

Consider the following passages:

"Authority is never egalitarian. An authority is always a superior of some kind, to be obeyed in some cases, in other cases to be followed, consulted, attended to, deferred to, or conformed to. . . . Authority in all its forms is associated with, and is a constant reminder of, some human limitation, weakness, or dependency" (Watt: 7).

"[A]uthoritative relationships exist between unequals: between master and novice, superior official and subordinate, leader and follower" (27)

"Authority is always associated with inequality of some kind, and nowhere is this more obvious than in the authority that goes with knowledge. In knowing *how* as well as in knowing *about*, some people know more than others. It is often rational to defer to the judgement of those who know more than we do, and irrational to prefer our own judgement. It is often the easiest way, and sometimes the only way, in which we escape from our own ignorance or incapacity" (47).

"Moral authority can be thought to exist only if we consider someone else's *moral* judgement to be more reliable than our own" (59).

"[A]ll authoritative relationships are marked by inequality in some sense" (66)