

UNITED WISDOM

Must We Always Keep a Promise?

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-17-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Must We Always Keep a Promise?

Epigraph

> *When agreements are made according to what is right, what is spoken can be made good.*

The Analects I.13, the philosopher Yu's words, James Legge translation. The agreement's rightness is a condition; the historical context establishes no contemporary contract law.

What this article is about

Vadim promised to transport books for a small reading group on Saturday. The organiser declined another vehicle and arranged the time. On Friday, he was invited to an interesting meeting. Transport now seems dull and inconvenient; he wants to say that no spoken word should limit freedom. The other extreme sounds familiar too: a promise must be fulfilled under all conditions. Between them, we lose the question of what a promise creates and why not every action becomes permissible through confident agreement.

This hypothetical scene concerns an ordinary, freely accepted task. Nobody has become ill, conditions have not changed, and hidden circumstances have not emerged. The question concerns neither subsequent revision nor an initial lack of knowledge. It concerns the word's weight, the reliance it creates, and the boundaries of performance. We will examine why wanting to withdraw does not cancel an agreement, why promising something wrong does not make it right, and how agreed release differs from unilateral disappearance. The answer will be no universal judgment of character or substitute for legal decisions. It aims to clarify a particular action and responsibility for it.

I. A Promise Differs from a Wish and a Prediction

Vadim can want to help, expect to be free, and actually accept the transport task. These statements look alike only from a distance. A wish expresses a preference. A prediction reports an expected capacity. A promise lets someone rely on a definite action. Saturday, the car, and the books were agreed in the scene; the organiser built her next step on that answer. Withdrawal therefore involves more than Vadim's changed desire. It affects an option his words already allowed another person to consider available.

Not every friendly remark becomes a promise. It would be nice to help differs in purpose and definiteness from I will collect the books at ten. That distinction nevertheless does not permit retrospectively interpreting clear agreement as a casual prediction. If Vadim remembers

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

confirming the time when asked, saying he was merely hoping does not describe the conversation. Checking should recover actual words and intelligible expectations, rather than choose the most advantageous formulation after another meeting becomes possible.

Conversely, the listener's expectation alone does not establish an obligation. They may have taken polite attention for agreement without asking. The discrepancy then needs naming and the task clarifying. Nobody can require performance of everything they wanted to hear. Responsibility may include communicating an ambiguity, especially if it became apparent beforehand. That differs from acknowledging a definite promise. Precision protects both parties: the recipient from empty agreement, the speaker from limitless expansion of their participation's meaning.

A promise need not be solemn. Its weight in an ordinary task can arise through a simple answer. That simplicity requires attention: something said within a minute can organise several hours of someone else's day. Recognising this does not make all speech a potential trap. Intention, conditional capacity, and accepted action can be honestly separated. Such language does not diminish freedom. It permits exercising freedom before agreement and retaining responsibility afterwards, without erasing the difference between those moments.

II. Keeping One's Word Matters for the Relationship, Beyond Self-Image

Vadim may fulfil the task to remain someone who always keeps his word. That self-conception can support action, but does not exhaust the ethical subject. If preserving a flawless biography matters most, the organiser becomes a means of testing his character. Her task, time, and opportunity to respond recede. It is more useful in this scene to ask what was accepted for another person than to defend the title of reliable person at any cost.

Reliability appears in possibilities for shared action. The organiser need not check hourly whether Vadim's promise still stands. If clear agreements repeatedly change without communication, others need backup plans even after confirmation. This describes a possible consequence, rather than a measured psychological effect. It shows why nonperformance can cost more than the journey's duration: a basis for planning with this person's participation is lost. We claim no inevitable loss of every relationship following one refusal.

Psalm 15 depicts a person living truthfully before God and maintaining an oath despite personal loss. In the biblical religious context, fidelity belongs to a wider righteous life. The limited comparison recalls that inconvenience does not itself empty a word. It authorises no harm through any oath's content and does not turn an ordinary journey into a religious vow. The source's grounds and the modern scene's particularity are preserved rather than declared a common code of every tradition.

If Vadim fulfils the transport task, he need not exhibit his sacrifice and demand gratitude for every minute. He freely accepted the agreement; a more interesting meeting has not made it someone else's unjust domination. He can acknowledge that the choice has become less pleasant and still perform it. This preserves his authorship of the action. Instead of claiming the books forced him, he can say more precisely that he earlier agreed, someone relies on it, and he now considers that a ground for acting.

III. Inconvenience Is Not Identical to Grounds for Cancellation

After the invitation, the transport time feels lost. Beforehand, it was a chosen contribution. Changed attractiveness does not mean the agreement changed. A new opportunity can produce regret, but regret does not automatically release a promise. Otherwise, every promise lasts only until a more appealing option arrives. The word then loses its purpose: it no longer allows reliance on something definite because it continually depends on an unknown next alternative.

This reasoning has a limit. It does not make every inconvenience trivial or tell someone their own life lacks significance. One can reconsider future agreements' extent and notice a habit of accepting too much. Deciding to stop promising transport in future nevertheless differs from disappearing from an already accepted Saturday. Today's irritation sometimes yields a useful conclusion about later participation without cancelling today's task. Holding both levels is more precise than choosing between permanent submission and having no commitments at all.

Vadim can request release or offer a confirmed replacement. The question then remains open to the organiser's response. If she agrees, the agreement changes jointly rather than only in his thoughts. If she declines, that does not automatically prove cruelty. Another vehicle may genuinely be unavailable, or postponement may disrupt the plan. Declining release establishes no indefinite right to control him; it concerns a definite accepted task. Neither party should enlarge that task into a judgment of the other's whole person.

Keeping a word after it loses appeal is difficult precisely because freedom was real at the outset. Its trace now remains in someone else as intelligible expectation. This is no physical chain or final prohibition on revision. It is a significant ground to consider in the next action. In the initial scene, it weighs more than changed preference alone. That assessment concerns the described case rather than equating professional contracts, dangerous relationships, and every human request.

IV. The Promise's Content Also Needs Assessment

If someone promised to humiliate an absent person or disclose information they cannot rightly dispose of, promising does not make that action right. This differs from inconvenient book transport. Recognising the difference prevents fidelity from becoming blind performance. Someone can break a promise of a wrongful act while acknowledging the mistake in making it. Refusing performance need not erase the earlier agreement. It can stop the error continuing while retaining responsibility for expectations already created.

At the beginning of Republic I, Socrates examines justice defined as truthfulness and returning what is owed. The example of returning arms shows that a general action's name alone does not assess every instance. The dialogue supplies no modern mental-health standard, household weapons procedure, or complete promise theory. We use only a limited question: does performance become right because it can be called repayment or fulfilment? The answer requires attention to particular content and consequences.

The danger is renaming every unwanted task wrongful. Vadim may find transport humiliating because he would rather discuss books than carry boxes. That experience does not establish the task's ethical impermissibility. Identify a significant ground: whose rights, consent, or dignity does the action itself affect? If the ground is simply preferring something else now, the question returns to preference. A strong cannot must not decorate an ordinary do not want to.

Fidelity and content assessment therefore are not mutually exclusive principles. The first preserves accepted responsibility's weight; the second prevents using that weight as permission to harm. Their relationship needs particular examination. A permissible and genuinely accepted action carries strong grounds for performance. An impermissible action carries grounds for refusing performance and correcting what is available. Unclear content requires clarification. This author-designed sequence is not attributed to Plato as a ready procedure and does not replace decisions about legally binding contracts.

V. Fidelity Differs from Stubbornly Proving Consistency

Vadim may object that if promises can be assessed after being spoken, nobody will remain reliable. The concern recognises a real possibility of self-justification, but banning all examination does not resolve it. Consistency matters when directed towards a worthy, intelligible task. Stubbornly repeating an erroneous action preserves only outward resemblance to earlier words. It can defend an inflexible self-image while leaving consequences to others. Distinguish fidelity to accepted responsibility from refusing to hear grounds concerning its content.

In Analects I.13, the philosopher Yu connects a word that can be made good with an agreement's rightness. In XIII.20, determination to speak sincerely and carry out everything said does not itself represent the highest ethical level. The historical context concerns an official's qualities and retains its hierarchy. The limited comparison shows that firmness needs an object of assessment. It does not make the ancient hierarchy a contemporary ranking of human dignity or derive a ready revision procedure from brief sayings.

In ordinary situations, the distinction appears in responding to another person. A reliable participant clarifies what is needed and hears consequences. A stubborn participant may literally do what they once said even after the recipient clearly declines. If the organiser finds another vehicle and asks Vadim not to come, demonstrative transport no longer necessarily preserves the agreement. Having said something does not grant the right to impose it on its proposed recipient. Consent continues to matter after initial acceptance.

A request for release nevertheless does not always make the recipient's refusal an exercise of domination. Preserve the particular history. Was agreement free? Who relied on it? What change is now proposed? What response was received? This history guards against performance for a heroic self-image and convenient withdrawal in freedom's name. Fidelity concerns people and purposes when consistency is assessed through more than matching words: it also preserves the grounds that gave those words meaning.

VI. Release by Agreement Differs from Secret Cancellation

Vadim asks whether another driver could be found, and the organiser agrees to consider it. That agreement does not yet finally cancel the transport. Until replacement is confirmed, the previous expectation may remain. Clarify the stage: searching is permitted, but the result is not secured. Otherwise, discussing change easily produces different understandings of the same day. Vadim considers himself free; the organiser thinks he is finding assistance while remaining responsible for the original vehicle. Truthful communication keeps the transition visible.

Release has a subject and an appropriate source. The person promised an action can decline it or accept another option within their role. A group member not responsible for transport cannot necessarily release Vadim from the organiser's expectation. Nor can an affected promise be cancelled merely through a conversation with a friend who approves withdrawal. Support helps with difficulty but does not replace the response of the person relying on performance. Here, the question goes to the agreement's party rather than a convenient witness.

Consent may contain conditions: another driver confirmed by evening, transport on Sunday, or performance of only part. Conditions must not disappear beneath a general claim that

agreement was reached. Naming them lets the new task's fulfilment be checked. This does not bureaucratise friendly help. One clear message may suffice for a small task. Both parties need to understand what they may now rely on instead of deriving different releases from the same polite words.

If consent is absent, one can still take responsibility for unilateral withdrawal. Sometimes a person will not perform the promise. Calling this withdrawal and recognising its consequence is more honest than declaring the conversation automatic release. The article imposes no universal penalty or indefinite compensation. It preserves different states: requested, received agreement, proposed replacement, confirmed replacement, cancelled unilaterally. Without that distinction, revision may merely conceal what happened to another person's intelligible expectation.

VII. Nonperformance Calls for Particular Correction

Suppose Vadim chose the meeting and failed to arrive. The next day, he wants to explain being tired, distressed, and unwilling to disappoint anyone. These conditions may be true and deserve attention. They do not describe the whole matter. The organiser lacked transport after confirmation. The first available acknowledgment concerns precisely that: he agreed, she relied on it, he did not perform or notify her in time. Accuracy requires no public humiliation. It prevents replacing the event with a narrative of inwardly good intention.

Correction depends on the consequence rather than only wanting to feel reliable again. The books may still need moving; others may already have done it at a cost in time. Find out what remains without demanding that the organiser immediately supply redemption. She may not want new help. His offer does not give Vadim a right to regain the former role unilaterally. Preserving another person's voice especially matters after an action that already deprived them of choosing an alternative in time.

A corrective promise needs proportion too. Saying he will always be there creates an enormous new expectation without repairing the missed Saturday. Name one action, deadline, and available extent. If the organiser agrees, a new task arises. If not, acknowledgment still matters as an accurate description rather than a bargain to restore reputation. Forgiveness, gratitude, and trust cannot be demanded in exchange for finally naming one's own nonperformance.

It helps afterwards to change how future agreement is made. Vadim may answer later, clarify duration, or accept fewer journeys. Such changes matter if they do not rewrite the past as someone else's excessively strict request. Learning about one's capacity can coexist with acknowledging a freely accepted, unperformed task. Calling oneself an unreliable person is too large to correct one journey. Saying nobody may expect anything erases its ethical

meaning. Between them lies definite responsibility that permits a new, more honest participation.

VIII. Freedom Remains Before and After a Promise

Before agreeing, Vadim can decline transport, suggest another day, or say he has not decided. He need not become a flawless volunteer to hold that right. Freedom does not disappear after clear agreement, but action gains another ground of assessment: someone was already enabled to rely on it. Freedom cannot therefore be considered as though the conversation never happened. The accepted word becomes part of the circumstances of the next choice, while the person remains that choice's author.

This does not give a promise power over an entire life. Accepting book transport does not require attending every meeting, accepting any new request, or supporting another's position. Expansion needs separate discussion. Someone can keep a definite word and decline the next task. Such limitation protects fidelity itself: if every agreement quietly becomes permanent availability, promising becomes dangerous and the definite task disappears beneath a general designation of being one of us.

Always therefore needs several distinct answers. Not every statement is a promise. Not every promised action is permissible. Not every cancellation breaches an agreement if intelligible release is given. And not every inconvenience justifies withdrawal. These distinctions supply no universal excuse; they make responsibility precise. Vadim has strong grounds to perform ordinary transport or obtain actual consent to replacement. A more interesting invitation alone supplies no such consent.

Keeping one's word means maintaining a relationship to the accepted task and the person relying on it. Sometimes that means performance, sometimes justified refusal of wrongful content with acknowledgment of the error, sometimes agreed release. Truthful description and limits matter in each case, beyond a consistently heroic image. A promise gains ethical force through responsibility for freely created expectation. That force deserves respect without making speech permission for every action or erasing people's ability to respond to matters affecting their lives.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary promise. Recover the words, task, deadline, and confirmation without reading motives. Distinguish a wish, prediction, conditional agreement, and definite acceptance. Identify what the other person changed in reliance on your answer, if known. Do not declare every expectation obligatory, or retrospectively turn clear agreement into casual hope. In legal, dangerous, or professional situations, this exercise replaces neither the relevant decision nor qualified assistance.

Examine the content. Is the action itself permissible with regard to affected people's consent and rights? If not, identify grounds for refusing performance and your mistake in accepting. If permissible, clarify why you no longer want it. Changed attractiveness differs from significant grounds. Future promises can be limited while responsibility for the present one remains. Do not use a large declaration of freedom to erase a particular conversation.

If changing the task, approach the agreement's party. Name the proposed replacement, its stage, and confirmation deadline. Until actual agreement, do not treat requesting release as release itself. If consent is obtained, check the new conditions. If withdrawing unilaterally, name it honestly and recognise a definite consequence without requiring understanding in exchange for explanation.

After acting, examine one promise's fulfilment rather than a whole person's worth. Offer available correction after nonperformance, leaving the recipient free to decline. Formulate one future boundary for more precise agreements. This author-designed practice is no reliability test and carries no research efficacy claim. It clarifies accepted responsibility so that fidelity becomes neither stubbornly doing wrong nor an attractive name for cancellation without trace.

Key quotation

> *He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not.*

Psalm 15:4, concluding clause, King James Version. This edition's numbering is retained. The passage concerns fidelity before God within righteous living; the excerpt does not make wrongful promises permissible.

Connections between traditions

Source	Context	Limited comparison	Difference retained
Analects I.13	Right agreement and a word made good	Content matters alongside fidelity	Historical saying is not contract law
Analects XIII.20	An official's qualities	Firmness alone is not the highest evaluation	Ancient hierarchy does not rank modern dignity
Plato, Republic I	Examining justice's definition	Repayment and performance need particular content	No modern medical or emergency procedure
Psalm 15:1–5	Truthful living before God	Inconvenience does not empty an accepted word	The source's religious context remains
United Wisdom	Vadim's hypothetical transport	Performance, content, release, and correction	The practice is not attributed to ancient texts

Sources

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge, Project Gutenberg 3330. Continuous selected I.4–15 and XIII.17–23 contexts were read, web lines 37–47 and 367–374; I.13 and XIII.20 are used. The epigraph is I.13's first sentence, spoken by the philosopher Yu rather than wrongly attributed to Confucius himself.

• Plato. The Republic, Benjamin Jowett, Project Gutenberg 1497. A continuous selected passage of the actual Book I dialogue was read, web lines 1575–1614, beyond the translator's introductory summary. Cephalus's conversation and clarification with Polemarchus on returning what is owed are used, conventional locator 331c–332a. No literal quotation is supplied.

• Psalms, King James Version, Wikisource. Psalm 15:1–5 was read in full within the displayed context; the key quotation is 15:4's ending. KJV numbering is not mixed with another numbering tradition. Edition rights are not declared established in all countries; full texts are not imported.

Tags

promise, word, fidelity, reliability, agreement, expectation, freedom, consent, content, duty, performance, refusal, release, replacement, deadline, postponement, inconvenience, preference, responsibility, correction, trust, boundary, dignity, consistency, stubbornness, Confucius, Plato, Psalms

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.