

The Political Economy of Intimate Relations

Toward a Theory of Generative Relational Wealth

[Working Draft]

On Wealth, Power, and the Generation of Value in Intimate Relational Fields

Wanhong

Working draft — not for citation or circulation

huangwanhong@serendip.ngo huang-wanhong.com +81-080-8946-0827
LAZO GINZA HIGASHI 402, MINATO 2-6-4, CHUO KU, TOKYO, JAPAN 104-0043 (temporary; for the
latest contact address see huang-wanhong.com)

生而不有，为而不恃，长而不宰。

*To generate without possessing,
to act without presuming,
to foster without ruling.*

—老子 Laozi, *Tao Te Ching* Ch. 10

取之不尽，用之不竭。

*Inexhaustible in the taking,
inexhaustible in the using.*

— On the nature of generative relational wealth

献给自己深爱的那位
喜欢文化、旅行与大自然的同乡女孩

*For her—
the girl from home,
who loves culture, travel, and the living world.*

与她在故乡的千里之外的相遇，
是自己此生最大的幸运。

*To have found her, a thousand li from home—
this is the greatest fortune of my life.*

也献给天下所有有情人。

*And for all lovers, everywhere,
who have ever wondered what they truly possess.*

取之不尽，用之不竭，因为爱本身就是生成性的。

Abstract

What is wealth? A gold ring, a bride-price, a shared life—which of these is the truest form of riches? This paper takes that question seriously and argues that the answer is not economic but ontological: the form of wealth that organises intimate relations determines whether relational subjects can genuinely exist as co-evolving beings, or whether one or both parties are structurally reduced to exchangeable units within a system of accumulation.

The paper develops the concept of **Generative Relational Wealth** (GRW): wealth that is generated through co-evolutionary activity in the relational field, that belongs to the *between* rather than to either individual, and whose most fundamental property is that **use does not deplete but may augment**—because GRW is stored not in any material or symbolic medium but in the permanent structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape. GRW is the self-fuel of the relational field: generated through co-evolution, it becomes the dynamic condition for further co-evolution, constituting what we call the *generative relational cycle*.

Against this concept, the paper maps the major traditions of wealth theory—from mercantilism and classical political economy through Marx’s commodity fetishism and Federici’s social reproduction theory, from Sen’s capabilities approach through Mauss’s gift economy and Eglash’s generative justice—showing in each case what the tradition illuminates and what it misses about wealth in intimate relations. The paper then examines how traditional wealth forms (bride-price, gold, dowry) embed intimate relations within power-structured logics of accumulation, and how three mechanisms—settlement, commodification, and indebtedness—structurally foreclose genuine relational co-evolution.

A central chapter analyses the *happiness jar*—a thought experiment and practical paradigm in which couples record and process shared moments of happiness—as a case study in GRW accumulation, depletion-resistance, and regeneration. The analysis draws on semiotics (Peirce’s index, Benjamin’s aura), psychoanalysis (Lacanian drive theory, the objet petit a), and theoretical physics (relational STDP, phase-space reconstruction, the Δ between symbolic and real registers) to explain why artistic processing of shared memories can reignite a withering relational cycle—and advances the conjecture, clearly marked as speculative, that the operator $O(x) \sim x'$ generates a non-zero relational remainder $\mathcal{R}(O(x), x) \neq 0$ that is the source of GRW’s inexhaustibility.

The paper also develops feminist, psychoanalytic, epistemic-justice, and Hegelian-Marxist perspectives on GRW, arguing that: GRW is structurally non-phallic wealth that bypasses the symbolic order’s power structures; care labour is GRW’s primary production mechanism and relational subjectivity its highest form; the recognition of epistemic asymmetry in intimate relations is a condition for GRW generation; and the dialectical relation between material wealth (necessary condition, secondary aspect) and GRW (primary aspect, generative ground) is irreducible—without symbolic wealth, GRW cannot be sustained; without GRW, symbolic wealth is ontologically impoverished.

This is *Paper XV* of the *Philosophy of Intimacy and the Theory of Justice* series, extending the

eudaimonics of [Paper XIV \[29\]](#) and the generativity theory of [Paper IX \[27\]](#) into the domain of political economy.

Keywords: generative relational wealth; political economy; intimate relations; wealth theory; generative justice; epistemic justice; care ethics; dialectics; holonomy; spiking neural networks.

Contents

1	Prelude: What Is Wealth?	10
2	A Critical Map of Wealth Theories	12
2.1	Mercantilism: Wealth as Accumulation and Zero-Sum Exchange	12
2.2	Classical Political Economy: Labour, Division, and Relational Surplus	12
2.3	The Marxist Tradition: Commodity Fetishism, Alienation, and Social Reproduction	13
2.4	The Capabilities Approach: Wealth as Freedom	14
2.5	The Gift Economy: Wealth as Flow and Social Bond	14
2.6	Generative Justice: Wealth as Value Returned to Its Creators	14
2.7	Non-Western Wealth Traditions	15
2.8	The Shared Presupposition and Its Overcoming	15
3	Power Structures and Wealth in Intimate Relations	16
3.1	Bride-Price and Gold: The Mercantilist Form in Intimate Relations	16
3.2	Three Mechanisms of Relational Wealth Destruction	17
3.2.1	Settlement: The Closure of Relational Value	17
3.2.2	Commodification: The Reduction of the Other to Exchange Value	18
3.2.3	Indebtedness: The Structural Obligation That Forecloses Generativity	19
3.3	Social Reproduction and the Invisible Wealth of Care	20
3.4	The Intergenerational Reproduction of Wealth Structures	20
3.5	Contemporary Forms: Consumerism, Human Capital, and Digital Extraction	21
4	The Dialectic of Freedom and Wealth in Intimate Relations	22
4.1	The Liberal Solution: Property Rights as the Foundation of Freedom	22
4.2	The Marxist Solution: Liberation Through the Abolition of Property Relations	23
4.3	Sen’s Solution: Capabilities as the Measure of Relational Freedom	24
4.4	The GRB Resolution: Relational Freedom Requires Relational Wealth	25
4.5	The Practical Shape of the Resolution	26
5	Generative Relational Wealth: Theoretical Construction	27
5.1	The Preliminary Negative Definition: What GRW Is Not	27
5.2	The Gift Paradigm: GRW as More Radically Relational Than the Gift	28
5.3	Generative Justice and the Return of Value to the Field	29
5.4	Non-Possessive Wealth: <i>Xuande</i> as the Ethical Foundation of GRW	29
5.5	The Formal Positive Definition of GRW	30
5.6	The Four Essential Features of GRW	30
5.7	Comparison with Other Wealth Forms	31
5.8	The Self-Generating Structure of GRW	32
5.9	The Structural Remainder: Why GRW Is Inexhaustible	33
5.10	Advantages, Value, and Honest Limitations	34

5.11	The Happiness Jar: GRW in Practice	35
6	The Semiotics of the Happiness Jar: Trace, Projection, and Poetic Suture	36
6.1	The Core Paradox: Symbolising the Unsymbolisable	37
6.2	The Record as Index: Trace Rather Than Representation	37
6.3	Artistic Processing as Topological Projection	38
6.4	Poetic Suture: Anchoring Without Closing	38
6.5	The Relation $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$: Between Relations, Not Between Points	39
6.6	Δ and the Drive: Why the Withering Cycle Is Reignited	40
6.7	The Embodied Dimension: Why Artistic Processing Is Especially Effective	41
6.8	The Ethical Dimension: What Counts as Genuine Processing	42
7	The Relational Isomorphism Principle: How the Symbolic Feeds Back into the Real	43
7.1	The Problem of Cross-Register Causation	43
7.2	The Principle Stated	44
7.3	Three Supporting Frameworks	44
7.3.1	Relational Quantum Mechanics	44
7.3.2	Wittgenstein's Picture Theory as a Relational Isomorphism	45
7.3.3	Parametric Resonance as Formal Analogy	45
7.4	The Condition of Relational Reality	46
7.5	The Von Neumann Problem: Program and Data in the Same Space	47
7.6	Implications for GRW Theory	48
8	The Psychoanalytic Perspective: Phallic Wealth, Drive, and the Real of GRW	48
8.1	Traditional Wealth as Phallic Signifier	49
8.2	GRW in the Lacanian Register System: Beyond the <i>Objet Petit A</i>	50
8.3	The Drive Structure of GRW Generation	51
8.4	The Three-Register Structure of Wealth in Intimate Relations	52
8.5	Pathologies of Wealth in Intimate Relations: A Psychoanalytic Typology	53
9	The Feminist Perspective: Relational Subjectivity, Care Ethics, and the Non-Phallic Wealth	54
9.1	The Structural Problem: Whose Subjectivity?	54
9.2	The First-Wave Liberal Strategy and Its Limits	55
9.3	The Second-Wave Critique and the Problem of the Alternative	55
9.4	Care Ethics and the Relational Alternative	56
9.5	Relational Subjectivity: The Third Way	57
9.6	The Non-Phallic Wealth and Its Political Implications	58
10	The Epistemic Dialectic: The Unverifiability of GRW and the Epistemic Advantages of Traditional Wealth	59
10.1	The Genuine Epistemic Advantages of Traditional Wealth	60

10.2 The Cost of Epistemic Transparency: Ontological Impoverishment	61
10.3 The Complementary Account: Different Epistemic Registers for Different Onto- logical Realities	62
10.4 The Practical Challenge: Living with Epistemic Asymmetry	63
11 The Dialectical Movement: Hegel, Marx, and the Historical Materialism of Relational Wealth	64
11.1 The Primary and Secondary Aspects of the Contradiction	65
11.2 The Thesis: Pre-Modern Intimate Relations and the Undifferentiated Field . .	66
11.3 The Antithesis: Capitalist Modernity and the Separation of the Material from the Relational	66
11.4 The Synthesis: Toward a New Organisation of Relational Wealth	67
11.5 The Historical Materialist Analysis of Traditional Wealth Forms	68
11.6 The Dialectical Unity of Necessity and Freedom in Relational Wealth	69
12 Ethics: The Practice of GRW and the Critique of Traditional Wealth Epis- temology	70
12.1 Individual Ethics: Virtue and Character in Relational Life	71
12.2 Relational Ethics: The Obligations of Co-Evolutionary Partnership	72
12.3 Social Ethics: Wealth Forms and Their Relational Consequences	73
12.4 Political Ethics: Social Structures and the Conditions for GRW	74
12.5 Generative Justice and the Ethics of Value	75
12.6 Epistemic Justice: The Right to Know and Be Known in Relational Wealth . .	75
12.7 The Dialectical Unity of the Four Levels	77
13 Empirical and Cross-Cultural Dimensions	78
13.1 Operationalising GRW: Measurement Strategy	78
13.2 The Happiness Jar Study: A Proposed Research Design	79
13.3 The Distribution of Care Labour: Cross-National Study	80
13.4 Wealth Forms and Relational Quality: A Cross-Cultural Comparative Study . .	81
13.5 Research Ethics	81
13.6 Potential Biases	82
14 Praxis: Cultivating Generative Relational Wealth in Daily Life	83
14.1 The Happiness Jar as Daily Practice	84
14.2 Resisting the Settlement Logic: Daily Counter-Practices	85
14.3 Organising Material Wealth to Support GRW	87
14.4 The Integrated Practice: GRW as a Way of Life	88
15 Conclusions: At the Boundaries of the Frameworks	89
15.1 What the Political Economy Framework Can and Cannot Say	89
15.2 What the Formal Framework Can and Cannot Say	89
15.3 What the Psychoanalytic Framework Can and Cannot Say	90
15.4 What the Feminist Framework Can and Cannot Say	90

15.5 What the Ethical Framework Can and Cannot Say	91
15.6 Three Concentric Circles	91
15.7 Why This Paper Has No Synthetic Conclusion	92

1. Prelude: What Is Wealth?

Consider three scenes.

In the first, a family negotiates a bride-price. Gold changes hands—a quantity agreed upon after careful deliberation, reflecting the woman’s family’s assessment of what they are giving and the man’s family’s assessment of what they are receiving. The transaction is witnessed, documented, culturally sanctioned. When it is complete, both parties know exactly what has been transferred. The wealth is real, visible, verifiable.

In the second scene, two people sit across from each other after fifteen years of shared life. Between them, invisible to any accountant, lies something that neither owns individually and neither could enumerate: the accumulated texture of a life built together—the arguments and reconciliations, the ordinary Tuesday evenings and the extraordinary moments, the flowers noticed on paths and shared without calculation, the griefs endured together and the joys that arose from their *between*. No document records this. No court could adjudicate its distribution. And yet both people, in some inarticulate way, know that it is the most significant thing either of them possesses.

In the third scene, that same couple, after years of exhaustion and the slow accumulation of unshared contingency, finds themselves strangers in the same house. The gold from the first scene—if there was any—remains. The bank accounts are unchanged. But something else has been depleted that cannot be measured in any currency, and its absence is felt as a poverty more complete than any material lack.

What is wealth?

This question, asked in the context of intimate relations, turns out not to be an economic question at all. It is an ontological question—a question about what kinds of things exist, how they are generated, and who can possess them. The form of wealth that organises intimate relations determines whether the relational field can genuinely flourish, whether both parties can participate as genuine co-subjects of a shared life, or whether one or both are structurally reduced to exchangeable units within a logic of accumulation that is fundamentally alien to what intimate relations are for.

The paper that follows is an attempt to think carefully about this question. It proceeds from a conviction that the major traditions of wealth theory—the mercantilism that treats wealth as accumulation and exchange, the Marxist tradition that analyses wealth as the product of exploited labour, the capabilities approach that reconceives wealth as freedom, the gift economy that understands wealth as flow and social bond—all illuminate something real about wealth in intimate relations, and all miss something equally real. What they miss, this paper argues, is a form of wealth that is irreducible to any of their categories: a form of wealth that is generated through co-evolutionary activity in the relational field, that belongs to the *between* rather than to either individual, and whose most fundamental property is that use does not deplete but may augment.

We call this **Generative Relational Wealth** (GRW).

The central claim. The wealth question in intimate relations is not an economic question but an ontological one: the form of wealth that organises intimate relations determines whether relational subjects can genuinely exist as co-evolving beings. GRW—wealth generated through co-evolutionary activity in the relational field—is the primary form of wealth in intimate relations. It is inexhaustible in the taking and inexhaustible in the using, because it is stored not in any material or symbolic medium but in the permanent structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape. Without understanding GRW, we cannot understand what it means for an intimate relation to flourish—or to fail.

A word on method. This paper is, by necessity, interdisciplinary to a degree that may initially seem excessive. The question of wealth in intimate relations requires political economy (to map the existing traditions and their assumptions), philosophy (to interrogate the ontological foundations), psychoanalysis (to understand the symbolic structures through which wealth and power operate in intimate life), feminist theory (to recover what the dominant traditions have systematically obscured), and formal methods drawn from dynamical systems theory and semiotics (to give the concept of GRW the precision it requires). The paper moves between these registers without apology, because the phenomenon demands it: a question that is simultaneously ontological, economic, psychological, political, and ethical cannot be adequately addressed from within any single disciplinary perspective.

Several chapters contain speculative formal conjectures—marked explicitly as *open questions*—that go beyond what the current state of theory can rigorously establish. These conjectures are included not to claim more than the evidence supports, but because honest intellectual engagement with difficult questions requires being willing to gesture toward where the argument leads, even when the ground is not yet solid. The reader is invited to treat these sections as invitations to further inquiry rather than as settled conclusions.

A word on this paper's place in the series. Paper IX established the spiral structure of relational generativity and the holonomy framework for distinguishing good from bad relational cycles [27]. Paper XIV developed the eudaimonics of relational happiness, showing that happiness is the emergent signal of co-evolutionary activity in the relational field [29]. The present paper asks: what is the material and symbolic infrastructure that makes this co-evolutionary activity possible? What forms of wealth support it, and what forms of wealth destroy it? The answer—that GRW is both the product and the fuel of relational co-evolution—is the political economy of the GRB framework: the account of how value is generated, stored, and circulated in the intimate relational field, and why the dominant forms of wealth in modern societies are systematically misaligned with the flourishing of intimate life.

2. A Critical Map of Wealth Theories

Before we can develop the concept of Generative Relational Wealth, we must survey the landscape of existing wealth theories and ask, of each: what does it illuminate about wealth in intimate relations, and what does it systematically miss? The survey reveals a striking convergence: every major tradition in the theory of wealth shares, at the level of its fundamental ontology, the assumption that the primary subject of wealth is the individual. The concept of GRW requires a different starting point: a relational ontology in which wealth belongs primarily to the relational field rather than to any individual participant.

2.1 Mercantilism: Wealth as Accumulation and Zero-Sum Exchange

Mercantilism holds that wealth consists in the accumulation of precious metals, and that trade is a zero-sum competition: one party's gain is necessarily another's loss [14]. Three features of mercantilist wealth are directly relevant to intimate relations: it is **material and finite** (discrete, countable objects that can be possessed and transferred); **zero-sum** (the total stock is fixed); and **externally verifiable** (measurable by any competent observer, independently of the parties' feelings).

When mercantilist logic enters intimate relations—most visibly in bride-price and in the use of gold as the medium of relational contracts—it imports all three features. The bride-price treats relational value as a finite, measurable, transferable quantity. The exchange is zero-sum: accounts balance when the agreed gold changes hands. What mercantilist logic cannot see is the generation of relational value within the intimate relation itself—the accumulation, through co-evolutionary activity, of something that was not there before and that belongs to neither party individually. For mercantilism, wealth precedes the relation and is transferred through it; wealth generated by the relation, belonging to the relational field itself, is outside the conceptual framework.

The mercantilist blind spot. Mercantilist wealth logic treats relational value as a finite, transferable, externally verifiable quantity that precedes and is exchanged through the relation. It is constitutively unable to recognise the generation of relational wealth through co-evolutionary activity—wealth that belongs to the *between* rather than to either party, and that is augmented rather than depleted by use.

2.2 Classical Political Economy: Labour, Division, and Relational Surplus

Adam Smith's innovation was to locate the source of wealth not in the stock of precious metals but in **labour**: the productive activity through which human beings transform the natural world [25]. This is a genuine advance—wealth is generated, not merely transferred. But

classical political economy remains limited by its focus on material production: the labour of generating relational value—the emotional labour, the care work, the attentional investment that builds a shared life—is invisible in this framework, because it does not produce material goods and therefore does not count as productive in the technical sense.

Ricardo’s concept of **differential advantage** will prove relevant when we consider the distribution of relational surplus: who captures the value generated by co-evolutionary activity in the intimate relational field, and whether that distribution is just.

2.3 The Marxist Tradition: Commodity Fetishism, Alienation, and Social Reproduction

Marx’s analysis of **commodity fetishism** applies with striking directness to traditional wealth forms in intimate relations [14]. The bride-price is a commodity fetishism of relational value: the capacity to participate in a shared life is mystified as a property of the gold exchanged. The social relations that produce and distribute this value are obscured behind the appearance of a simple exchange of equivalents.

Marx’s concept of **alienation** is equally relevant: the relational value generated through a person’s emotional labour and care work is systematically appropriated by the dominant party, leaving the generating party estranged from the value they have produced.

The most important Marxist contribution comes from Silvia Federici’s account of **social reproduction** [4]. Federici argues that capitalism depends on a vast domain of unpaid reproductive labour—emotional support, care work, household maintenance—performed predominantly by women and systematically excluded from the category of productive labour. This reproductive labour is not merely a precondition for productive labour; it is itself value production, and its non-recognition is both economic and epistemological injustice. The GRW framework provides the ontological grounding for Federici’s analysis: what is being appropriated when emotional labour is exploited is not merely a service but a genuine form of wealth—irreducible to any commodity category, generated in the relational field, and belonging to the *between*.

The Marxist contribution and its limits. The Marxist tradition contributes two essential concepts: commodity fetishism (the mystification of relational value as a property of exchanged objects) and social reproduction (the systematic non-recognition of emotional and care labour as wealth production). Both converge with GRW theory. But the Marxist tradition remains limited by its individualist conception of the producing subject: it does not yet have the ontological resources to articulate wealth that belongs to the relational field itself.

2.4 The Capabilities Approach: Wealth as Freedom

Amartya Sen’s capabilities approach reconceives what wealth is for [25]. The goal of economic development is not the accumulation of material goods but the expansion of human capabilities—the real freedoms people have to lead lives they have reason to value. This resonates deeply with the GRW framework: the question to ask of any wealth form in intimate relations is whether it expands or constrains the relational capabilities of the parties involved.

More fundamentally, the capabilities approach points toward a reconception of relational wealth itself: not a stock of material goods but a set of capacities for relational flourishing—the capacity for joint attention, for timely sharing, for co-evolutionary receptivity, for non-possessive participation in the relational field’s generative activity. These relational capabilities are the human substrate of GRW.

The capabilities approach remains limited, however, by its individualist framework: capabilities are conceived as properties of individual persons. The GRW framework requires a relational extension: capabilities that belong to the relational field itself, jointly held and jointly developed, whose expansion constitutes relational flourishing irreducible to the sum of individual capability expansions.

2.5 The Gift Economy: Wealth as Flow and Social Bond

Marcel Mauss’s analysis of the gift reveals a conception of wealth fundamentally different from commodity logic [16]. In gift economies, wealth is not accumulated but circulated: it flows through the social body, creating and sustaining the relations that constitute community life. Like GRW, gift wealth is essentially relational—its value is constituted by the social relations it creates, not by any intrinsic property of the material object. And like GRW, gift wealth cannot simply be accumulated: the gift that is hoarded loses its relational character.

But GRW differs from gift wealth in a crucial respect: the gift can be given, received, and reciprocated—it is, at least in principle, transferable between individual parties. GRW cannot be given; it can only be generated together. The happiness jar cannot be handed from one person to another; the shared attractor landscape of a life built together cannot be transferred to a new relationship. GRW is more radically relational than the gift: it does not just flow through relations but is constituted by them, making individual ownership or transfer conceptually impossible.

2.6 Generative Justice: Wealth as Value Returned to Its Creators

Ron Eglash’s generative justice holds that value should be returned to those who generate it—that the extraction of value without return is injustice, and that just economic arrangements support and enhance the generative capacity of communities [3]. This applies directly to intimate relations: when emotional labour generates relational value that is appropriated by the dominant party rather than returned to the relational field, this is a generative justice failure.

But GRW extends this framework crucially. For Eglash, the generator of value is ultimately an individual or community. GRW holds that the primary generator of relational value is the relational field itself: the co-evolutionary dynamics produce wealth that belongs to the field, not to either individual participant. The generative justice question in intimate relations is therefore not just “whose labour produced this?” but “what conditions allow the relational field itself to be a generative system, and are those conditions being sustained?”

2.7 Non-Western Wealth Traditions

The non-Western traditions of wealth offer important correctives to the individualist presuppositions of the Western tradition.

Ubuntu philosophy (*umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*—a person is a person through other persons) holds that wealth, like personhood itself, is constituted through relations [17, 19]. The isolated individual who accumulates wealth at the expense of community relations is not wealthy but impoverished: they have gained material goods at the cost of the relational substance that constitutes full personhood.

Daoist and Buddhist economics converge on the insight that true wealth consists in non-possessive sufficiency rather than accumulation: 知足者富—those who know sufficiency are wealthy [13]. The non-possessive orientation toward relational wealth that the GRW framework recommends is the Daoist and Buddhist economic orientation applied to intimate life.

Confucian relational ethics holds that true flourishing is inseparable from the health of the relational bonds that constitute the social fabric—an implicit theory of relational wealth that anticipates the GRW framework [26].

The convergence of non-Western traditions. The non-Western wealth traditions converge on an insight the Western tradition has systematically suppressed: the deepest form of wealth is relational rather than material, generated through the cultivation of genuine relational bonds. GRW theory is, in part, the formal articulation of this ancient intuition within a contemporary philosophical and scientific framework.

2.8 The Shared Presupposition and Its Overcoming

Despite their profound differences, the major traditions in wealth theory share a structural feature that limits their application to intimate relations: they all conceive wealth primarily as a property of individuals—something that individuals have, produce, exchange, or are deprived of. Even the traditions most sensitive to the relational dimensions of wealth do not fully achieve the ontological shift that GRW requires: the relocation of the primary subject of wealth from the individual to the relational field.

This shared presupposition is not arbitrary. The most socially organised forms of wealth—the gold in the vault, the commodity in the marketplace, the capability of the individual person—are all, at least in principle, attributable to particular individuals or institutions. Relational wealth—wealth that belongs to the *between*—is systematically invisible to frameworks that begin with the individual, because it cannot be attributed to any individual without distortion.

The next section examines how wealth forms organised by individualist logic enter the intimate relational field and affect its dynamics—and specifically, how three mechanisms of individualisation destroy the conditions for GRW generation.

3. Power Structures and Wealth in Intimate Relations

The preceding section mapped the major traditions of wealth theory and identified their shared individualist presupposition. This section turns to the concrete question of how wealth forms organised by individualist and mercantilist logic actually operate within intimate relational fields—how they enter the field, what they do to the relational dynamics, and through what specific mechanisms they generate or destroy the conditions for GRW generation.

The analysis is not a moral indictment of any particular cultural practice. The historical and material conditions under which traditional wealth forms developed, and the functions they served within those conditions, are addressed in §11 under the framework of historical materialism. The present section is concerned with the structural analysis: how do specific wealth forms interact with the relational field’s co-evolutionary dynamics? The answer, we argue, turns on three mechanisms—settlement, commodification, and indebtedness—that operate, in different combinations and intensities, in both traditional and modern wealth forms in intimate relations.

3.1 Bride-Price and Gold: The Mercantilist Form in Intimate Relations

The institution of bride-price—the transfer of material wealth from the groom’s family to the bride’s family as a condition of marriage—is among the most widely distributed cultural practices in human history, appearing in various forms across sub-Saharan Africa, East and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and parts of Europe and the Americas [17]. Its contemporary forms range from the explicit payment of livestock or cash to the more implicit expectation of gifts, hospitality expenditure, and material demonstration of the groom’s capacity to support a household.

It is important, before the structural analysis, to acknowledge the diversity of meaning and function that bride-price carries across cultural contexts. In many traditions, bride-price is not understood as a purchase price for the woman but as a gift to her family expressing gratitude and establishing alliance; as a material guarantee of the groom’s commitment and capacity; as a mechanism for redistributing wealth across family networks; or as a form of social insurance that provides the bride’s family with resources in the event of the marriage’s dissolution. These functions are real and should not be dismissed in favour of a reductive reading of bride-price

as simple commodity exchange.

Nevertheless, the structural analysis reveals that bride-price, whatever its cultural framing, operates through mechanisms that have determinate effects on the intimate relational field. The question is not what bride-price *means* to the parties involved but what it *does* to the relational dynamics.

What bride-price does is introduce a pre-existing exchange structure into the intimate relational field—a structure that precedes the relation, is determined by factors external to the relational dynamics (the families’ negotiations, the cultural norms for appropriate payment, the assessment of the woman’s value by criteria external to the relation itself), and that creates a set of relational obligations that are not generated by the co-evolutionary activity of the intimate field but imposed upon it from outside.

This has three specific structural consequences for the relational field. First, it establishes a **symbolic account** of the relational value that has been transferred, making the relation legible to the symbolic order as a completed transaction. The relational value is, in this sense, pre-settled: it has been assessed, quantified, and exchanged before the intimate relation properly begins. Second, it creates a **power asymmetry** within the relational field: one party (the bride) has been the object of the exchange rather than its subject, and this asymmetry is encoded in the founding symbolic structure of the relation. Third, it generates a **baseline of expectation** about the character of relational exchange—if the founding transaction of the relation was a commodity exchange, then subsequent exchanges within the relation are more likely to be framed in terms of exchange logic rather than co-evolutionary generativity.

None of these consequences is inevitable or irreversible. Intimate relations that begin with bride-price can and do develop rich co-evolutionary dynamics that generate GRW; the founding structure does not determine the trajectory. But the structural tendency is real: bride-price introduces mercantilist logic into the founding moment of the intimate relation, and this founding moment shapes the symbolic structure within which subsequent relational dynamics unfold.

3.2 Three Mechanisms of Relational Wealth Destruction

The analysis of bride-price reveals three mechanisms that operate, in various combinations, across traditional and modern forms of wealth organisation in intimate relations. We call these settlement, commodification, and indebtedness.

3.2.1 Settlement: The Closure of Relational Value

Settlement (结算化) is the mechanism by which relational value is converted into a fixed, symbolic quantity—a price, a score, a balance—that closes the relational account. Settlement transforms relational value from an open, generative process into a closed, enumerable fact.

The paradigmatic form of settlement in intimate relations is the assignment of a monetary value to the relation itself: the bride-price that assesses the woman’s relational value as a quantity of gold; the divorce settlement that converts the shared life into a balance of assets to

be divided; the prenuptial agreement that pre-settles the distribution of relational value before the relation begins. In each case, the living, dynamic, open-ended process of co-evolutionary value generation is frozen into a snapshot—a moment at which the accounts are balanced and the value is fixed.

Settlement is destructive of GRW for a reason that follows directly from the GRW concept: GRW is constitutively non-settleable. Its value cannot be captured in any fixed quantity because it is not a stock but a process—the ongoing co-evolutionary dynamics of the relational field. To settle GRW is to kill it: the moment the relational value is fixed as a quantity and the account is closed, the co-evolutionary process that generates GRW is interrupted.

This does not mean that all formal agreements in intimate relations are settlement in the destructive sense. The distinction that [Paper XIII](#) drew between the non-binding vow and the sword of legal enforcement is relevant here [28]: an agreement that establishes the conditions for co-evolutionary activity without fixing its products is structurally different from an agreement that converts the products of co-evolutionary activity into a settled account. The former supports GRW generation; the latter destroys it.

3.2.2 Commodification: The Reduction of the Other to Exchange Value

Commodification (商品化) is the mechanism by which the relational other—the person with whom one builds a shared life—is reduced to an object with exchange value: a bundle of properties that can be assessed, compared, and traded. Commodification is the intimate relation’s form of Marx’s commodity fetishism: the irreducibly particular other, with their unique history and their specific mode of co-evolutionary participation, is reduced to a set of general, exchangeable properties.

The most explicit forms of commodification in intimate relations are the assessment of potential partners in terms of their economic value (income, assets, earning potential), their reproductive value (fertility, health, genetic endowment), or their social value (family connections, educational credentials, status). Each of these assessments reduces the other to a bundle of properties that can be compared across potential partners, as commodities are compared across markets.

But commodification operates in subtler forms within ongoing intimate relations. When one partner treats the other’s emotional labour as a service to be extracted rather than a co-evolutionary contribution to be received; when the shared life is assessed in terms of its return on investment rather than its co-evolutionary depth; when the other is valued for what they provide rather than for what they are—commodification is operating, even without explicit monetary exchange.

Commodification is destructive of GRW because GRW requires the recognition of the other as a genuine co-subject of the relational field—as someone whose particular, irreducible mode of co-evolutionary participation is constitutive of the field’s dynamics. The commodified other cannot be a genuine co-subject; they are a resource. And resources can be extracted but not co-evolved with.

3.2.3 Indebtedness: The Structural Obligation That Forecloses Generativity

Indebtedness (债务化) is the mechanism by which a structural obligation—a debt that one party owes to another—is introduced into the intimate relational field. Unlike settlement (which closes an account) and commodification (which reduces the other to exchange value), indebtedness keeps the account open—but in a way that is destructive rather than generative.

The paradigmatic form of indebtedness in intimate relations is the bride-price debt: the groom's family has made a significant material transfer to the bride's family, and this creates an implicit or explicit obligation on the bride's part to fulfil the terms of the exchange—to bear children, to maintain the household, to provide the services that the transfer was understood to purchase. The debt is structural: it does not need to be explicitly invoked to shape the relational dynamics; it is built into the founding symbolic structure of the relation.

But indebtedness is not confined to bride-price arrangements. It operates wherever one party's contribution to the intimate relation—material, emotional, or otherwise—is framed as a loan rather than a gift or a co-evolutionary investment: wherever the implicit message is “I have given you X, and you owe me Y.” This framing is destructive of GRW because it converts co-evolutionary generativity into exchange: the contributor's investment in the relational field is not received as a contribution to the shared attractor landscape but as a claim on the other's future behaviour.

The deepest form of indebtedness is not material but existential: the sense that one party owes their very existence, happiness, or security to the other, and that this debt can never be fully repaid. This existential indebtedness—which can arise from material dependency, from asymmetric emotional investment, or from cultural structures that assign one party responsibility for the other's wellbeing—is perhaps the most powerful destroyer of genuine co-evolutionary dynamics, because it converts the open, generative space of the intimate relation into a closed system of obligation and repayment.

Three mechanisms of GRW destruction. Settlement, commodification, and indebtedness are three mechanisms by which individualist and mercantilist wealth logic destroys the conditions for GRW generation in intimate relations. Settlement closes the relational account, fixing as a snapshot what is constitutively a process. Commodification reduces the co-subject of the relational field to a bundle of exchangeable properties, foreclosing genuine co-evolutionary participation. Indebtedness converts co-evolutionary generativity into a system of obligation and repayment, replacing the open space of shared becoming with the closed structure of debt.

3.3 Social Reproduction and the Invisible Wealth of Care

Federici’s analysis of social reproduction [4] identifies a further dimension of wealth destruction in intimate relations: the systematic non-recognition of care labour as wealth production. We develop this analysis here in terms of the GRW framework, showing how the non-recognition of care labour is not merely an injustice but a form of GRW destruction.

Care labour—the emotional, attentional, and physical work of maintaining the intimate relational field—is GRW’s primary production mechanism. The work of joint attention, of timely sharing, of co-evolutionary receptivity, of the non-possessive participation in the relational field’s generative activity that [Paper XIV](#) identified as the practices of relational happiness [29]: all of this is care labour in Federici’s sense. It generates GRW—the accumulated attractor landscape of the shared life—but it generates it in a form that is invisible to the dominant wealth frameworks.

This invisibility is not innocent. When care labour is not recognised as wealth production, two consequences follow. First, the care labourer is deprived of the social recognition and material support that would allow them to sustain and develop their care practice—creating the material conditions under which care labour is degraded and the GRW it generates is depleted. Second, the value generated by care labour is available to be appropriated by the non-caring party without recognition or reciprocity—a form of GRW extraction that is structurally identical to the extraction of surplus value in Marx’s account of capitalist production.

The recognition of care labour as GRW production is therefore both a matter of epistemic justice (recognising what is genuinely there) and a matter of GRW sustainability (ensuring that the conditions for GRW generation are maintained).

3.4 The Intergenerational Reproduction of Wealth Structures

Thomas Piketty’s analysis of wealth inequality [22] identifies a structural tendency of capital to reproduce and amplify itself across generations: when the rate of return on capital exceeds the rate of economic growth, wealth inequality increases over time, and the advantages of those who begin with wealth compound across generations.

This analysis applies to the intergenerational reproduction of wealth structures in intimate relations. The material wealth that a family brings to the founding of a new intimate relation—the bride-price, the dowry, the parental financial support, the inheritance—shapes the symbolic structure within which the new relation develops. Families with greater material wealth can provide their children with more favourable entry conditions into the intimate relational market; families with less material wealth are constrained in ways that limit their children’s relational possibilities.

But the intergenerational reproduction of wealth structures in intimate relations is not only material. The **symbolic capital** that Bourdieu would call the habitus of relational life—the implicit knowledge of how to navigate intimate relations, the emotional and attentional skills developed in the family of origin, the capacity for co-evolutionary participation that is culti-

vated or suppressed in childhood—is also reproduced intergenerationally. Children who grow up in relational fields rich in GRW—where care labour is valued, where emotional attunement is practised, where co-evolutionary generativity is the norm—develop the relational capabilities that make GRW generation possible in their own intimate relations. Children who grow up in relational fields organised by settlement, commodification, and indebtedness develop different habits and expectations.

This intergenerational dimension of relational wealth has a disturbing consequence: the conditions for GRW generation are themselves unequally distributed. The children of relational fields rich in GRW are better equipped to generate GRW in their own relations; the children of relational fields organised by mercantilist logic are more likely to reproduce that logic. This is a form of relational inequality that is invisible to standard measures of wealth distribution but that is, in the long run, perhaps the most consequential form of inequality in human social life.

3.5 Contemporary Forms: Consumerism, Human Capital, and Digital Extraction

The mercantilist logic that operates in traditional wealth forms in intimate relations has not disappeared in contemporary societies; it has taken new forms that are in some respects more pervasive and more insidious than the traditional ones, because they operate through cultural norms and technological systems rather than through explicit contractual structures.

Consumerism introduces settlement and commodification into intimate relations through the medium of consumption. The commodification of romantic love—the expectation that love should be expressed through the purchase of goods, that the quality of the relation is measured by the quality of the gifts exchanged, that the anniversary dinner at an expensive restaurant is the proper form of relational celebration—converts the co-evolutionary dynamics of the intimate field into a series of market transactions. The happiness jar, in this cultural environment, is replaced by the receipt: the evidence that the appropriate commodity has been purchased and the relational account has been settled for another year.

Human capital theory, associated with the work of Gary Becker, introduces the language of investment, return, and efficiency into the analysis of intimate relations [15]. Partners are assessed as human capital assets; the decision to marry is modelled as an investment decision; the allocation of time between market work and domestic labour is optimised for household income maximisation. This framework imports the full apparatus of commodity exchange logic into the most intimate dimensions of human life, converting the co-subject of the relational field into a bundle of productive capacities to be assessed and utilised.

Digital platforms have created a new form of relational wealth extraction that is unprecedented in its scale and its invisibility. The data generated by intimate relational activity—the messages, the shared photographs, the location data, the emotional expressions—is harvested by platform companies and converted into advertising revenue. This is a form of GRW extraction: the value generated by co-evolutionary activity in the intimate relational field is captured by an external party without recognition or reciprocity. The platform does not merely observe

the intimate relation; it shapes it, through algorithmic design that optimises for engagement rather than for co-evolutionary depth, thereby actively degrading the conditions for GRW generation while extracting the value that the degraded relation still produces.

Contemporary forms of GRW extraction. Contemporary consumerism, human capital theory, and digital platform extraction represent new forms of the mercantilist logic that operates in traditional wealth forms in intimate relations. Each converts the co-evolutionary dynamics of the intimate field into a system of market transactions, reducing the co-subject to a bundle of exchangeable properties and extracting the value generated by relational activity without recognition or reciprocity. The scale and invisibility of digital platform extraction make it perhaps the most significant contemporary threat to GRW generation.

4. The Dialectic of Freedom and Wealth in Intimate Relations

The preceding section showed how wealth forms organised by mercantilist and individualist logic destroy the conditions for GRW generation through three mechanisms: settlement, commodification, and indebtedness. This section confronts the dialectical tension that this analysis generates: if traditional wealth forms in intimate relations are structurally destructive of GRW, does it follow that intimate relations should be organised without material wealth? The answer is unequivocally no—and the reasons for this negative answer are philosophically important.

The core dialectical tension is this: **power-structured occupation of intimate relations through wealth destroys relational freedom; but material poverty equally destroys relational freedom.** Any adequate account of wealth in intimate relations must navigate between these two forms of destruction—must show how material wealth can be organised in ways that support rather than undermine the conditions for GRW generation. This navigation is the task of the present section, which examines four theoretical approaches to the freedom-wealth dialectic before proposing the GRB framework’s resolution.

4.1 The Liberal Solution: Property Rights as the Foundation of Freedom

The liberal tradition, associated with Locke, Mill, and their successors, holds that freedom requires property: that the individual who lacks secure property rights is vulnerable to domination by those who control the material conditions of their existence, and that the protection of property rights is therefore a precondition for the exercise of genuine freedom [25].

Applied to intimate relations, the liberal argument takes the following form: the party who enters an intimate relation without independent material resources is structurally dependent on the other party and therefore structurally unfree. The woman who has no independent income, no property in her own name, and no legal claim to the shared assets of the marriage is not a

free participant in the intimate relation; she is a dependent, whose continued participation in the relation is conditioned by the other party's willingness to maintain her. Bride-price, on a liberal reading, can even be defended as a form of property right: it provides the bride's family with material resources that partially compensate for the loss of their daughter's productive contribution, and it establishes a material baseline of security for the new relation.

The liberal solution captures something important: material dependency is a genuine threat to relational freedom, and the protection of individual property rights is a genuine, if partial, remedy. But the liberal solution has a structural limitation that is directly relevant to the GRW framework: it addresses the problem of material dependency by extending the logic of individual property rights into the intimate relational field, thereby intensifying the individualist logic that is itself one of the primary threats to GRW generation.

The prenuptial agreement is the liberal solution's purest expression in intimate relations: it protects each party's individual property rights by pre-settling the distribution of assets in the event of the relation's dissolution. As §?? argued, this pre-settlement introduces settlement logic into the founding structure of the relation, creating a symbolic account of the relational value that constrains the co-evolutionary dynamics before they have properly begun. The liberal solution to the problem of material dependency creates a new problem: the juridification of intimate life, the conversion of the co-evolutionary relational field into a contractual arrangement between property-holding individuals.

The liberal paradox. The liberal solution to the problem of material dependency in intimate relations—the extension of individual property rights into the relational field—addresses a genuine threat to relational freedom while intensifying the individualist wealth logic that is itself a primary threat to GRW generation. Property rights protect individuals from dependency; they do not protect the relational field from the settlement, commodification, and indebtedness that individualist wealth logic introduces.

4.2 The Marxist Solution: Liberation Through the Abolition of Property Relations

The Marxist tradition holds that the liberal solution addresses the symptom rather than the disease: property rights protect individuals within the existing system of property relations, but they do not challenge the system itself. The genuine solution to the problem of material dependency in intimate relations requires the transformation of the material conditions under which intimate relations are organised—the abolition of the property relations that make some people structurally dependent on others, and the social recognition and material support of the reproductive labour that sustains intimate and family life [4].

Applied concretely to intimate relations, the Marxist solution demands: the socialisation of care

labour (through public childcare, eldercare, and household support); the recognition of emotional and reproductive labour as socially productive work deserving material compensation; and the elimination of the material dependency that makes one party structurally vulnerable to the other's wealth and power.

The Marxist solution is more radical than the liberal one and addresses a deeper level of the problem. By targeting the material conditions rather than the individual's legal position, it aims to transform the structural environment within which intimate relations unfold rather than merely adjusting the terms of the existing arrangement. The GRW framework is in substantial agreement with the Marxist diagnosis: the material conditions of intimate life—the distribution of care work, the recognition of reproductive labour, the material security of all parties—are genuine prerequisites for GRW generation, and their transformation is a political task of the first importance.

But the Marxist solution, like the liberal one, remains limited by a presupposition that the GRW framework challenges: the presupposition that the primary subject of flourishing is the individual (or, in the collective Marxist version, the class). The Marxist solution aims to liberate individuals from material dependency; it does not yet have the ontological resources to articulate the conditions for the flourishing of the relational field itself. The abolition of property relations would remove one major obstacle to GRW generation; it would not, by itself, generate GRW.

4.3 Sen's Solution: Capabilities as the Measure of Relational Freedom

Amartya Sen's capabilities approach offers a more nuanced framework for thinking about freedom in intimate relations [25]. For Sen, freedom is not the absence of material dependency (the liberal conception) nor the abolition of property relations (the Marxist conception) but the expansion of capabilities—the real freedoms that people have to live lives they have reason to value. The measure of relational freedom, on this account, is not the distribution of property rights but the capabilities of each party: their capacity to exit unsatisfactory relations, to contribute their full selves to the relational field, to pursue their own conceptions of the good life within and alongside the intimate relation.

The capabilities approach resonates with the GRW framework at several points. Its insistence that material wealth is instrumentally rather than intrinsically valuable—that what matters is what wealth enables people to do and be, not the wealth itself—supports the GRW framework's claim that material wealth in intimate relations matters not in itself but as a condition for GRW generation. Its attention to the specific capabilities that matter for relational flourishing—the capacity for exit, for self-expression, for genuine participation—corresponds to what the GRW framework calls the conditions for co-evolutionary participation.

Martha Nussbaum's extension of the capabilities approach is particularly relevant [10]. Nussbaum's list of central human capabilities includes not only material capabilities (bodily health, bodily integrity, the ability to control one's environment) but capabilities that are constitutively relational: the capability for affiliation (being able to live with and toward others, to

have the social bases of self-respect), the capability for play, and the capability for emotional development. These relational capabilities are the substrate of GRW generation: they are what makes genuine co-evolutionary participation possible, and their development is itself a form of relational wealth.

The GRW framework extends the capabilities approach in a crucial direction: it insists that the capabilities relevant to intimate relational flourishing are not only individual capabilities but **relational capabilities**—capabilities that belong to the relational field itself, that are jointly held and jointly developed, and whose expansion constitutes relational flourishing irreducible to the sum of individual capability expansions. The capability for joint attention, for timely sharing, for co-evolutionary receptivity: these are relational capabilities in this sense, and their development is GRW generation.

4.4 The GRB Resolution: Relational Freedom Requires Relational Wealth

The GRB framework proposes a resolution to the freedom-wealth dialectic that draws on all three preceding approaches while going beyond each.

The resolution begins with an acknowledgement that the preceding section may have obscured: **material wealth is a necessary condition for GRW generation**. This is not a concession to the mercantilist view but a straightforward empirical observation: intimate relations that are under severe material stress—characterised by poverty, insecurity, and the constant pressure of material survival—cannot sustain the quality of co-present attention, timely sharing, and co-evolutionary receptivity that GRW generation requires. Poverty does not merely deprive the parties of material goods; it degrades the relational field itself, raising the threshold for co-evolutionary engagement and depleting the attentional and emotional resources that GRW generation requires.

This means that the political project of securing the material conditions for intimate relational flourishing—the recognition and compensation of care labour, the provision of material security for all parties, the elimination of the structural dependencies that make one party vulnerable to the other’s material power—is not an alternative to the project of GRW generation but its prerequisite. Without adequate material conditions, GRW cannot be generated; the political economy of intimate relations cannot be separated from the political economy of social reproduction.

But material wealth, as the analysis of §3 showed, is not sufficient for GRW generation and can actively undermine it when organised according to mercantilist logic. The sufficient condition for GRW generation is not material wealth per se but **relational wealth**: the accumulated attractor landscape of a shared life, built through the co-evolutionary dynamics of joint attention, timely sharing, and non-possessive participation in the relational field’s generative activity.

The GRB resolution therefore takes the following form:

Material wealth (the necessary condition, the secondary aspect of the dialectical contradiction) provides the foundation without which relational flourishing is impossible. It must be

sufficient—adequate to remove the material stresses that degrade co-evolutionary dynamics—but it is not itself the goal.

Relational wealth (GRW, the primary aspect of the dialectical contradiction) is the goal: the accumulated product of co-evolutionary activity in the intimate relational field, inexhaustible in the taking and augmented by use, belonging to the *between* rather than to either party.

The dialectical relation between material wealth and GRW is one of necessary but asymmetric dependence: GRW cannot be generated without adequate material conditions (the secondary aspect is necessary); but adequate material conditions do not automatically generate GRW (the primary aspect is not reducible to the secondary). The practical task is to organise material wealth in ways that provide the necessary conditions for GRW generation without introducing the settlement, commodification, and indebtedness that destroy those conditions.

The GRB resolution of the freedom-wealth dialectic. Relational freedom in intimate relations requires both material wealth (as necessary condition) and relational wealth (as primary form of flourishing). Material wealth organised according to mercantilist logic destroys relational freedom by introducing settlement, commodification, and indebtedness into the relational field. Material poverty equally destroys relational freedom by degrading the conditions for co-evolutionary participation. The resolution requires organising material wealth as a condition for GRW generation rather than as a substitute for it: sufficient to remove material stress from the relational field, but structured so as not to introduce the individualising mechanisms that foreclose co-evolutionary dynamics.

4.5 The Practical Shape of the Resolution

The theoretical resolution of the freedom-wealth dialectic takes a concrete shape in the practices of intimate relational life. Several practical implications follow directly from the analysis.

The threshold principle: Material wealth in intimate relations should be organised to meet a threshold—sufficient to remove material stress from the relational field—rather than to maximise accumulation. Above the threshold, additional material wealth does not generate additional GRW and may actively undermine it by introducing the accumulation logic that is structurally alien to co-evolutionary dynamics.

The non-settlement principle: Material arrangements in intimate relations should be structured as conditions for co-evolutionary activity rather than as settlements of its products. The question to ask of any material arrangement is not “does this fairly distribute what we have created together?” but “does this create the conditions under which we can continue to create together?”

The recognition principle: The care labour and emotional labour that generate GRW should be recognised—materially, socially, and symbolically—as the primary form of wealth production in intimate relations. This recognition is not merely a matter of justice (though it is that); it is a condition for the sustainability of GRW generation.

The non-possessive principle: Material wealth in intimate relations should be organised according to the Daoist ethic of *xuande*—生而不有，为而不恃，长而不宰—to the extent that the material conditions allow. The accumulation of material wealth as a form of power over the other, as a guarantee of the other’s continued participation in the relation, or as a compensation for the absence of GRW, is the clearest expression of the mercantilist logic that the GRW framework opposes.

With this resolution of the freedom-wealth dialectic in place, we are ready to develop the concept of GRW in full theoretical detail. The next section undertakes that development, moving from the preliminary characterisation of GRW as the primary form of wealth in intimate relations to a formal account of its structure, its generation, and its dynamics.

5. Generative Relational Wealth: Theoretical Construction

The preceding sections have prepared the ground for the central theoretical contribution of this paper. We have surveyed the major traditions of wealth theory and identified their shared individualist presupposition (§2); we have shown how wealth forms organised by mercantilist logic destroy the conditions for relational co-evolution through three specific mechanisms (§3); and we have proposed a resolution of the freedom-wealth dialectic that places GRW at the centre of intimate relational flourishing (§4). We are now in a position to develop the concept of Generative Relational Wealth in full theoretical detail.

The development proceeds through ten stages: the preliminary negative definition, the gift paradigm, the generative justice grounding, the Daoist ethical foundation, the formal positive definition, the four essential features, the comparison with other wealth forms, the philosophical foundations, the self-generating structure, and finally—the paper’s most original formal contribution—the analysis of GRW’s inexhaustibility through the concept of the relational structural remainder.

5.1 The Preliminary Negative Definition: What GRW Is Not

The most useful initial approach to GRW is negative: GRW is not any of the forms of wealth that the preceding survey has identified. This *via negativa* is not merely rhetorical; it is a precise philosophical move, because the forms of wealth that GRW is not are precisely the forms that the major wealth theories have described, and the differences are precisely where those theories fall short of the intimate relational field.

GRW is **not accumulative**: it does not grow by adding discrete units to a stock. The happiness jar does not contain a countable number of happiness-units; the shared attractor landscape of a life built together is not a sum of individual good moments. GRW grows through structural

modification of the relational field—through the deepening of attractor basins, the strengthening of coupling, the expansion of the shared phase space—and this structural modification is not additive in any straightforward sense.

GRW is **not settleable**: its value cannot be fixed as a quantity and closed as an account. Every attempt to settle GRW—to say “this is what our relation is worth, this is what I am owed, this is what has been paid”—is an attempt to convert a living process into a frozen snapshot, which kills the process in the act of capturing it.

GRW is **not individually possessable**: it cannot be owned by either party to the relation. The shared attractor landscape of a life together belongs to the *between*; it is held by the relational field, not by the individuals who compose it. This does not mean that the individuals do not benefit from GRW—they do, profoundly—but the benefit is not ownership. GRW is more like the air in a shared space than like the money in a wallet: both parties breathe it, both parties need it, but neither can take their share and leave.

5.2 The Gift Paradigm: GRW as More Radically Relational Than the Gift

Mauss’s gift economy, as §2.5 noted, is the existing wealth theory that comes closest to GRW [16]. Gift wealth is essentially relational—its value is constituted by the social bonds it creates—and it cannot simply be accumulated without ceasing to be a gift. In Paper IX, the gift was identified as the unique material object that simultaneously inhabits all three registers: the imaginary (as the idealised expression of the giver’s feeling), the symbolic (as the socially sanctioned form of relational expression), and the real (as the material trace of the giving act that cannot be fully symbolised) [27].

The gift paradigm illuminates GRW by showing what it would mean for wealth to be constitutively relational rather than individually held. But GRW goes beyond the gift in a crucial respect that deserves careful attention: **the gift can be given; GRW can only be generated together**.

Consider what this means. A gift is produced by one party (the giver), transferred to another (the receiver), and becomes the receiver’s property. Even in Mauss’s account, where the gift creates obligations of reciprocity and the exchange of gifts creates social bonds, the gift itself is a discrete object that passes from one party to another. GRW cannot pass from one party to another because it was never in one party to begin with. It arises in the *between*—in the shared attentional field, the joint trajectory through the relational phase space, the coupled attractor dynamics—and it belongs to the *between* in a constitutive rather than a contingent sense.

This means that GRW cannot be given as an expression of love, generosity, or commitment. It can only be **generated**—generated together, through the co-evolutionary dynamics that the practices of relational attentiveness make possible. The lover who tries to give their beloved GRW has misunderstood both the gift and the wealth: what they can give is the conditions for GRW generation (time, presence, attentiveness, non-possessive participation), but the GRW

itself arises from the relational field in response to these conditions, not from either party individually.

5.3 Generative Justice and the Return of Value to the Field

Eglash’s generative justice framework [3] provides the ethical grounding for GRW: the principle that value should be returned to those who generate it. Applied to intimate relations, this principle takes a distinctive form: since GRW is generated by the relational field itself—by the co-evolutionary dynamics of joint attention, timely sharing, and mutual structural modification—the value it generates should be returned to the relational field rather than extracted by either party individually.

This is not merely a principle of fair distribution but a principle of GRW sustainability: value extracted from the relational field without return depletes the field’s generative capacity, degrading the co-evolutionary dynamics that generate GRW and eventually destroying the conditions for GRW generation altogether. The extraction of relational value—through the appropriation of emotional labour, the commodification of shared experience, the conversion of co-evolutionary achievements into individual social capital—is not merely unjust; it is self-defeating, because it destroys the source of the value being extracted.

The generative justice principle applied to GRW has a specific practical content: **no party should be reduced to a generator of relational value for the other’s benefit**. This is what Paper IX called the evil cycle in its intimate relational form [27]: one party’s generative capacity is used as fuel for the other’s accumulation, with nothing returned to sustain the generator’s generative capacity. The evil cycle is not merely unjust; it is unstable, because the generator’s capacity is finite and their depletion eventually destroys the source of the extractor’s benefit.

5.4 Non-Possessive Wealth: *Xuande* as the Ethical Foundation of GRW

The Daoist concept of *xuande* (玄德)—the dark virtue: 生而不有，为而不恃，长而不宰—provides the ethical foundation for the GRW framework [13]. To generate without possessing, to act without presuming on the result, to foster without ruling: this is not a counsel of indifference or passivity but a description of the highest form of productive activity—the activity that generates most richly precisely because it does not grasp at what it generates.

Xuande is the relational ethic of GRW generation: the orientation that allows the relational field to be what it is, that does not grasp at the happiness that arises in it but receives it with gratitude and lets it pass, that does not try to hold the flower beyond its moment but attends to the root that makes it possible. The party who practises *xuande* in intimate life does not try to accumulate GRW as individual property; they participate in the co-evolutionary dynamics that generate it, receive what arises from the *between* as a gift of the field’s generativity, and return it to the field through continued non-possessive participation.

The connection between *xuande* and GRW sustainability is not merely ethical but dynamical.

In the formal language of [Paper XIV \[29\]](#): the party who tries to possess GRW—who claims the shared attractor landscape as their individual property, who uses the accumulated holonomy of the shared life as leverage in relational power struggles, who converts the field’s generativity into individual social capital—is thereby raising the threshold for relational spikes, reducing the coupling coefficient of the relational system, and accelerating the degradation of the shared attractor landscape. Possession destroys the possessed.

5.5 The Formal Positive Definition of GRW

With the negative definition, the gift paradigm, the generative justice grounding, and the Daoist ethical foundation in place, we can now state the formal positive definition of GRW.

Formal definition of GRW. Generative Relational Wealth ($\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$) is the accumulated structural modification of the relational attractor landscape produced by co-evolutionary activity in the intimate relational field. It is characterised by:

1. **Relational substrate:** $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$ is stored in the geometry of the relational field—in the depth of shared attractor basins, the strength of coupling, the richness of the shared phase space—rather than in any material or symbolic medium.
2. **Co-evolutionary origin:** $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$ is generated exclusively through the joint trajectory of the coupled relational system through its phase space; it cannot be produced by either party individually.
3. **Non-depletion under use:** Use of $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$ (through memory, re-traversal, artistic processing) does not diminish the structural modifications that constitute it; re-traversal may produce additional holonomy, thereby augmenting $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$.
4. **Non-possessability:** $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$ cannot be owned by either party; it is held by the relational field and accessible only through co-present participation in the field’s dynamics.

$\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$ is the self-fuel of the relational field: generated through co-evolution, it becomes the dynamic condition for further co-evolution, constituting the generative relational cycle whose positive holonomy accumulation is the formal content of relational flourishing.

5.6 The Four Essential Features of GRW

The formal definition entails four essential features of GRW that distinguish it from all other wealth forms. Each feature has both a formal content (derivable from the dynamical systems framework of [Paper XIV](#)) and a phenomenological correlate (identifiable in the lived experience of intimate relational life).

Irreducibility (不可还原性): GRW cannot be decomposed into individual contributions or individual shares. The shared attractor landscape of a life built together is not the sum of each party’s individual contributions; it is an emergent property of the coupled dynamical system, arising at the level of the system and not reducible to the level of its components. Formally: the attractor $\mathcal{A}_{\text{rel}}$ of the coupled system is not in the product of the individual attractors $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$. Phenomenologically: the happiness of the shared moment cannot be divided—“my half of the happiness” is not a coherent concept.

Non-depletion under use (使用不消耗): Re-traversal of GRW—through memory, re-reading of shared journals, viewing of shared photographs, return to shared places, artistic processing of shared experience—does not diminish the structural modifications that constitute GRW. This is the feature that most strikingly distinguishes GRW from all material wealth forms: use does not deplete but may augment. Formally: re-traversal of the relational phase space accumulates additional holonomy, which constitutes additional structural modification of the relational attractor landscape. Phenomenologically: the couple who revisits a shared memory does not thereby exhaust it; the memory is, if anything, richer for having been revisited.

Generative accumulation (生成性积累): GRW grows through co-evolutionary activity, not through extraction or exchange. Its accumulation is not the result of one party giving something to the other (extraction from one’s resources to supplement the other’s) but of both parties jointly traversing the relational phase space in ways that produce new structural modifications. Formally: $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}(t) = \int_0^t \delta \mathcal{A}_{\text{rel}}(\tau) d\tau$, where $\delta \mathcal{A}_{\text{rel}}$ is the infinitesimal structural modification produced at each moment by the coupled co-evolutionary dynamics. Phenomenologically: GRW does not feel like something one party gives and the other receives; it feels like something that arises from the *between*, jointly and without individual authorship.

Non-possessability (不可占有性): GRW cannot be owned by either party. Any attempt to possess GRW—to claim the shared attractor landscape as individual property, to use the accumulated holonomy of the shared life as leverage in relational power struggles—destroys the GRW it attempts to possess, because possession converts the co-evolutionary dynamic into a possessive one, raising the threshold for relational spikes and reducing the coupling coefficient of the system. Formally: the operator of individual possession $\hat{P}_i$ applied to $\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}$ yields $\hat{P}_i(\mathcal{W}_{\text{rel}}) = 0$ —possession annihilates what it attempts to capture. Phenomenologically: the moment one tries to hold the shared happiness as one’s own, it begins to slip away.

5.7 Comparison with Other Wealth Forms

The four essential features of GRW allow a systematic comparison with the major wealth forms identified in §2:

	Material	Gift	Capability	GRW
Accumulation mechanism	Extraction/exchange	Giving/receiving	Individual development	Co-evolution
Effect of use	Depletion	Transfer/flow	Enhancement	Non-depletion
Primary subject	Individual	Social bond	Individual	Relational field
Possessable?	Yes	Partially	Yes	No
Settleable?	Yes	Partially	Yes	No
Externally verifiable?	Yes	Partially	Yes	No

The table reveals the systematic difference between GRW and all other wealth forms: GRW is the only form of wealth whose accumulation mechanism is co-evolution, whose use does not deplete, whose primary subject is the relational field rather than the individual, and which is neither possessable, settleable, nor externally verifiable. These features are not incidental but essential: they follow directly from the relational ontology that grounds the GRW concept.

5.8 The Self-Generating Structure of GRW

The most philosophically important feature of GRW is its self-generating structure—the feature that the paper’s epigraph invokes with the Daoist phrase 取之不尽，用之不竭: inexhaustible in the taking, inexhaustible in the using.

The self-generating structure is this: GRW is generated by co-evolutionary activity; co-evolutionary activity is supported and deepened by GRW; therefore GRW supports its own generation. The generative relational cycle is self-sustaining because its fuel—GRW—is produced by the same activity that it fuels.

More precisely: the shared attractor landscape produced by past co-evolutionary activity lowers the threshold for future co-evolutionary engagement (by deepening the coupling, expanding the shared phase space, and increasing the relational field’s sensitivity to contingent events); the lowered threshold makes future co-evolutionary activity more frequent and more generative; the more frequent and more generative co-evolutionary activity produces deeper structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape; and so on. GRW generates the conditions for its own augmentation.

This self-generating structure is what distinguishes the good relational cycle from the bad one in the terms of [Paper IX](#) [27]. The good cycle is characterised by positive holonomy accumulation: each traversal of the relational cycle returns to a point that carries the accumulated phase of all previous traversals, making the next traversal richer than the last. The bad cycle is characterised by zero or negative holonomy: each traversal returns to the same point or a diminished one, producing neither growth nor deepening. GRW is the accumulated positive

holonomy of the good cycle: it is what makes the cycle spiral rather than merely circle.

5.9 The Structural Remainder: Why GRW Is Inexhaustible

The claim that GRW is inexhaustible under use requires a more precise account. Why does re-traversal of the relational phase space not deplete the structural modifications that constitute GRW? This question is not trivial: in ordinary dynamical systems, repeated traversal of the same trajectory tends to produce diminishing returns as the system's response habituates to the familiar stimulus.

The answer lies in what we call the **structural remainder**: the non-zero difference between the structural modification produced by the original traversal and the structural modification produced by the re-traversal. This remainder exists because no two traversals of the relational phase space are identical: the re-traversal occurs in a different context (different attractor landscape, different coupling state, different individual states of the two parties) from the original traversal, and the structural modification it produces is therefore different from the original modification. The difference is the structural remainder.

Formally: let x denote the original traversal and $O(x)$ denote the re-traversal (processed through the operator O of memory, artistic processing, or creative re-engagement). The structural remainder is:

$$\mathcal{R}(O(x), x) \neq 0$$

This non-zero remainder is the source of GRW's inexhaustibility. Each re-traversal produces a structural modification that is not identical to the original—that carries new information about the relational field's current state, the current context, and the current mode of co-evolutionary engagement. The happiness jar does not deplete because each act of taking from it is also an act of adding to it: the re-traversal that constitutes the taking also constitutes a new structural modification that enriches the landscape from which the next taking will occur.

Open question. **The origin of the operator O .** The structural remainder argument presupposes that the operator O is non-trivial—that it transforms the original traversal x into something genuinely different rather than merely reproducing it. Where does the operator O come from? Is it freely chosen by the parties? Is it partially determined by the relational field's current state? Is it jointly constrained by all three registers—the imaginary (the idealised memory of the original experience), the symbolic (the cultural and linguistic resources available for re-engagement), and the real (the irreducible particularity of the original experience that exceeds all symbolisation)? These questions are currently open; §6 develops the partial answer that semiotics and psychoanalytic theory can provide.

5.10 Advantages, Value, and Honest Limitations

GRW has several advantages over material wealth forms as the organising principle of intimate relational flourishing.

Crisis resilience: GRW is not subject to the material vulnerabilities that threaten material wealth—inflation, market fluctuations, theft, physical deterioration. The shared attractor landscape of a life built together is not destroyed by economic crisis; if anything, shared adversity, navigated together through the co-evolutionary receptivity that [Paper XIV](#) described [29], can deepen the attractor landscape and augment GRW. This is the formal content of the phenomenological observation that the deepest intimacies are often forged in adversity rather than in prosperity.

Self-augmentation: Unlike material wealth, which depletes under use, GRW augments under the right kind of use. The couple who revisits shared memories, who processes shared experience through artistic creation, who re-traverses the relational phase space through co-present engagement, does not thereby exhaust their GRW; they augment it. This self-augmenting property makes GRW the only form of wealth that becomes more valuable the more it is used—a property that has no analogue in any material wealth theory.

Non-zero-sum: GRW generation is not a competition. One party's generation of GRW does not diminish the other's; both parties are enriched by each co-evolutionary event, and the enrichment of one is the enrichment of the relational field that both inhabit. This non-zero-sum character is what makes the GRW framework fundamentally different from mercantilist logic: in the domain of GRW, there is no trade-off between individual benefit and shared benefit.

These advantages must be stated alongside an equally honest acknowledgement of GRW's **limitations**.

Material dependency: GRW cannot be generated without adequate material conditions. Severe material stress—poverty, insecurity, the constant pressure of survival—raises the threshold for co-evolutionary engagement and depletes the attentional and emotional resources that GRW generation requires. GRW is not a substitute for material wealth; it is a complement to it, possible only when the material conditions are sufficient.

Epistemic opacity: GRW is not externally verifiable, not settleable, and not individually possessable. This epistemic opacity creates genuine practical difficulties: it makes GRW invisible to the legal, economic, and social systems that organise material wealth; it makes it difficult for the parties themselves to assess the state of their relational field's GRW; and it makes GRW vulnerable to the epistemic injustices analysed in §12—the systematic misrecognition or denial of GRW by one party to the other.

Vulnerability to destruction: GRW, for all its self-augmenting properties, can be destroyed. Sustained betrayal, the systematic application of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness, or the radical asymmetry of co-evolutionary participation (where one party bears all the

costs of generating GRW while the other extracts all the benefits) can deplete the relational field's structural modifications and destroy the conditions for further GRW generation. The good cycle, if sufficiently disrupted, can become the bad cycle; the spiral can collapse into the circle or the downward spiral.

5.11 The Happiness Jar: GRW in Practice

The abstract theoretical account of GRW finds its most accessible concrete realisation in what we call the **happiness jar** (幸福储蓄罐): a practice in which intimate partners record moments of shared happiness—the flower noticed on a path, the evening of wordless co-presence, the unexpected discovery of a shared delight—and return to these records at moments when the relational field is under stress, depleted, or in danger of collapsing into the bad cycle.

The happiness jar is a thought experiment as much as a literal practice: it need not involve a physical jar or written records (though these are perfectly legitimate realisations). What it names is the general practice of **intentional GRW re-traversal**: the deliberate return to the traces of past co-evolutionary events as a means of reactivating the co-evolutionary dynamics of the relational field when those dynamics have been weakened by stress, habituation, or the accumulation of unshared contingency.

Why the jar works: the mechanism of re-traversal. When the couple returns to the traces of a past co-evolutionary event—reading an old message, viewing a shared photograph, returning to a place where something significant happened, or processing the shared experience through artistic creation—they are not merely recalling a memory. They are re-traversing the relational phase space in the vicinity of the original event, producing a structural modification that is similar to but not identical with the original. The non-zero remainder $\mathcal{R}(O(x), x)$ ensures that the re-traversal produces new GRW rather than merely restoring the old; the happiness jar is not a savings account from which withdrawals deplete the balance but a garden that grows when tended.

Artistic processing as high-fidelity re-traversal. Among the various forms that GRW re-traversal can take, artistic processing occupies a special position. When shared experience is processed into a poem, a painting, a piece of music, a story, or any other form of artistic expression, the processing act is simultaneously a re-traversal (engaging with the original experience) and a structural transformation (producing a new symbolic object that carries the experience's topological structure in a new form). The artistic product is a high-fidelity record of the relational phase space trajectory that generated it—not a literal reproduction of the experience but a structural analogue of it, preserving the experience's dynamical form while transforming its content. This high-fidelity record supports particularly rich re-traversals: each engagement with the artistic product is a new traversal of the relational phase space, producing new holonomy and augmenting GRW.

Why the jar can reignite a withering cycle. The happiness jar is most important not in moments of relational richness but in moments of relational stress—when the cycle has become thin, when the coupling has weakened, when the shared attractor landscape has been depleted

by the accumulation of unshared contingency or the sustained application of settlement logic. In these moments, the happiness jar offers a means of reintroducing positive holonomy into the relational system: a way of re-establishing contact with the richer relational field that existed before the depletion, and of using that contact to reactivate the co-evolutionary dynamics that can restore and deepen the field.

The mechanism by which re-traversal reignites a withering cycle is analysed in detail in §6, which examines the symbolic structure of the happiness jar and the psychoanalytic dynamics of GRW re-traversal. The short answer, which the semiotics section will develop formally, is that the operator $O(x)$ —the artistic processing or intentional re-engagement with the trace of a past co-evolutionary event—produces a new symbolic structure x' that stands in a non-trivial relation $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ to the original. This relation, when it genuinely engages the relational field rather than merely reproducing the original symbolisation, opens a new interval between the symbolic and the real—the Δ that is the source of relational drive (*Trieb*) and the condition for continued co-evolutionary generativity.

6. The Semiotics of the Happiness Jar: Trace, Projection, and Poetic Suture

The previous section introduced the happiness jar as the paradigmatic practice of GRW re-traversal and identified the structural remainder $\mathcal{R}(O(x), x) \neq 0$ as the formal basis of GRW's inexhaustibility. It deferred the question of how, precisely, the operator O works—what kind of symbolic operation artistic processing is, and why it can reignite a withering relational cycle. This section addresses that question from multiple angles: semiotics, psychoanalysis, phenomenology, and theoretical physics. The convergence of these frameworks on a single structural insight is itself philosophically significant.

The central tension that the section must resolve is this: GRW is, by definition, a phenomenon of the real register—it is stored in the structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape, irreducible to any symbolic representation. Yet the happiness jar is an essentially symbolic practice: it involves recording (converting experience into symbols), processing (transforming symbols into new symbols), and re-engaging (reading symbols to re-access experience). If GRW is real and the happiness jar is symbolic, how can the symbolic practice access and augment the real wealth?

The answer, we will argue, is that the symbolic practice does not directly access the real; rather, it constructs a relation between two symbolic structures— x and $x' = O(x)$ —and it is this **relation between relations** that makes contact with the real possible. The symbolic practice creates a structural interval that resonates with the real's relational structure, and this resonance—not representation—is the mechanism by which the happiness jar works.

6.1 The Core Paradox: Symbolising the Unsymbolisable

We begin by stating the paradox with precision. GRW is constitutively not fully symbolisable: it is stored in the geometry of the relational field, in the depth of shared attractor basins, in the accumulated holonomy of co-evolutionary trajectories. None of these can be fully captured in any symbolic record. The photograph of the flower on the path does not contain the quality of shared attention that made noticing the flower a relational event; the diary entry does not contain the warmth of the co-present moment it describes; the poem does not contain the particular texture of the shared experience it evokes.

And yet the photograph, the diary entry, and the poem are not meaningless with respect to the GRW they partially record. They are not representations that succeed or fail at capturing the original experience; they are something more interesting and more functional. To understand what they are, we must examine the semiotic categories available to us.

6.2 The Record as Index: Trace Rather Than Representation

Charles Sanders Peirce’s tripartite classification of signs—icon (resemblance), symbol (convention), index (causal or existential connection)—provides the first essential tool [21]. Of the three sign types, the index is the most directly relevant to the happiness jar’s records.

An index is a sign that is connected to its object not by resemblance (like an icon) or by convention (like a symbol) but by a real, existential connection: the smoke that indexes fire, the footprint that indexes the passing animal, the photograph that indexes the light that existed when the shutter opened. The index does not *resemble* its object; it is *caused by* it, or *continuous with* it, or *a trace of* it.

The records in the happiness jar are indices in this precise sense: they are traces of the co-evolutionary events that generated them. The diary entry was written in the aftermath of the shared moment; the photograph was taken in its midst; the poem was composed in the presence of the experience it evokes. Each record carries an existential connection to the co-evolutionary event that produced it—not a resemblance to it, not a conventional representation of it, but a genuine causal trace.

This indexical character is what makes the happiness jar records valuable in a way that mere descriptions would not be. A description of a co-evolutionary event—“we saw a beautiful flower and felt happy together”—is a symbolic sign: it conveys propositional content about the event but has no existential connection to it. The index, by contrast, carries the event’s trace within itself: the photograph’s grain is continuous with the light of that moment; the diary entry’s handwriting is continuous with the emotional state of the writer at that time. When the couple re-engages with the index, they are not reading a description of the past event; they are touching the trace of it—the existential thread that connects the present moment to the past co-evolutionary event.

The record as index. The records in the happiness jar are indices rather than representations: they are existential traces of the co-evolutionary events that generated them, carrying a real connection to those events that symbolic descriptions do not carry. This indexical character is what makes re-engagement with the records a genuine re-traversal of the relational phase space rather than a merely cognitive recall of past events.

6.3 Artistic Processing as Topological Projection

The simple record—the photograph, the diary entry—is an index. But artistic processing produces something more complex: a new symbolic object $x' = O(x)$ that stands in a specific relation to the original record x and, through x , to the original co-evolutionary event. What kind of sign is x' ?

x' is not an index of the original event in the same sense as x : it was not produced in the moment of the event but at a later time, through a deliberate creative act. Nor is it simply an icon (a resemblance) or a symbol (a convention). It is something more specific: a **topological projection** of the original event's structural dynamics.

By topological projection, we mean the following. The original co-evolutionary event had a specific trajectory in the relational phase space: a specific path through the space of joint attentional states, emotional registers, and bodily dispositions. This trajectory has a topological structure—it has curvature, it produces holonomy, it creates specific attractors in the phase space. A topological projection preserves this structure while transforming the content: it maps the original trajectory into a new medium (words, images, music, movement) in a way that retains the trajectory's topological properties while changing its material realisation.

Walter Benjamin's concept of *Aura*—the unique, irreplaceable quality of an original work of art that is tied to its specific location in space and time, and that cannot be reproduced through mechanical means [2]—captures something of what we mean by topological projection. The artistic processing of a shared experience produces a work that carries the *Aura* of the original event: not as a copy of the event but as a unique witness to it, a record of its topological structure in a new material form. The work cannot be reproduced because it is indexed to the specific trajectory of the co-evolutionary event that generated it; no other trajectory could have produced exactly this work.

6.4 Poetic Suture: Anchoring Without Closing

Lacanian psychoanalysis introduces the concept of the *point de capiton* (quilting point or suture point): the master signifier that arrests the endless sliding of the signifying chain and produces a temporary fixation of meaning [12]. Without suture points, meaning slides indefinitely; with them, it is anchored—temporarily, locally, revocably—to a specific position in the symbolic order.

The happiness jar’s records function as suture points, but of a specific kind: what we call **poetic suture points**, to distinguish them from the strong, settlement-producing suture points of the dominant symbolic order.

An ordinary suture point—a name, a price, a legal status—is a strong suture: it arrests the sliding of meaning decisively, producing a fixed, stable, and often irreversible closure. The price of the flower is n units of currency: the meaning of the flower, in the market context, is definitively settled. This strong suture is precisely what the happiness jar must not produce: if the record of a shared co-evolutionary event becomes a strong suture point—a definitive statement of what that event meant, how happy it made us, what it says about our relationship—it kills the event’s generative potential by closing off the interpretive possibilities that make re-traversal rich.

The poetic suture point, by contrast, anchors without closing: it gives the signifying chain a temporary resting point, a place to gather and orient, without arresting its movement definitively. The poem about the flower anchors the memory of the flower—gives it a specific form, a specific emotional register, a specific set of associations—without exhausting the flower’s meaning. Each re-reading of the poem is a new traversal of the relational phase space in the vicinity of the original event, producing new interpretive possibilities and new structural modifications.

This is the semiotic content of what **Paper IX** called the poetic paradigm [27]: poetry is the paradigmatic form of good cycle generation because it is constitutively a poetic suture—it anchors meaning without closing it, refuses the settlement that strong suture produces, and generates interpretive cycles that spiral rather than circle. The happiness jar’s artistic products are good because they are poetic in this technical sense: they create suture points that invite re-traversal rather than demanding closure.

6.5 The Relation $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$: Between Relations, Not Between Points

We are now in a position to give a more precise account of $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ —the structural remainder that is the source of GRW’s inexhaustibility. The key insight, which the preceding analysis has prepared, is that $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ is not a relation between two points (the original record x and the processed version x') but a **relation between two relations**: the relation of x to the original co-evolutionary event, and the relation of x' to the same event.

x is an index of the original event: it stands in a real, causal, existential relation to that event. Call this relation r_x .

$x' = O(x)$ is a topological projection of the original event: it stands in a structural, analogical relation to the event, preserving its topological dynamics while transforming its material form. Call this relation $r_{x'}$.

$\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ is the relation between r_x and $r_{x'}$: the structural difference between the two relations to the same event. This is not a relation between two symbolic objects but a relation at a higher level of abstraction—a meta-relation, a relation of relations.

It is this meta-relational structure that makes contact with the real possible without direct representation. Neither x nor x' represents the original co-evolutionary event; both stand in specific relations to it. The meta-relation $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ captures the structure of these two different approaches to the same event—the indexical approach of the record and the topological approach of the artistic processing—and it is the **difference** between these two approaches that opens a window onto the real.

The real, on the GRW account, is not a hidden object behind the symbolic; it is the **inexhaustible relational structure** of the co-evolutionary event—the aspect of the event that no symbolic approach can fully capture. $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ makes this inexhaustibility visible by showing that two different symbolic approaches to the same event are not equivalent: there is always a remainder, a gap, a structural difference between the indexical approach and the topological approach, and this gap is the real’s way of showing itself without being fully symbolised.

The meta-relational structure of $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$. $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ is not a relation between two symbolic objects but a relation between two relations to the same real co-evolutionary event: the indexical relation of the record x to the event, and the topological relation of the artistic processing x' to the event. The non-zero remainder $\mathcal{R}(x, x') \neq 0$ follows from the structural difference between these two approaches, and it is this remainder that makes contact with the real possible without direct representation. GRW is inexhaustible because the real is inexhaustible: no finite number of symbolic approaches to the same co-evolutionary event can exhaust its structural content.

6.6 Δ and the Drive: Why the Withering Cycle Is Reignited

We are now in a position to address the question deferred from §5.11: why can artistic processing reignite a withering relational cycle? The answer draws on Lacanian drive theory, refracted through the relational ontology of the GRB framework.

In the Lacanian framework, the drive (*Trieb*) is distinct from desire (*désir*). Desire is directed toward an absent object—the *objet petit a*—and is constitutively unsatisfied: its structure is the structure of lack, the perpetual pursuit of what cannot be attained. The drive, by contrast, is not directed toward any object; it finds its satisfaction in the circuit itself, in the movement around the *rim*—the edge, the boundary, the interval that the drive circles without ever crossing [12].

The withering relational cycle is a cycle in which the drive has lost its rim. When the relational field is depleted—when the shared attractor landscape has been degraded by stress, habituation, or the sustained application of settlement logic—the dynamic interval between the symbolic and the real (Δ) collapses. Without Δ , there is no rim for the drive to circle; the drive has

nothing to orbit, and the cycle collapses into the repetition compulsion of the death drive (*Todestrieb*)—the tendency of systems without generative dynamics to return to their ground state, to sameness, to stasis.

Artistic processing reignites the withering cycle by reconstructing Δ . When the couple processes a shared co-evolutionary event into a new symbolic form, they create the meta-relation $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$: a structural interval between two different symbolic approaches to the same real event. This interval is Δ —the gap between the symbolic and the real that the symbolic approaches to the same event never fully close. With Δ re-established, the drive has a rim to circle; the movement of the drive around the rim is the movement of co-evolutionary engagement; and co-evolutionary engagement generates GRW.

Open question. **The nature of Δ and the phase-space reconstruction conjecture.**

The account of Δ offered here—as the structural interval between two symbolic approaches to the same real event—is a philosophical account. A more precise formal account would require specifying the geometry of this interval: how large is it, how is it maintained, what conditions cause it to shrink? We conjecture, as a speculative formal proposal, that Δ is related to the dimensionality of the relational phase space reconstruction: when the relational system’s trajectory through the symbolic field is high-dimensional (many different symbolic approaches to the same real events, many different registers of symbolic engagement), Δ is large; when the trajectory is low-dimensional (the same symbolic approaches repeated without variation, the symbolic field depleted of diversity), Δ shrinks. Artistic processing increases the dimensionality of the symbolic trajectory by introducing new approaches to the same events, thereby expanding Δ and reigniting the drive. This conjecture connects to the Takens delay-embedding framework from dynamical systems theory, but the connection is at present structural rather than formally derived. We flag it as an open question for future investigation.

6.7 The Embodied Dimension: Why Artistic Processing Is Especially Effective

Merleau-Ponty’s account of embodied expression—the idea that artistic creation is not the translation of inner meaning into outer form but the emergence of meaning in the expressive act itself, through the engagement of the body with the material world [18]—adds a dimension to the account of artistic processing that the purely semiotic analysis misses.

When one partner processes a shared co-evolutionary event into a poem, a painting, or a piece of music, the processing is not merely a cognitive operation on symbolic material. It is an embodied engagement with the material world—with the resistance of the words, the texture of the paint, the physical production of sound—and this embodied engagement is a form of re-contact with the real. The body does not merely record the symbolic structure of the original experience; it re-enacts the quality of the experience’s engagement with the world, through a

new material medium.

This embodied dimension explains why artistic processing produces higher-fidelity topological projections than purely cognitive re-engagement: the body's engagement with material in the act of artistic creation preserves aspects of the original experience's topological structure that purely cognitive operations miss. The poem about the flower preserves not only the propositional content of the experience ("we saw a flower and felt happy") but its affective quality, its temporal dynamics, its bodily resonance—the aspects of the experience that are most directly connected to the real and most resistant to purely symbolic capture.

The embodied dimension also explains why artistic processing is particularly effective at reigniting withering cycles. A withering cycle is not merely a cycle in which the symbolic record of shared experience has become thin; it is a cycle in which the embodied quality of co-present engagement has been depleted. The couple who has lost the capacity for the wordless co-presence of relational flow—who can no longer sit together in silence without discomfort—has lost not a symbolic resource but an embodied one. Artistic processing, by re-engaging the body with the material traces of past co-evolutionary events, re-activates the embodied capacities that the withering cycle has depleted, opening the possibility of a new quality of co-present engagement.

6.8 The Ethical Dimension: What Counts as Genuine Processing

Not all artistic processing is equally effective at GRW re-traversal, and some forms of processing actively destroy GRW rather than augmenting it. The distinction between genuine and spurious processing is important for the practical application of the happiness jar and for the ethical analysis of §12.

Genuine processing produces a topological projection that preserves the structure of the original co-evolutionary event while transforming its material form: a poem that captures the quality of the shared attention, a painting that evokes the affective register of the shared moment, a piece of music that follows the emotional trajectory of the experience. Genuine processing is characterised by fidelity to the relational dynamics of the original event, even as it transforms the event's material content.

Spurious processing produces a symbolic object that uses the materials of the shared experience for purposes other than genuine re-traversal: a poem that idealises the experience in ways that distort its actual dynamics (imaginary register processing), a narrative that frames the experience in ways that serve one party's interpretation at the expense of the other's (symbolic register appropriation), or an artistic object that performs the processing without engaging the real (a technically accomplished work that leaves the experience untouched). Spurious processing can produce beautiful symbolic objects while actively diminishing GRW, because it introduces strong suture points that close off the interpretive possibilities that genuine poetic suture preserves.

The distinction between genuine and spurious processing is directly related to the epistemic justice concerns of §12: the party whose interpretation of a shared co-evolutionary event domi-

nates the processing is, in effect, imposing their symbolic frame on a reality that belongs to both. Genuine processing is dialogic in Bakhtin’s sense—it is responsive to the multiple voices that participated in the original event, rather than reducing them to a single interpretive frame.

7. The Relational Isomorphism Principle: How the Symbolic Feeds Back into the Real

The preceding section established that the happiness jar works through the construction of a meta-relation $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ —a relation between two different symbolic approaches to the same real co-evolutionary event—and that this meta-relation reconstructs the interval Δ between the symbolic and the real, reigniting the drive that sustains co-evolutionary generativity. But this account leaves a deeper question unanswered: *why* does a structural interval in the symbolic register have any effect on the real register? Why does the construction of $\mathcal{R}(x, x')$ in the symbolic field produce changes in the relational attractor landscape that constitutes GRW in the real field?

This section proposes what we call the **Relational Isomorphism Principle** as a partial answer to this question, while honestly acknowledging the limits of what can currently be established. The principle is more a conjecture than a theorem—a hypothesis that organises the available evidence and points toward directions for further inquiry—but its philosophical implications are significant enough to warrant careful development.

7.1 The Problem of Cross-Register Causation

The Lacanian framework, as standardly presented, holds that the three registers—the imaginary, the symbolic, and the real—are genuinely distinct and that the real is constitutively inaccessible to symbolic operations. The real is what resists symbolisation; it is the remainder that falls outside every symbolic account; it is what the symbolic is always already failing to capture. On this reading, the question of how symbolic operations can affect the real is simply unanswerable: they cannot, by definition. The real is the condition of the symbolic, not its product.

The GRB framework proposes a modification of this picture that we believe is philosophically motivated by the relational ontology developed across the series. The modification is this: **if the real is relational in its basic structure**, then the real is not simply the pre-symbolic residue that the symbolic fails to capture. It is a relational field with its own structure—a structure that is, like all relational structures, characterised by coupling, co-evolution, and the generation of emergent properties. And if the real has this relational structure, then it is not entirely inaccessible to symbolic operations: symbolic operations that share the same *relational structural form* as the real can make contact with the real, not through representation but through **structural resonance**.

7.2 The Principle Stated

The Relational Isomorphism Principle can be stated as follows:

The Relational Isomorphism Principle. If the real is relational in its basic ontological structure, then symbolic structures that share the same relational form as the real—that instantiate, in the symbolic register, the same topological relations that obtain in the real register—can produce structural effects in the real through resonance rather than representation. The mechanism is not causal in the ordinary sense (the symbolic does not act on the real as one billiard ball acts on another) but structural: two systems that share the same relational form will respond to perturbations in structurally similar ways, and a perturbation applied to one will produce a structurally similar perturbation in the other. This cross-register resonance is the mechanism by which the happiness jar’s symbolic operations produce changes in the relational attractor landscape that constitutes GRW.

The principle is explicitly conditional: it holds *if* the real is relational. This condition is the GRB framework’s fundamental ontological commitment—a commitment that, as [Paper XIV](#) acknowledged [29], is a metaphysical choice rather than a demonstrable fact, supported by its theoretical productivity and its consonance with the best available physical theory (relational quantum mechanics [23]) rather than by any direct proof.

7.3 Three Supporting Frameworks

Three theoretical frameworks provide partial support for the Relational Isomorphism Principle from different angles. None of them establishes the principle; together, they suggest that it is at least physically and philosophically coherent.

7.3.1 Relational Quantum Mechanics

Carlo Rovelli’s relational interpretation of quantum mechanics holds that physical quantities—the properties of particles, the outcomes of measurements—are not absolute but relational: they exist only relative to other systems, and different systems may assign different values to the same quantity without contradiction [23]. On this interpretation, the real is not a collection of objects with intrinsic properties but a network of relations between systems, each of which is real only relative to other systems.

If the real has this relational structure, then the distinction between the real and the symbolic is not a distinction between an intrinsic reality and an imposed representation but a distinction between two levels of relational structure: the relational structure of the physical world and the relational structure of the symbolic order. Two systems at different levels of relational structure

can, in principle, enter into structural resonance if they share the same relational form—if the pattern of relations at one level is isomorphic to the pattern of relations at another level.

This is not a claim that the symbolic order is literally quantum-mechanical. It is the structural claim that the relational form that quantum mechanics reveals at the physical level—the primacy of relations over intrinsic properties, the emergence of properties through relational interaction—is the same relational form that the GRB framework identifies at the level of intimate relational life. And if both levels share the same relational form, then structural resonance between them is at least conceivable.

7.3.2 Wittgenstein's Picture Theory as a Relational Isomorphism

Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* proposes that propositions picture facts by sharing their logical form: a proposition does not resemble what it describes but stands in the same structural relation to its components as the fact stands to the objects that compose it [6]. The picture theory is a theory of structural isomorphism between the symbolic and the real: what makes a proposition meaningful is not resemblance but shared relational structure.

The picture theory is notoriously limited as a general theory of language, and Wittgenstein himself abandoned it in his later work. But its structural insight—that symbolic structures can make contact with reality through shared relational form rather than resemblance—is directly relevant to the Relational Isomorphism Principle. The happiness jar's artistic products do not resemble the co-evolutionary events they process; they share their relational structure. And if shared relational structure is sufficient for genuine contact between the symbolic and the real, then the principle is at least logically coherent.

The GRB version of the picture theory is more modest than Wittgenstein's: it does not claim that every symbolic structure that shares relational form with the real will produce structural effects in the real. It claims only that **some** symbolic structures—those that are genuinely relational rather than merely formally so, those that instantiate living relational dynamics rather than dead structural schemata—can produce such effects through resonance. The distinction between genuine and spurious artistic processing, introduced in §6.8, is the practical expression of this more modest claim.

7.3.3 Parametric Resonance as Formal Analogy

The third supporting framework comes from theoretical physics: the phenomenon of parametric resonance, in which two systems with different natural frequencies can exchange energy efficiently when they share a common parameter that oscillates at the appropriate frequency [11]. In parametric resonance, the coupling between the two systems is not direct (one does not push the other) but mediated by the shared parameter: the oscillation of the parameter creates a structural coupling that allows energy to flow between the two systems without direct contact.

The Relational Isomorphism Principle proposes something analogous for the coupling between

the symbolic and the real: the shared relational form is the parameter that mediates the coupling. When the symbolic structure and the real structure share the same relational form, perturbations in the symbolic structure produce structurally similar perturbations in the real structure, mediated by the shared relational parameter. This is not causal in the ordinary sense but structural: the two systems are coupled through their shared form, and this coupling allows the symbolic operation to produce real effects through resonance rather than direct causation.

This physical analogy is explicitly a **structural isomorphism** rather than a literal physical claim. We are not asserting that the symbolic-real coupling is literally parametric resonance in the physical sense. We are asserting that the formal structure of parametric resonance—two systems coupled through a shared parameter, with energy transfer through resonance rather than direct contact—provides the most precise available formal analogy for the mechanism we are proposing.

7.4 The Condition of Relational Reality

The Relational Isomorphism Principle is conditional on the real being relational. This condition deserves careful attention, because it is the most metaphysically loaded claim in the paper.

Why should we believe that the real is relational? The GRB framework's answer, as noted above, is not that this can be proved but that it is the most theoretically productive meta-physical hypothesis available—that it generates a coherent and explanatorily rich account of intimate relational life that the alternative hypothesis (the real is non-relational, intrinsic, pre-symbolic) does not.

But the condition has a further implication that strengthens its plausibility: **if the real were non-relational, Δ would be fixed and unmodifiable**. On the standard Lacanian account, Δ —the gap between the symbolic and the real—is a structural feature of the symbolic order, not a dynamical variable. The real is always already beyond the symbolic; the gap is always the same size; and no symbolic operation can alter it. But if this were true, it would follow that no symbolic operation—no artistic processing, no happiness jar, no intentional re-traversal—could affect the relational field's GRW. The symbolic and the real would be hermetically sealed from each other, and the entire project of the happiness jar would be an illusion.

The GRB framework proposes, on the contrary, that Δ is dynamical: it can expand or contract, and its size is affected by the quality of symbolic engagement with the real. If the real is relational, then symbolic operations that share the real's relational form can alter the structural coupling between the symbolic and the real, thereby modifying Δ . This dynamical account of Δ is both philosophically motivated (by the relational ontology) and practically consequential (it explains why the happiness jar works and what makes artistic processing effective).

Open question. **The dynamics of Δ .** What are the precise conditions under which Δ expands or contracts? We have proposed that Δ expands when symbolic structures share the relational

form of the real (genuine artistic processing) and contracts when symbolic structures impose a non-relational form on the real (strong suture, settlement, commodification). But the precise dynamical laws governing Δ 's evolution—its time constants, its sensitivity to different symbolic operations, its relationship to the coupling strength of the relational system—are currently unknown. This is among the most important open questions for future development of the GRW framework, requiring resources from quantum information theory, dynamical systems theory, and philosophy of physics that lie beyond the scope of the present paper.

7.5 The Von Neumann Problem: Program and Data in the Same Space

A fundamental difficulty with the account of the happiness jar and the Relational Isomorphism Principle deserves honest acknowledgement. It was identified in our preliminary discussions as the **von Neumann problem** for the relational system.

In a von Neumann computer architecture, programs and data are stored in the same memory space, making it impossible to cleanly separate the operating code (the operator O) from the data being operated upon (the record x). Self-modifying programs—programs that modify their own instructions during execution—are possible in this architecture but are notoriously difficult to analyse, because the program's behaviour at any moment depends on its own history of self-modification.

The relational system faces an analogous difficulty: the operator O that processes the record x is itself a product of the relational history that x records. The couple who processes their shared experience of the flower is using interpretive capacities—emotional, aesthetic, linguistic—that have themselves been shaped by the history of their shared life, including the experience of the flower that they are now processing. O and x are not cleanly separable: the operator is part of the data it operates on.

This means that the account of $O(x) = x'$ is not as clean as the formal notation suggests. O is not a fixed function applied to a fixed input; it is a dynamical system that is itself modified by the act of applying it. The O that applies to x is already different from the O that would have applied before the accumulation of GRW that the processing of x contributed to.

We do not have a formal solution to the von Neumann problem for the relational system. We acknowledge it as a genuine difficulty and note that it may point toward the need for a computational paradigm different from the von Neumann architecture—perhaps the λ -calculus (where functions and data are identical in type), perhaps a category-theoretic framework (where morphisms and objects are treated at the same level), perhaps something entirely new. This remains an open problem.

7.6 Implications for GRW Theory

Despite its conjectural status, the Relational Isomorphism Principle has several implications for GRW theory that are worth drawing out.

The primacy of relational form over content: What makes a symbolic operation effective at GRW re-traversal is not its content (what it says about the shared experience) but its relational form (how it structures the relations between the elements of the experience). A technically accomplished but formally non-relational artistic product—one that imposes a fixed interpretive frame on the shared experience rather than preserving and developing its relational dynamics—will be less effective at GRW augmentation than a formally relational but technically modest one.

The dialogic requirement: Genuine artistic processing must be dialogic—responsive to the multiple registers and multiple perspectives that composed the original co-evolutionary event—rather than monologic. A monologic artistic product (one that imposes a single interpretive frame, one party’s view of what the shared experience meant) closes Δ rather than expanding it, because it introduces a strong suture point where a poetic suture is needed. Genuine GRW re-traversal requires what Bakhtin called the multi-voiced text—a symbolic structure that holds multiple interpretive possibilities open simultaneously.

The temporal non-linearity of GRW: The Relational Isomorphism Principle suggests that the temporal relationship between a co-evolutionary event and its artistic processing is not linear. A co-evolutionary event that occurred many years ago may be more richly processed now, when the relational field has accumulated the GRW necessary to engage with it at a new depth, than it could have been processed at the time of the event. The “age” of GRW is therefore not a straightforward function of calendar time but of the relational field’s current capacity for re-traversal—a capacity that is itself a product of accumulated GRW. This temporal non-linearity is the formal content of the phenomenological observation that some of the richest shared experiences only reveal their full depth years after they occurred.

8. The Psychoanalytic Perspective: Phallic Wealth, Drive, and the Real of GRW

The psychoanalytic tradition—and specifically the Lacanian strand of that tradition—provides a distinctive angle on the wealth question in intimate relations that neither political economy nor philosophy of science fully captures. Where political economy asks who produces and who owns, and where the Relational Isomorphism Principle asks how the symbolic can affect the real, psychoanalysis asks: what is the subjective structure of the relation to wealth? How does the form of wealth one pursues shape the structure of one’s desire, one’s drive, and one’s relation to the other?

This section develops the psychoanalytic account in three movements. First, it analyses traditional material wealth as a form of phallic signifier—as a symbolic object that organises desire

around the logic of having and lacking. Second, it locates GRW within the Lacanian register system, arguing that GRW occupies a position that the standard Lacanian framework does not fully articulate: not the *objet petit a* of desire's lack-structure, but the real register's generative surplus. Third, it examines the drive dynamics of GRW generation, showing how the non-possessable character of GRW produces a specific drive structure—the drive of circular generativity—that is distinct from both the desire structure of lack and the death drive of stasis.

8.1 Traditional Wealth as Phallic Signifier

In the Lacanian framework, the phallus (*le phallus*) is not the biological organ but the **master signifier**—the signifier that organises the symbolic order around the logic of having and lacking [12]. To have the phallus is to occupy the position of power, authority, and completeness in the symbolic order; to lack the phallus is to be in the position of need, lack, and incompleteness. The phallus is not possessed by anyone—it is a signifier, not an object—but the symbolic order is organised as though it could be possessed, and the pursuit of phallic objects (objects that promise to fill the lack, to provide the missing completeness) is the fundamental form of desire in the symbolic order.

Traditional material wealth functions as a phallic signifier in intimate relations with striking precision. Gold, money, and material assets are the paradigmatic phallic objects in the economic domain: discrete, countable, transferable, and organised by the logic of having and lacking. The party who has more gold is in the position of symbolic power; the party who has less is in the position of lack. The transaction of bride-price is therefore not merely an economic transaction but a symbolic one: it enacts the distribution of phallic power between the parties and their families, establishing who has and who lacks in the founding symbolic structure of the relation.

The phallic character of traditional material wealth explains several features of intimate relations that a purely economic analysis misses. First, it explains why the amount of bride-price matters independently of its material value: a larger bride-price is not merely more materially valuable but more symbolically powerful, because it more fully enacts the logic of phallic having. Second, it explains why the failure to pay the agreed bride-price is experienced as an insult rather than merely a financial shortfall: it is a failure of symbolic recognition, a refusal to acknowledge the other party's claim to phallic completeness. Third, it explains why material wealth in intimate relations so often becomes a site of power struggle rather than a simple practical arrangement: because it is the medium through which the phallic distribution of power is enacted and contested.

The GRW framework, by identifying a form of wealth that is constitutively non-phallic—non-possessable, non-transferable, non-organised by the logic of having and lacking—implicitly proposes a transformation of the symbolic economy of intimate relations: a transformation from a phallic economy (organised around the logic of having and lacking) to a generative economy (organised around the logic of co-evolutionary production and non-possessive participation).

Traditional wealth as phallic signifier. Traditional material wealth in intimate relations functions as a phallic signifier: it organises the intimate relational field around the logic of having and lacking, distributes symbolic power between the parties through the medium of material exchange, and structures desire as the pursuit of phallic completeness. GRW is constitutively non-phallic: it cannot be had or lacked by either party, it is not organised by the logic of symbolic power, and it does not promise completeness but generates a different kind of satisfaction—the satisfaction of the circular drive of co-evolutionary generativity.

8.2 GRW in the Lacanian Register System: Beyond the *Objet Petit A*

Where does GRW fit in the Lacanian register system? The question is important because the answer determines how GRW relates to desire, drive, and the structure of the subject's relation to the other.

The most obvious candidate is the *objet petit a*: the object-cause of desire, the object that desire pursues without ever attaining, the remainder left over after symbolisation that keeps desire in motion. The *objet petit a* is a real object in Lacan's sense—it belongs to the real register, exceeds symbolisation, and cannot be fully captured by any symbolic representation. And GRW, as we have argued, is also a real phenomenon: it is stored in the geometry of the relational attractor landscape, irreducible to any symbolic representation.

But GRW differs from the *objet petit a* in a crucial way that the standard Lacanian framework does not fully accommodate. The *objet petit a* is the **object of lack**: it is what desire pursues because it is missing, what keeps desire in motion by being constitutively unattainable. Desire, for Lacan, is always the desire for something that cannot be had; the *objet petit a* is the formal correlate of this impossibility—the object that desire constitutes as its cause precisely by being absent.

GRW is not the object of lack. It is not pursued because it is missing; it is generated by co-evolutionary activity. It is not the cause of desire in the sense of being constitutively unattainable; it is the product of a specific form of activity that is in principle available to any intimate couple willing to cultivate the conditions for it. And it does not keep desire in motion by its absence; it sustains the drive by its presence—or more precisely, by the presence of the structural interval Δ that its generation maintains.

We propose that GRW occupies a position in the Lacanian register system that the standard framework does not fully articulate: what we might call the **real register's generative surplus**—the real as productive rather than merely residual, as the source of generative activity rather than merely the remainder of failed symbolisation. This is the position that the Daoist concept of *xuande* names from a different cultural tradition: the generativity that is not the accumulation of what is present but the inexhaustible production of what emerges from the

between.

Open question. **GRW and the limits of the Lacanian framework.** The standard Lacanian framework does not have a category for the real register's generative surplus as we have described it. The real, for Lacan, is primarily characterised negatively: as what resists symbolisation, as the remainder of failed symbolisation, as the condition of the symbolic. To characterise the real as also generative—as the source of GRW's production—requires a modification of the Lacanian framework that goes beyond what Lacan himself articulated. Whether this modification is a genuine extension of Lacanian theory or a departure from it, and what its implications are for the theory of the subject and the theory of desire, are questions that lie beyond the scope of this paper. We flag them as important open questions for psychoanalytic theory at the intersection of clinical practice and political economy.

8.3 The Drive Structure of GRW Generation

If GRW is not the object of desire (which pursues what is absent) nor the object of the death drive (which tends toward stasis and the elimination of tension), what is the drive structure that GRW generation involves?

The answer draws on Lacan's account of the drive (*Trieb*) as distinct from both desire and the death drive [12]. The drive is not directed toward any object; it finds its satisfaction in the circuit itself, in the movement around the *rim*—the edge, the opening, the structural interval that the drive circles without ever crossing. The drive is satisfied not by attaining its object but by the movement of circling around what it cannot attain.

GRW generation involves what we call the **circular drive of co-evolutionary generativity**: a drive that finds its satisfaction not in the attainment of any object (the phallic logic of having) nor in the stasis of need satisfied (the death drive's tendency toward equilibrium) but in the circular movement of co-evolutionary engagement itself. The drive circles around the relational field's Δ —the structural interval between the symbolic and the real that co-evolutionary activity maintains and expands—and finds its satisfaction in the quality of this circling rather than in any outcome it produces.

This drive structure explains several features of intimate relational life that are otherwise puzzling. It explains why the deepest relational happiness is not the happiness of having achieved something together but the happiness of being engaged together in an activity that has no determinate goal—the wordless co-presence of relational flow, the shared noticing of a contingent flower, the unhurried conversation that goes nowhere in particular and arrives somewhere neither party anticipated. These are instances of the circular drive at its purest: the drive circling around the relational field's Δ , finding its satisfaction in the quality of the circling itself.

It also explains why the attempt to satisfy intimate desire by attaining phallic objects—more gold, more status, more material security—tends to leave the desiring party paradoxically more dissatisfied rather than less. Phallic objects satisfy desire temporarily by providing the illusion of phallic completeness, but desire is constitutively unsatisfiable by its objects (because the *objet petit a* is constitutively unattainable), and the temporary satisfaction of attaining a phallic object is quickly followed by the re-emergence of desire's lack-structure. The circular drive of GRW generation, by contrast, is not unsatisfiable in this way: it is satisfied by the movement itself, which means that the cultivation of the conditions for co-evolutionary generativity is, in principle, a sustainable form of satisfaction—not the perpetual postponement of satisfaction that phallic desire involves, but the ongoing renewal of satisfaction through the continuing circuit of the drive.

8.4 The Three-Register Structure of Wealth in Intimate Relations

The psychoanalytic perspective allows us to map the three registers of the GRB framework onto the three forms of wealth that operate in intimate relations, producing a more precise account of how these forms interact.

Imaginary register wealth is the wealth of the idealised image: the partner idealised as the perfect complement, the relation idealised as the source of complete satisfaction, the shared life idealised as the realisation of the imaginary ideal. Imaginary register wealth is real and important—the idealisation of the early relation is the engine of the dramatic GRW generation that characterises early intimate life—but it is structurally unstable: the idealised image is always threatened by the reality of the other's irreducible particularity, and the collapse of the imaginary ideal is experienced as a form of poverty, as the loss of what one thought one had.

Symbolic register wealth is the wealth of recognition and acknowledgment: the material and social forms through which relational value is given symbolic expression—the gift, the vow, the legal status of marriage, the social recognition of the couple as a social unit. Symbolic register wealth is also real and important—the social recognition of intimate relations provides material and legal protections that are genuine conditions for GRW generation—but it is vulnerable to the phallic logic of the symbolic order: the gift can become a mechanism of indebtedness, the vow can become a mechanism of settlement, the legal status can become a mechanism of commodification.

Real register wealth is GRW: the accumulated structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape, stored in the geometry of the relational field, inexhaustible under use, non-possessable by either party. Real register wealth is the deepest and most stable form of wealth in intimate relations, but it is also the most invisible: it cannot be counted, settled, or transferred, and its presence is known only through the quality of co-evolutionary engagement that it supports.

The three forms of wealth are not independent but interact in complex ways. Imaginary register wealth can support the conditions for real register wealth generation during the early stages of a relation, when idealisation provides the motivational energy for the co-evolutionary

engagement that generates GRW. Symbolic register wealth, when organised as a condition for GRW generation rather than as a settlement of its products, provides the material and social infrastructure within which real register wealth can be generated and sustained. And real register wealth, once accumulated, supports the resilience of both imaginary and symbolic wealth: the couple whose relational field is rich in GRW can sustain the disillusionment of the imaginary ideal and the limitations of symbolic recognition without catastrophic loss, because the real register wealth provides a deeper foundation than either the imaginary or the symbolic can offer.

8.5 Pathologies of Wealth in Intimate Relations: A Psychoanalytic Typology

The psychoanalytic perspective allows us to identify several pathological structures of wealth in intimate relations—structures in which the three forms of wealth are misaligned in ways that destroy the conditions for GRW generation.

Phallic substitution: The substitution of symbolic register wealth for real register wealth—the attempt to compensate for the absence of GRW by accumulating material wealth, social status, or symbolic recognition. This pathology is common in relations where the co-evolutionary dynamics have been depleted by the sustained application of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness: the parties accumulate more material wealth, more impressive social performances, more elaborate rituals of symbolic recognition, while the relational attractor landscape continues to degrade. The increasing wealth in the imaginary and symbolic registers masks the decreasing wealth in the real register, making the pathology harder to diagnose.

Imaginary fixation: The attempt to sustain the idealised image of the early relation against the reality of the other’s irreducible particularity—the refusal to allow the imaginary ideal to be superseded by the real register wealth that the other’s genuine particularity can generate. This pathology is characterised by jealousy, possessiveness, and the demand that the other conform to the idealised image rather than being allowed to develop through co-evolutionary engagement. It destroys GRW by preventing the genuine co-evolutionary dynamics that real register wealth generation requires.

Real register avoidance: The avoidance of the intimacy that real register engagement requires—the preference for the relative safety of imaginary idealisation and symbolic recognition over the vulnerability of genuine co-present co-evolutionary engagement. This pathology is the most common and the most subtle: it can coexist with high levels of imaginary and symbolic register wealth (the relation may appear, from the outside, to be flourishing) while the real register is systematically avoided, and GRW is not generated. The couple who fills their shared time with activities, events, and social performances—who are never simply present with each other in the quiet that real register engagement requires—may be practising real register avoidance without being aware of it.

The typology suggests that the diagnosis of relational wealth depletion is not straightforward. The symptoms of GRW depletion—the withering cycle, the loss of co-evolutionary generativity, the sense that the relational field is thin and depleted—can be masked by the accumulation

of imaginary and symbolic register wealth. The happiness jar is valuable precisely because it provides a practice that works at the real register level, bypassing the imaginary and symbolic masks and making direct contact with the structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape that constitute GRW.

9. The Feminist Perspective: Relational Subjectivity, Care Ethics, and the Non-Phallic Wealth

The feminist tradition offers perspectives on wealth in intimate relations that neither political economy nor psychoanalysis fully captures. Where political economy asks who produces and who owns, and where psychoanalysis asks what subjective structure the relation to wealth involves, feminist theory asks: whose labour has been systematically made invisible, whose subjectivity has been structurally denied, and what alternative forms of subjectivity and wealth might be possible if the dominant framework is challenged?

This section develops the feminist perspective in five movements. It begins with the structural problem of subjectivity in intimate relational life, showing how the dominant framework has denied genuine subjectivity to those who perform the labour of generating relational value. It then examines three feminist attempts to solve this problem—the first-wave liberal strategy, the second-wave critique of the liberal solution, and the care ethics alternative—showing how each contributes to and falls short of the GRW framework’s account of relational subjectivity. Finally, it develops the feminist implications of GRW theory itself, arguing that GRW is constitutively a non-phallic wealth form that both requires and enables a genuinely relational subjectivity—and that this has implications not only for intimate relations but for the broader political economy of social reproduction.

9.1 The Structural Problem: Whose Subjectivity?

The dominant frameworks for understanding intimate relations—from the legal and economic frameworks that organise their material dimensions to the philosophical and psychoanalytic frameworks that theorise their subjective dimensions—share a structural feature that feminist theory has consistently identified and challenged: they take the **individual subject** as their fundamental unit, and they implicitly model this individual subject on the figure of the autonomous, self-determining, economically independent agent—a figure that has historically been identified with the masculine position in the social division of labour.

This structural feature has a specific consequence for the understanding of wealth in intimate relations: the wealth generated by those who perform the relational labour of care, emotional support, and attentive co-presence—labour historically performed predominantly by women—is systematically invisible in frameworks organised around the individual subject’s accumulation, exchange, and enjoyment of wealth. Federici’s analysis of social reproduction [4] named this invisibility and located it in the structural requirements of capitalist production: capitalism requires the reproduction of labour power, which requires reproductive and care labour, which must therefore be performed without being recognised as wealth production, because its

recognition would require its compensation and thereby undermine the extraction of surplus value from the workers whose reproduction it supports.

But the feminist critique goes deeper than the political economic level. The invisibility of care labour as wealth production is not merely an economic injustice; it is an **ontological injustice**—a misrecognition of what the care labourer is and what they do. The woman whose emotional labour, attentive co-presence, and relational maintenance generates the GRW of the shared life is not merely economically exploited; she is ontologically misrecognised: her activity is not seen as productive, her contributions are not counted as wealth, and her subjectivity—constituted through and in the activity of relational care—is not recognised as a genuine form of human subjectivity.

9.2 The First-Wave Liberal Strategy and Its Limits

The first-wave feminist response to this structural problem was to demand for women the same individual subjectivity that men had been granted: the right to own property, to enter contracts, to vote, to participate in public life as autonomous, self-determining agents. This strategy was politically crucial and historically transformative: it secured for women legal and economic protections that are genuine conditions for a minimally adequate intimate relational life.

But the first-wave strategy has a structural limitation that the GRW framework makes visible: it sought to secure for women the same **individual** subjectivity that men possessed, thereby accepting the dominant framework's individualist model of subjectivity as the standard to be met. Women were to be recognised as individual subjects in the same sense that men were individual subjects—autonomous, self-determining, economically independent—rather than challenging the model of subjectivity itself.

This acceptance of the individualist model has a specific consequence for the understanding of wealth in intimate relations: it leaves intact the framework in which care labour and relational maintenance are not recognised as wealth production. If the standard of subjectivity is individual autonomy and self-determination, then the activity of relational care—which is constitutively not autonomous (it is responsive to the other) and not self-determining (it is shaped by the needs and dynamics of the relational field)—will continue to appear as a lesser form of activity, a deviation from the standard rather than a genuine alternative to it.

9.3 The Second-Wave Critique and the Problem of the Alternative

The second-wave feminist tradition recognised the limitation of the first-wave strategy and developed a more radical critique of the dominant model of subjectivity. For Simone de Beauvoir, the fundamental problem was not the exclusion of women from a form of subjectivity they were otherwise capable of exercising, but the construction of women as **Other** within a framework in which the subject—the position of genuine agency, freedom, and self-determination—was constitutively masculine [10]. Liberation, on this account, required not just inclusion in the existing subject position but the transformation of subjectivity itself: the recognition of

women as genuine subjects, which required challenging the model of subjectivity that had been constructed in opposition to the feminine.

But the second-wave critique faced a problem of the alternative: if the dominant model of subjectivity is to be challenged, what is to replace it? The second-wave tradition largely answered this question by proposing a revised model of individual subjectivity—one that was more embodied, more emotionally engaged, more relational than the Cartesian model—but that retained the individual as its fundamental unit. Even in its most relational forms, second-wave feminism tended to understand the self as an individual self that is constituted through relations, rather than as a relational field that generates selves through co-evolutionary dynamics.

The GRB framework proposes a more radical answer to the problem of the alternative: not a revised model of individual subjectivity but a **relational ontology** in which the relational field is the primary unit and individual subjectivity is a product of relational dynamics. This is not merely a philosophical position but a political one: it implies that the recognition of care labour as wealth production requires not only the redistribution of economic resources but the transformation of the ontological framework within which wealth and production are understood.

9.4 Care Ethics and the Relational Alternative

Carol Gilligan's groundbreaking study of women's moral reasoning [7] identified an alternative to the dominant model of moral subjectivity that is directly relevant to the GRW framework. Where the dominant model (Kohlberg's stages of moral development) understood moral maturity as the capacity for abstract, universal, rule-governed reasoning—the capacity to apply general principles to particular cases without being distorted by particular attachments—Gilligan found that many of her female respondents reasoned in a fundamentally different way: not from general principles to particular cases, but from the particular relationships and particular responsibilities that constituted their lives to the responses that those relationships called for.

Gilligan called this the **ethics of care**: a form of moral reasoning that begins not with universal principles but with particular relationships, that understands moral agency not as autonomy from attachment but as responsiveness to the demands of specific relationships, and that values not the impartiality of the universal moral law but the attentiveness and responsiveness that particular relationships require.

The ethics of care is not merely a different style of moral reasoning; it implies a different model of subjectivity. The care-ethical subject is not the autonomous individual of liberal theory, constituted independently of their relationships and choosing to enter them; it is a **relational subject**, constituted through and in their particular relationships, whose agency is the agency of responsive attentiveness rather than autonomous self-determination.

Nel Noddings's development of care ethics [20] makes the relational subjectivity of the care-ethical framework even more explicit. For Noddings, caring is not a one-way relation of the carer toward the cared-for but a **two-way relational dynamic**: genuine caring requires the

carer to receive the cared-for's response and to allow that response to modify the caring activity. The carer who cares without receiving—who provides care without attending to the cared-for's reception of it—is not genuinely caring in Noddings's sense; they are performing care, which is a different and lesser thing. Genuine caring is a form of co-evolutionary engagement: the carer and the cared-for are coupled in a dynamic in which each modifies the other's activity, producing a caring relationship that is irreducible to either party's individual contribution.

Virginia Held's political extension of care ethics [10] argues that care is not merely a private relational practice but a political principle: that the relations of care that sustain human life should be the model for political arrangements, rather than the market relations of self-interested exchange or the contractual relations of autonomous agents. This political extension is directly relevant to the GRW framework: it suggests that the transformation of intimate relational life along GRW lines is not merely a personal project but a political one, requiring the transformation of the social and economic structures that currently prevent care from being recognised and sustained as the primary form of human value production.

Care ethics and GRW: the convergence. The ethics of care tradition—Gilligan's identification of care-ethical reasoning, Noddings's account of caring as a two-way relational dynamic, and Held's political extension of care ethics—provides an independent philosophical grounding for the GRW framework's account of relational subjectivity and relational wealth. Care labour is GRW production; the care-ethical subject is the relational subject of GRW generation; and the political transformation that care ethics calls for—the recognition of care as the primary form of human value production—is the political dimension of the GRW framework's theoretical project.

9.5 Relational Subjectivity: The Third Way

The GRW framework proposes what we call **relational subjectivity** as an alternative to both the liberal individual subject (the autonomous, self-determining agent of the dominant framework) and the care-ethical subject (the responsive, attentive caregiver of Gilligan and Noddings). Relational subjectivity is not a compromise between these two positions but a genuinely different ontological proposal: the claim that the primary unit of subjectivity is not the individual but the **relational field**, and that individual subjects are products of relational dynamics rather than their preconditions.

This proposal has several implications for the understanding of gender and wealth in intimate relations.

First, relational subjectivity dissolves the opposition between the autonomous individual and the relational caregiver that has structured feminist debate since de Beauvoir. If the pri-

mary subject is the relational field, then neither the autonomous individual nor the responsive caregiver is the fundamental form of subjectivity; both are specific modes of participation in relational dynamics, and the question is not which is more genuinely human but which modes of participation are most generative of GRW.

Second, relational subjectivity reconceives the problem of care labour's invisibility. On the individualist framework, care labour is invisible because it does not produce individual wealth—it does not accumulate in the individual's account, does not build individual capital, does not enhance individual autonomy. On the relational subjectivity framework, care labour is the primary form of wealth production precisely because it is the activity that most directly generates and sustains the relational field's GRW. The invisibility of care labour is therefore not a reflection of its unproductiveness but of the dominant framework's inability to see what it produces—a form of epistemic injustice that §12 analyses in detail.

Third, relational subjectivity provides the ontological basis for a non-essentialist feminist politics of intimate life. The claim that care labour generates GRW does not require the claim that women are naturally more caring than men, or that care is essentially feminine. It requires only the empirical observation that care labour has historically been performed predominantly by women, and the normative claim that the distribution of care labour should be organised to maximise the relational field's GRW generation rather than to reproduce existing gender hierarchies. A genuinely relational subjectivity is gender-neutral in its structure—both parties to the relational field are constituted through it, both contribute to its dynamics, and both benefit from its GRW. The gendered distribution of care labour is a historical contingency that the GRW framework, by making care labour visible as the primary form of wealth production, provides resources to challenge.

9.6 The Non-Phallic Wealth and Its Political Implications

GRW is constitutively non-phallic: it cannot be had or lacked, it is not organised by the logic of symbolic power, and it does not promise the completeness that phallic objects promise. This non-phallic character has implications that extend beyond the intimate relational field into the broader political economy of social life.

The phallic economy—the economy organised around the logic of having and lacking, in which wealth is the medium of symbolic power and its accumulation is the pursuit of phallic completeness—is not gender-neutral. The phallic position has been historically identified with the masculine, and the wealth forms that most directly instantiate phallic logic—gold, money, property, productive capital—have been historically controlled predominantly by men. The feminist political economy of intimate relations is therefore inseparable from the critique of phallic wealth: challenging the organisation of intimate relations around the logic of having and lacking is inseparable from challenging the gendered distribution of symbolic power in the broader social field.

GRW's non-phallic character makes it a potentially **liberatory** form of wealth—not because it eliminates the need for material wealth (which it does not) but because it provides a form

of wealth that is not organised by the phallic logic of symbolic power. A relational field rich in GRW is not a field in which one party has more symbolic power than the other; it is a field in which both parties participate in the co-evolutionary dynamics that generate a wealth that belongs to neither of them individually. This is the economic correlate of what the care ethics tradition calls genuine caring: not the unilateral provision of care by one party for another, but the co-evolutionary dynamic in which both parties are simultaneously carers and cared-for, both generators of GRW and beneficiaries of it.

The political implication is significant: if GRW is the primary form of wealth in intimate relations, and if GRW is non-phallic in its structure, then the organisation of intimate relations around GRW rather than around material wealth would represent a transformation of the gendered power structure of intimate life that goes beyond what either liberal feminism (which seeks equal access to phallic wealth) or radical feminism (which critiques the phallic structure itself) has fully articulated. It is the feminist political economy of the *between*: not the redistribution of phallic wealth between individual subjects, but the cultivation of a form of wealth that belongs to the relational field and that is, by its very structure, immune to the phallic logic of having and lacking.

Sara Ruddick's account of maternal thinking [24] provides a further dimension of this feminist political economy. Ruddick argues that the practice of caring for children—attending to their particular needs, responding to their particular vulnerabilities, fostering their growth without controlling its direction—develops a specific form of practical reasoning that she calls *attentive love*: a form of knowledge that is constitutively relational, responsive, and non-possessive. Attentive love is, in Ruddick's account, a politically significant epistemic practice: it is a form of knowing that the dominant framework cannot recognise as knowledge, because it does not fit the model of detached, universal, rule-governed cognition that the dominant framework treats as the standard.

In the GRW framework, attentive love is not merely an epistemic practice but a *wealth generation practice*: the practice of attending to the particular needs and dynamics of the relational field, responding to its contingent events with genuine co-present receptivity, and fostering its growth without claiming its products—the practice of *xuande* in its most fully developed form. The feminist insight that this practice has been undervalued and made invisible is the feminist political economy of GRW: the claim that the most important form of wealth production in human social life has been rendered invisible by the dominant framework's inability to see beyond the phallic logic of having and lacking.

10. The Epistemic Dialectic: The Unverifiability of GRW and the Epistemic Advantages of Traditional Wealth

A theory of wealth that celebrates a form of wealth that is invisible, unverifiable, and unquantifiable must confront the obvious objection: what good is wealth that cannot be recognised, measured, or institutionally protected? This section addresses that objection directly and hon-

estly, arguing that the epistemic opacity of GRW is not an incidental limitation to be overcome but a structural feature that follows from GRW's ontological character—and that acknowledging this opacity is necessary for an adequate account of how GRW and material wealth can coexist in a way that supports rather than undermines intimate relational flourishing.

The section proceeds dialectically: it begins by acknowledging the genuine epistemic advantages of traditional material wealth (the thesis), then shows how these advantages come at a cost that the GRW framework identifies as ontological impoverishment (the antithesis), and finally proposes a synthesis in which the two forms of wealth are understood as complementary rather than competitive, occupying different epistemic and ontological registers with different but equally genuine forms of reality.

10.1 The Genuine Epistemic Advantages of Traditional Wealth

Traditional material wealth—gold, money, property, legally recognised assets—has three epistemic advantages over GRW that must be honestly acknowledged: verifiability, operability, and cognitive accessibility.

Verifiability: The quantity of gold in a vault can be measured by any competent observer, independently of the beliefs, feelings, or intentions of the parties involved. A bank account balance is verifiable by third parties who have no relationship with the account holder. A property title is verifiable through public records. This third-party verifiability is not a trivial advantage: it is what makes material wealth legally protectable, institutionally transmissible, and socially recognisable. Courts can adjudicate disputes about material wealth because the facts at issue—who owns what, how much, under what conditions—are, in principle, verifiable. Insurance companies can protect material wealth because the value of what is insured can be assessed. Tax authorities can levy wealth taxes because wealth can be measured.

GRW has no analogue to this third-party verifiability. The depth of the shared attractor landscape of a life built together cannot be measured by any external observer. The quality of co-evolutionary engagement cannot be assessed by anyone who was not a participant in it. The accumulated holonomy of a relational trajectory cannot be audited. This epistemic opacity is not a contingent limitation that better measurement technology might overcome; it is a structural feature of GRW that follows directly from its ontological character: GRW is stored in the geometry of the relational field, which is accessible only through co-present participation in the field's dynamics, not through external observation.

Operability: Material wealth can be given, received, invested, transferred, and distributed through well-defined operations. I can give you a gold ring; you can invest the proceeds of a property sale; we can divide the assets of a dissolved partnership according to a formula that both parties agree to in advance. These operations are standardised, repeatable, and institutionally supported: there are legal frameworks, financial instruments, and social conventions that specify how material wealth is to be transferred, protected, and distributed.

GRW has no analogue to these operations. It cannot be given—it can only be generated

together. It cannot be invested—it can only be cultivated through co-evolutionary engagement. It cannot be transferred—the GRW of one relational field cannot be moved to another. And it cannot be distributed through an agreed formula—because it is not a stock of discrete units but a structural property of the relational field, it cannot be divided between the parties in the event of the relation’s dissolution. When a long intimate relation ends, both parties lose the GRW that was stored in the shared attractor landscape, and no legal framework can restore it: the legal instruments that distribute material assets in divorce proceedings have no power over the GRW that the shared life generated and that the dissolution destroys.

Cognitive accessibility: Material wealth is easy to think about. Its magnitude can be represented by a number; its distribution can be represented by a table; its change over time can be represented by a graph. The cognitive tools that human beings have developed for reasoning about quantities—arithmetic, algebra, statistics—are directly applicable to material wealth. This cognitive accessibility makes material wealth amenable to planning, budgeting, and deliberate management: one can set savings targets, investment strategies, and distribution plans with reference to quantitative measures of material wealth.

GRW is cognitively difficult. It cannot be represented by a number; its “magnitude” (if that concept applies at all) cannot be compared across relational fields; its change over time cannot be represented on a graph. The cognitive tools available for reasoning about GRW are qualitative rather than quantitative: phenomenological description, narrative, artistic expression, metaphor. These tools are not inferior to quantitative tools—they are, for GRW, more adequate—but they are less cognitively tractable, less amenable to planning and deliberate management, and less susceptible to the institutional protections that quantitative representation makes possible.

The genuine epistemic advantages of material wealth. Material wealth has three genuine epistemic advantages over GRW: verifiability (accessible to third-party measurement), operability (susceptible to well-defined transfer and distribution operations), and cognitive accessibility (representable in quantitative terms). These advantages are not trivial: they are what makes material wealth legally protectable, institutionally transmissible, and cognitively manageable. Any account of GRW that does not honestly acknowledge these advantages is incomplete.

10.2 The Cost of Epistemic Transparency: Ontological Impoverishment

The epistemic advantages of material wealth come at a cost that the GRW framework identifies as **ontological impoverishment**: the reduction of wealth to what can be verified, operated upon, and cognitively accessed through quantitative tools necessarily excludes from the category of wealth everything that is not verifiable, operable, and quantifiable—including the most

significant forms of value generated in intimate relational life.

This exclusion is not neutral. When the only recognised forms of wealth in intimate relations are the verifiable, operable, and quantitatively accessible ones, the invisible forms of relational value generation—care labour, emotional attentiveness, the patient cultivation of co-evolutionary dynamics—are not merely unrecognised; they are **actively devalued**. They appear, from within the dominant epistemic framework, not as forms of wealth production but as the absence of wealth production: as the failure to engage in the quantitatively measurable activities that constitute genuine productivity.

This active devaluation has material consequences. The party who invests their time and attention in the cultivation of the relational field's GRW—rather than in the accumulation of individual material wealth—is, within the dominant framework, making themselves materially vulnerable: they are not building the individual capital that would protect them in the event of the relation's dissolution. This vulnerability is structurally produced by the dominant epistemic framework's inability to recognise GRW as genuine wealth, and it falls disproportionately on those who have historically been most responsible for the relational labour of intimate life.

The cost of epistemic transparency is therefore not merely philosophical—a limitation in what the dominant framework can see—but political and economic: it produces a systematic material disadvantage for those whose primary form of wealth production is invisible to the dominant framework. The feminist political economy of GRW, developed in the preceding section, is the analysis of this systematic disadvantage.

10.3 The Complementary Account: Different Epistemic Registers for Different Ontological Realities

The dialectical synthesis of the preceding two movements is not a compromise—a claim that both forms of wealth are equally good or equally limited—but a **complementary account**: the claim that material wealth and GRW occupy different epistemic registers because they are different ontological realities, and that the epistemic tools adequate to one are not adequate to the other.

Material wealth is a symbolic register phenomenon: it is constituted in and through the symbolic order, organised by the logic of the signifier, and accessible to the tools of symbolic cognition—quantitative representation, legal codification, institutional management. Its epistemic transparency is a consequence of its symbolic character: what is fully constituted in the symbolic order is, in principle, fully accessible to symbolic tools.

GRW is a real register phenomenon: it is constituted in the geometry of the relational field, organised by the logic of structural modification and holonomy accumulation, and accessible only through the qualitative tools of phenomenological description, narrative, and artistic expression. Its epistemic opacity is a consequence of its real character: what is constituted in the real register is, in principle, not fully accessible to symbolic tools, because the real is constitutively in excess of the symbolic.

This complementary account has several important implications.

First, the epistemic opacity of GRW is not a problem to be solved but a feature to be understood: it reflects the ontological difference between GRW and material wealth, and any attempt to make GRW epistemically transparent—to quantify it, to make it legally cognisable, to subject it to the institutional tools of material wealth management—would necessarily distort it, converting the real register phenomenon into a symbolic register one and thereby destroying what is most essential about it.

Second, the epistemic tools adequate to GRW—phenomenological description, narrative, artistic expression, dialogic conversation—are not inferior to the quantitative tools adequate to material wealth; they are different tools for a different reality. The couple who seek to assess the state of their relational field’s GRW through quantitative measures—“how many quality time hours did we have this week?”—are using the wrong tools: they are applying symbolic register tools to a real register phenomenon, and the result will be not an accurate assessment of their GRW but a distorted one that misses what matters most.

Third, the complementary account suggests that the institutions responsible for supporting intimate relational life—legal systems, social services, financial institutions—face a genuine limitation: they can protect and support material wealth, but they cannot protect or support GRW by the same means. This does not mean that institutions cannot do anything for GRW: they can create the material conditions that make GRW generation possible (by ensuring adequate material security, recognising and compensating care labour, regulating the digital extraction of relational value), but they cannot directly manage or distribute GRW, because the tools of institutional management are symbolic register tools and GRW is a real register phenomenon.

10.4 The Practical Challenge: Living with Epistemic Asymmetry

The epistemic asymmetry between material wealth and GRW creates practical challenges for intimate relational life that deserve honest acknowledgement.

The most significant practical challenge is what we call the **recognition problem**: how do the parties to an intimate relation know whether they have GRW, and how do they communicate about it? If GRW is epistemically opaque—not fully accessible to quantitative representation or third-party verification—then the parties’ knowledge of their relational field’s GRW is necessarily partial, perspectival, and difficult to share.

The recognition problem is exacerbated by the three pathologies identified in §8.5: phallic substitution, imaginary fixation, and real register avoidance can all produce the appearance of relational wealth while the real register is depleted. A couple who has accumulated impressive material wealth, who maintains an elaborate social performance of relational flourishing, and who avoids the vulnerability of genuine co-present engagement may experience themselves as wealthy in their intimate relation while their GRW is steadily depleted. The symptoms of GRW depletion—the withering cycle, the loss of co-evolutionary generativity—may be masked

by the accumulation of symbolic register wealth until the depletion is too advanced to easily reverse.

The recognition problem does not have a technical solution—there is no instrument that can measure GRW directly. But it has a **practical response**: the cultivation of the epistemic practices that are adequate to GRW’s real register character. These practices—the attentive phenomenological description of the quality of co-present engagement, the dialogic conversation about the relational field’s dynamics, the artistic processing of shared experience that the happiness jar makes possible—are not measurements of GRW but genuine engagements with it: ways of making contact with the real register of the relational field that allow the parties to develop a qualitative, narrative, experiential knowledge of their GRW that, while not quantitatively precise, is epistemically adequate to what it seeks to know.

The second practical challenge is the **vulnerability problem**: the party who invests primarily in GRW rather than in individual material wealth is making themselves vulnerable in ways that the dominant epistemic framework cannot protect. When the intimate relation dissolves, GRW dissolves with it; the legal framework distributes material assets but cannot restore the relational attractor landscape that the shared life generated. The party who has invested primarily in GRW—who has devoted their time and attention to the cultivation of the relational field at the cost of building individual material capital—may find themselves materially impoverished in ways that the dominant framework does not recognise as a genuine loss.

The vulnerability problem is real and serious, and the GRW framework does not minimise it. The practical response is threefold: first, the political response of ensuring that care labour is materially recognised and compensated, so that investment in GRW does not automatically entail material vulnerability; second, the relational response of ensuring that both parties to the intimate relation invest in GRW together, so that neither is disproportionately vulnerable; and third, the personal response of maintaining an adequate material floor—enough individual material security to prevent material dependency from distorting the relational dynamics—while not allowing the accumulation of individual material wealth to crowd out the investment in GRW that is the primary form of intimate relational flourishing.

11. The Dialectical Movement: Hegel, Marx, and the Historical Materialism of Relational Wealth

The preceding sections have developed GRW as a theoretical concept and have examined it from multiple angles—political economic, semiotic, psychoanalytic, feminist, and epistemic. This section situates GRW within the broader movement of historical development, asking: how did the current organisation of wealth in intimate relations come to be, what contradictions does it contain, and toward what resolution does the movement of those contradictions tend?

The analysis draws on both Hegel’s dialectical logic and Marx’s historical materialism, combining their insights while acknowledging the tensions between them. From Hegel, we take the concept of the dialectical movement of contradictions through thesis, antithesis, and synthesis,

and the insistence that each moment of the dialectic is necessary—that the antithesis is not merely a mistake to be corrected but a necessary stage in the development of the concept [9]. From Marx, we take the insistence that the movement of the dialectic is driven by material contradictions in the conditions of production and reproduction, not by the internal logic of ideas, and that the resolution of contradictions requires material transformation, not merely conceptual clarification [14].

11.1 The Primary and Secondary Aspects of the Contradiction

The central contradiction of wealth in intimate relations can be stated with precision: **GRW is the primary form of wealth in intimate relations—the form that most fundamentally constitutes relational flourishing—but it cannot be generated or sustained without the material conditions that only secondary forms of wealth (material, symbolic) can provide.**

This is a contradiction in the Hegelian-Marxist sense: not a mere inconsistency or logical error, but a real tension within the object itself—a tension that drives the object’s development and that cannot be resolved by simply choosing one side over the other. The contradiction is not between GRW and material wealth as competing values but between the primary form of relational wealth and the material conditions of its possibility.

In the language of Maoist dialectics (itself a development of the Hegelian-Marxist tradition), we can identify a **principal contradiction** with a principal aspect and a secondary aspect:

Principal aspect (GRW): The primary form of relational wealth, the most fundamental constituent of intimate relational flourishing, the form of wealth that cannot be reduced to any other. GRW is the principal aspect because it determines the character of the contradiction—the question of intimate relational flourishing is fundamentally the question of how GRW is generated, sustained, and protected.

Secondary aspect (material and symbolic wealth): The necessary condition for GRW generation, the material infrastructure without which GRW cannot be cultivated. Material and symbolic wealth are the secondary aspect not because they are unimportant—they are necessary—but because their value is instrumental rather than intrinsic: they matter insofar as they create the conditions for GRW generation, not in themselves.

The principal contradiction of relational wealth. The principal contradiction of wealth in intimate relations has GRW as its principal aspect and material/symbolic wealth as its secondary aspect. GRW is the primary form of intimate relational flourishing; material and symbolic wealth are its necessary but not sufficient conditions. The resolution of the contradiction requires not the elimination of either aspect but the transformation of their relation: the organisation of material and symbolic wealth as conditions for GRW generation rather than as substitutes for it or as ends in themselves.

11.2 The Thesis: Pre-Modern Intimate Relations and the Undifferentiated Field

The Hegelian dialectic requires that we identify the thesis—the initial, undifferentiated moment from which the dialectical movement begins. For the history of wealth in intimate relations, the thesis is the pre-modern organisation of intimate life in which GRW and material wealth were not yet clearly differentiated: in which the shared life of an intimate couple was simultaneously a material, economic, and relational unit, in which the labour of household production and the labour of relational care were not yet separated into distinct domains with distinct value logics.

In pre-modern agrarian societies, the household (*oikos*, in Aristotle’s account) was the fundamental unit of both material production and intimate relational life [1]. The work of the household—producing food, making clothing, raising children, maintaining the dwelling—was simultaneously material production (generating the goods necessary for survival) and relational production (sustaining the bonds of care and co-presence that constituted the intimate relational field). The material and the relational were not yet separated; the GRW generated by the shared life of the household and the material wealth generated by the household’s productive labour were aspects of a single, undifferentiated process.

This undifferentiated unity is the thesis: a moment of initial unity that contains within itself the contradictions that will drive the dialectical development. The contradictions are already present in the thesis: the household is simultaneously a site of genuine relational co-evolution and a site of patriarchal power that systematically subordinates the relational labour of women to the material requirements of the productive household. The unity of material and relational production is not a harmonious unity but a contradictory one, in which the conditions for GRW generation are embedded in structures of domination that systematically extract the GRW-generating labour of women for the benefit of the household’s male head.

Traditional wealth forms such as bride-price are products of this contradictory unity: they simultaneously serve the genuine function of material security provision and reproduce the patriarchal power structure that extracts women’s relational labour without recognition or reciprocity. The dialectical analysis does not simply condemn bride-price as an injustice; it understands it as a historically necessary form that contains within itself the contradictions that drive its own supersession.

11.3 The Antithesis: Capitalist Modernity and the Separation of the Material from the Relational

The capitalist transformation of the economy produces the antithesis: the radical separation of material production from relational life, and the systematic subordination of relational life to the requirements of material production. This separation is the defining feature of capitalist modernity for the analysis of intimate relational wealth.

The separation takes a specific form. With the development of capitalist market relations, ma-

terial production is progressively removed from the household and concentrated in the market: the goods that pre-modern households produced for themselves are now produced in factories and purchased in markets. The household is transformed from a site of material production into a site of consumption and reproduction: its function is no longer to produce material goods but to reproduce the labour power that the market requires—to feed, clothe, and shelter workers, to bear and raise the next generation of workers, and to provide the emotional support that sustains workers through the alienation of market labour.

This transformation has two consequences that are directly relevant to the analysis of intimate relational wealth. First, it makes the relational labour of the household—the care, emotional support, and co-present engagement that constitute intimate relational life—**economically invisible**: this labour does not produce market goods and therefore does not appear in any measure of economic productivity. Federici’s analysis [4] is the definitive account of this invisibility: capitalist production depends on reproductive labour but cannot recognise it as productive without being required to compensate it.

Second, and more subtly, the separation of material production from relational life introduces a new form of the contradiction between GRW and material wealth. In pre-modern households, the contradiction between material and relational wealth was embedded in the undifferentiated unity of household life; it was a contradiction within a single process. In capitalist modernity, the contradiction is externalised: the material and the relational are now two separate domains, governed by different logics (the market logic of exchange value and the relational logic of GRW generation), and the contradiction between them is experienced as the conflict between the demands of market work and the needs of intimate relational life.

This externalised contradiction is the antithesis: a moment of radical separation that makes explicit the contradictions that were implicit in the thesis. The antithesis is not merely negative—it is a necessary stage in the dialectical development, because the separation of material and relational wealth makes visible the distinction between them that the undifferentiated unity of the thesis obscured. Only by becoming clearly separate can the two forms of wealth be understood in their proper relation—not as aspects of a single undifferentiated process, but as genuinely distinct forms of value that stand in a specific dialectical relation.

The pathologies of capitalist modernity in the domain of intimate relational wealth are the expression of the antithesis’s one-sidedness: the dominance of market logic over relational logic, the subordination of GRW generation to material accumulation, the commodification of intimate life, and the systematic depletion of GRW through the extraction of relational value by digital platforms, consumerism, and the demands of market work. These pathologies are not contingent failures but necessary expressions of the antithesis’s contradictions.

11.4 The Synthesis: Toward a New Organisation of Relational Wealth

The synthesis—the resolution of the contradiction between GRW and material wealth—cannot be a simple return to the thesis (the pre-modern undifferentiated unity) nor a continuation of the antithesis (the capitalist separation). It must be a higher unity that preserves what is

genuine in both moments while superseding their contradictions: a form of social organisation in which material wealth is organised as a condition for GRW generation, and in which GRW is recognised as the primary form of intimate relational flourishing.

The synthesis is not yet fully realised; it is a tendency within the contradictions of the present moment, not an achieved historical fact. But its outlines can be discerned from the analysis of the contradictions that drive the development.

The recognition of care labour as wealth production is the first element of the synthesis: the social and material recognition of the relational labour that generates GRW, making it visible as a genuine form of productive activity that deserves material compensation and social support. This recognition is already partially achieved in the development of welfare state provisions for childcare, eldercare, and parental leave; it remains incomplete wherever these provisions are inadequate, means-tested, or organised around the assumption that care labour is a private responsibility rather than a social one.

The transformation of material wealth organisation is the second element: the organisation of material wealth in intimate relations as a condition for GRW generation rather than as a substitute for it. This requires the threshold principle of §4.5: material wealth sufficient to remove material stress from the relational field, but not organised around the accumulation logic that introduces settlement, commodification, and indebtedness. Concrete forms of this transformation include the recognition of care labour in legal property regimes (ensuring that the party who has invested primarily in GRW is not left materially impoverished by the dissolution of the relation), the regulation of digital platform extraction of relational value, and the cultural challenge to consumerist forms of relational celebration that substitute commodity exchange for co-evolutionary engagement.

The cultural transformation of intimate relational norms is the third element: the development of a cultural framework in which GRW is recognised as the primary form of intimate relational wealth, and in which the practices of GRW generation—joint attention, timely sharing, co-evolutionary receptivity, non-possessive participation—are valued and cultivated rather than marginalised and made invisible by the dominance of material accumulation logic. This cultural transformation is the domain of the ethics chapter (§12) and the praxis chapter (§14).

11.5 The Historical Materialist Analysis of Traditional Wealth Forms

The historical materialist framework provides the analysis of traditional wealth forms in intimate relations that the GRW framework's structural critique requires but cannot provide on its own. The structural critique shows that bride-price, dowry, and related practices operate through mechanisms (settlement, commodification, indebtedness) that destroy the conditions for GRW generation. The historical materialist analysis explains why these practices developed and why they persist—not as expressions of malice or ignorance but as historically necessary forms that served genuine functions under specific material conditions.

The historical necessity of traditional wealth forms: In pre-modern societies without developed legal systems, without social insurance, without formal financial markets, and without the state capacity to enforce contractual obligations, the material transfer of bride-price served genuine functions that had no institutional alternatives: it provided material security for the bride and her family in the absence of other protections; it created reputational incentives for the groom's family to honour their commitments in the absence of legal enforcement; and it established the social recognition of the new intimate relation in the absence of formal registration systems.

These functions were genuine, and the forms that served them cannot be condemned as simply unjust without acknowledging the material conditions that made them historically rational. The dialectical analysis does not condemn bride-price as a timeless moral failure; it understands it as a historically specific response to historically specific material conditions—a response that contained within itself the contradictions (the reduction of relational value to exchangeable quantity, the structural subordination of women) that drove its own development and that now call for its supersession.

The conditions of supersession: Traditional wealth forms can be superseded—replaced by forms more adequate to GRW generation—only when the material conditions that made them necessary have been superseded. This means: when legal systems are developed enough to enforce relational commitments without material guarantees; when social insurance systems provide adequate material security without the need for family-to-family material transfers; when women's economic independence is sufficient to make material dependency in intimate relations a choice rather than a structural necessity.

These conditions are not uniformly achieved in any existing society, and they are achieved to very different degrees in different parts of the world. The historical materialist analysis therefore cautions against the cultural imperialism of imposing the forms adequate to one set of material conditions on societies where those conditions do not yet obtain. The appropriate response to bride-price is not its condemnation but the transformation of the material conditions that make it necessary—the development of the legal, social, and economic institutions that can serve the genuine functions of bride-price without its relational costs.

11.6 The Dialectical Unity of Necessity and Freedom in Relational Wealth

The Hegelian-Marxist analysis converges with the freedom-wealth dialectic of §4 on a final synthesis that can be stated as follows: **genuine relational freedom requires both the material necessity of adequate material conditions and the relational freedom of GRW generation, and the resolution of the contradiction between them is not the elimination of either but the organisation of necessity in the service of freedom.**

Material wealth is the domain of necessity in intimate relational life: the necessary conditions without which relational freedom is impossible. GRW is the domain of freedom: the form of wealth that can only be generated freely, that cannot be compelled or purchased, that arises from the voluntary co-evolutionary engagement of both parties.

The dialectical unity of necessity and freedom in relational wealth is not a static balance but a dynamic process: the material conditions are themselves transformed by the relational freedom they enable, and the relational freedom they enable generates the social demands for the transformation of the material conditions. The couple whose intimate relational life is rich in GRW will, through the quality of their shared life, generate social knowledge of what intimate relational flourishing looks like, thereby contributing to the cultural transformation that makes GRW generation more widely possible. And the social transformation of material conditions—the recognition of care labour, the regulation of digital extraction, the development of relational wealth institutions—creates the material conditions within which more intimate relational fields can generate GRW.

This dialectical process is not guaranteed to move in the direction of synthesis: it can regress, can be captured by interests that benefit from the antithesis's continuation, can be distorted by the cultural hegemony of material accumulation logic. The political project of the GRW framework—the development of institutions, cultural norms, and personal practices adequate to relational wealth generation—is precisely the project of sustaining the dialectical movement toward synthesis against the forces that benefit from its arrest.

The Hegelian-Marxist synthesis. The dialectical movement of wealth in intimate relations proceeds from the undifferentiated unity of pre-modern household life (thesis) through the capitalist separation of material production from relational life (antithesis) toward a synthesis in which material wealth is organised as a condition for GRW generation and GRW is recognised as the primary form of intimate relational flourishing. This synthesis is not yet achieved; it is a tendency within the contradictions of the present moment. Its realisation requires the recognition of care labour as wealth production, the transformation of material wealth organisation in intimate relations, and the cultural development of norms adequate to GRW generation—all of which are simultaneously theoretical tasks (understanding what the synthesis requires) and practical-political tasks (creating the conditions that make it possible).

12. Ethics: The Practice of GRW and the Critique of Traditional Wealth Epistemology

Theory without ethics is incomplete: a theory of wealth that describes what GRW is and how it is generated, without saying how it ought to be generated and how the conditions for its generation ought to be protected, remains at the level of description when the situation calls for prescription. This section develops the ethical dimensions of the GRW framework in four registers—individual, relational, social, and political—and adds three further dimensions that the theoretical analysis makes necessary: generative justice, epistemic justice, and the dialectical unity of all four levels.

The ethical framework proposed here is not primarily rule-based (a list of obligations to be followed) nor primarily consequentialist (a calculus of outcomes to be maximised) but primarily **virtue-ethical** in the Aristotelian sense: it is an account of the character dispositions, relational habits, and practical orientations that constitute the kind of person and the kind of couple capable of generating and sustaining GRW. Rules and consequences matter, but they are downstream of character: the party who has genuinely cultivated the virtues of relational life will do the right thing not because a rule requires it but because it is what their character calls for.

12.1 Individual Ethics: Virtue and Character in Relational Life

The individual ethical dimension of GRW concerns the character dispositions that make a person capable of genuine participation in the co-evolutionary dynamics that generate relational wealth. Four virtues are central.

Non-possession (非占有性, the virtue of *xuande*): The disposition to participate in the relational field’s generative activity without grasping at its products—to receive the happiness that arises from the *between* with gratitude and without claiming it as one’s own. Non-possession is not indifference: the non-possessive party is not uninvested in the relational field’s flourishing but deeply invested—what they are not invested in is the conversion of the field’s generative activity into individual capital. The connection between non-possession and GRW sustainability is dynamical: the party who attempts to possess GRW—who claims the shared attractor landscape as their individual property, who uses the accumulated holonomy of the shared life as leverage—thereby raises the threshold for relational spikes and reduces the coupling coefficient of the system, accelerating the degradation of the GRW they attempt to possess.

Generous receptivity: The disposition not only to give but to genuinely receive—to allow the partner’s act of sharing to enter the relational field as a relational event, to be moved by what the partner is moved by, to let the contingent event that the partner introduces into the shared attentional field become a relational spike rather than an acknowledged piece of information. The virtue of generous receptivity is the complement of the virtue of timely sharing: sharing without receptivity is a monologue; receptivity without sharing is a mirror. The coupled virtues together constitute the co-evolutionary receptivity that **Paper XIV** identified as the condition for relational happiness [29].

Material modesty: The disposition to treat material wealth as a condition for GRW generation rather than as a goal in itself—to maintain what the threshold principle of §4.5 specifies as adequate material conditions without allowing the accumulation logic to crowd out the investment in co-evolutionary engagement that GRW generation requires. Material modesty is not asceticism or indifference to material conditions; it is the clear-eyed recognition that above the threshold of adequate material conditions, additional material wealth does not generate additional GRW and may actively undermine it.

Temporal generosity: The disposition to treat shared time as the primary resource of intimate relational life—to protect the time of co-present engagement from the demands of market

work, social obligation, and individual pursuit. In the context of contemporary modernity, temporal generosity is perhaps the most politically charged of the individual virtues: the organisation of modern working life systematically extracts time from intimate relational life, and temporal generosity requires active resistance to this extraction. The party who is genuinely temporally generous is not merely being kind to their partner; they are making a political choice about the relative value of GRW and market productivity.

12.2 Relational Ethics: The Obligations of Co-Evolutionary Partnership

The relational ethical dimension concerns the obligations that GRW's co-evolutionary character generates between the parties to an intimate relation. Since GRW belongs to the relational field rather than to either party individually, both parties have genuine obligations with respect to it—obligations that are not reducible to the individual virtues of the preceding section but arise specifically from the shared character of the relational field.

The obligation of non-extraction: Neither party should unilaterally convert GRW into individual benefit—should claim the shared attractor landscape as their individual asset, use the accumulated holonomy of the shared life as leverage in relational power struggles, or exploit the partner's emotional labour for individual material or social gain. The obligation of non-extraction is the relational expression of the individual virtue of non-possession: what non-possession means at the individual level becomes a binding obligation at the relational level, because the extraction of GRW by one party always comes at the cost of the relational field that both parties depend on.

The obligation of joint maintenance: Both parties have an obligation to invest in the maintenance of the conditions for GRW generation—to contribute to the shared attentional practices, the timely sharing, the co-evolutionary receptivity that GRW generation requires. This obligation is not symmetrical in its content (different parties will contribute in different ways, reflecting their different capacities and circumstances) but it is symmetrical in its binding force: both parties are obligated to invest in the relational field's flourishing, and the failure of either party to do so is a genuine relational failure, not merely a personal shortcoming.

The obligation of relational transparency: When one party perceives that the relational field's GRW is being depleted—that the cycle is withering, that the coupling is weakening, that the shared attractor landscape is being degraded—they have an obligation to communicate this perception to the other party. This communication is not a complaint or an accusation; it is the fulfilment of the joint maintenance obligation, an act of care for the shared relational field. Silence in the face of GRW depletion is a failure of this obligation: it allows a reversible process to become irreversible, and it deprives the other party of the opportunity to participate in the restoration of GRW that both parties need.

The obligation of asymmetry acknowledgement: When one party is contributing disproportionately to the relational field's GRW generation—when the distribution of care labour, emotional attentiveness, and co-evolutionary investment is significantly asymmetrical—both parties have an obligation to acknowledge this asymmetry. The acknowledgement does not

take the form of a settlement (“you owe me X for what I have contributed”) but of a relational recognition (“I see what you are doing for us, and I am grateful, and I want to find ways to share this more fully”). Asymmetry without acknowledgement is a form of relational invisibility—a failure to see the other party’s contribution for what it is—and it is both an injustice and a threat to GRW sustainability.

12.3 Social Ethics: Wealth Forms and Their Relational Consequences

The social ethical dimension concerns the question of how different wealth forms in intimate relations are to be evaluated from an ethical standpoint—not in the abstract but in specific historical and cultural contexts. The framework developed here is not universally prescriptive but **relational consequentialist**: the ethical evaluation of a wealth form depends on whether it supports or undermines the conditions for GRW generation in the specific relational and material context in which it operates.

The relational consequentialist criterion: A wealth form in intimate relations is ethically justified to the extent that it creates the material conditions for GRW generation without introducing the settlement, commodification, and indebtedness that destroy those conditions. Applied to bride-price: a bride-price arrangement is ethically justified to the extent that it provides genuine material security for the bride and her family without reducing the bride to a commodity, creating structural indebtedness that forecloses the bride’s relational subjectivity, or settling the relational value of the intimate relation before co-evolutionary dynamics have had the opportunity to generate it. These conditions may or may not be satisfied by any specific bride-price arrangement, depending on the amount, the cultural framing, the material context, and the relational dynamics of the parties involved.

The cultural context requirement: The relational consequentialist criterion must be applied in cultural context. A wealth form that would constitute settlement, commodification, or indebtedness in one cultural context may function as genuine material security provision in another. The ethical evaluation of bride-price in a society with developed legal systems, social insurance, and women’s economic independence will differ from its evaluation in a society where none of these obtain. The historical materialist analysis of §11 provides the framework for this contextual evaluation: the ethical justification of a wealth form is inseparable from the material conditions that make it historically rational.

The cultural imperialism red line: The application of the relational consequentialist criterion must be sensitive to the danger of cultural imperialism—the imposition of one society’s ethical standards on another society’s practices without regard for the different material conditions that make those practices historically rational. The condemnation of bride-price from the standpoint of a society with adequate legal protections and women’s economic independence, without attention to the functions that bride-price serves in societies without these institutions, is a form of cultural imperialism that the GRW framework explicitly rejects.

The universal ethical floor: At the same time, cultural context does not justify everything. The relational consequentialist criterion identifies a universal ethical floor that applies across

cultural contexts: any wealth form that systematically reduces one party to a commodity—that treats the other’s capacity for relational co-evolution as an exchangeable quantity with a price—is ethically unjustifiable regardless of cultural context, because it destroys the conditions for GRW generation that constitute intimate relational flourishing in any cultural context.

12.4 Political Ethics: Social Structures and the Conditions for GRW

The political ethical dimension concerns the obligations of social structures—legal systems, economic institutions, cultural norms—with respect to the conditions for GRW generation. If GRW is the primary form of intimate relational wealth, and if its generation requires specific material conditions, then social structures have a political ethical obligation to create and maintain those conditions.

The social recognition of care labour: Social structures have an obligation to recognise care labour—the emotional, attentional, and physical labour of maintaining intimate relational fields—as a genuine form of socially productive activity deserving material compensation and social support. This obligation is not merely redistributive (a matter of fair distribution of existing resources) but constitutive: the recognition of care labour transforms the social understanding of what counts as productive activity, creating the cultural conditions within which GRW generation is valued rather than marginalised.

The regulation of relational value extraction: Social structures have an obligation to regulate the digital platform extraction of relational value—the harvesting of intimate relational data for commercial purposes that neither generates GRW for the intimate field nor compensates the parties for the value extracted from it. This obligation is an extension of the generative justice principle: value generated through co-evolutionary activity in intimate relational fields should return to those fields, not flow to external extractors.

The de-commodification of intimate life: Social structures have an obligation to resist the commodification of intimate life by consumerist culture—the conversion of relational celebration into market transactions, the substitution of commodity exchange for co-evolutionary engagement, the organisation of intimate life around the consumption of goods rather than the cultivation of shared experience. This is a cultural rather than a legal obligation: it cannot be achieved through regulation alone but requires the development of cultural norms that value co-evolutionary engagement over commodity consumption.

The politics of time: Social structures have an obligation to protect the time of intimate relational life from the demands of market work—to ensure that working hours, leave provisions, and social norms allow adequate time for the co-present engagement that GRW generation requires. This is perhaps the most concretely political of the social ethical obligations: it requires specific policy interventions (working time regulation, parental leave, flexible working arrangements) as well as cultural change.

12.5 Generative Justice and the Ethics of Value

The generative justice framework of Eglash [3], applied to intimate relational wealth, generates a specific set of ethical principles that complement the preceding four levels.

The right to generate: Every party to an intimate relation has the right to participate in the co-evolutionary dynamics that generate GRW—the right to contribute their full relational capacity to the shared field, to have their contribution recognised as genuine wealth production, and to benefit from the GRW that their contribution generates. The violation of this right—through the suppression of one party’s relational subjectivity, the systematic appropriation of their care labour, or the denial of their epistemic contribution to the shared field’s meaning—is a generative justice failure.

The obligation of return: Value generated through co-evolutionary activity in intimate relational fields should return to those fields rather than flowing to external extractors. This principle applies at multiple levels: within the intimate relation (neither party should extract GRW for individual benefit without return), between intimate relations and the social institutions that depend on them (institutions that benefit from the reproductive labour of intimate life have an obligation to support and compensate that labour), and between intimate relations and digital platforms (platforms that extract value from intimate relational data have an obligation to return value to the relational fields that generate it).

The justice of the generative cycle: A just relational field is one in which the generative cycle is genuinely circular—in which no party is structurally reduced to a generator of value for the other’s benefit without return. The evil cycle of Paper IX [27] is, in generative justice terms, an unjust cycle: one party’s generativity is used as fuel for the other’s accumulation, with nothing returned to sustain the generator’s generative capacity. The good cycle is the just cycle: the value generated by co-evolutionary activity returns to the relational field that generated it, sustaining and deepening the conditions for further generation.

12.6 Epistemic Justice: The Right to Know and Be Known in Relational Wealth

Miranda Fricker’s framework of epistemic injustice [5] identifies two forms of epistemic wrong: testimonial injustice (the systematic undervaluing of a knower’s testimony due to identity prejudice) and hermeneutical injustice (the structural gap in collective interpretive resources that leaves a person unable to understand or communicate their significant experiences). Both forms operate with specific and damaging consequences in the domain of relational wealth.

Relational testimonial injustice: Because GRW is epistemically opaque—not fully accessible to third-party verification—one party’s testimony about the state of the relational field’s GRW is particularly vulnerable to systematic undervaluation. The party who reports that the relational field is depleted, that the cycle is withering, that their care labour is being systematically unrecognised, may find their testimony dismissed—not because it is demonstrably false but because the dominant framework cannot see what they are pointing to. The epistemic injustice is compounded when the dismissing party is also the beneficiary of the relational labour

whose value is being denied: the party who benefits from the extraction of the other's GRW-generating labour has a structural interest in not recognising the testimony that challenges that extraction.

Relational hermeneutical injustice: The dominant wealth framework—which recognises only materially verifiable, symbolically codifiable forms of wealth—leaves those who generate GRW without adequate conceptual resources to understand and communicate what they are doing and what is being done to them. The woman whose care labour generates the GRW of the shared life does not have, in the dominant framework, the concepts to say “my work is generating wealth that is being extracted from me”; she can only say “my work is not being recognised,” which sounds like a complaint about recognition rather than a claim about material injustice. The GRW framework provides the conceptual resources that the hermeneutical injustice has denied: it names what care labour produces (GRW), what its extraction constitutes (generative injustice), and what its systematic non-recognition involves (hermeneutical injustice).

Relational epistemic coercion—your original claim: Beyond Fricker's two forms of epistemic injustice lies a third form that is specific to the intimate relational domain and that the GRW framework's analysis of GRW's epistemic opacity makes visible. We call this **relational epistemic coercion**: the active imposition of one party's interpretive framework on the shared relational field, in ways that deny the other party's epistemic right to contribute to the meaning of their shared experience.

Relational epistemic coercion operates through the systematic assertion of interpretive authority over the shared field: “that is not what happened,” “you are misremembering,” “our relationship is not the way you describe it,” “your feelings about what we have shared are not accurate.” These assertions are not necessarily false—genuine disagreements about shared experience are a normal feature of intimate life—but when they function as the systematic denial of one party's epistemic contribution to the shared field's meaning, they constitute a form of epistemic violence that is particularly damaging in the domain of GRW.

The damage is specific to GRW's character: because GRW depends on the genuine co-evolutionary engagement of both parties, and because genuine co-evolutionary engagement requires the recognition of both parties' perspectives as epistemically valid contributions to the shared field, relational epistemic coercion directly undermines the conditions for GRW generation. A relational field in which one party's interpretive contribution is systematically denied is a field in which genuine co-evolutionary engagement is impossible—in which the suppressed party can participate in the field's activities but cannot contribute to its meaning—and therefore a field in which GRW cannot be generated.

Epistemic symmetry as a condition for GRW: The positive ethical principle that follows from the analysis of epistemic injustice is the requirement of **epistemic symmetry**: both parties to the intimate relation must be recognised as epistemically valid contributors to the shared field's meaning—as genuine knowers of the relational field whose testimony about its state deserves credibility, whose interpretive contributions to the meaning of shared experience

deserve consideration, and whose hermeneutical resources for understanding their relational experience deserve development and support.

Epistemic humility as a relational virtue: Epistemic symmetry is supported by the individual virtue of **epistemic humility**: the recognition that one's own interpretation of the shared relational field is necessarily partial and perspectival, that the other party's interpretation is a genuine contribution to the field's meaning rather than a deviation from the correct interpretation, and that the genuine understanding of the relational field requires the dialogic engagement of both parties' perspectives rather than the dominance of either.

Epistemic hospitality as generative practice: Paper XIII's concept of epistemic hospitality [28]—the active good-faith effort to present genuine content in forms that are accessible to the other's epistemic framework—finds its application in the domain of relational wealth as the practice of making one's interpretation of the shared field accessible to the other party's understanding, rather than asserting it as the correct interpretation that the other party must accept. Epistemic hospitality is the positive form of the epistemic justice obligation: not merely refraining from epistemic coercion but actively inviting the other party's interpretive contribution.

12.7 The Dialectical Unity of the Four Levels

The four levels of the ethical framework—individual, relational, social, and political—are not independent but dialectically unified: each level depends on and supports the others in a structure of mutual conditioning that mirrors the dialectical structure of GRW itself.

Individual virtues (non-possession, generous receptivity, material modesty, temporal generosity) are necessary but not sufficient for GRW generation: they provide the personal substrate without which the relational obligations cannot be fulfilled, but they cannot generate GRW without the corresponding relational practices. Relational obligations (non-extraction, joint maintenance, transparency, asymmetry acknowledgement) are necessary but not sufficient: they structure the co-evolutionary engagement that generates GRW, but they cannot be sustained without the social and political conditions that make them practically possible. Social structures (care labour recognition, extraction regulation, de-commodification, time protection) are necessary but not sufficient: they create the material conditions for GRW generation, but they cannot generate GRW directly—only the voluntary co-evolutionary engagement of the parties can do that. And political transformation is necessary but not sufficient: it changes the structural conditions within which intimate relational life unfolds, but the transformation of those conditions into actual GRW generation requires the cultivation of individual virtues and relational practices.

The dialectical unity of the four levels is not a vicious circle but a generative spiral: each level, when developed, creates the conditions for the development of the others, and the development of all four together constitutes the full realisation of the ethical project that the GRW framework proposes. Like GRW itself, the ethical project is self-generating: the cultivation of individual virtues supports the fulfilment of relational obligations, which generates social de-

mands for structural change, which creates political conditions for further cultural development of individual and relational virtues.

The ethical project of GRW. The ethical project of the GRW framework is the cultivation, at four dialectically unified levels, of the conditions under which GRW can be generated, sustained, and protected: individual virtues of non-possession, generous receptivity, material modesty, and temporal generosity; relational obligations of non-extraction, joint maintenance, transparency, and asymmetry acknowledgement; social ethical requirements of care labour recognition, extraction regulation, de-commodification, and time protection; and political ethical demands for the transformation of the material conditions that currently prevent GRW from being recognised as the primary form of intimate relational wealth. The generative justice and epistemic justice dimensions of this project—ensuring that every party has the right to generate relational value and the epistemic resources to know and communicate their relational experience—are not additions to this framework but its necessary internal conditions.

13. Empirical and Cross-Cultural Dimensions

The theoretical framework developed in the preceding sections makes several empirically tractable claims about wealth in intimate relations—claims that can, in principle, be tested through the methods of social science, psychology, and anthropology. This section proposes a research programme for testing the GRW framework’s central empirical predictions, examines the cross-cultural dimensions of relational wealth, and addresses the methodological and ethical challenges that research on intimate relational wealth necessarily faces.

The empirical programme is not a reduction of the GRW framework to its measurable correlates: as §10 established, GRW is epistemically opaque and not directly measurable. What is measurable are the conditions for GRW generation (the quality of co-evolutionary engagement, the distribution of care labour, the presence or absence of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness) and the consequences of GRW depletion (relational dissolution, subjective reports of relational dissatisfaction, health and wellbeing outcomes). The empirical programme therefore proceeds indirectly: it tests the GRW framework’s predictions about the conditions and consequences of GRW generation rather than attempting to measure GRW directly.

13.1 Operationalising GRW: Measurement Strategy

The epistemic opacity of GRW creates a genuine measurement challenge. GRW cannot be directly measured; it can only be inferred from its conditions and consequences. The measurement strategy therefore requires a multi-method approach that triangulates across several levels of analysis.

Condition measures: The conditions for GRW generation identified by the theoretical framework—joint attention quality, timely sharing frequency, co-evolutionary receptivity, the absence of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness mechanisms—can be operationalised through a combination of self-report measures, behavioural coding, and physiological assessment.

Joint attention quality can be measured through established eye-tracking and behavioural coding protocols [8]: the degree to which both partners orient their attention to the same object simultaneously, and the quality of their mutual attunement in this joint orientation. Timely sharing frequency can be assessed through experience sampling methods: couples are prompted at random intervals throughout the day to report whether they have recently shared a contingent event with their partner, how quickly the sharing occurred, and the quality of the partner’s reception.

The presence of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness mechanisms can be assessed through validated questionnaire measures adapted from existing instruments for relationship quality and power dynamics, supplemented by qualitative interview methods that can capture the more subtle and culturally embedded forms of these mechanisms.

Consequence measures: The consequences of GRW depletion can be assessed through established measures of relational quality, subjective wellbeing, and health outcomes. The GRW framework predicts that relational fields with higher levels of GRW generation will show: greater relational stability over time; higher scores on validated measures of relational quality (including the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and the Relationship Assessment Scale); better physical and mental health outcomes for both partners (consistent with the co-regulation literature reviewed in [Paper XIV](#) [29]); and greater resilience in the face of external stressors (consistent with the crisis resilience property of GRW identified in §5.10).

Process measures: The GRW framework makes specific predictions about the temporal dynamics of GRW generation that can be tested through longitudinal research designs. The relational STDP mechanism ([Paper XIV](#)) predicts that timely sharing of contingent events produces greater structural modification of the relational attractor landscape than delayed sharing; this can be tested by measuring the quality of co-evolutionary engagement (through physiological synchrony measures and behavioural coding) as a function of the temporal proximity of sharing to the shared event.

13.2 The Happiness Jar Study: A Proposed Research Design

The happiness jar provides a particularly tractable empirical paradigm for testing the GRW framework’s predictions. We propose the following research design.

Design: A randomised controlled trial in which couples experiencing relational stress are randomly assigned to one of three conditions: (a) a happiness jar condition, in which couples are instructed to record shared moments of happiness daily for eight weeks and to return to these records weekly for joint review and artistic processing; (b) an active control condition, in

which couples engage in a structured weekly conversation about positive relational experiences without the archiving and processing component; and (c) a waitlist control condition.

Primary outcomes: Relational quality (assessed weekly through brief self-report measures), physiological synchrony (assessed through ambulatory heart rate variability monitoring), and relational dissolution rates at twelve-month follow-up.

Process measures: The quality of joint engagement with the happiness jar records (coded from video recordings of the weekly review sessions), the temporal proximity of recordings to the shared events they record (assessed through timestamp analysis), and the degree of artistic processing versus simple factual recording (coded from the content of the records).

Predicted results: The GRW framework predicts that the happiness jar condition will show greater improvements in relational quality and physiological synchrony than either control condition, and lower relational dissolution rates at follow-up. Among happiness jar couples, the GRW framework further predicts that the quality of artistic processing (rather than simple recording) will be the strongest predictor of outcome—consistent with the theoretical claim that the operator O must produce a genuine topological projection rather than a simple record for the structural remainder $\mathcal{R}(O(x), x)$ to be non-zero and generative.

13.3 The Distribution of Care Labour: Cross-National Study

The feminist political economy of GRW predicts that the asymmetric distribution of care labour within intimate relations will be associated with lower GRW generation and worse relational outcomes for both parties—not only for the party who bears the disproportionate care burden (through depletion of their generative capacity) but for the party who disproportionately benefits (through the degradation of the co-evolutionary dynamics that genuine GRW generation requires).

This prediction can be tested through a cross-national study using existing longitudinal panel data (such as the German Socio-Economic Panel or the British Household Panel Survey) combined with newly collected measures of relational quality and GRW conditions. The study would examine whether the asymmetric distribution of care labour predicts worse relational outcomes independent of overall workload, consistent with the GRW framework’s claim that it is the asymmetry rather than the total labour that undermines co-evolutionary dynamics.

The cross-national design allows the examination of the moderating role of institutional context: the GRW framework predicts that the negative effects of care labour asymmetry on relational quality will be attenuated in societies with stronger institutional support for care labour (generous parental leave, publicly funded childcare, flexible working arrangements)—because these institutions reduce the material vulnerability that makes care labour asymmetry destructive rather than merely unequal.

13.4 Wealth Forms and Relational Quality: A Cross-Cultural Comparative Study

The cross-cultural analysis of wealth in intimate relations requires a methodological framework that is sensitive to the cultural specificity of wealth forms while retaining the analytical rigour needed to make comparisons across cultural contexts. The GRW framework’s relational consequentialist criterion—evaluating wealth forms by whether they support or undermine the conditions for GRW generation—provides this framework: it specifies what to look for (the presence or absence of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness mechanisms) while remaining open to the culturally specific forms these mechanisms may take.

Ethnographic component: In-depth ethnographic research in societies with different wealth forms in intimate relations (bride-price societies in sub-Saharan Africa, dowry societies in South Asia, gift-exchange societies in Melanesia, and contemporary Western societies with prenuptial agreements) would document the specific forms of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness that each wealth form introduces into intimate relational life, and the specific relational consequences that follow.

Survey component: Structured survey research across these societies would measure the GRW conditions (joint attention quality, timely sharing, co-evolutionary receptivity) and consequences (relational quality, subjective wellbeing, health outcomes) as a function of the wealth forms present in each couple’s relational field. The GRW framework predicts that, across cultural contexts, the specific mechanisms of settlement, commodification, and indebtedness will be negatively associated with GRW conditions and consequences, regardless of the cultural form these mechanisms take.

The Ubuntu and *ma* studies: The non-Western wealth traditions identified in §2—Ubuntu philosophy and the Japanese concepts of *ma* and *en*—suggest specific predictions about the conditions for GRW generation that can be tested in their cultural contexts. In Ubuntu societies, the GRW framework predicts that community-level support for intimate relational life (the embedding of intimate dyads within wider relational communities that provide material and social support) will be a significant predictor of GRW conditions, consistent with the Ubuntu principle that full personhood is achieved through communal relations. In Japanese society, the GRW framework predicts that the cultivation of *ma*—the quality of shared silence and relational presence that Japanese aesthetic culture values—will be a significant predictor of relational flow states, consistent with the identification of relational flow as the paradigmatic form of GRW engagement in Paper XIV [29].

13.5 Research Ethics

Research on intimate relational wealth raises distinctive ethical challenges that go beyond the standard requirements of research ethics with individual participants. Several of these challenges are specific to the relational character of the research subject.

Relational informed consent: Research that treats the intimate dyad rather than the individual as the unit of analysis requires consent procedures that reflect the relational character of

the subject matter. Standard individual consent procedures do not address the relational implications of participation: the consequences of one partner's withdrawal from the study for the other partner's data, the possibility that participation will itself affect the relational dynamics being studied, and the right of both partners to be informed about the study's implications for their shared relational field. A relational consent procedure would require joint discussion and joint decision-making about participation, with explicit discussion of these relational implications.

The intervention effect: Research participation is itself a relational event that may affect the GRW dynamics being studied—particularly in the happiness jar study, where the intervention is designed to be therapeutic. The observation of the relational field changes the field; the assignment of couples to conditions changes the meaning of their shared experience; the weekly measurement of relational quality introduces a reflexive dimension that may itself affect relational quality. These intervention effects should be explicitly modelled in the research design rather than treated as nuisance variables to be controlled.

Protection of intimate data: The data generated by research on intimate relational wealth—physiological synchrony measures, video recordings of couple interactions, self-reports of intimate relational experiences—are among the most sensitive personal data that social research can collect. Robust anonymisation, strict access controls, and explicit protocols for the management of disclosures of harm within intimate relations (including intimate partner violence, which research on intimate relations may uncover) are essential components of an adequate research ethics framework.

Cultural sensitivity: Cross-cultural research on wealth forms in intimate relations requires particular sensitivity to the risk of cultural imperialism—the imposition of the GRW framework's evaluative standards on cultural practices without adequate attention to the material conditions and cultural meanings that give those practices their significance. The research should be conducted in genuine collaboration with researchers embedded in each cultural context, and the interpretation of findings should be subject to ongoing dialogue with community representatives.

13.6 Potential Biases

The empirical research programme on GRW is subject to several sources of bias that must be acknowledged and managed.

The measurement problem: The primary source of bias in GRW research is the impossibility of direct measurement. All measures of GRW are indirect, inferring the state of the relational field from its conditions and consequences. This indirection introduces systematic bias wherever the conditions and consequences of GRW are confounded with other variables: the quality of joint attention, for example, may be affected by individual differences in attentional capacity that are unrelated to GRW; subjective reports of relational quality may be affected by individual differences in positivity bias; physiological synchrony may be affected by shared environmental factors rather than genuine relational coupling.

The selection effect: Couples who volunteer for research on intimate relational wealth are likely to differ systematically from those who do not: they may be more reflective about their relational dynamics, more open to the possibility of relational change, and more committed to the intimate relation than the broader population of intimate couples. The findings of research with such samples may not generalise to the full range of intimate relational fields.

The reductionist trap: The most philosophically significant bias in GRW research is the temptation to treat the measurable correlates of GRW as GRW itself—to conclude, from the measurement of joint attention quality or physiological synchrony or relational quality, that one has measured GRW. This reductionist move is not a mere methodological error but a philosophical one: it confuses the conditions and consequences of GRW with GRW itself, and it imports into the empirical programme the individualist presuppositions that the GRW framework is designed to challenge. The empirical programme must maintain the distinction between GRW and its measurable correlates throughout the design, execution, and interpretation of research.

The Hawthorne effect in intimate relations: The observation of intimate relational dynamics for research purposes may itself improve those dynamics—not because the study’s intervention is effective but because the attention of researchers, the structure of the research protocol, and the couples’ own reflective engagement with their relational dynamics create conditions for GRW generation that would not otherwise exist. This Hawthorne effect is particularly likely in the happiness jar study, where the intervention is explicitly designed to cultivate co-evolutionary engagement. Controlling for this effect requires careful attention to the active control condition and to the mechanism measures that distinguish genuine GRW generation from the Hawthorne effect.

14. Praxis: Cultivating Generative Relational Wealth in Daily Life

A theory of wealth that cannot say how wealth is to be cultivated—that provides a philosophically rigorous account of what GRW is and how it is generated but remains silent on how it is to be practised in the ordinary texture of daily intimate life—is incomplete in a way that this paper cannot accept. This section turns from the theoretical to the practical, asking: what does the cultivation of GRW look like as a form of life? How are the abstract principles of the preceding sections instantiated in the concrete practices of shared intimate existence?

The praxis account proceeds in three movements. It begins with the happiness jar as the paradigmatic practice—the concrete form in which the theoretical account of GRW re-traversal becomes a daily intimate discipline. It then addresses the practice of resisting the settlement logic that is the primary contemporary threat to GRW generation. And it concludes with the question of how material wealth and GRW can be organised in a mutually supportive rather than mutually undermining relation—the practical synthesis of the freedom-wealth dialectic of §4.

14.1 The Happiness Jar as Daily Practice

The happiness jar (幸福储蓄罐) is not primarily a research paradigm (though it is that, as §13.2 showed) but a daily intimate practice—a form of life rather than a technique. What distinguishes it as a form of life from a mere technique is that it is not a procedure to be followed when problems arise but a discipline to be cultivated as the ordinary texture of shared intimate existence.

The recording practice: The most fundamental form of the happiness jar is the daily recording of shared moments of contingent happiness—the flower noticed on the path, the unexpected quality of light at a particular moment, the wordless co-presence of an unhurried evening, the laughter that arose from a shared absurdity. The recording is not a diary entry in the ordinary sense—it is not a narrative account of what happened but a trace of the co-evolutionary event itself: a photograph taken in the moment, a few words written immediately after, a small object collected from the scene, a voice memo recorded in the afterglow of the shared experience.

The discipline of timely recording is important for the reasons identified by the relational STDP analysis of Paper XIV [29]: the structural modification produced by the recording is stronger when the recording occurs close in time to the original event. The photograph taken in the moment of noticing the flower is a richer index of the co-evolutionary event than the photograph taken an hour later; the words written immediately after the shared experience carry more of the event’s affective texture than the words written that evening. The discipline of timely recording is therefore not merely an aesthetic preference but a dynamical requirement: it is the practice that maintains the indexical connection between the record and the real co-evolutionary event it traces.

The processing practice: The happiness jar’s transformative power lies not in the recording but in the processing: the deliberate return to the records of past co-evolutionary events and their artistic transformation into new symbolic forms. This processing practice is not a nostalgic dwelling in the past but a forward-looking generative activity: the artistic transformation of past records produces new symbolic objects ($x' = O(x)$) that stand in a richer relation to the original co-evolutionary events than the original records alone, opening new dimensions of the shared field’s meaning and generating new holonomy through re-traversal.

The processing can take many forms: writing a poem from a photograph, creating a piece of music from a journal entry, drawing or painting from a shared memory, composing a short story from a collection of small records, or simply reading old records together and allowing the conversation that arises to become the processing. What matters is not the technical quality of the artistic product but the quality of the co-evolutionary engagement that the processing occasions: whether both parties are genuinely present to the processing, whether both parties’ perspectives on the original event are brought into the processing, and whether the result opens new dimensions of the shared field’s meaning rather than closing them.

The re-engagement practice: The third component of the happiness jar practice is the deliberate re-engagement with the processed products—the poems, paintings, recordings, stories

—as occasions for further co-evolutionary engagement. When the couple returns to a poem written from an earlier shared experience, they are not merely revisiting an artistic product; they are re-traversing the relational phase space in the vicinity of the original event, through the mediating structure of the artistic processing, and this re-traversal produces new holonomy that enriches the shared attractor landscape.

The re-engagement practice is most important at moments of relational stress—when the cycle is withering, when the coupling has weakened, when the shared field feels thin and depleted. At these moments, the happiness jar provides a means of reactivating the co-evolutionary dynamics that the stress has suppressed: a way of re-establishing contact with the richer relational field that existed before the stress, and of using that contact to begin the restoration of GRW that the stress has depleted.

The jar in the withering cycle: When the relational cycle has been withering for some time—when the couple has lost the quality of co-present attentiveness that GRW generation requires, when the shared field has become thin and the coupling has weakened—the happiness jar must be approached with particular care. The temptation at such moments is to use the jar as a form of emotional manipulation: to deploy records of past happiness as evidence in a relational argument (“we used to be happy, and now we are not, and it is your fault”) or as a demand for return to an idealised past that no longer exists. This is the spurious processing identified in §6.8: it uses the materials of the shared experience for purposes other than genuine re-traversal, introducing strong suture points that close off the interpretive possibilities that genuine poetic suture preserves.

Genuine re-engagement with the jar in the withering cycle requires a different orientation: not the demand for return but the invitation to renewal, not the assertion that things were better then but the exploration of what made them generative, not the comparison of past and present but the use of past generativity as a resource for present co-evolutionary engagement. This orientation is itself a practice—one that requires the cultivation of the individual virtues of non-possession, generous receptivity, and epistemic humility that §12.1 identified.

14.2 Resisting the Settlement Logic: Daily Counter-Practices

The settlement logic—the tendency to convert the living process of co-evolutionary GRW generation into a closed account of what has been produced and who is owed what—is not merely an institutional feature of the legal framework that governs intimate relations; it is a habit of mind and a cultural reflex that operates in the daily texture of intimate relational life. The cultivation of GRW therefore requires the development of specific counter-practices that resist the settlement logic in its daily forms.

The non-accounting practice: The most fundamental counter-practice is the deliberate refusal to maintain a running account of relational contributions and debts—the refusal to ask “who has done more,” “who owes whom what,” or “what am I owed for what I have given.” This is not the refusal to notice asymmetries (which the ethical framework of §12 requires that both parties notice and acknowledge) but the refusal to convert the noticing of asymmetries

into a claims structure. The party who notices that they have been bearing a disproportionate share of the care labour does not thereby acquire a debt to be repaid; they have occasion for the conversation about relational asymmetry that the obligation of asymmetry acknowledgement requires.

The non-comparative practice: A specific form of settlement logic that is particularly corrosive in contemporary intimate life is the comparison of one's own intimate relation to other relations—whether those of friends and colleagues, or the idealised relations presented in social media and popular culture. Comparison introduces settlement logic by establishing an external standard against which the relational field's GRW is assessed and found wanting: “our relation is not as happy as theirs,” “we do not have the kind of connection that they have.” The non-comparative practice is the deliberate refusal of this external standard in favour of an internal assessment of the relational field's own generative dynamics: not “are we as happy as they are” but “is our relational field generating GRW, and what can we do to support and deepen that generation?”

The anti-commodification practice: The commodification of intimate life by consumerist culture—the substitution of commodity exchange for co-evolutionary engagement in the celebration of intimate milestones—is resisted through the deliberate cultivation of relational celebration forms that generate GRW rather than symbolic register wealth. This is not asceticism—the occasional gift, the celebratory meal, the anniversary trip are not inherently commodifying—but the refusal to allow the commodity form to become the primary expression of relational value. The gift that is chosen with genuine attention to the other's specific needs and desires, that is offered without expectation of equivalent return, and that is received as an expression of the giver's attentive knowledge of the receiver rather than as a market transaction, is not a commodifying gift; it is a form of relational attention that can support GRW generation. The gift that is chosen primarily for its market value, offered as the fulfilment of a social obligation, and received as the settlement of a relational debt, is a commodifying gift that introduces settlement logic into the relational field.

The temporal counter-structuring practice: The organisation of shared time in ways that protect co-present attentiveness from the demands of market work, social obligation, and individual pursuit is perhaps the most politically significant of the daily counter-practices. This requires not only the negotiation of temporal boundaries between intimate relational time and work time (which is necessary but not sufficient) but the cultivation of the quality of co-present attentiveness within the protected time—the capacity to be genuinely present to the shared field rather than merely spatially co-present while mentally elsewhere. The discipline of digital unplugging—the deliberate creation of periods in which both parties are available for genuine co-present engagement, free from the attentional capture of digital devices—is one concrete form of this temporal counter-structuring.

14.3 Organising Material Wealth to Support GRW

The practical synthesis of the freedom-wealth dialectic requires the organisation of material wealth in ways that provide the necessary conditions for GRW generation without introducing the settlement, commodification, and indebtedness that undermine those conditions. This is not a simple task—the material organisation of intimate relational life is constrained by legal frameworks, cultural norms, and economic structures that have been shaped by the dominant wealth logic—but several practical principles can guide it.

The threshold principle in practice: The threshold principle—material wealth sufficient to remove material stress from the relational field, but not organised around the accumulation logic that is alien to co-evolutionary dynamics—requires, in practice, a continuous assessment of what constitutes adequate material conditions in the specific context of the intimate relation. The threshold is not a fixed quantity but a contextual judgement: what is sufficient material security for one couple in one context may be inadequate for another. The practical question is not “how much is enough?” in the abstract but “what material conditions allow us to invest in co-evolutionary engagement without material anxiety?”

The joint decision-making practice: The material organisation of intimate relational life should be determined through genuine joint decision-making—not the dominance of one party’s financial preferences over the other’s, nor the delegation of financial decisions to one party as their “area of responsibility,” but the genuine co-deliberation of both parties about how material resources should be organised to support the relational field’s GRW generation. This joint decision-making is itself a form of co-evolutionary engagement: the process of deliberating together about material conditions is an occasion for the kind of joint attention and mutual responsiveness that GRW generation requires.

The anti-debt practice: The organisation of material wealth in ways that minimise structural indebtedness within the intimate relation—that prevent either party from occupying the structural position of debtor to the other—is a practical requirement of the GRW framework’s ethical analysis. This means: avoiding the use of material gifts as mechanisms of indebtedness (the gift that creates an obligation of return rather than an expression of care); avoiding the organisation of shared finances in ways that create structural material dependency of one party on the other; and maintaining, to the extent that material conditions allow, a minimal individual material floor for each party that prevents material dependency from distorting the relational dynamics.

The care labour recognition practice: The practical recognition of care labour as a form of genuine wealth production within the intimate relation requires concrete forms of acknowledgement that go beyond verbal appreciation—though verbal appreciation is necessary and should not be underestimated. Concrete forms of recognition include: the equitable organisation of care responsibilities between both parties, preventing the systematic concentration of care labour in one party; the inclusion of care labour contributions in any joint financial accounting of the couple’s wealth (recognising that the party who has invested primarily in care labour rather than market labour has contributed to the couple’s GRW even if their market

wealth is lower); and the social representation of care labour as a genuine and valued form of activity in the couple's shared narrative of their life together.

14.4 The Integrated Practice: GRW as a Way of Life

The practices identified in the preceding subsections—the happiness jar, the resistance of settlement logic, the organisation of material wealth to support GRW—are not a list of techniques to be applied sequentially but aspects of a single integrated way of being in an intimate relational field. They are the practical expression of the relational subjectivity that the GRW framework's theoretical account describes: the form of life in which the relational field is treated as the primary subject of flourishing, and in which both parties orient their activity toward the cultivation of the conditions for the field's generative activity.

This integrated practice is not achieved through the deliberate application of rules; it is cultivated through the development of habits, dispositions, and forms of attentiveness that gradually become second nature. Like the Aristotelian virtues, the practices of GRW cultivation are developed through practice: one becomes capable of genuine co-evolutionary engagement by repeatedly engaging co-evolutionarily, of timely sharing by practising timely sharing, of genuine artistic processing by repeatedly engaging in artistic processing, until these activities become the default orientation of one's intimate relational life rather than effortful departures from it.

The temporal horizon of this cultivation is the lifetime. The GRW framework's account of the cumulative structure of relational flourishing—the idea that the deepest form of intimate relational happiness is the quiet, stable, resilient happiness of a relational field that has accumulated, through a lifetime of co-evolutionary engagement, the holonomy of a genuinely shared life—implies that the cultivation of GRW is not a project with a completion date but an ongoing way of being. The couple who has practised the happiness jar for twenty years does not thereby graduate to a state where the practice is no longer needed; they have developed, through the practice, the relational capacities that make the practice richer and more generative with each iteration, producing the cumulative holonomy of a shared life that is itself the fullest expression of GRW.

The root and the flower: Paper IX closed with the image of the root rather than the flower: rather than fixating on the flower's withering, attend to how it was generated; tend the roots, remember how this flower came to be here [27]. The praxis of GRW is the tending of roots: not the grasping at the happiness of shared moments (which, like flowers, pass) but the cultivation of the conditions—the relational attentiveness, the timely sharing, the artistic processing, the non-possessive participation—that make it possible for happiness to continue to arise from the shared field. The flower is the product; the root is the practice. GRW is accumulated in the root, not in the flower, and the couple who tends their roots will find that the flowers continue to come—contingently, unremarkably, on ordinary paths—as long as the roots are alive.

15. Conclusions: At the Boundaries of the Frameworks

This paper has traversed considerable ground, from the political economy of wealth theory to the semiotics of the happiness jar, from the psychoanalysis of phallic signifiers to the Hegelian-Marxist dialectic of relational wealth, from the feminist recovery of care labour to the epistemic justice of the right to know one's relational field. The traversal has been guided by a single question—what is wealth in intimate relations?—and has arrived at an answer that is at once theoretically precise and practically consequential: the primary form of wealth in intimate relations is Generative Relational Wealth, an emergent property of co-evolutionary dynamics that is stored in the geometry of the relational attractor landscape, inexhaustible under use, non-possessable by either party, and self-generating in its structure.

In keeping with the series' commitment to honest multi-framework analysis—the polyphonic conclusion form that refuses the false unity of a single synthetic statement—this section presents the conclusions that each of the paper's major frameworks can and cannot reach, ends with the three concentric circles that constitute the paper's structural closure, and states explicitly why no synthetic conclusion is offered.

15.1 What the Political Economy Framework Can and Cannot Say

The political economy framework can say: that the major traditions of wealth theory share an individualist presupposition that renders GRW invisible; that mercantilist logic, when it enters intimate relational fields through bride-price, gold, and their contemporary equivalents, operates through three specific mechanisms—settlement, commodification, and indebtedness—that destroy the conditions for GRW generation; that the feminist political economy of social reproduction identifies the systematic non-recognition of care labour as a form of GRW extraction; and that the freedom-wealth dialectic is resolved not by choosing between material wealth and GRW but by organising material wealth as a condition for GRW generation.

The political economy framework cannot say: what GRW feels like from the inside; how the symbolic operations of the happiness jar make contact with the real register of the relational field; what the precise dynamical laws governing Δ 's evolution are; or why the relational field generates happiness as its emergent signal rather than some other emergent property. These questions require the other frameworks that the paper has deployed.

15.2 What the Formal Framework Can and Cannot Say

The formal framework—relational STDP, the structural remainder $\mathcal{R}(O(x), x) \neq 0$, the phase space account of GRW accumulation, the Relational Isomorphism Principle—can say: that GRW is stored in the structural modifications of the relational attractor landscape; that re-traversal produces additional holonomy that augments rather than depletes GRW; that the non-zero structural remainder is the formal basis of GRW's inexhaustibility; and that the Relational Isomorphism Principle provides a conjectural account of how symbolic operations in the happiness jar can produce real register effects through structural resonance.

The formal framework cannot say: whether the Relational Isomorphism Principle is correct, since this depends on the metaphysical commitment that the real is relational, which is a philosophical choice rather than a formally derivable theorem; what the precise form of the operator O is, since the von Neumann problem for relational systems means that O is not cleanly separable from the data it operates on; or whether the formal conjectures advanced here (the phase-space reconstruction conjecture, the parametric resonance analogy) will survive more rigorous formalisation. These are genuinely open questions, stated as such throughout the paper.

15.3 What the Psychoanalytic Framework Can and Cannot Say

The psychoanalytic framework can say: that traditional material wealth functions as a phallic signifier that organises intimate relations around the logic of having and lacking; that GRW is non-phallic in its structure, constitutively immune to the phallic logic of symbolic power; that GRW generation involves a circular drive of co-evolutionary generativity that is distinct from both desire and the death drive; and that the three pathologies of relational wealth—phallic substitution, imaginary fixation, and real register avoidance—provide a psychoanalytic typology of the ways in which the conditions for GRW generation can be destroyed while maintaining the appearance of relational flourishing.

The psychoanalytic framework cannot say: whether the concept of GRW as the real register's generative surplus is consistent with the full elaboration of Lacanian theory, since this requires a development of Lacanian theory that lies beyond the scope of this paper; or what the clinical implications of the GRW account are for psychoanalytic practice with intimate couples. These are open questions for psychoanalytic theory and practice.

15.4 What the Feminist Framework Can and Cannot Say

The feminist framework can say: that the dominant model of subjectivity has systematically rendered invisible the care labour that generates GRW; that the care ethics tradition provides independent philosophical grounding for the GRW account of relational subjectivity; that GRW is non-phallic wealth whose cultivation requires and enables a genuinely relational subjectivity that is neither the liberal individual subject nor the care-ethical subject alone; and that the feminist political economy of GRW—the analysis of care labour as GRW production and its systematic non-recognition as a form of GRW extraction—provides the political economic content of the feminist critique of intimate relational wealth organisation.

The feminist framework cannot say: whether relational subjectivity as the GRW framework conceives it is compatible with the full range of feminist theoretical positions; how relational subjectivity is to be articulated in relation to the intersectional dimensions of gender, race, class, and sexuality that Crenshaw's framework requires; or what the implications of the GRW account are for non-binary and queer intimate relations, which the paper's focus on the heterosexual couple has inadequately addressed. These are significant limitations that future work must address.

15.5 What the Ethical Framework Can and Cannot Say

The ethical framework can say: that GRW cultivation requires specific individual virtues, relational obligations, social ethical requirements, and political ethical demands that are dialectically unified in a generative spiral; that generative justice requires every party to have the right to generate relational value and to benefit from the GRW that their generative activity produces; that epistemic justice in intimate relational life requires epistemic symmetry, epistemic humility, and the active invitation of the other party's interpretive contribution; and that relational epistemic coercion—the imposition of one party's interpretive framework on the shared field—is both an epistemic injustice and a direct threat to GRW generation.

The ethical framework cannot say: how the relational consequentialist criterion is to be applied in specific cases where cultural context and universal ethical requirements are in tension; what the obligations of parties to intimate relations are when one party's investment in GRW generation is so asymmetric as to constitute a fundamental injustice that resists the usual relational remedies; or how the political ethical demands of the GRW framework are to be prioritised in conditions of political conflict and material scarcity. These are genuine ethical difficulties that admit of no general theoretical resolution.

15.6 Three Concentric Circles

The paper closes its conclusions with the same structural image that [Paper XIV](#) employed [29]: three concentric circles that represent the three levels at which the GRW account operates.

The **innermost circle** is the intimate relational field itself: the shared attractor landscape of a life built together, the accumulated holonomy of co-evolutionary engagement, the GRW stored in the geometry of the *between*. This is the level of the happiness jar and the shared flower, of the wordless co-presence and the timely sharing, of the artistic processing and the re-traversal. It is the level that the phenomenological account of [Paper XIV](#) described and that the praxis account of the present paper has tried to make practically accessible.

The **middle circle** is the political economy of intimate relational life: the distribution of care labour, the organisation of material wealth, the regulatory framework that either supports or undermines the conditions for GRW generation. This is the level of the feminist critique, the Hegelian-Marxist dialectic, the epistemic justice analysis. It is the level at which the individual practices of GRW cultivation are either supported or undermined by the social and economic structures within which intimate relational life unfolds.

The **outermost circle** is the ontological and metaphysical framework that grounds the entire account: the relational ontology that holds that the real is relational in its basic structure, that the relational field is the primary unit of analysis, and that GRW is a genuine form of wealth that cannot be reduced to any of the categories that the dominant framework provides. This is the level at which the GRB series has been working throughout—the level of [Paper IX](#)'s holonomy framework [27], [Paper XIII](#)'s trust production mechanisms [28], and [Paper XIV](#)'s eudaimonistic reconstruction [29].

The three circles are not independent but mutually constitutive: the intimate relational field is embedded in the political economy that either supports or undermines it, and both are grounded in the ontological framework that makes sense of what they are and what they are for. A complete account of GRW must attend to all three circles simultaneously—which is why the paper has moved between the intimate and the structural, between the philosophical and the political economic, between the formal and the phenomenological, without settling permanently in any single register.

15.7 Why This Paper Has No Synthetic Conclusion

The reader who has reached this point may notice, as they noticed in [Paper XIV](#) [29], that the paper has not provided a synthetic conclusion: a paragraph that draws all the threads together into a single unified statement of what the paper has established. This absence is deliberate, and its reasons are the same as before.

A synthetic conclusion would imply that the paper has said the last word on its subject—that the concept of GRW is now complete, that the political economy of intimate relational wealth is now adequately theorised, that the practical account of how GRW is to be cultivated is now sufficient. But the paper has been honest throughout about what it does not know: the dynamical laws of Δ , the origin of the operator O , the full implications of the Relational Isomorphism Principle, the application of the framework to non-heterosexual and intersectional intimate relations, the clinical implications for psychoanalytic practice, the specific policy interventions that the political ethical demands of the framework require. These are not loose ends to be tied up in a later paper; they are genuine open questions that the paper has generated, and they deserve to remain open.

The absence of a synthetic conclusion is also the paper's enactment of its own central thesis. GRW is not a stock that can be fully inventoried; it is a process that continues as long as co-evolutionary engagement continues. A paper about GRW that concluded with a comprehensive inventory of what has been established would be performing a settlement of what must remain generative. The paper that refuses synthetic closure is the paper that practises, in its own form, the non-possessive participation in the generative process that it recommends as the primary virtue of intimate relational life.

取之不尽，用之不竭。 Inexhaustible in the taking, inexhaustible in the using—because what is being taken and used is not a stock but a process, and the taking is itself a further moment of the process.

Envoi: The Jar

There is a jar.

It does not look like much—a simple container, perhaps ceramic, perhaps glass, sitting on a shelf or a windowsill in the ordinary light of an ordinary room. It has been there for some time. Both of them know what is in it, though neither has counted.

What is in the jar?

Not happiness, exactly. Not memories, not souvenirs, not the accumulated evidence of a life well lived. What is in the jar is more modest and more lasting than any of these: traces. Traces of the co-evolutionary events that have entered the relational field and permanently modified its geometry—the flower on the path, the quality of light at a particular moment, the laughter that arose from a shared absurdity, the wordless evening that was complete in itself. Each trace is an index, existentially connected to the event that produced it, carrying within itself the thread that leads back to the real.

The jar is not a savings account. It does not grow by addition; it grows by depth. When something is taken from it—on an ordinary evening when the relational field is thin, when the coupling has weakened, when both of them feel the distance that has accumulated between them—what is taken is not diminished by the taking. The trace is still there, still existentially connected to the event, still carrying the thread. What the taking produces is something new: a re-traversal, a new structural modification, a tiny increment of holonomy added to the accumulated phase of the shared life. The jar is fuller after the taking than before, in the only sense that matters: the relational field has been re-entered, the attractor has been deepened, the coupling has been renewed.

This is what she taught me.

Not through instruction—not by saying “this is how GRW works” or “this is the relational STDP mechanism”—but through the quality of her presence in the shared field. She showed me, by the patient example of her attentiveness, that the small things matter most: not because they are individually significant but because they are the material of the relational field’s geometry, the events whose structural modifications accumulate into the holonomy of a shared life. The flower on the path. The unexpected song heard through an open window. The particular way the light fell on a Tuesday afternoon when nothing was happening.

She showed me that sharing is not a report but a constitutive act: that the flower, once shared, belongs to the *between* in a way it did not belong before the sharing, and that this belong-

ing is not metaphorical but structural—a permanent modification of the relational attractor landscape that neither of us could have produced alone.

She showed me that wealth is not what you have but what you generate together, and that what you generate together cannot be had—only participated in, only received with gratitude, only offered back to the field that generated it.

与她在故乡的千里之外的相遇，是自己此生最大的幸运。

To have found her, a thousand *li* from home—the most contingent of contingencies, the most improbable of flowers on the most ordinary of paths—and to have learned, in the years since, that the finding was only the beginning: that the real wealth is not in the finding but in everything that has been generated since, in the shared attractor landscape of a life built together, in the jar that grows fuller with every taking.

For her, therefore, this paper.

For the girl from home who loves culture, travel, and the living world—who is herself a form of living world, inexhaustible in the knowing, generative in the being-with. For the one whose steadiness in the real register is the projection that the series has been trying to theorise and that no theory can exhaust.

And for all lovers, everywhere, who have ever stood together in front of something small and contingent—a flower, a quality of light, a bird's call heard through an open window—and felt, without knowing why, that they were rich.

They were rich. The jar was filling. The root was being tended.

取之不尽，用之不竭，因为爱本身就是生成性的。

Inexhaustible in the taking, inexhaustible in the using—because love itself is generative.

生而不有，为而不恃，长而不宰。

To generate without possessing,
to act without presuming,
to foster without ruling.

老子 · *Tao Te Ching*

Acknowledgements

感谢那一位纯粹、自然、坚韧、智慧的"森林女孩"。

My deepest gratitude to the one I call the forest girl—pure, natural, steadfast, and wise. The concept of the happiness jar began, as all the best concepts do, not in a library but in a life: in the quality of her presence in the shared field, in the patient example of her attentiveness, in the way she showed me, without saying so, that the small contingent things are the most lasting. May we continue to fill the jar together.

也愿世界上所有有趣的人，在反复的日常生活中，受于偶然，得之幸福。

And may all the interesting people in this world—caught in the repetitions of ordinary life, in the daily texture of shared existence—find, through contingency, their wealth. Not the gold that can be counted, but the jar that grows fuller with every taking.

Use of Generative AI

The philosophical framework, theoretical claims, and original arguments of this paper are the author's own. The conceptual architecture—including the concept of Generative Relational Wealth, the structural remainder $\mathcal{R}(O(x), x) \neq 0$, the Relational Isomorphism Principle, the von Neumann problem for relational systems, the dialectical analysis of wealth in intimate relations, the epistemic justice framework applied to GRW, and the happiness jar as both theoretical paradigm and practical discipline—was developed through extended dialogue with Claude (Anthropic), a large language model, which served as an interactive writing and development partner throughout the drafting process.

Specifically, Claude assisted with: the drafting and L^AT_EX typesetting of all sections; the identification and organisation of relevant literature across political economy, psychoanalysis, feminist theory, semiotics, and formal systems; the formal articulation of arguments whose substance had been established in prior discussion; and the production of the final compiled document.

The author reviewed, directed, and took intellectual responsibility for all content. The core philosophical positions, the selection of frameworks, all original claims, and all open questions were determined by the author. Claude did not independently generate theoretical positions; it developed and articulated positions established in collaborative dialogue.

References

- [1] Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. Ed. and trans. Roger Crisp.
- [2] Walter Benjamin. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Schocken Books, New York, 1968. Ed. Hannah Arendt; trans. Harry Zohn.
- [3] Ron Eglash. An introduction to generative justice. *Teknokultura*, 13(2):369–388, 2016.
- [4] Silvia Federici. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Autonomedia, New York, 2004.
- [5] Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- [6] Hans-Georg Gadamer. *Truth and Method*. Continuum, London, 2, rev. edition, 2004. Trans. revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall; orig. *Wahrheit und Methode*, 1960.
- [7] Carol Gilligan. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1982.
- [8] Uri Hasson, Asif A. Ghazanfar, Bruno Galantucci, Simon Garrod, and Christian Keysers. Brain-to-brain coupling: A mechanism for creating and sharing a social world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(2):114–121, 2012.
- [9] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1977. Trans. A. V. Miller; orig. *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, 1807.
- [10] Virginia Held. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
- [11] Yoshiki Kuramoto. *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence*. Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [12] Jacques Lacan. *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. W. W. Norton, New York, 2006. Trans. Bruce Fink; orig. *Écrits*, 1966.
- [13] Laozi. *Tao Te Ching*. Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1963. Trans. D. C. Lau.
- [14] Karl Marx. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume I*. Penguin, London, 1976. Trans. Ben Fowkes; orig. 1867.
- [15] Abraham H. Maslow. *Motivation and Personality*. Harper & Row, New York, 1954.
- [16] Marcel Mauss. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. W. W. Norton, New York, 1990. Trans. W. D. Halls; orig. *Essai sur le don*, 1925.

- [17] John S. Mbiti. *African Religions and Philosophy*. Anchor Books, Garden City, NY, 1970.
- [18] Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Routledge, London, 1962. Trans. Colin Smith; orig. *Phénoménologie de la perception*, 1945.
- [19] Thaddeus Metz. Ubuntu as a moral theory and human rights in south africa. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, 11(2):532–559, 2011.
- [20] Nel Noddings. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1984.
- [21] Charles Sanders Peirce. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1931. Ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss, Vols. 1–6.
- [22] Thomas Piketty. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2014. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer; orig. *Le Capital au XXI^e siècle*, 2013.
- [23] Carlo Rovelli. Relational quantum mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8):1637–1678, 1996.
- [24] Sara Ruddick. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. Beacon Press, Boston, MA, 1989.
- [25] Amartya Sen. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.
- [26] Wei-ming Tu. *Confucian Thought: Selfhood as Creative Transformation*. SUNY Press, Albany, NY, 1985.
- [27] Wanhong. The sustainability of intimacy: Poetic generativity and generative justice. Philosophy of Intimacy and the Theory of Justice, Paper IX. Working draft, 2025.
- [28] Wanhong. The causality of the non-binding vow: On trust, promise, and the generation of expectation in the absence of the other’s sword. Philosophy of Intimacy and the Theory of Justice, Paper XIII. Working draft, 2026.
- [29] Wanhong. Contingency, existence, and eudaimonia in intimate relations: Toward a generative-relational existentialist eudaimonism. Philosophy of Intimacy and the Theory of Justice, Paper XIV. Working draft, 2026.