

Coerced Promises

Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Coerced Promises

Coerced promises are not morally or ethically-appropriate since based on the idea of intuition. Coerced promises have no real justification that person promising will fulfil the promises. Therefore, the reliability of promises should be taken into account since they create an interactive environment where one party carries the obligation to fulfil something out of coercion; therefore, creating over-expectations to the other party. The paper will articulately describe why coerced promises are only appropriate in the context of strangers as opposed to intimate relationships. The underpinning moral foundation behind coerced promises is based on the question of whether someone should be pressed hard to make a promise. In the face of the prevalence of coerced promises, the paper argues why it is inappropriate for people in intimate relationships to make false promises when faced with challenging situations. The second part of the paper will delineate why coerced promises are impossible. From a universal law perspective, the paper will give insight into why promises made of coercion are not considered as real promises; therefore, the victim of coerced promises have no obligation to fulfil the same.

In this regard, it is irrational since it shows that promises are valuable in modern society since people feel that they are less obligated to fulfil the promises that they make. People are more inclined to believing or making promises since they carry no moral force. Therefore, people in relationships using coerced promises shows that the foundation of their relationship is built on the fabric of lies. The reason behind the prevalence of promises is that the people making coerced promises are given the moral power to develop and take obligations on their own. Therefore, relationships will thrive better when both partners are given to have moral powers and obligations to fulfil the same. People attach some much importance to promises since they shift the moral powers to make them actionable to another person (Chwang, 2010). Thus,

the argument cannot be carried to the next paragraph since coerced promises are based on assumptions that the individual making the promise should bear the weight of fulfilling it by virtue of uttering what the other party expected.

In addition, the four counterexamples on coerced promises fail since they are founded on the fabric of immorality. In this regard, the counterexample of surrender fails; it is perceived as coerced action as opposed to coerced promises. The actions associated with surrender shows that winning depends on the other losing; therefore, the victims are required to raise their hands and refrain from being picked up something that can cause harm to the other party. In this regard, promissory language is interpreted wrongly since the legitimacy of the surrender is questionable since the victor does not have the capacity to issue credible threats. The threats of the victors are intertwined with the perceptions that the assailant uses equipment such as guns to make their victims morally powerless. The counterexample of a shotgun wedding failed since Pa was not permitted to shoot his assailant for making Emily pregnant (Chwang, 2010). Thus, the phenomenon does not carry any moral force since in case Pa was permitted to shoot on moral grounds, the wedding proposal will be rendered as an offer rather than a threat.

Moreover, the counterexample of parental discipline failed since coercing a child to behave no moral power. Even though parents are able to credible threats, the latter is required to lose contact with their children after the promise is made to enforce the same. In the real world, children are required to obey their parent. Therefore, parents are required to carry out the punishment intended; therefore, they are deemed as making an offer rather than a coerced promise. Lastly, the alleged example of judges and criminals is inauthentic since the latter makes coerced promises with a moral force in a bid to make the offenders reform (Chwang, 2010). In this regard, a judge is likely to coerce an offender and use punishment as a threat to enforce the

same. The phenomenon described above does not depict the happenings of the real world. Therefore, they have no moral power since they are morally-permitted to do so, resulting in a situation of coercion due to the availability of a threat.

Furthermore, the response to the counterexample of surrender can be extended to the coerced promise based on the symbolic gestures that the victim uses. For example, a person can surrender after falling on his or her knees before surrendering, and the offender goes on to harm them. In this scenario, individuals are likely to argue that when winning is aimed at annihilating the loser, then the usage of the white flag is due to coercion. In the end, the scenario depicts the person making the threats as using coercion without making an explicit proposal. The counterexample of the shotgun is not resolvable since a situation can arise where Pa is morally-obligated to shoot Ben for his actions against his daughter. In such a case, the wedding proposal will be an offer instead of a threat (Chwang, 2010). Pa will be justified on shooting Ben with regards to what he had done to her daughter. Therefore, this case is challenging since it carries do not carry the moral force, and it is not even coercive. Ben can marry Emily in this case; therefore, it is not coercive since it is possible.

Additionally, the counterexample of parental discipline is not resolvable since the mother makes an offer for the child to apologize or be punished by being quiet for 10 minutes. Thus, the scenario depicts the issuance of an offer rather than a threat. The only way it can become a threat is when the parent causes the child to apologize after seeing her carrying a cane. Lastly, the counterexample of judges and criminals is deemed irresolvable based on the concept of "Promise to Behave." Thus the judge is depicted as making an offer rather than a threat. The phenomenon shows that in case the promise of change was coerced, it would be impossible.

Coerced promises are not appropriate for intimate couples; it shows that there is lack of integrity between the partners since one party is given the obligation to fulfil the promise. There are some promises in relationships that can be difficult to fulfil. In these cases, a partner is likely to feel disappointed without taking into account that the promise was coerced in the first place. Therefore, promises in relationships should be offers to avoid portraying an image of one partner seeing the other as manipulative. Besides, partners do not have the moral power to fulfil promises that are impossible by virtue of being in a relationship. The case of coerced promises in relationships correlates to the value attached to promises. Also, a partner can promise something that they know is impossible to achieve.

In conclusion, coerced promises should not be entertained in intimate relationships since they violate the very foundation on which intimacy is built on. Also, there should be balanced ground for negotiation so that not only party is left with a burden of bearing the obligations. Besides, there should be a clear line between moral power and an offer in a bid to comprehend the concept of coerced promises.

Reference

Chwang, E. (2010). On coerced promises: Chapter 6. 156-182.