

Cultivating Generativity: Recognition, Translation, and Co-creation in Relational Systems

A Preliminary Discussion of the Distribution of the Translation Burden

Wanhong Huang

huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

July 2026

Abstract

Governance arrangements that address heterogeneous participants commonly ask those participants to align with values, adapt to institutions, or integrate into an existing order. This paper draws attention to a feature of such arrangements that is seldom stated explicitly: the cost of crossing between meaning systems is positive in every heterogeneous encounter, and contemporary arrangements assign that cost almost entirely to the entering party. The paper names this cost the *translation burden*, describes the mechanism by which its distribution becomes invisible, and offers a two-clause criterion under which an arrangement is defective in respect of a party: the party's generation enters the shared system only after reformulation under the incumbent grammar, and nothing the party does can alter the terms of that reformulation. Asymmetry of the burden alone leaves an arrangement intact; the conjunction of the two clauses closes it. Three sites illustrate the same structure at different scales: educational practice, taken as a micro-level analogue; the government of mission and membership in organizations; and the accommodation of religious difference in plural polities. The paper claims a perspective and a problematization, and it leaves the substantive limits of accommodation, the observation problem, and the cost of reciprocity open.

Keywords: translation burden; relational grammar; recognition; generative relational governance; multicultural coexistence

Draft. This is a preprint draft. It is circulated for comment, and its arguments, formulations, and open questions are subject to revision. Correction and criticism are welcome at huangwanhong@serendip.ngo.

Licence. © 2026 Wanhong Huang. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence (CC BY-NC 4.0).

You are free to share and adapt the material, under the following terms: you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the licence, and indicate if changes were made; and you may not use the material for commercial purposes. The full text of the licence is at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

Use of generative artificial intelligence. An AI assistant (Anthropic’s Claude) was used extensively in preparing this manuscript: for literature survey, for drafting prose from the author’s specifications, for verification of references against sources, for consistency auditing, and for typesetting. Formulations and objections arose in the course of that exchange as well as from the author. Every claim, argument, and citation was reviewed and decided by the author, who is responsible for the content and for any errors.

Suggested citation: Wanhong Huang, *Cultivating Generativity: Recognition, Translation, and Co-creation in Relational Systems*, draft preprint, 2026.

1 INTRODUCTION

This section states the problem the paper addresses, the contribution it claims, and the order of the argument. The method is conceptual: a structure is described, a criterion is stated, and three illustrative sites are read through it.

Three familiar demands share a form. A school asks a pupil to acquire the mode of reasoning in which its questions are posed. A firm asks a new employee to identify with a mission, a set of values, and a working culture. A polity asks a minority community to integrate into a public order whose terms were settled before the community's arrival. Each demand is intelligible, each has a defensible purpose, and each is treated in a separate literature.

What the three arrangements share becomes visible once a single question is asked of them: who is required to perform the work of crossing between meaning systems? In all three, the answer is the same party, and it is the party with the weaker position. The pupil learns the teacher's idiom. The employee learns the firm's. The minority learns the majority's. The incumbent side is exempted, and the exemption is rarely stated, since the arrangement carries it in the form of a competence criterion, where it reads as a property of the party.

This paper takes that allocation as its object. Section 3 characterizes the vocabulary through which the allocation is naturalized. Sections 4 through 8 supply the conceptual apparatus: relational grammars and their activation, the translation burden, the distinction between commensuration, translation, and coupling, and the return path through which an incumbent grammar is itself altered. Section 9 states the criterion. Sections 10 through 12 pass the criterion over educational practice, organizational governance, and the accommodation of religious difference in plural polities, and Section 13 sets the three side by side. Sections 14 through 16 fix the bounds of the account, its debts, and its costs. Section 17 lists the questions the account opens.

The contribution claimed is modest in form and general in reach. The paper identifies a structure common to domains ordinarily treated apart, supplies a criterion for assessing arrangements in respect of that structure, and relocates the object of governance from the participants to the conditions under which participants generate anything together.

2 SCOPE OF THE DISCUSSION AND RELATION TO THE COMPANION PAPERS

This section fixes what the paper covers, what it excludes, and how it stands to the companion discussions in the same series.

The paper covers arrangements in which one party, holding the position that sets the terms, receives a party whose meaning system was formed elsewhere. Schools, firms, professional bodies, public agencies, international organizations, and polities receiving migrants all instantiate the form. The paper excludes three adjacent subjects. It excludes the substantive question of which practices a public order may permissibly limit, addressed in Section 14 only to the extent of marking its own silence. It excludes the design of in-

stitutions, since the account yields constraints and supplies no blueprint. It excludes the question of enforcement, since the account identifies a defect and provides no party with a remedy.

The framework within which the account is developed is Generative Relational Being (GRB): a theory of how subject, meaning, value, creation, and normativity co-emerge through generative relational processes. Four companion papers carry parts of the surrounding territory and are relied upon here without restatement. A discussion of interpretive justice in organizations establishes that the authority to interpret a rule extends to the rules governing challenge to its own exercise, and states a criterion of regenerability. A discussion of participation justice supplies a criterion of generative sufficiency. A discussion of recognition justice treats inclusion, and distinguishes the recordable levels of an organization's conduct from the levels that no instrument reaches. A discussion of value conversion treats the fixing of equivalences between heteromorphic values, and supplies the closure criterion on which the present criterion is patterned. The present paper adds one element to that group: the question of who bears the cost of crossing, and the consequences of settling it one-sidedly.

3 THE ALIGNMENT VOCABULARY OF CONTEMPORARY GOVERNANCE

This section describes the vocabulary in which the demand for adaptation is ordinarily expressed, identifies the assumption the vocabulary carries, and marks the point at which the assumption becomes consequential. The method is a reading of standard formulations in three institutional registers.

Organizational recruitment asks for identification with mission, vision, and values, and assesses candidates for cultural fit. Civic integration policy asks newcomers for knowledge of a language, a constitutional order, and a set of shared values, and in several jurisdictions makes residence conditional on demonstrating it. Pedagogy in its examination-facing form asks a pupil to produce answers in a specified register. Each formulation carries a presupposition: the values, the order, and the register exist already, in determinate form, and the task of governance is to bring the entering party into conformity with them.

The presupposition carries three consequences, and they are worth separating.

Claim 3.1. (Unidirectional interpretation). Under the alignment presupposition, interpretation runs one way. The entering party is required to establish what the incumbent order means and to render its own conduct in the incumbent's terms. The incumbent side is under a corresponding duty to state its terms clearly, and under none to establish what the entering party means.

Claim 3.2. (Prior settlement of value). The alignment presupposition locates the value to be realized in the past of the relationship. Where the value that matters is generated in the encounter itself, the presupposition excludes it by construction, since an arrangement that admits only conformity to settled terms has no channel through which unsettled terms could arise.

Claim 3.3. (Deficit description). Where the entering party fails to conform, the arrangement possesses a ready description of the failure, expressed as a property of that party: weak motivation, insufficient professionalism, incomplete integration. The arrangement holds no corresponding description of its own contribution to the failure, because it registers no such contribution.

Claim 3.3 identifies the mechanism that makes the whole structure difficult to see from inside. The mechanism is examined in Section 5, after the vocabulary needed to state it has been introduced.

4 RELATIONAL GRAMMARS AND THE ACTIVATION OF A REPERTOIRE

This section introduces the paper's primary analytic unit, states how a subject stands to it, and states how a relational system stands to it. The definitions are stipulative and are used in this sense throughout.

Definition 4.1. (Relational grammar). A relational grammar is the set of rules, capacities, standings, expectations, and meaning structures under which a subject participates in the generation of relations. A grammar settles how the subject may act, how others take the subject's acts, how the subject takes the acts of others, and which relations the subject may generate with whom.

The term is drawn from a companion discussion of asymmetry and power, where the relevant contrast is with resources. Resources describe a state; a grammar supplies the rule under which states are updated. Long-run behaviour follows the second.

Definition 4.2. (Grammar repertoire). A subject holds many grammars at once. A single person may hold the grammars of a parent, an engineer, a member of a religious community, a resident of a country other than the one in which they were raised, a colleague, and a friend. The set of grammars a subject can bring to interaction is that subject's repertoire.

Definition 4.3. (Grammar activation). A relational system engages part of a repertoire. Activation is the process by which some grammars enter the generation of relations in a given system while others fall silent. Activation is jointly produced: the interaction, the institution, the history, and the situation settle it together with the subject, and the subject alone settles it in no case.

Definition 4.3 carries the paper's departure from identity-based analysis. A woman who is an engineer enters a meeting holding both grammars. Where the surrounding system answers her consistently as a woman and seldom as an engineer, the engineering grammar remains unactivated, whatever she holds and whatever she prefers. Where the system answers her consistently as a professional, that grammar stabilizes. The observable outcome is a property of the system and of her jointly, and the language of individual identity choice locates it wrongly.

Claim 4.4. (Reshaping under activation). Grammars are altered by the systems that activate them. The same nominal position carries different generative capacities across systems: a member of a religious minority may be positioned as a community representative, an ordinary colleague, an object of consultation, an object of suspicion, or a broker between constituencies, and each positioning supplies a different set of acts the person may perform intelligibly. Writing G for a grammar, the pattern is $G_{t+1} = F(G_t, I_t)$, with I_t the interaction at t .

Claim 4.5. (Inclusion restated). Under Definitions 4.2 and 4.3, a count of the subjects present in an organization measures something other than the range of grammars participating in its generation. An organization may hold a diverse membership while a single grammar settles what its meetings decide, what its documents record, and what its evaluations reward. The magnitude that bears on generation is the set of activated grammars.

Claim 4.5 gives the microfoundation for a point developed in the companion discussion of recognition: representation and recognition come apart, and they come apart at the level of activation.

5 THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE TRANSLATION BURDEN

This section defines the paper’s central quantity, states why it is never zero, and states the mechanism by which its distribution escapes notice. The method is analytic, with the claims stated so that each may be assessed separately.

Definition 5.1. (Translation burden). The translation burden of a party in a relational system is the work that party must perform to render what it generates into a form the system takes up, and to render what the system generates into a form the party can act on. The burden includes the acquisition of the receiving idiom, the reformulation of one’s own contributions within it, the suppression of contributions for which it has no form, and the uncertainty carried while all of this is underway.

Definition 5.2. (The alignment default). An arrangement exhibits the alignment default in respect of a party when the whole of that party’s translation burden falls on the party, and the incumbent grammar is exempt from alteration by the encounter.

Claim 5.3. (Positivity). In any encounter between parties holding distinct grammars, the aggregate translation burden exceeds zero. The magnitude varies with the distance between grammars and with the demands of the joint task; the quantity itself is a feature of heterogeneity and admits of distribution alone.

Claim 5.4. (Distribution as a governed variable). Since the aggregate burden is positive, every arrangement distributes it. Arrangements that leave the distribution unstated distribute it as well, ordinarily to the party holding the weaker position, because that party bears the cost of failure.

Claim 5.5. (Concealment through competence criteria). The alignment default conceals itself by writing the incumbent grammar into the criteria of competence. Where directness of speech is registered as professionalism, a party whose grammar favours indirection appears uncommitted. Where written argument in a specified register is registered as rigour, a party trained in another register appears imprecise. Where an unaccented command of the receiving language is registered as integration, a party who holds the language otherwise appears unintegrated. In each case the arrangement's own contribution to the difficulty is transcribed into the record as a property of the party.

Claim 5.5 is the paper's sharpest claim and its most exposed. It asserts something stronger than the observation that criteria carry cultural content, which is widely established. It asserts that the criteria perform an accounting function: they convert a cost the arrangement imposes into a defect the party carries, and they do so while operating exactly as designed, with no participant acting in bad faith and no rule being broken. Section 15 sets this beside the prior work that comes closest to it.

Claim 5.6. (Location of power). Where an asymmetry of translation burden obtains, the operative power lies in the exemption. A party that need not establish what the other means, and whose grammar the encounter leaves as it found it, holds a position that the content of its values does not by itself explain. Two arrangements may hold identical values and differ entirely in this respect.

Claim 5.6 restates a result of the companion discussion of asymmetry and power in the vocabulary of the present paper. Asymmetry generates power in every relation, including relations that are benign and constitutive; generativity absorbs it, and absorption is work performed continuously. The exemption from translation is exactly the withdrawal of that work.

6 RECOGNITION OF A GRAMMAR AND ITS DISTANCE FROM RECOGNITION OF AN IDENTITY

This section states the first of the three operations named in the title, distinguishes it from the recognition of identities, and marks what it requires of the recognizing party. The method is a contrast between two things the same word covers.

Recognition in its familiar institutional form attaches to categories. An organization recognizes a group, records its presence, provides for its holidays, its languages, and its spaces, and treats the group's members as bearers of the recognized attribute. That form of recognition is a real achievement and secures real goods.

Recognition of a grammar is a different operation. Its object is the generative structure a party brings: the mode of reasoning, the ordering of obligations, the forms in which a claim is properly raised, the conditions under which a commitment counts as made. Its test is practical. A party's grammar has been recognized when the receiving side can anticipate which acts that party will treat as intelligible, and can distinguish that party's silence-as-refusal from silence-as-consideration.

Claim 6.1. (The perceptual object of listening). Listening, in the sense the account requires, is directed at the other party's generative grammar and passes over the content of particular utterances. Uptake conducted under the receiver's own grammar fails the requirement while presenting as attentiveness, since it returns the utterance in a form the speaker's grammar did not license.

Claim 6.2. (Underdetermination). A grammar is unobservable; utterances are observable. Inference from a finite sample of utterances to a grammar is underdetermined, so a single consultation, survey, or intake interview cannot deliver what recognition of a grammar requires. The requirement is continuous and revisable engagement, and it follows from the underdetermination and from nothing about anyone's good intentions.

One constraint is placed on this section's argument and held throughout. The reason for recognizing a party's grammar is owed to that party. The account declines the instrumental formulation under which an organization should listen because listening sustains the organization's generative capacity, and Section 16 states why the instrumental formulation is unavailable to it.

7 COMMENSURATION, TRANSLATION, AND COUPLING

This section separates three operations that ordinary usage runs together, and identifies which of them the account requires. The distinction is drawn from a companion discussion and is stated here because the argument of Sections 8 and 9 depends on it.

Definition 7.1. (Commensuration). Commensuration subsumes distinct values under a common metric, so that items formerly incomparable acquire a rate of exchange. The operation is well described in the sociology of quantification, where it is established as interpretive, institutionalized, and a mode of power.

Definition 7.2. (Translation). Translation maps expressions of one grammar onto expressions of another while both grammars persist. Every translation leaves a residue: material that the receiving grammar holds no form for, which is carried by the translator or lost.

Definition 7.3. (Coupling). Coupling is mutual perturbation between two grammars in which both remain distinct and each is altered by the other. Coupling presupposes translation and adds the return path: the receiving grammar registers the encounter and is different afterwards.

Claim 7.4. (Subsumption ruled out). A single-grammar arrangement, in which one party's contributions are admitted after subsumption under the other's metric, satisfies the two clauses of the criterion stated in Section 9. Ruling out subsumption therefore requires no appeal to the merits of plurality and follows from the criterion alone.

The claim is stated negatively and remains so. The account identifies arrangements it rules out; the region of admissible coupling is left unspecified, for reasons given in Section 16.

8 CO-CREATION AND THE RETURN PATH OF REVISION

This section states the third operation named in the title, distinguishes it from aggregation, and identifies the structural feature it requires. The method is the specification of a condition, followed by a statement of the pathology that mimics its satisfaction.

Co-creation, in the sense used here, is the generation of a determination that neither party held before the encounter and that neither could have produced alone. Aggregation is a different operation: the sum of what the parties brought, admitted side by side. An arrangement that provides for aggregation and forecloses co-creation is a common and stable form, and the language of diversity does not distinguish the two.

Definition 8.1. (The return path). An arrangement holds a return path in respect of a party when alterations to the shared grammar are traceable to that party's participation, and when the party can identify such alterations.

Claim 8.2. (Formal revisability and its exhaustion). A stated permission to revise a shared grammar can coexist with the practical impossibility of revising it. Where a value is held by a sufficient portion of a collective, the remainder converges or bears a cost in recognition, and recognition is what constitutes them as participants. Formal revisability survives in such a system and substantive revisability does not.

Claim 8.3. (Consequence for measurement). Where an arrangement produces convergence, the arrangement's consensus is a variable the arrangement itself generates. High agreement recorded in surveys, consultations, and engagement scores is therefore compatible with the total foreclosure of the return path, and is evidence of nothing in respect of the criterion.

Claim 8.3 places a serious limit on the observability of the defect this paper describes, and Section 17 carries it forward as an open question.

9 THE CRITERION OF RECIPROCAL TRANSLABILITY

This section states the criterion the paper offers, states what it declines to condemn, and states its relation to the criteria of the companion papers. The criterion assesses arrangements in respect of a party and issues no verdict on parties.

Criterion 9.1. (Reciprocal translability). An arrangement is defective in respect of a party when both of the following hold. (i) What that party generates enters the shared system only after reformulation under the incumbent grammar. (ii) Nothing the party does within the arrangement can alter the terms of that reformulation.

Four features of the criterion deserve statement.

First, asymmetry of the translation burden does not by itself trigger the criterion. A pupil bears more of the burden than a teacher, a new entrant more than an established member, an applicant more than a panel. Such asymmetries are constitutive of the relations in which teaching, induction, and assessment occur, and an account that condemned them would condemn the relations. Clause (ii) carries the weight: what closes an arrangement is the exemption of its grammar from the encounter.

Second, the criterion is indifferent to the quality of the incumbent grammar. An arrangement whose grammar is admirable and closed satisfies the criterion; an arrangement whose grammar is crude and open fails it. The ground of the asymmetry is that a closed arrangement removes the means by which its own errors would be found, and the closure of a good grammar is therefore the graver institutional failure. The same ordering appears in the companion discussion of value conversion, where fixing a defensible rate and closing the question is treated as worse than fixing a poor rate and leaving it open.

Third, the criterion assesses arrangements and passes over admissions. An organization that admits few parties, on stated and contestable grounds, satisfies the criterion in respect of those it admits. Section 14 treats the bounds of admission directly.

Fourth, the criterion belongs to a family. A companion discussion holds an interpretation unjust when it extinguishes the capacity of a relation to generate a further interpretation of the same question; another holds a conversion arrangement indefensible when it extinguishes the capacity of the relations it orders to generate a further determination. Criterion 9.1 applies the same form one level further out, to the terms under which a party's generation is received at all.

Claim 9.2. (Two floor violations). Two conditions violate the criterion's floor from opposite directions. Subsumption admits the party's contribution after conversion into the incumbent grammar and satisfies clause (i). Fragmentation leaves each grammar intact and unengaged, so that nothing either party does bears on the other, and satisfies clause (ii) for both. Coexistence with mutual indifference therefore fails the criterion as squarely as assimilation does.

10 MICRO-LEVEL ILLUSTRATION FROM EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

This section reads an established practice through the criterion, in order to exhibit the structure at the smallest scale at which it appears. The section makes an analogical claim and no jurisdictional one: teaching is not a case of governance, and the licensed statement is that educational practice exhibits a generative relational logic from which governance arrangements can be read.

The practice in question is well documented. An experienced teacher meeting a pupil's error treats the error as the output of a working system and sets out to establish which system produced it. The teacher enters the pupil's idiom, uses the pupil's own terms, and places within that idiom a single new element: a question the pupil's current system cannot answer, an object whose behaviour it does not predict, an experience for which it holds no

account. The teacher then withdraws. What follows is generated by the pupil under the pupil's own grammar, and the resulting understanding is often one the teacher did not hold at the outset either.

Read through the criterion, three features stand out. The pupil's grammar enters as grammar and receives an answer in its own terms, so clause (i) fails. The teacher's own account of the material is altered by the encounter, and the alteration is traceable to this pupil, so clause (ii) fails. The teacher governs the conditions of learning and governs no part of the learning.

The contrast case is equally familiar and requires no bad teacher. An examination-facing arrangement receives the pupil's reasoning only after reformulation in a specified register, and holds no channel through which a pupil's reasoning could alter the register. Both clauses hold. The pupil who reasons well in an unlicensed form is recorded as having reasoned poorly, which is Claim 5.5 in its narrowest and most measurable setting.

Two debts are owed here and are stated in full in Section 15. The pedagogy of entering the learner's system has a long literature, and the critique of the transmission model of teaching is decades old. The present paper claims no novelty in the description of good teaching. It claims that the description generalizes, and that what generalizes is the location of the governed object.

11 MISSION AND MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE

This section applies the criterion to the government of mission and membership in organizations, identifies the point at which the alignment default enters, and states what the account asks of an organization. The method is an examination of standard recruitment and socialization practice.

Organizations state missions and hold values, and the account takes no exception to either. A shared direction is a condition of joint action, and an organization without one governs nothing. The question the criterion raises concerns the mode in which the direction is held.

Consider the standard formulation, in which a firm seeks candidates who identify with its mission and fit its culture. Three properties of the formulation follow from Section 5. The candidate is required to establish what the mission means in practice, which is ordinarily underdetermined by its text. The firm is required to establish nothing about the candidate's meaning system, and its assessment of fit is conducted under its own grammar throughout. Where the resulting relationship generates little, the available description is a mismatch of values, located in the candidate.

Claim 11.1. (Selection and homogenization). An arrangement that selects for grammatical proximity to the incumbent order narrows the range of activated grammars over time, since each intake is assessed by the grammar the previous intake stabilized. The narrowing is produced by the arrangement operating as designed.

Claim 11.1 has substantial prior support in work on cultural matching in hiring and

on the attraction, selection, and attrition dynamics of organizational demography, and the paper concedes the mechanism to that literature. The addition made here is the object of the narrowing. What narrows is the set of grammars available to the organization's generation, which is a different magnitude from the demographic composition of its membership and can move in the opposite direction.

The account's ask of an organization is correspondingly specific. Recognition of a grammar is asked in the sense of Section 6, so that a new member's mode of raising a claim is legible to the organization before it is judged. Translation is asked in both directions, so that the mission's terms are rendered into terms the member can act on, and the member's contributions are rendered into terms the organization can take up while remaining attributable to the member. A return path is asked in the sense of Definition 8.1, so that the mission is amenable to enrichment by members who arrive after its formulation. A mission held in that mode retains direction and declines to fix the whole content of the value it will later be found to have served.

Two guards are placed on this section. First, the recent movement in organizational practice from cultural fit toward cultural addition addresses part of the same problem and is conceded as prior work; the present account differs in taking the object to be a generative mechanism and treating the addition of a culture as insufficient by itself. Second, the account declines the business case. Whether grammatical variety improves organizational performance is a contested empirical question with a mixed record, and the reason offered here for reciprocal translation is owed to the member. Section 16 states why the account cannot borrow the performance argument even where the evidence would support it.

12 ACCOMMODATION OF RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCE IN PLURAL POLITIES

This section reads a large scholarly literature through the criterion, at the largest scale the paper treats. The section is descriptive and comparative in method, names no state and no current case, and takes no position on any particular national policy. Its object is the structure of the problem as the literature reports it.

Research on the accommodation of Islam in European polities identifies a cluster of difficulties that recur across jurisdictions with markedly different constitutional settlements. Six are separable, and each bears on the criterion.

12.1 *The Formation of Public Terms*

Several traditions of state construction presuppose a public sphere governed by a shared set of substantive commitments, and integration is accordingly framed as entry into those commitments. The framing sustains a familiar objection from minority communities, that a permission to live is granted while recognition is withheld. The framing also sustains a serious reply, that a public order without substantive commitments cannot protect the parties within minority communities whose position those commitments secure. Both positions are held by careful scholars, and the criterion adjudicates neither. What the criterion registers is whether the commitments are held in a mode that admits alteration traceable

to the participation of those asked to enter them.

12.2 Authority Over the Meaning of a Practice

Contests over religious dress supply the clearest instance. The same practice is described by its adherents as an observance and an identity, by some critics as an expression of a patriarchal structure, and by some analysts as a political statement, and individual cases genuinely differ. A public authority reaching a determination must therefore settle whose account of the practice's meaning governs. That is a question of interpretive authority, treated at length in the companion discussion, and it is the site at which clause (i) ordinarily becomes operative: the practice enters the public record only after reformulation under a grammar the adherent did not license.

12.3 Aggregation Into a Single Group

Policy instruments commonly address Muslim communities as a unit. The populations so addressed differ by region of origin, language, legal tradition, observance, generation, and the degree to which religious identification organizes their lives at all. Aggregation produces a documented effect: the instrument stabilizes the identity it addresses, and parties within the population who hold other grammars find those grammars deactivated by the very arrangement designed to include them. The mechanism is Definition 4.3 operating through policy, and the literature on groupism records it independently.

12.4 Treatment Under Security Frameworks

A body of research documents the migration of religious difference into security policy, and the effects it produces where an ordinary member of a population is addressed first as a risk-bearing category and second as a participant. The account adds one distinction to that literature, drawn from a companion discussion of scale. A higher authority may determine what an organization or an agency is permitted to do; it does not determine how that body describes the persons before it. The restriction is a condition and the category is an act.

12.5 Structural Conditions of Participation

A substantial empirical literature locates the operative difficulties in education, employment, and residential segregation, and reports that religious identification acquires disproportionate weight where other channels of participation are closed. The finding operates as a constraint on the present account and supplies it with little support: where the channels are closed, an arrangement can satisfy Criterion 9.1 in full and generate little, because the parties have no joint task through which to generate anything. Reciprocal translability is a condition on arrangements and supplies no substitute for the material conditions of participation.

Table 1: The three illustrative sites under the alignment default and under reciprocal translability.

Site	Party bearing the burden	Description of failure available to the arrangement	Object of governance under the criterion
Educational practice	The pupil	Weak aptitude or effort	The conditions of learning
Organization	The entering member	Mismatch of values or of culture	The coupling of member and organizational grammars
Plural polity	The minority community	Incomplete integration	The conditions of common public generation

12.6 *The Provenance of the Terms of Entry*

The commitments into which integration is asked have histories. Toleration, the separation of religious and civil authority, equal standing before the law, and the freedoms of conscience and expression were generated through long and contested processes, in significant part through conflict over religious difference. A settlement held as a completed inheritance yields integration in the sense of adaptation. The same settlement held as a continuing process yields a different arrangement, in which parties arriving later participate in the continuation of what they are asked to join. The criterion does not decide which of these an order should be, and it does register that the first satisfies clause (ii) by construction.

13 STRUCTURAL COMPARISON ACROSS THE ILLUSTRATIVE SITES

This section sets the three illustrative sites side by side, in order to exhibit the common structure and to mark where the analogy between them ends. Table 1 states the comparison.

Two limits on the comparison are stated here and held. First, the three sites differ in kind. Teaching is a relation of care conducted under an asymmetry that is temporary by design; organizational membership is contractual and exit is ordinarily available; a polity holds coercive authority and exit from it is not comparable. The structure identified is common; the permissible responses are not, and a measure appropriate in a classroom carries no authorization at the scale of a polity. Second, the severity of the defect varies with the density of a party's other relations. Foreclosure in one organization is survivable by a party who holds recognition elsewhere, and a party for whom the arrangement is the only one available stands differently. The duty rises as the alternatives fall.

14 THE BOUNDS OF RECIPROCITY AND THE GROUNDS OF LIMITATION

This section states what the account declines to license, supplies the test by which permissible limitation is distinguished from foreclosure, and states the point at which the account runs out. The section is included because the argument of Sections 9 through 12 invites a

reading it does not support.

The account licenses no requirement that every party be admitted to every arrangement, and no requirement that every practice be accommodated. Arrangements have purposes, some purposes are incompatible with some practices, and a party may be excluded on grounds that are stated and answerable. The following test separates the permissible case from the case the criterion condemns.

Claim 14.1. (Conduct and nature). A limitation grounded in conduct leaves the party's standing intact: the facts can be disputed, the conduct can cease, and reinstatement is available in principle. A limitation grounded in an ascribed nature forecloses that standing, since nothing the party does bears on the ground. Permissible limitation is answerable to conduct and reversible in principle.

Claim 14.1 has a doctrinal counterpart worth borrowing in constraint form. Legal systems that permit prospective restriction typically require a present-fact predicate that is disputable, an antecedent published term applied congruently, and a standing review at which the measure lapses by default unless it is re-justified. The third requirement is clause (ii) of the criterion institutionalized. The account borrows the constraint and declines the apparatus, since an organization that imports procedural machinery acquires the appearance of review together with the substitution of reasons the companion discussion of interpretive justice describes.

Two limits are stated plainly. First, where two parties cannot both occupy a setting, the account identifies the incompatibility and supplies no ground for determining which of them yields. That determination is made on other grounds, and those grounds are to be stated openly. Second, every limitation will be describable as an incompatibility of modes. The available check is procedural and weak: the excluded party retains standing to contest the description after exit.

15 RELATION TO PRIOR WORK

This section states the paper's debts and marks the points at which its claims are already held by others. The method is a survey by claim, and the standard applied is that a claim already in print is conceded.

The location of the object of governance in conditions has extensive precedent. Work on adaptive and polycentric governance establishes that arrangements are crafted from within by the parties they order, and distinguishes rules in use from rules in form. Work on state legibility establishes that administration requires the governed to become readable, and reads the requirement as a transformation imposed on them. Work on governmentality supplies the general form of governing through the conditions of conduct.

The recognition claims are held in part by the recognition tradition, whose treatment of misrecognition as a harm to the constitution of persons the paper adopts, and by the status model of recognition, from which the paper differs in treating recognition capacity as a system property that varies and can be lost. The literature on epistemic injustice sup-

plies the closest antecedent to Claim 6.1: interpretation of a party's contribution under the dominant hermeneutical resource is already identified there as a distinct wrong.

The translation claims have the strongest prior owners. Work on trading zones and boundary objects in the study of science establishes that parties holding distinct idioms coordinate through partially shared structures without convergence, and the notion of interactional expertise names the competence Section 6 describes. Work in actor-network theory uses translation as a central term. Work on commensuration establishes Definition 7.1 and its political character. The term coupling is taken from systems theory, where structural coupling names mutual perturbation between systems that remain distinct. The paper's addition is neither the operation nor its description, and consists in the question of distribution: which party is required to perform it, and what follows from exempting the other.

In education, the critique of transmission-model teaching, the analysis of learning within a zone of proximal development, the pedagogy that builds instruction from the knowledge held in a learner's household and community, and the practice of designing from the symbolic and material resources a community already holds all precede this paper's treatment of Section 10, and Section 10 claims only that the structure generalizes.

In organizational research, work on cultural matching in hiring, on attraction, selection, and attrition, on organizational socialization, and on the integration-and-learning perspective on diversity establishes Claim 11.1 and much of Section 11's diagnosis. The most recent of that work also withdraws the performance case for diversity, which is one ground for Section 16's refusal of it.

On the accommodation literature, the paper reports and declines to adjudicate, and Section 12 relies on research on civic integration policy, on secularism and religious practice, on groupism in the analysis of ethnicity, on the securitization of minority religion, and on the empirical study of socioeconomic incorporation, including work that reports a trade-off between accommodation and structural outcomes and therefore stands as a challenge to any straightforward reading of Section 12.

The vocabulary of alignment is borrowed from a different debate, concerning the specification of objectives for artificial agents, and the borrowing is loose. The parallel is limited to the direction of adaptation, and the disanalogies are large enough that Section 17 raises the connection as a question and asserts nothing.

16 LIMITS OF THE ACCOUNT

This section states what the account costs, what it fails to deliver, and which of its features are severable. The method is enumeration, and the register is deliberately unfavourable to the paper.

The account supplies no optimum. Coupling has its own pathology: strong coupling synchronizes, and synchronization is the convergence described in Claim 8.2. Any statement of the correct degree of coupling would be an objective function, and the account holds none. Claim 9.2 names two floor violations and the region between them is left un-

specified, which means the account rules out arrangements and recommends none.

The account supplies no remedy and no observer. Criterion 9.1 identifies a defect and confers standing on nobody to raise it. Claim 8.3 removes the ordinary instruments by which the defect would be measured, and whether closure of the return path can be seen from inside the relation is unsettled.

The account declines the performance argument. Reciprocal translation is expensive, slow, and unreliable in yield. An arrangement that adopts it accepts higher coordination costs and a higher frequency of open disagreement, and the account cannot offset those costs with a promise of innovation, because the reason it offers is owed to the party and because the empirical record on the performance of grammatical variety is mixed. An arrangement under acute time pressure may have adequate grounds for the alignment default, and the account then registers a cost paid and declines to describe it as a solution.

The account is silent on the substantive limits of accommodation, as Section 14 states, and it is silent on cases where the determining act sits at a higher scale than the arrangement under assessment.

The account's parts are severable in one direction. Criterion 9.1 can be retained by a reader who rejects the concealment claim of Section 5, since the criterion stands on the two clauses alone. The reverse is unavailable: a reader persuaded of Claim 5.5 has accepted the material from which the criterion is built.

17 OPEN QUESTIONS

This section states the questions the account opens. The paper identifies a neglected structure and supplies no solution to it. If the structure is real, the following questions arise immediately.

1. Individuation. What counts as one grammar, and by what test are two grammars distinct? Definitions 4.1 and 4.2 presuppose an answer and supply none.
2. Inference. Given Claim 6.2, what procedure over what interval permits a defensible inference from a party's utterances to a party's grammar, and what error is tolerable?
3. Observation. Can the foreclosure of a return path be detected from inside the relation, and by whom? An arrangement's participants are the parties whose convergence Claim 8.2 predicts.
4. Measurement. Given Claim 8.3, what would count as evidence that a return path is open? A candidate is the production of a result the arrangement did not intend, and the candidate is untested.
5. The good region. Can the interval between subsumption and fragmentation be characterized without the introduction of an objective function?
6. Bounds. On what grounds are the substantive limits of accommodation to be settled, given that Criterion 9.1 supplies none and Claim 14.1 constrains the form of a limitation while leaving its content open?

7. Cost. Under what conditions can an arrangement bear the coordination cost of reciprocal translability, and what follows for arrangements that cannot?
8. Scale. Where the act determining a party's reception occurs at a scale above the arrangement, how is the arrangement's own responsibility for the description of that party to be separated from its lack of authority over the decision?
9. Transposition. Does the alignment vocabulary in the specification of artificial agents share this structure, or share the word alone?

18 STATEMENT OF THE POSITION DEFENDED

This section states the position the paper defends in the form in which it is to be assessed.

Arrangements that receive heterogeneous parties distribute a positive cost of crossing between meaning systems, and contemporary arrangements assign that cost to the entering party while exempting their own grammar from the encounter. The exemption is where the operative power sits, and the criteria of competence conceal it by recording the cost as a defect in the party who bears it. An arrangement is defective in respect of a party when the party's generation enters only after reformulation and nothing the party does can alter the terms of reformulation.

The correlate for practice is narrow. Arrangements govern the conditions under which parties generate, and the generation itself lies beyond the reach of any arrangement. What an arrangement can hold open is the recognition of a party's grammar, the conduct of translation in both directions, and a path by which the shared grammar registers the encounter. What no arrangement can specify in advance is what the parties will then produce.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alba, R. and N. Foner. 2015. *Strangers No More: Immigration and the Challenges of Integration in North America and Western Europe*. Princeton University Press.
- [2] Argyris, C. and D. Schön. 1978. *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- [3] Ashby, W. R. 1956. *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.
- [4] Ashworth, A. and L. Zedner. 2014. *Preventive Justice*. Oxford University Press.
- [5] Asad, T. 2003. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- [6] Boltanski, L. and L. Thévenot. 2006. *On Justification: Economies of Worth*. Princeton University Press.
- [7] Brubaker, R. 2004. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Harvard University Press.
- [8] Callon, M. 1986. Some elements of a sociology of translation. In J. Law, ed., *Power, Action and Belief*. Routledge.
- [9] Cesari, J. 2013. *Why the West Fears Islam: An Exploration of Muslims in Liberal Democracies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- [10] Collins, H. and R. Evans. 2007. *Rethinking Expertise*. University of Chicago Press.
- [11] Cover, R. 1983. The Supreme Court, 1982 term. Foreword: nomos and narrative. *Harvard Law Review* 97(1): 4–68.
- [12] Dotson, K. 2012. A cautionary tale: on limiting epistemic oppression. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 33(1): 24–47.
- [13] Eglash, R., A. Bennett, C. O'Donnell, S. Jennings and M. Cintorino. 2006. Culturally situated design tools: ethnocomputing from field site to classroom. *American Anthropologist* 108(2): 347–362.
- [14] Eglash, R. 2016. An introduction to generative justice. *Teknokultura* 13(2): 369–404.
- [15] Ely, R. and D. Thomas. 2001. Cultural diversity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46(2): 229–273.
- [16] Ely, R. and D. Thomas. 2020. Getting serious about diversity: enough already with the business case. *Harvard Business Review* 98(6): 114–122.
- [17] Espeland, W. and M. Stevens. 1998. Commensuration as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 313–343.
- [18] Fraser, N. 2000. Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review* 3: 107–120.
- [19] Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- [20] Fricker, M. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press.
- [21] Fuller, L. 1969. *The Morality of Law*, revised edition. Yale University Press.
- [22] Gabriel, I. 2020. Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment. *Minds and Machines* 30(3): 411–437.
- [23] Galison, P. 1997. *Image and Logic: A Material Culture of Microphysics*. University of Chicago Press.
- [24] Honneth, A. 1995. *The Struggle for Recognition*. Polity Press.
- [25] Joppke, C. 2007. Beyond national models: civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics* 30(1): 1–22.
- [26] Koopmans, R. 2010. Trade-offs between equality and difference: immigrant integration, multiculturalism and the welfare state in cross-national perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(1): 1–26.
- [27] Kymlicka, W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford University Press.
- [28] Laurence, J. 2012. *The Emancipation of Europe's Muslims*. Princeton University Press.
- [29] Luhmann, N. 1995. *Social Systems*. Stanford University Press.
- [30] Mahmood, S. 2005. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton University Press.
- [31] Maturana, H. and F. Varela. 1980. *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. Reidel.
- [32] Modood, T. 2007. *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Polity Press.
- [33] Moll, L., C. Amanti, D. Neff and N. González. 1992. Funds of knowledge for teaching: using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice* 31(2): 132–141.

- [34] Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge University Press.
- [35] Parekh, B. 2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Macmillan (UK) and Harvard University Press (US).
- [36] Ragazzi, F. 2016. Suspect community or suspect category? The impact of counter-terrorism as 'policed multiculturalism'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(5): 724–741.
- [37] Rivera, L. 2012. Hiring as cultural matching: the case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review* 77(6): 999–1022.
- [38] Schneider, B. 1987. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology* 40(3): 437–453.
- [39] Scott, J. C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State*. Yale University Press.
- [40] Shachar, A. 2001. *Multicultural Jurisdictions*. Cambridge University Press.
- [41] Star, S. L. and J. Griesemer. 1989. Institutional ecology, 'translations' and boundary objects: amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science* 19(3): 387–420.
- [42] Taylor, C. 1994. The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann, ed., *Multiculturalism*. Princeton University Press.
- [43] Van Maanen, J. and E. Schein. 1979. Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. Staw, ed., *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 1, 209–264. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [44] Vygotsky, L. 1978. *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press.
- [45] Young, I. M. 2011. *Responsibility for Justice*. Oxford University Press.