Anthropology, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle, Germany.

Marilyn Friedman, W. Alton Jones Professor of Philosophy, Vanderbilt University, USA.

Anna Elisabetta Galeotti, Professor of Political Philosophy, University of Piemonte Orientale, Vercelli, Italy.

Peter Jones, Emeritus Professor of Political Philosophy, Newcastle University, UK.

Geoffrey Brahm Levey, Australian Research Council Future Fellow in Political Science and Associate Professor, University of New South Wales, Australia.

Anne Phillips, Professor of Political and Gender Theory, and Graham Wallis Professor of Political Science, London School of Economics, UK.

Alison Dundes Renteln, Professor of Political Science, University of Southern California, USA.

Acknowledgement

This research project took its first steps at a workshop hosted by the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts at the Palace of the Academies in Brussels. I thank the Academy and the Director of its Academic Centre, Dr Marc De May and Administrator Inez Dua, for their hospitality during my time there as a Visiting Fellow. This research was supported by the Australian Research Council's *Discovery Projects* funding scheme (project DP0772343). The views expressed herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Australian Research Council.

The intellectual exchange at the workshop benefited additionally from the contributions of Joel Anderson, John Bowen, Beate Roessler, and Edi Terlaak, to whom I extend my thanks. The individual chapters in this volume have been peer reviewed, and although they cannot be named, I owe thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions. I am grateful to my Commissioning Editor at Routledge, Natalja Mortensen, and to Lillian Rand and Paola Celli for overseeing the smooth editorial and production process.

Parts of Peter Jones' chapter first appeared online in "Accommodating Religion and Shifting Burdens," *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, DOI 10.1007/s11572-014-9328-z, July 24, 2014; I thank Springer Science & Business Media for permission to reprint that material. A different version of Marilyn Friedman's chapter appeared as "Jewish Self-Hatred, Moral Criticism, and Autonomy" in Marina Oshana, ed., *Personal Autonomy and Social Oppression: Philosophical Perspectives* (Routledge, 2014), and I thank Taylor & Francis for permission to reprint that material.

Geoffrey Brahm Levey
Sydney, Australia

1 Authenticity and the multiculturalism debates

Geoffrey Brahm Levey

Multiculturalism became globally controversial in the twenty-first century. Much of this disquiet relates to the presence or anticipation of Muslim immigrants in the community, the salience of religious identity in the public sphere, and public fears aroused by Islamic militancy. Yet controversy has always stalked multiculturalism. Ever since its introduction as a public philosophy and policy for responding to cultural diversity in Canada and Australia in the 1970s, and subsequently in other liberal democracies, there has been a perception that multiculturalism undermines social cohesion and national identity. Other long-standing criticisms are that it places the interests of groups over those of the individual, and that it invites trouble by raising questions about who counts as a group member and what constitutes a genuine cultural practice for the purposes of political recognition.

At the heart of these concerns are the modern values of autonomy and authenticity. In his seminal essay “The Politics of Recognition,” Charles Taylor (1992) identifies these two ideals as the source of the dilemmas over identity politics in the West (see also *ibid.* 1991). Autonomy highlights capacities that individuals ideally have in common, such as rational self-direction and charting one’s own course in life. Respect for these capacities, says Taylor, promotes a “politics of universalism” that emphasizes the equal dignity of citizens. Authenticity, on the other hand, stresses the uniqueness of individuals’ or groups’ identities. While it is also universal in the sense that all may lay claim to it, authenticity, according to Taylor, produces a “politics of difference” in which recognition of one’s own identity is sought precisely because it is one’s own. Taylor (*ibid.*: 39) notes how the “politics of difference grows organically out of the politics of universal dignity.” However, he argues that contemporary democracies find identity politics so vexatious because these two animating modern values have pressed in opposite directions. Whereas autonomy has been taken to connote procedural liberalism, equal rights based on common citizenship, and the “difference-blind” state, authenticity recommends differentiated citizenship, cultural rights, and the multiculturalist state.

Taylor’s account of the profound ramifications of the values of autonomy and authenticity is pitched abstractly. It is intended to capture general

propensities of these values in modern culture and politics. Unsurprisingly, the import of and relation between these values is more complicated when they are considered less sweepingly.

By the late 1980s arguments were being made that respect for individual autonomy justifies cultural recognition and various cultural rights (Kymlicka 1989; Tamir 1993; Habermas 1994). Indeed, it is arguable that autonomy is now more often invoked to defend cultural recognition than it is to defend liberal neutrality and the “difference-blind” state, as had traditionally been the case.¹ This wrinkle does not necessarily refute Taylor’s contrast between the political implications of autonomy and authenticity. Most autonomy-based defenses of cultural recognition, after all, stem from certain received ideas about what autonomy entails and entertain cultural recognition only insofar as these elements are respected. Their primary commitment, in other words, is to liberal values and justice rather than to identity and its esteemed recognition.² Still, some scholars bridge the two sides. Axel Honneth, for example, defends the importance of recognition for an individual’s well-being and self-esteem in similar terms to those of Taylor. He too contends that nonrecognition or misrecognition causes people real psychological harm. Yet Honneth views appropriate social recognition as an essential condition of individual autonomy rather than as the corollary of authenticity (Honneth 1996; Anderson and Honneth 2005).

A further complication is that the concept of authenticity itself figures centrally in the understanding of autonomy. The autonomous person determines her own life on the basis of motivations, beliefs and values that are her own. Many liberals thus look beyond individuals’ stated preferences to consider also the forming of their preferences. They want to be sure that individuals’ preferences haven’t been unduly influenced by distorting conditions external to them, such as coercive threats, misinformation, manipulation and deceit, and moral and emotional blackmail and the like. Some cast the net even wider to include systemic and structural distortions in society, such as relations of domination and dependence or, as just noted, misrecognition or the absence of sufficient care, nurturance or love. These attempts to establish individuals’ “true selves,” free of distortion, implicitly and often explicitly appeal to the idea of authenticity as an integral condition of autonomous agency. When people worry, for example, that Muslim girls or women who wear the hijab, niqab or burqa do so either as a result of intimidation from the males in their family or because they have internalized the oppressive norms of their faith community, it is the authenticity of their preferences they are worrying about.

The concept of authenticity also goes to the question of the legitimate expression of a particular culture. That is, in many real-world cases it is not enough that individuals or groups have unique or distinctive identities to warrant their recognition, as Taylor would have it. Rather, their expression of these identities through beliefs and practices must also be shown to be “culturally authentic.” This condition is usually taken to mean conforming

to historically original or traditional cultural expressions or otherwise displaying historical continuity. Hence, the US Supreme Court agreed that the Old Order Amish could withdraw their children after a few years of general schooling, having established the longevity and rigor of their traditional culture.³ Hence, too, the Quebec Court of Appeals determined that the Cree Indians were no longer “Cree,” and therefore were not entitled to protection of their fishing and hunting lands, after it was shown that some group members engaged in mainstream activities, such as eating Kentucky Fried Chicken.⁴

“Authenticity” enters multicultural politics, then, in three quite distinct and (as we shall see) complexly interrelated ways. First, in Taylor’s sense of value being bestowed directly on individual and group identity such that these command recognition by others, which I will call the *authenticity of identity*. Second, it arises as a condition of individuals’ autonomy that bestows legitimacy on their values, beliefs and preferences as being their own, which I will call the *authenticity of preferences*.⁵ Third, authenticity is invoked as a form of cultural pedigree that bestows legitimacy on particular beliefs and practices, which is commonly called *cultural authenticity*. In each case, the authenticity idea is called on to anchor or legitimate claims to some kind of public recognition. The considerable work asked of this concept raises a number of vital questions: Should “authenticity” be accorded the importance it holds in multicultural politics? Do its pitfalls outweigh its utility? Does the authenticity ideal sustain the entitlement to political recognition and accommodation claimed in its name? Is the notion of “authenticity” avoidable in making sense of and evaluating cultural claims? Or does it, perhaps, need to be rethought or recalibrated?

This book pursues these and related questions. The contributors—who hail variously from the fields of political theory, philosophy, anthropology and law—do not uniformly agree in either their approaches or in their answers to them. Some argue for abandoning the idea of authenticity, some for questioning its primacy, some for refining its meaning, and some for pluralizing its compass. All, however, agree that the influence of “authenticity” on thinking about identity, autonomy and culture is significant and in need of serious reevaluation. Taken together, the Chapters included in this volume cast a cool eye over the uses to which the idea of authenticity has been put in multicultural politics and suggest alternative ways of proceeding, both conceptually and in practice.

For the remainder of this Chapter I will contextualize some of the issues surrounding the “three authenticities”—“identity,” “preference” and “cultural”—and indicate how they relate to the Chapters and arguments that follow.

Identity authenticity

Authenticity is a modern ideal. According to Taylor (1991: 26), it is part of the “massive subjective turn of modern culture” that took shape in the

eighteenth century (notably articulated by Rousseau, Herder and Kant), “in which we come to think of ourselves as beings with inner depths.” Autonomy is part of the same inward turn, which raises a question about their connection.

Taylor presents autonomy as grounding human dignity in the capacity of individuals to determine for themselves “a view of the good life” and how they wish to live their lives. He characterizes authenticity as an individual’s or a group’s “unique identity,” whereby being true to oneself means being true to one’s distinctness and originality (Taylor 1992: 57, 38, 1991: 28–29). Clearly, these two ethics may coincide—one’s view of the good life might well amount to expressing one’s original identity (Cooke 1997). They also play supporting roles to each other. I have already noted how the concept of authenticity is drawn on in accounts of autonomous agency (which will be pursued in the next section). By the same token, autonomy services authenticity in allowing the individual to arrive at her identity.

A key question is whether identity is chosen or whether it is received and therefore developed mainly through self-discovery. Students of authenticity are divided.

Lionel Trilling (1974) contrasted authenticity with the earlier modern ideal of sincerity. In his celebrated account, sincerity entails a self whose identity is given. Mastering one’s identity is an act of self-discovery, and being true to one’s self is to be true to this received identity. On this basis, the *sincere self* seeks congruence between its inner depths and its outer manifestations lest it appear false to others. Sincerity is thus exercised toward other people and “implies a public end in view” (ibid.: 9). In contrast, authenticity is a private or anti-public virtue. The *authentic self’s* inner depths, for Trilling, have no fixed identity, which is chosen or created rather than discovered. It is uninterested in congruence between its inner depths and its outward manifestations, opposes convention and social conformity, and may bear an ironic attitude even to the identity it adopts (ibid.: 121; Evans 2003: 69). The artist is the example *par excellence* of authenticity for Trilling: “the artist seeks his personal authenticity in his entire autonomousness—his goal is to be as self-defining as the art-object he creates” (Trilling 1974: 100).

Taylor’s account of authenticity is less individualistic. Although he acknowledges the originality of the authentic self, he stresses how human life has a dialogical character: “We define our identity always in dialogue with, sometimes in struggle against, the things our significant others want to see in us” (ibid. 1992: 32–33). Dialogical relations are ongoing, and do not just pertain to the developmental stages of a personality, which can later be jettisoned. Even the work of a solitary artist, Taylor notes, is addressed to some viewer. On this account, an authentic identity cannot be “inwardly generated” in a literal or monological sense. Taylor (ibid.: 34) speaks of “discovering” one’s own identity rather than creating or choosing it.

The dialogical point is an important corrective. It suggests why the pictures of the “simply inherited” self and the “totally created” self are equally misleading. Yet, in another sense, the dialogical point simply reproduces the

definitional quandary over authenticity in a more realistic context. Embedded in dialogical relations, is the authentic self the person who “tracks” these relations or who struggles to define her own identity, notwithstanding them? Surely, both paths are open to her. Even dialogically formed and dependent selves, as Mark Evans (2003: 70) notes, can be oppositional. It is also important to note that this process of self-definition need not be augmented by autonomy. The latter entails a rationally and critically self-reflective dimension. Such cool detachment is precisely what Romantic notions of authenticity repudiated in favor of the heart-felt and the spontaneous.

Ultimately, the “politics of recognition” argument does not hinge on whether an authentic identity is mainly self-discovered or relatively chosen. Rather, it is because of my or our unique identity, *however arrived at*, that political recognition is warranted. Before looking more closely at this claim to recognition, another set of relations requires clarification: that between identity, culture, and cultural membership. Dialogical relations—which Taylor (1989: 36) otherwise calls a “web of interlocation”—may be wide-ranging. They are not necessarily coterminous with a culture, let alone a particular cultural membership. The significance of culture for identity must therefore be considered in addition to the “dialogical point.”

Taylor argues that cultures are intrinsically valuable. They are the *locus* of the goods valued by individuals, and so are not reducible to the value that individuals may singly place on the culture. The thesis is controversial. The example given is the survival of francophone culture in Quebec: “It is not just a matter of having the French language available for those who might choose it ... it also involves making sure that there is a community of people here in the future that will want to avail itself of the opportunity to use the French language” (1992: 58). Perhaps, but then people individually and collectively now and in the future will have a beneficial interest in this language and its perpetuation. Still, the proposition that cultures have intrinsic value is intelligible against some widespread practices. Consider, for example, how societies collect, restore and exhibit cultural artifacts and strive to tell the story of long-lost civilizations in museums, and much of this at public expense. Or how nations at war will take pains to avoid destroying their enemy’s art galleries and significant architecture. Such behavior suggests how cultures and their contents may be viewed as achievements that are valuable for their own sake. However, even if this is right, it scarcely extends to a public duty to preserve every unique living culture.

Most liberal multiculturalists offer instrumental reasons for valuing culture. Cultures are said, for example, to provide their members with a “context of choice” (Kymlicka 1989, 1995), the “boundaries of the imaginable” (Margalit and Raz 1990), mutual recognition and a sense of “belonging” (Tamir 1993: 67), and that which “facilitates social relations” (Raz 1995: 178). They are also said to be important to people’s well-being in grounding their identity and sustaining their self-respect and self-image, which is why it is one’s own culture and not some other context of choice that arguably

warrants recognition. A standard objection is that these accounts are not instrumental enough. Whether a culture enhances the well-being of its members is a contingent matter. In some cases, cultures or specific traditions are arguably harmful to some members, for example, inflicting genital mutilation on their girls or, in Judaism, denying a woman the opportunity to remarry if her husband refuses to grant her a divorce. That cultures are a “mixed bag” combining good and not-so-good elements is surely true. However, this means only that cultures or their practices should not receive unqualified acceptance or support.

A more serious criticism is that liberal accounts ignore the way in which cultures actually operate. James Johnson (2000), for example, highlights how cultures are constructed and manipulated to serve certain members’ interests, and how their putative “options” are themselves the products of strategic politics. In a similar vein, Anthony Appiah worries that collective identities set expectations regarding the way in which a proper member should behave. Several contributors to this book express similar concerns (see the Chapters by Phillips, Bader, Renteln and Foblets, and Friedman). Appiah (2005: 110) goes so far as to state that political recognition replaces one tyranny (society’s negative image of a group) with another (the group’s prescriptive image of itself). He faults Taylor for being too ready to accept the monological collective identities that are presented for public recognition (*ibid.*: 108). A related concern is that recognition freezes or ossifies particular cultural narratives that are historically dynamic, contested, and in flux.⁶

These criticisms pertain particularly to cultural authenticity (discussed in the third section) and to collective forms of identity authenticity. They do not apply so obviously to the identity authenticity of individuals. Following Herder, Taylor (1992: 31) insists that authenticity predicated on a unique identity applies both to individuals and to collectives. Both categories may have unique identities and may resist social conformity and cultural assimilation. However, they are not symmetrical. Collective identities cannot oppose convention and conformity entirely since any shared identity, however unique, depends on both of these things. The fact that cultures are internally contested and historically dynamic might seem, then, only to strengthen the case of individuals to gain recognition of their own cultural interpretations and commitments. Their cultural inventiveness and distinctiveness constitute the perfect antidote to vested and elite interests and could contribute to the dynamism of the culture.

Evans (2003) views the problem from the opposite angle, arguing that precisely because individual authenticity resists conventions and conformity, it is problematic as an ethical basis for supporting cultures, which, perforce, are shared and relatively stable. He suggests that Trilling’s ethic of sincerity, with its fixed identity, is more conducive to multiculturalism. However, this suggestion overlooks the way in which many cultural practices may be individually claimed and accommodated. Exemptions from standing regulations or law are a case in point. For example, Avigail Eisenberg (Chapter 8)