

From Epistemic Authority to Generative Relation:

Rethinking Knowledge, Power, and Education

Wanhong HUANG

huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

This paper joins two claims. The first is a general claim about generative processes. Every relation that generates value generates power alongside it, and a generative system is complete only when it generates, from within the same relation, the mechanisms that keep its power from detaching and hardening into fixed structure. I state this as the principle of co-generated governance. The second is a claim about knowledge. Knowledge is one form of value, and it follows this general law. When knowledge accumulates and social institutions encode it as authority, it can turn from a shared medium of understanding into a possession that ranks persons and closes the space of exchange. I argue that these two claims are one claim in two registers, and that education is the practice in which the internal governance of epistemic power is either generated or forfeited. The critique targets the alienation of functional asymmetry into structural domination, and it leaves functional asymmetry itself untouched, since asymmetry of that kind is a condition of many relations working at all. The governing thesis is that the corrective to epistemic domination is the return of knowledge to relation, so that authority is compelled to keep answering to the field that produced it, rather than a reduction of knowledge or an external containment of the knower. The paper develops a generative ethics of knowledge as a set of conditions the logic of generation imposes, and closes by redefining scholarly maturity as the capacity to hold knowledge without converting it into a barrier.

Keywords: generative relation; co-generated governance; knowledge and power; epistemic authority; philosophy of education

1. Introduction

Modern educational thought inherits a promise. The expansion of knowledge expands human freedom. The promise governs curricula, credentialing systems, and the moral self-image of the learned, and it is not false. Knowledge extends the reach of a mind, opens new concepts, and lets distant people share a common frame.

This paper attends to a condition under which the promise inverts. As a person accumulates knowledge, the people around that person sometimes withdraw. They keep a respectful distance. They fall silent in the presence of expertise. They decline to raise a question they judge too simple. The withdrawal presents itself as deference, and it hollows out the very exchange that knowledge was meant to enable. Knowledge that was to enlarge understanding has contracted the space in which understanding is shared.

I take this outcome to be structural rather than accidental, and I take its explanation to lie beyond the philosophy of education proper. The paper therefore proceeds along two spines that meet at a single point.

The first spine is a claim about generative processes as such. Wherever value is generated through relation, power is generated in the same motion, because value once produced is unevenly held, and uneven holding is what power names. A system that generates value without generating any counter-force against the fixation of that power will see its power detach from relation and harden into structure. A sustainable generative system must therefore generate, internally, the mechanism that keeps power bound to its relational origin. I state this claim as the principle of co-generated governance, that a generative system is complete only when the mechanisms governing its generated power are themselves generated by the same relation that generates the value. This is the ethical core, and it is an ethics of anti-fixation generated within relation rather than a restraint imposed from outside.

The second spine is a claim about knowledge. Knowledge is one form of value among many. It is generated, held, and exchanged, and it confers advantage on those who hold it. It therefore obeys the general law. The knowledge relation generates understanding and generates epistemic power together, and it turns oppressive precisely when the power detaches from the relation and becomes an attribute of a person, a credential, or an institution.

The two spines meet at relation. The general ethics locates the anti-fixation mechanism in relation, and the theory of knowledge locates the correction of epistemic domination in the return of knowledge to relation. The thesis of the paper is that these are the same location. What follows sets out the general law, applies it to knowledge, locates the point at which epistemic power detaches, specifies the kind of relation that holds power bound and the boundary within which the account applies, and states the ethics that follows.

2. Generativity and Its Shadow

I begin with the general structure, since the account of knowledge is a special case of it.

Value takes many forms. Material wealth is one form. Recognition, attention, and standing are others. Knowledge belongs among them. Across these forms a single pattern holds wherever value is produced through relation. The generation of value and the generation of power are two faces of one process. A relation produces new value. The new value produces new differences in capacity, influence, and access. Those differences constitute a distribution of power. No intention is required for the sequence to run. It runs because value, once produced, is unevenly held.

The pattern has a precedent in the analysis of material value. In its origin, accumulated material value serves to organize production and coordinate resources. Under alienation it becomes an independent force that defines the worth of persons and governs their relations. The generalization is that any generative medium is subject to this alienation, in which a means of relation turns into a power that stands over relation.

Two kinds of power must be separated at this point, since the argument turns on the difference. The first is functional asymmetry. A teacher guides a student, a physician directs a patient, a supervisor directs a doctoral candidate, and in each case one party carries a capacity

the other has not yet developed and applies it toward a shared end. Asymmetry of this kind is a condition of the relation working at all, and it is not the target of the critique. The second is structural domination, in which the asymmetry ceases to serve the shared end and begins to serve its own preservation, so that the holding of knowledge becomes a standing entitlement to speak and the withholding of it a standing disqualification of others. What the paper opposes is asymmetry that has become a self-preserving structure, and the mere fact of asymmetry falls outside the critique.

The passage from the one to the other has a name, and naming it closes the logic. Power does not turn into fixed structure by necessity. It turns into fixed structure through alienation. The full sequence runs from relation to value to power to alienation to structure, and the fourth term is the true site of transformation. A relation generates value, the value generates a distribution of power, and so far nothing pathological has occurred, since the power remains answerable to the relation that produced it. Alienation is the moment at which the power detaches from that relation and begins to stand over it. Structure is the settled result. The question of governance is therefore the question of how to prevent the fourth step, and it is not a question of suppressing the third.

The recognition reframes the ethical question. The aim cannot be the abolition of power, since the abolition of power would require the abolition of value generation, and a relation that generates nothing sustains no one. Power is the shadow that generativity casts, and a thing casts no shadow only when it produces no light. The question concerns what becomes of power after it is generated, and specifically whether it is allowed to alienate.

Here two responses divide. External restraint lets value be generated, lets power appear, and then presses on the power from outside through an institution built to contain it. The restraint arrives against the process and after it. Internal restraint lets the relation that generates value also generate a force that resists the fixation of the power, so that generation stays open. The restraint arrives from within the process and as part of it.

The two responses differ in what they produce, and the difference is why the internal one is preferred. External restraint produces compliance. It sets a rule over the power and secures obedience to the rule, and the power it governs remains intact underneath, waiting for the moment the rule relaxes. It treats the symptom of fixation rather than its cause, since the cause is the detachment of power from relation and an external rule leaves that detachment in place. Internal restraint produces renewal. What limits the power is the continued generation itself, the fact that the relation keeps producing new value and keeps admitting new participants, so that no distribution of power can settle before the next round of generation unsettles it. The limiting force is therefore not supervision imposed on a static power but the ongoing generativity of the relation, which keeps the power in motion and denies it the stillness in which it would harden.

The wager of this paper is that only internal restraint is stable, and that its site is relation. The root of fixed power is the rupture of relation. Power hardens at the moment it detaches from the relation that produced it and begins to demand deference on its own account. The corrective must therefore be a mechanism that returns power to relation and keeps it there, compelling the powerful to keep answering to the field that granted them power. Stated gen-

erally: a sustainable generative system must generate mechanisms that prevent power from detaching from its relational origin and hardening into structure. Power must be kept in the condition of relation and prevented from becoming a substance.

The claim can be sharpened into a single proposition, which I will call the principle of co-generated governance. A generative system is complete only when the mechanisms that govern its generated power are themselves generated through the same relational process that generates the value. The force of the word same is the whole of the claim. A governance produced elsewhere and applied afterward is external, and it yields the compliance described above. A governance produced by the same relation that produces the value is internal, and it alone renews rather than merely restrains. On this principle the governance of a generative system is not an addition to the system, a set of rules bolted on once the value is in hand. It is a component of generativity itself, and a system that generates value without generating its own governance is, by this measure, incomplete, since it has produced the power without producing what keeps the power bound. The principle converts the ethics of the paper from a list of recommended virtues into a condition of completeness that the logic of generation imposes on any generative system whatever.

3. Knowledge as a Form of Value

Knowledge instances the general law with unusual clarity, because the two faces of the generative process are so easily mistaken for one.

Consider the arrival of a new theory. The value side of the event is evident. A new concept appears, a new explanatory reach, a new field of practice. The power side arrives in the same instant and is easy to overlook. Who holds the right to interpret the theory? Who sets the standard by which a claim counts as valid? Who decides what qualifies as knowledge at all? Each question marks a position of power that the act of generating understanding has brought into being. The generation of understanding is at once the generation of a distribution of epistemic authority.

The alienation of knowledge follows the general arc. In its origin, knowledge helps people understand the world and enlarge their capacities. Under alienation the qualification to know becomes the mechanism that decides who holds the right to speak. Academic language grows dense past the point of necessity. Professional boundaries rise. The ordinary person is deemed unqualified to enter the discussion. Knowledge that began as an open space becomes a resource that a few control. The medium of shared understanding has turned into a structure of rank.

This is why the withdrawal described in the introduction is not, for the most part, a fear of knowledge. It is a response to a structure of power that knowledge carries once institutions have encoded it. What the deferential defer to is the encoded position rather than the understanding. The knower may hold no such intention, and the structure operates regardless, which is exactly what makes it structural. The problem of epistemic domination is therefore the general problem of value and power, read in the register of knowledge, and it reduces to the same question: how the force that resists the fixation of epistemic power can be generated together with the knowledge, and how understanding can be co-created without being extracted as the private standing of those who hold it.

4. The Epistemic Ego

The general law says that power hardens when it detaches from relation. In the case of knowledge, the site of detachment has a specific and nameable location. It is the attachment between knowledge and self.

The danger does not reside in knowledge. It resides in the bond a person forms between their knowing and their identity. Where that bond is tight, a set of distortions follows. Criticism of a view registers as an attack on the person. Disagreement registers as a threat to standing. The defense of knowledge becomes indistinguishable from the defense of self, and at that point the knowledge has ceased to circulate in the relation and has been captured as a possession of the ego. This is the epistemic form of the detachment that the general theory describes. Knowledge becomes a substance a person owns rather than a process a relation generates.

The consequence is a closing of the field. A subject who holds knowledge as identity requires deference to secure the identity, and the requirement of deference is exactly the pressure that silences the other. The self-attachment of the knower and the withdrawal of the interlocutor are two ends of one structure.

This is also why a merely formal equality fails to correct the problem. Contemporary education prizes inclusive dialogue, participation, and equality of voice. Where the underlying relation still runs from expert to learner, these become ceremony. The forms of equality are performed while the asymmetry they were meant to dissolve remains intact, and the performance can deepen the silence it claims to cure, since it asks the deferential to speak while leaving in place every reason for their deference. Formal equality addresses the surface of the exchange and leaves the site of detachment untouched.

The corrective is a mode of holding knowledge in which knowledge stays detached from the ego and bound to the relation. This mode does not require the surrender of authority. It requires that the person cease to depend on authority for the security of their position. A scholar can hold deep knowledge and decline to convert it into a barrier to entry, because what the deferential fear is the weight of the position rather than the understanding itself, and a knower can carry knowledge without letting others feel that weight. A knower who holds knowledge in this way gives it to the field rather than keeping it as a mark of self, acts without requiring the deference of others, and guides an inquiry without ruling it. Held this way, knowledge remains in the relation that produced it, and the epistemic power it carries is kept from hardening into rank.

5. The Generative Relation

The mode described above is a condition rather than a private virtue. It is the condition under which a certain kind of field becomes possible, and it is worth stating the structure of that field directly, since it is the positive form of everything the earlier sections describe negatively.

The argument so far leans on relation as the site of restraint, and this invites an immediate objection. Many relations dominate. The family can dominate, the lineage of master and disciple can dominate, and the sealed community can dominate, and each of these is a relation of great intensity. Relation as such therefore cannot be what limits power, and the term must

be narrowed. Not every relation is generative. A generative relation is one that satisfies three conditions together, and the conditions are what let it govern the power it produces. The first is reciprocity, the condition that influence runs in both directions, so that the one who guides is also answerable to the one who is guided. The second is openness, the condition that the relation admits new participants and does not close its boundary against entry. The third is revisability, the condition that the understanding the relation produces can be reopened and revised, so that no result of the relation becomes fixed beyond challenge. Where all three hold, power cannot settle, because reciprocity keeps it answerable, openness keeps the field entrant, and revisability keeps its products in motion. Where any of the three fails, the relation persists and its generative character does not. The dominating family fails reciprocity. The sealed community fails openness. The dogmatic lineage fails revisability. These are relations, and they are not generative relations, and the distinction is what keeps the appeal to relation from proving too much.

The three conditions also mark the boundary of the theory, which is worth stating plainly, since a claim that applies everywhere explains nothing. The theory governs systems whose purpose is generation, the making of understanding, value, and capacity that did not exist before. It does not follow that every social system has this purpose. A system whose purpose is the reliable execution of a fixed function under urgency, where the good served is the correct and rapid completion of a determinate task rather than the generation of the new, will rationally organize itself around a functional asymmetry that the present theory does not ask it to dissolve. The boundary does not run between fields, since a single field contains both kinds of moment, and an inquiry into how a determinate procedure should itself be revised is generative even where the procedure's execution is not. The boundary runs between purposes. Where a system exists to generate, the principle of co-generated governance binds it. Where a system exists to execute, another standard applies, and the confusion of the two is itself an error the distinction is meant to prevent.

Two conditions must hold together. There must be difference, and there must be safety. Difference alone, an expert facing a non-expert without safety, converts into hierarchy, which is the outcome the paper has been tracing. Safety alone, without difference, offers no stimulus and generates nothing new. The generative field is the coincidence of the two. Where a rich store of experience meets a genuine welcome of another's distinct background, difference and safety hold together, and a new shared understanding emerges that neither party held in advance.

What emerges belongs to neither party in advance, and this is the mark of a generative relation. On the possessive picture, communication transfers a substance from the one who has it to the one who lacks it, and the most that equality can mean is that the two come to hold the same substance. Between people of unequal knowledge that equality is nearly impossible, and the pursuit of it keeps the transfer running in one direction under a gentler name. On the generative picture, the relation between the two produces a third thing that was present in neither of them at the outset. Equality then means something the possessive picture cannot state. It is the mutual recognition that each party holds the capacity to generate new meaning, and this recognition is available even where knowledge is deeply unequal, since it concerns the capacity to generate rather than the stock already held.

The distinction bears on why a relation can carry every mark of openness and still oppress. Equality is a structure before it is a technique, and technique can express that structure but cannot create it. Three layers can be distinguished. The first is the relation of social identity, in which one party is the professor and the other the student. The second is the relation of psychological attitude, in which the professor holds that the student's thought may carry something the professor has not seen. The third is the layer of practical technique, the manner of asking, responding, and organizing discussion. Where the second layer is absent, the third becomes instrumental. A person may ask open questions, refrain from interrupting, and convene the discussion as a circle, and if the governing assumption remains that the exchange will be steered toward a conclusion the leader already holds, the other party registers the concealed asymmetry, since communication travels through attention, affect, and the treatment of uncertainty as much as through words. A dialogue conducted only to secure the eventual assent of the other is a one-directional transmission in a softer form. The requirement is that the two layers hold together. Without the inner condition the outer technique becomes a courteous hierarchy, and without the outer technique the inner condition cannot be realized in practice. The mature educator is distinguished from the ordinary transmitter of knowledge by holding both, which is to say by knowing not only the content but the means by which another is enabled to become a generator of knowledge in turn.

The educator who sustains such a field occupies a model position worth abstracting from any individual case. On the possessive picture of knowledge the teacher is the owner of knowledge and the student is its recipient, and the flow runs in one direction. On the generative picture the teacher is the creator of a condition under which the student generates their own understanding. The difference matters because a thought merely received still belongs to an external authority, while a thought a person reaches themselves enters that person's own subjectivity and becomes genuinely their own. The generative educator therefore withholds the ready conclusion so that the other may arrive at it, which is more demanding than stating it.

Two features define this model position. The first is that standing is not used as a filter. The educator does not let position screen out a potentially valuable exchange on the basis of the interlocutor's rank, and a person of low standing is met as a possible source of understanding rather than as a mere recipient of it. The second is that the educator's own claims are not imposed. Understanding is elicited rather than transmitted. Together these features describe an authority that has been kept bound to relation, an authority present in the field yet declining to serve as an instrument of subordination. This is the general law satisfied in the case of knowledge. Epistemic power has been generated, and it has been kept from detaching.

The disposition is harder to enact than to describe, and the difficulty locates the real problem. A person can write at length on openness and humility and still, in every exchange, transmit the message that the other does not understand and must be corrected. Another person, holding little theoretical vocabulary, may open an unforced space as a matter of temperament. The difference lies in mode of being rather than in the quantity of knowledge held. The gap between the theory of the generative relation and the capacity to enact it is the gap the ethics of the next section must address.

6. A Generative Ethics of Knowledge

The ethics that follows is an application of the general ethics of anti-fixation to the specific medium of knowledge. It asks for no reduction of knowledge. It asks that knowledge be kept in the condition of relation. Three principles state the requirement.

Non-appropriation

The first principle governs the bond between knowledge and self, which the fourth section identified as the site of detachment. It does not lower the standing of knowledge. It refuses the appropriation of knowledge as a mark of the self, the identification of the knowing with the identity of the knower. The knower who does not appropriate holds their knowledge as a contribution owed to a shared field rather than as evidence of a superior kind of person. Non-appropriation is the personal enactment of the general anti-fixation mechanism, and it is a structural condition rather than a moral disposition, since what it prevents is precisely the alienation identified in the second section, the detachment of power from relation at the point where knowledge fuses with self. It severs the attachment at which epistemic power would otherwise harden into rank, and it keeps the knower answerable to the field.

Epistemic hospitality

The second principle governs the relation to the one who does not yet know. It welcomes the newcomer into the space of knowing and treats that welcome as a condition of generation rather than as a concession granted from above. Hospitality is the mechanism by which difference and safety are made to coincide, and it converts the boundary that expertise erects into a threshold that others may cross. Where non-appropriation keeps power from hardening at the site of the self, hospitality keeps the field open at its edge, so that the relation continues to admit the new participants through whom further generation becomes possible.

Co-generation

The third principle governs the aim of the enterprise as a whole. The purpose of a knowledge relation is the generation of new possibility rather than the reproduction of existing knowledge in new holders. Its measure is the third thing, the understanding that neither party held in advance and that the relation between them brings into being. A relation organized for co-generation measures its success by the questions it makes askable rather than by the answers it transmits, and it keeps the value it produces in circulation rather than allowing that value to be captured as the private standing of those who already hold it. Co-generation is the positive face of the anti-extraction requirement. It names the condition under which understanding created in common remains common, and it is the point at which the ethics of knowledge rejoins the general ethics of generative systems.

The three principles are one principle differentiated by site. Non-appropriation holds the center open, hospitality holds the edge open, and co-generation holds the product in circulation. Each keeps epistemic power in the condition of relation at a different point where it would otherwise detach and fix. Together they are the internal governance that the general theory requires, realized in the medium of knowledge, and they are the principle of co-generated

governance stated for the case in which the value is understanding.

7. Conclusion

The paradox with which the paper began is not a flaw in knowledge to be corrected by reducing it. It is the shadow that every generative medium casts, and it calls for the structural response that the general theory prescribes. The generation of understanding generates epistemic power, and the response is to keep that power bound to the relation that produced it, through an internal governance rather than an external constraint. Education is the name of the practice in which this binding is learned, and the maturity of a scholar is measured by the capacity to enact it.

The claim underneath the discussion of knowledge is more general than education, and it is worth stating in its general form at the close. The question the paper finally poses concerns the conditions necessary for a generative system to remain generative, and it reaches past the narrower question of what educators ought to do. The principle of co-generated governance answers that question. A system remains generative only while the power it produces stays bound to the relation that produces it, and it stays bound only while the system generates, alongside its value, the governance that keeps power from alienating. The three principles developed for knowledge are the instance of that answer in the medium of understanding, and the same structure governs any medium through which value is generated in relation. Education is where the structure is most visible, because knowledge fuses with self more readily than most forms of value do, though the structure extends well beyond education. What the paper offers, in the end, is a general theory of the governance of generative systems, and the account of knowledge is its first application.

Real seniority, on this account, is not the accumulation of more knowledge. It is the condition reached, after knowledge enough has been accumulated, in which a person no longer needs knowledge to secure their position. The beginner is tempted to say: I know, and so I will display. The mature scholar is freer to say: I know something, and the more important matter is what we might still discover together. This is why certain figures who hold real authority are the easiest to approach. They carry the weight of authority without letting others feel it, which is to say they have kept their power in the condition of relation.

The highest form of knowledge is not the capacity to answer more questions. It is the capacity to create a space in which more people can ask meaningful ones.