Reflections on Exchange Injustice in Generative Relational Systems

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Working draft — 8 September 2026

Abstract

An exchange can improve a person's position while placing unjustified demands on that person. Historical inquiry helps explain this possibility, yet a background wrong also requires a specified connection to the bargain under assessment. This paper develops a bounded transmission principle: a wrong bears on a particular transactional demand when that demand withholds an owed response, exercises wrongful control over alternatives, appropriates authority beyond the participants' standing, or claims to extinguish an obligation without an adequate basis. The principle identifies sufficient grounds of objection within its stated domain; it supplies neither a complete definition of exploitation nor a universal standard of fair price. The argument separates the recipient's acceptance, the provider's offer and demand, third-party enforcement, and the discharge of prior obligations. Paired cases show that these judgments can change independently while price and immediate benefit remain constant. A proposal to exchange RMB 10,000 for withdrawal from a collaboration develops the role of duration, reciprocal authorization, material urgency, and supported future opportunities. A capital-mediated consumption case examines the creation of identity-based inadequacy, the sale of a useful remedy, and commercial claims to moral authorship of love or belonging. Family, workplace, and colonial applications test the same distinctions under different distributions of responsibility. The resulting account connects historical repair to transaction-specific justification while preserving independent providers' legitimate claims and recipients' authority to make difficult choices. Its institutional implications concern the separation of emergency access from disputed conditions, the scope of enforcement, and the reconstruction of practical alternatives. The examples are conceptual constructions, and the proposed mechanisms require empirical investigation in concrete applications.

Keywords: exchange justice; exploitation; historical responsibility; generative relations; consent; contractual authority; manufactured inadequacy; capital; repair.

Manuscript status and preparation

This note records the article's research status, preparation process, and terms of reuse. The accompanying article is a theoretical working draft intended for substantive author review.

Research status. The manuscript offers normative arguments and constructed comparative cases. It reports neither an original empirical dataset nor estimated causal effects. Its literature engagement is targeted. Publication identities and the material used were verified online before inclusion. The accompanying `citation_verification.md` records sources, access levels, and claim limits. Several books were accessible through publisher descriptions, abstracts, or selected excerpts; fuller engagement with those works and additional assessment of originality remain part of submission preparation.

Preparation disclosure. The research questions and initial examples originate in the author's supplied exploratory conversation. Preparation involved OpenAI's ChatGPT and Codex for conceptual reconstruction, source discovery and verification, argumentative development, LaTeX drafting, and compilation. The author attribution and contact information follow the supplied template. This version awaits the author's substantive review and approval of its formulations.

Licence and rights. Following the supplied template, copyright 2026 Wanhong Huang. Except where otherwise indicated, this work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. Its terms govern sharing, adaptation, attribution, and indications of changes. Reuse does not imply authorial endorsement. Third-party rights and applicable copyright exceptions remain governed by their respective terms and applicable law. The author retains rights preserved by the licence. The official deed and legal-code link are available at `https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/`.

DRAFT

1 Exchange justice and the history of available choices

The problem of exchange justice concerns the authority people acquire through transactions as well as the benefits those transactions provide. A person can have compelling reasons to accept assistance while retaining a complaint against the conditions attached to it. Conversely, a person's circumstances can reflect grave injustice while a particular provider remains entitled to ordinary payment for a useful service. This introduction establishes the distinction through a paired case and locates the article's contribution within existing work on exploitation, markets, and structural responsibility.

Consider a researcher whose access to a shared workspace has been destroyed. An equipment provider offers immediate access to a replacement facility in exchange for a fee and a promise to abandon an unrelated collaboration. In one history, the provider deliberately destroyed the original access through a wrongful act and owes restoration. In a second history, the loss arose through another actor's wrongdoing, and the provider has neither participated in that wrong nor inherited its obligations. Stipulate identical current facilities, prices, information, practical alternatives, and prospective benefits. The researcher understands the terms in each case and judges acceptance preferable to continued exclusion. The two bargains nevertheless present different questions about what the provider may demand. In the first history, the provider conditions an owed response on a new concession. In the second, assessment of the concession requires an additional argument about its purpose, scope, or effects. The second provider's independence defeats one accusation; the remaining terms still require scrutiny.

This comparison distinguishes the reasons governing the researcher's choice from the reasons governing the provider's claim. Acceptance can be a defensible response to circumstances that the offeror had a duty to prevent or repair. If both parties were assigned the same moral verdict simply because both participate in one transaction, the researcher's practical response would obscure the provider's responsibility. An equally sweeping historical verdict would distribute responsibility for the original wrong to anyone who later offers access. Both approaches lose the relation between a particular claim and its grounds.

The separation of benefit, consent, and exploitation has established antecedents. Wertheimer treats unfair advantage as compatible with mutually beneficial and consensual transactions [13]. Satz's account of noxious markets examines vulnerability, impaired agency, and harmful individual and social consequences [11, pp. 94–98]. The present article draws on these distinctions while concentrating on a narrower object: the justification of a specified condition and the authority claimed through its acceptance. A favorable assessment of the assistance itself leaves that object open to examination.

Historical inquiry also faces a substantial challenge from within exploitation theory. Zwolinski argues that structural injustice typically contributes little to determining whether sweatshop exchanges are exploitative or whether their providers bear special responsibility [16]. The challenge requires an account of connection. A distant injustice, even a severe one, does not by itself identify what the present trader owes. Young's account of political responsibility through social connection provides a broader way to address structural injustice while distinguishing that responsibility from blame [14]. The present argument treats responsibility for institutional change and responsibility for a particular demand as related questions with potentially different bearers.

Recent work on structural exploitation also examines diffuse relationships. Ferguson and McKittrick-Sweitzer develop an account concerned with diffuse exploitation, including supply-chain connections between agents who never transact with each other [2]. This article makes no claim to originate the relational extension of exploitation theory. Its distinct task is to disaggregate the judgments surrounding a transaction once relevant responsibilities and connections have been identified. A party can be implicated in a harmful arrangement without every payment made within it having the same moral status. Conversely, an apparently ordinary payment can become objectionable when presented as the purchase of something already owed.

The proposed *bounded transmission principle* identifies several grounds on which a background or prior wrong bears on a present demand. The connection may consist in conditioning an owed response, exercising wrongful control over alternatives, seeking authority beyond the parties' standing, or treating

DRAFT

a limited transfer as the discharge of a distinct obligation. These grounds support specific objections; they leave room for other accounts of unfair pricing, harmful consequences, and institutional injustice. The principle's scope is therefore selective. Its purpose is to make historical criticism answerable to the particular act or claim that criticism concerns.

The phrase *generative relational systems* identifies the setting in which this problem becomes especially important. Goods, skills, money, associations, and institutions help produce later opportunities. Their practical significance depends on existing relationships and the conditions under which those relationships can continue or change. A collaboration may support learning, income, care, or public inquiry. Money may finance exactly those activities or enable departure from a harmful association. Evaluating an exchange requires attention to these effects without assigning either money or relationships a fixed place in a universal hierarchy of value.

The argument proceeds from objects of judgment to the generation of practical alternatives, then develops the transmission principle and applies it to a proposed exchange of RMB 10,000 for withdrawal from a collaboration. A substantial capital case examines the production of inadequacy, the sale of relief, and claims to the authorship of love and belonging. Family, workplace, and colonial cases test the allocation of duties across domains. Controlled comparisons then isolate changes in responsibility, scope, urgency, and repair. The final discussion concerns institutional responses, objections, and the limits of the proposed contribution. Each case is stipulated for analytical purposes; applications to actual people or organizations require independent evidence of the relevant conduct and relationships.

2 The objects of transactional judgment

An assessment of exchange becomes more precise when it identifies the action, claim, or institutional practice under examination. This section separates the positions occupied by the recipient, the provider, and the enforcing institution. It then distinguishes the temporal dimensions of a bargain and the baselines relevant to each judgment. The distinctions allow a transaction to receive a differentiated assessment without reducing its evaluation to a single comparison of quantities.

2.1 Acceptance, demands, and enforcement

The recipient's acceptance concerns the use of available options. A worker may accept a job because its wages meet urgent needs and exceed the income available elsewhere. Such reasons can establish the prudence of acceptance and support its moral permissibility. The worker's responsibility to dependents, the risks of delay, and the absence of a reliable alternative can strengthen that assessment. An account of injustice should accommodate the agency expressed in this decision, including the person's ability to understand and criticize the bargain while accepting it.

The provider's offer concerns the act of making a possibility available under specified conditions. Some offers confer a useful option at acceptable terms. Other offers are themselves objectionable, for example when they communicate a credible intention to withhold an urgently owed service unless the recipient submits to an unrelated demand. These possibilities require attention to the complete offer. Referring only to the new resource leaves its conditions out of the description.

The provider's demand concerns the justification of the requested return. A fee might cover a legitimate cost, secure a fair share of cooperative gains, or finance an independently valuable activity. A condition might coordinate a shared schedule or protect information entrusted for a defined purpose. Each claim needs grounds adequate to its content. Ownership of a resource can support some decisions about its use while leaving a demand for control over another person's unrelated associations unjustified. The scope of ownership and the scope of interpersonal authority require separate arguments.

Enforcement concerns the action of an institution or third party that imposes consequences for alleged nonperformance. An institution adds its own power to the relation. Its reasons must address the particular remedy, the parties' standing, the circumstances of assent, and the effects of enforcement. A promise to perform a bounded task, a promise to surrender all future associations, and a promise purporting to

DRAFT

Table 1: Objects and grounds of transactional judgment

Object	Relevant grounds	Illustrative distinction
Acceptance	Available options, commitments, urgency, and the recipient's judgment	Taking useful assistance while contesting its conditions
Offer	The complete proposal and the provider's existing duties	Creating an option versus withholding an owed response conditionally
Demand	Entitlement, purpose, proportionality, and relational scope	Payment for added work versus payment for the return of another's property
Enforcement	Institutional standing, process, remedy, and effects	Compensation for a bounded breach versus compelled lifelong compliance
Discharge	The content of an obligation and an adequate response or settlement	Receipt of relief versus settlement of an independent reparative claim

bind an absent collaborator invite different assessments. This paper discusses moral justification for enforcement; the legal enforceability of a clause depends on its jurisdiction and governing rules.

Discharge concerns the claim that an obligation has been satisfied or extinguished. Delivery of a replacement resource may fulfill part of a duty of repair. It may also be a new service supplied under a separate agreement. Whether an earlier debt has been discharged depends on the debt's content, the response delivered, and any adequately authorized settlement. Acceptance of a resource provides evidence of receipt. Further premises are needed to treat receipt as forgiveness, a waiver of unrelated claims, or approval of the provider's conduct.

These objects are summarized in Table 1. Separating them does not imply that they are independent in every case. An unjustified demand can make an offer wrongful and undermine the justification for enforcement. The point is that their connections require explanation. The recipient's permissible acceptance has a different subject and rationale from the provider's permissible insistence.

2.2 Entry, performance, and subsequent agency

The temporal dimensions of exchange supply different kinds of reasons. Entry concerns how the parties reached the bargaining situation and how assent was obtained. Performance concerns what they provide, receive, and undertake. Subsequent agency concerns their continuing capacity to deliberate, revise plans, associate, and make claims. A formally clear agreement may arise after the provider wrongfully destroyed alternatives. A procedurally satisfactory agreement may include an excessively broad restriction. An initially reasonable commitment may encounter circumstances that change the justification of a demanded remedy.

Procedural assessment therefore includes the practical conditions of refusal and deliberation alongside the presence of an affirmative response. A person can understand a contract and still lack time, independent advice, or security against retaliation. These facts have different implications. Missing information may undermine understanding; material deprivation may make a choice urgent without erasing understanding. Treating all constrained choices as equivalent obscures both the affected person's competence and the reasons for changing the circumstances.

Content assessment includes price, duration, risk, the distribution of gains, and the authority purportedly transferred. Consequence assessment includes foreseeable effects on participants and affected third parties. The same payment can finance a temporary pause or accompany a permanent exclusion. Its numerical identity settles little about the second difference. Monetary valuation remains useful for costs and compensation, while the content of the undertaking determines the kind of justification required.

2.3 Comparative baselines and outstanding obligations

Different judgments require different comparisons. The actual refusal option helps explain the recipient's decision. An appropriate repair baseline helps identify what the responsible actor owes. A fair

DRAFT

cooperative alternative may inform the division of gains. A feasible institutional alternative may guide reform. Moving among these baselines without explanation can make an argument appear stronger than its premises allow.

Suppose a provider returns equipment that the provider wrongfully retained. The recipient gains relative to continued deprivation. The provider also performs something already owed. A comparison with deprivation establishes the practical value of return; the prior obligation determines its status as repair. If the provider additionally supplies a genuinely new service, that service can support a distinct claim to payment. Its price and conditions remain assessable on their own grounds. The account consequently allows mixed transactions containing restitution, new work, and disputed concessions.

A complete moral verdict may eventually combine these judgments. The value of disaggregation appears before that final stage: it identifies the actual disagreement and the response it warrants. An excessive price, an invalid claim to control another person's future, and an unpaid reparative debt call for different corrections. A uniform verdict of unfair exchange can express reasonable concern while leaving those corrections unspecified.

3 The generation of practical alternatives

Historical assessment requires a description of how the parties' options became available or unavailable. This section distinguishes practical access from abstract possibility, separates different forms of involvement in constraint, and specifies the limited role of counterfactual reconstruction. The objective is to identify responsibility without treating dependence itself as evidence of wrongdoing.

3.1 Practical access and the conditions of refusal

An option is practically accessible when a person can use it under the relevant temporal, material, informational, and social conditions. A training program beginning next year provides little immediate alternative to income needed this week. An available job may require transport, documentation, childcare, or disclosure that the applicant cannot safely arrange. A right to appeal can have limited practical value if invoking it predictably triggers retaliation before an independent decision becomes available. Each example identifies a barrier requiring evidence; the word available should carry an explicit account of access.

Refusal also has content. A person may refuse one condition while seeking to continue the relationship, negotiate a narrower undertaking, or obtain time for advice. Institutions that recognize only complete acceptance or complete departure may suppress these intermediate possibilities. Their suppression can be justified in some settings, such as a task whose components must be performed together. In other settings it reflects a provider's interest in bundling an urgently needed resource with a concession that has little connection to its provision.

Practical accessibility admits degrees, yet a general numerical index would conceal the reasons at issue. A remote alternative can be technically possible and prohibitively dangerous. An expensive alternative can become accessible through a dependable subsidy. A formally equal rule can impose very different burdens on people with different responsibilities. Assessment should specify the burden, its distribution, and its relevance to the transaction, allowing the affected person to correct an outsider's assumptions about what is feasible.

The generation of choices is an established concern in market ethics. Satz discusses how market practices can change the alternatives within which individual choices appear advantageous [11, pp. 180–181]. Marx's account of primitive accumulation connects the wage relation to the historical separation of producers from means of production [7]. These antecedents support examining the formation of the bargaining environment. They do not independently establish any particular contemporary actor's responsibility for a particular person's need.

DRAFT

3.2 Creation, maintenance, benefit, and response

Creation concerns an actor's contribution to producing a constraint. A provider may destroy access, spread false information, or appropriate assets. The moral character of this contribution depends on independently defensible standards governing injury, deception, property, or equal standing. An actor who successfully competes for a scarce position also changes someone else's alternatives. That fact alone leaves wrongdoing unestablished. The relevant inquiry identifies both a causal contribution and the duty or standard it violates.

Maintenance concerns continuing control over a constraint together with a responsibility to remove or mitigate it. An institution may inherit records and assets through which an earlier exclusion continues. Its current administrators may lack personal culpability for the original action while possessing role-based duties to correct its present operation. Conversely, mere capacity to help does not establish unlimited responsibility. The grounds of an institutional role, an undertaking, a special relationship, or a general rescue duty must be stated along with the relevant limits.

Benefit concerns advantages received from another's constrained position. A consumer can obtain low prices within an unjust economic arrangement. An investor can receive returns shaped by exclusionary institutions. Such facts can matter for political responsibility, restitution, complicity, or fair contribution to reform. The appropriate category depends on further facts about the connection. Receipt of a benefit supplies a reason for inquiry; its mere presence does not settle the amount of a debt, establish culpable intention, or identify a particular contractual condition as wrongful.

Independent response concerns an actor who neither caused nor wrongfully maintains the relevant deprivation and who supplies a resource in response to it. The actor may still owe ordinary fairness, truthful representation, care arising from a professional role, or assistance under an independently justified duty. Independence from the original wrong has a defined implication: the original wrong cannot be assigned to this actor on the sole ground that the actor now trades with its victim. Other grounds of objection remain available.

These roles can overlap. A firm may contribute to a shortage, profit from it, and provide a service that reduces its effects. A household member may provide essential care while maintaining a restriction on access to outside help. Mixed involvement makes accurate specification especially valuable. It allows the service's contribution to be recognized alongside responsibility for the restriction, avoiding a verdict in which either usefulness or wrongdoing absorbs every feature of the relationship.

3.3 Dependence, legitimate commitments, and historical comparison

Dependence is a common condition of human activity. The taxonomy developed by Rogers, Mackenzie, and Dodds distinguishes inherent, situational, and pathogenic vulnerability and attends to the role of agency [10]. For exchange assessment, the relevant question concerns the source, governance, and moral character of a particular dependence. Cooperative specialization, disability support, education, and mutual care can create valuable dependencies. A demand for complete independence would remove the conditions of many worthwhile activities.

Legitimate commitments also narrow options. Reserving a laboratory for a project excludes competing uses during that period. Agreeing to confidentiality can limit later disclosure within a justified scope. Providing reliable care may require scheduling commitments. The justification concerns the purpose of the restriction, its connection to the activity, the parties' authority, and the available safeguards. A restriction gains little justification from the general claim that every meaningful relationship imposes some limits. Its particular limits still need reasons.

Counterfactual reconstruction helps distinguish the effects of wrongful acts from ordinary constraints. The relevant comparison might remove a specified deception while retaining the parties' resources and other circumstances. Alternatively, it might model the accessible options following a feasible repair. An ideal history free of every injustice is rarely available as a precise comparator. Repair can therefore draw on several forms of evidence: documented losses, established entitlements, feasible restoration, and the affected party's present priorities.

DRAFT

The historical inquiry remains bounded by its purpose. Determining whether a fee charges for the return of wrongfully retained property requires evidence about that property and the duty to return it. It need not await a complete history of the economic order. Broader reform may require a broader account. Matching the scale of inquiry to the claim under assessment makes historical reasoning both more demanding and more usable: relevant connections must be shown, while remote uncertainties cannot automatically postpone an otherwise well-supported remedy.

4 Historical wrongs and the justification of present demands

The connection between a background wrong and a transaction requires a normative argument about the demand being made. This section develops the bounded transmission principle, states its premises, and examines its limits through restoration and independent provision. The proposed principle supplies sufficient grounds for particular objections within a defined domain. Other grounds of transactional injustice, including unfair division between parties with acceptable alternatives, remain possible.

4.1 Normative premises and connections

The argument begins from three commitments. First, a person who owes a response to a wrong needs a justification for attaching additional burdens to its performance. The obligation itself gives the recipient a claim that differs from the opportunity to buy a new service. Second, persons possess standing to authorize some undertakings concerning their own conduct, subject to the rights of others and limits on the authority they may transfer. Third, institutions that enforce a demand need reasons for the authority they add to it. These premises are substantive moral commitments. Readers who reject them will also have grounds to reject the conclusions they support.

The bounded transmission principle can be stated in ordinary language. A specified prior or background wrong bears against a present demand when the demand makes access to an owed response conditional on an additional concession; draws its force from wrongful control that the demanding party exercises over the recipient's alternatives; purports to acquire authority beyond the standing of those who consent; or presents a limited transfer as settling an obligation whose discharge requires a different or further basis. The ground of objection should identify the responsible actor, the relevant duty or limit, the content of the demand, and the connection among them.

The first connection concerns conditional performance of a duty. A provider who owes the return of equipment asks for an unrelated promise before returning it. The recipient's entitlement explains the objection: the provider treats performance of that entitlement as a resource available for extracting a further concession. Reasonable arrangements needed to carry out restoration can be legitimate. Requiring a delivery time or a safe location differs from requiring silence about the wrongful retention. The difference concerns the relation of the condition to the duty's performance and the rights it affects.

The second connection concerns current wrongful control. A platform may retain the ability to restore access that it wrongfully removed, while offering a paid route around the resulting barrier. Even where the exact compensatory obligation remains disputed, using the continuing wrongful restriction to strengthen a demand adds a present wrong to the history. The claim depends on establishing the wrongfulness of the restriction and the actor's control over it. A costly inconvenience imposed by an independent technical constraint would require a different analysis.

The third connection concerns scope. A person can authorize a limited use of their own time while lacking authority to promise another person's future cooperation. An institution can allocate resources within its mandate while lacking standing to surrender a population's political agency for indefinite relief. These limits can matter even when the original deprivation arose independently. They become historically connected when the demand converts vulnerability produced by a wrong into a purported enlargement of authority. The scope objection therefore has both a general form and a historically specific application.

DRAFT

The fourth connection concerns discharge and interpretation. A provider delivers temporary relief and asserts that the recipient's acceptance extinguishes a distinct reparative claim. The assertion needs a basis adequate to that claim: performance of the relevant obligation, an appropriately authorized settlement, or another defensible ground of release. A provider's preferred description of a payment cannot alone determine its moral effect. The same reasoning applies to demands for retrospective endorsement. A benefit can be received without authorizing the provider to rewrite the history that made it necessary.

4.2 Restoration, additional services, and mixed obligations

The restoration case explains the principle without requiring agreement on a general theory of fair price. Suppose a wrongdoer owes the return of a person's tools. The wrongdoer offers return for a fee of RMB 1,000. An independent technician also offers RMB 1,000 of genuinely new work on those tools. The numerical equality supplies an inadequate basis for assigning the same status to the two fees. The first charges for an owed return; the second may charge for additional work. Assessment of the second fee depends on its fairness and the provider's duties, while the first already faces a specific objection.

Mixed cases require accounting for these components separately. Suppose the tools have deteriorated and restoration involves repair labor. If the wrongdoer bears responsibility for that deterioration, required labor can form part of the owed response. If the recipient requests an independent upgrade, the upgrade may support a legitimate fee. The relevant distinction concerns the obligation's content, not the physical difference between handing over an object and doing work. Describing every activity as a new service would allow a duty-bearer to redefine repair into ordinary commerce.

Finite capacity complicates performance without removing the need for justification. A provider may lack the resources to restore every loss immediately. Scheduling, installments, insurance, or collective arrangements can become necessary. These constraints may justify delay or partial performance under fair procedures. They supply little support for an unrelated claim to obedience or exclusive association. Where full repair is infeasible, the obligation requires an account of feasible performance and remaining responsibility. Impossibility of complete restoration does not turn every partial response into an unencumbered gift.

The affected party can also have reasons to settle a disputed claim. A settlement may exchange uncertain future recovery for secure assistance now. Its justification depends on understanding, representation where appropriate, the parties' standing, the treatment of undisputed entitlements, and freedom from wrongful pressure. The principle permits such settlements. It challenges the inference from mere receipt of relief to a comprehensive waiver and requires the scope of any settlement to be made explicit.

4.3 Independent provision and the limits of transmission

An independent provider illustrates the boundary of the account. Suppose an engineer supplies replacement equipment after an unrelated actor destroyed the recipient's access. The engineer charges a fair fee, makes accurate representations, and requests only conditions needed for the service. The recipient remains a victim of the original wrong. That history supports a claim against the responsible actor and may support public provision of assistance. It does not by itself make the engineer's fee a second instance of the original wrongdoing.

Independence requires evidence when institutional relationships are complex. A nominally separate company may act under common control, receive assets subject to an existing obligation, or participate in maintaining the barrier. A contractor can enforce another party's wrongful policy. The label independent describes the absence of relevant connections established through inquiry; separate legal names or temporal distance provide incomplete evidence for it. Equally, an accusation of connection must specify more than shared membership in an industry.

An independent provider can charge an exploitative price or impose a wrongful condition on other grounds. The principle therefore gives a limited negative conclusion: the recipient's harmful history alone supplies insufficient grounds for attributing that history to the provider. This boundary does not

DRAFT

certify the whole exchange as just. It protects accurate allocation while preserving ordinary standards of fair dealing and responsibilities arising from control, professional roles, or urgent need.

The principle also distinguishes criticism from compulsion. Establishing that a condition is unjustified can support its withdrawal, refusal to enforce it, or a duty to cease the wrongful practice. A positive obligation to continue supplying the resource on revised terms requires an additional ground. An existing duty of restoration can supply that ground in one case; an independently justified public funding scheme may supply it in another. The analysis should state that ground openly. Otherwise a persuasive objection to a demand would silently become an unlimited obligation to trade.

5 Monetary exchange and the future of collaboration

The exchange of money for withdrawal from a collaboration tests the account where the things exchanged have different forms of value. This section specifies the proposed undertaking, evaluates the generative significance of both money and association, and examines duration, authority, and uncertainty. Its aim is to identify the reasons relevant to the condition attached to payment without assigning a price to an entire relationship or its imagined future achievements.

5.1 The proposed payment and the scope of withdrawal

Consider a person, Mei, who receives an offer of RMB 10,000 from Jun on condition that Mei withdraw from an ongoing collaboration with Lin. The amount is a stipulated feature of the example, with no claim about its current exchange rate or purchasing power. The collaboration involves a real shared project, regular communication, reciprocal willingness to continue, and some access to the resources needed for its next stage. The case therefore includes more than admiration for a prestigious stranger. Its future remains uncertain even though continuation is a supported possibility.

The proposal initially leaves several matters unspecified. Withdrawal could mean declining one task, pausing participation for a month, ending a project, or accepting a lifetime prohibition on contact with Lin. Jun might seek a temporary arrangement necessary for another activity, wish to prevent a conflict of responsibilities, or seek exclusive control over Mei's associations. Mei might need the money for immediate security, wish to finance a different project, or have ample alternatives. Lin might welcome a pause, have relied on a particular commitment, or already wish to end the collaboration. Each specification can change the assessment.

The morally assessable object is the actual undertaking within these circumstances. A claim that RMB 10,000 is necessarily too little treats the amount as carrying its own answer. A claim that any accepted amount proves equivalence treats the act of acceptance as settling every dimension of justification. A more informative assessment identifies what Mei promises, what Jun receives, what each party already owes, and what other people retain authority to decide.

Suppose Jun offers the payment for a month of work that requires Mei's full attention, and the collaboration can resume afterward. A temporary pause may be a reasonable coordination condition. Suppose, by contrast, Jun demands permanent separation from Lin while seeking no service that requires it. The second condition reaches further into Mei's future and needs a correspondingly stronger account of its purpose and authority. Its broader scope establishes a greater justificatory burden. A final verdict also depends on the other facts, including any independently defensible protective reason for distance.

5.2 Money and association as situated resources

Money can support agency through its flexibility. For Mei, RMB 10,000 might secure housing, replace a failing computer, support a dependent, finance transport, or make departure from a harmful household possible. These uses can enable collaboration and other forms of association. Cash may also reduce the need to accept restrictive work later. Its generative significance depends on access to the goods it can purchase, the security of possession, and the obligations accompanying it.

DRAFT

The collaboration can support agency through shared knowledge, mutual recognition, trust, learning, and access to future work. These benefits emerge through reciprocal activity. Some can continue in a modified form; others may depend on a particular period of joint effort. A permanent prohibition could remove a supported path whose significance exceeds its immediate output. Such a loss can matter even where an exact monetary equivalent is unavailable.

Comparison therefore needs symmetrical attention to both sides. Emphasizing every possible future benefit of collaboration while treating cash as inert currency overstates the case against withdrawal. Emphasizing cash's flexible uses while reducing collaboration to present output makes the opposite error. The assessment should describe the feasible uses of each resource with comparable evidential care. A documented opportunity for paid study deserves more weight than a merely conceivable windfall; a confirmed project deserves more weight than an imagined discovery.

Zelizer's opening discussion of intimate relations and economic activity emphasizes their practical coexistence and the distinctions through which people organize that coexistence [15]. This orientation helps avoid a presumption that money necessarily contaminates relationships. Payment can sustain shared work, recognize care, or make an association more equal. The present case concerns the conditions and authority attached to payment, including whether those conditions preserve or undermine reciprocal agency.

Mei's own assessment remains central. An outside observer may overvalue a research project because it appears intellectually impressive and undervalue the material security needed for Mei's ordinary life. The observer may also underestimate a relationship's significance because its benefits lack a market price. Participation by the affected person helps correct both distortions. It supplies essential evidence about the value and burdens of the alternatives while leaving questions about others' rights and the provider's conduct available for independent assessment.

5.3 Reciprocal authority and the limits of alienation

A collaboration involves several agents' continuing contributions. Mei can decide whether to contribute personal labor, subject to justified existing commitments. Mei cannot sell Lin's willingness to collaborate, guarantee Lin's future affection, or transfer Lin's authorship. Jun can acquire only the undertaking that Mei has standing to make. Language describing the transaction as the purchase of the relationship can conceal this limited scope.

Lin's interests also require differentiation. A specific promise, shared ownership of work, or reasonable reliance on an agreed task may ground claims concerning notice, attribution, access to records, or compensation for a bounded loss. Disappointment about the loss of a valued collaborator has a different status. It can provide Mei with a reason for care and explanation without establishing Lin's entitlement to continued personal association. The generative value of a relationship gives participants reasons to consider its future; it does not make either participant the property of the project.

The same limit applies to hoped-for public benefits. Suppose an observer believes that Mei and Lin might eventually produce an important scientific advance. The possibility can support funding and efforts to remove avoidable barriers. It provides a weak basis for treating their speculative achievement as an asset already owned by the public. Any claim against withdrawal must identify actual duties and the grounds of any restriction it proposes. Otherwise concern for future value would authorize control over the people whose agency makes that value possible.

These scope limits also constrain Jun's demand. Payment for a defined undertaking supplies no automatic entitlement to supervise Mei's unrelated friendships, reinterpret Mei's motives, or demand gratitude for the entire course of Mei's life. A written clause may purport to confer such powers; the question is whether Mei has authority to confer them and whether Jun has adequate grounds to demand or exercise them. The formal distinction between the requested undertaking and the claims it can authorize is developed in Appendix A.

DRAFT

5.4 Duration, reversibility, and supported possibilities

Duration matters because a condition can regulate either a present allocation of time or a changing range of future decisions. A temporary pause with a clear end date allows the parties to plan around a defined interruption. An indefinite restriction creates uncertainty about when association can resume and may discourage investment by others. A permanent prohibition reaches circumstances that the parties can only partially anticipate. Its moral assessment requires attention to this expanding scope.

Reversibility also depends on more than a clause permitting exit. Repayment terms may make release practically inaccessible. A formal right to resume work may become ineffective after records have been destroyed, a team has dispersed, or a time-sensitive opportunity has expired. Conversely, adequate notice, retained access to shared materials, and a realistic path to repayment may preserve substantial flexibility. The analysis should identify what can actually be restored and at what cost.

Supported possibilities occupy a middle position between guaranteed outcomes and unrestricted imagination. Evidence of a supported possibility can include mutual intention, relevant skills, scheduled activity, accessible resources, and a plausible route to continuation. These features make the opportunity a present object of concern even though success remains uncertain. The strength of the claim should reflect that uncertainty. Loss of an available research path can ground an objection to wrongful interference without establishing compensation for every discovery that might conceivably have resulted.

Generative assessment also includes beneficial closure. Mei may reasonably end the collaboration to escape exhaustion, pursue family life, accept a different role, or simply change direction. Continuing every valuable relationship is impossible. A principle requiring preservation of all future options would frustrate commitment and overburden agency. The relevant standard concerns the justified governance of choices and restrictions, including the person's capacity to leave and to commit to a selected future.

The collaboration case thus yields a conditional judgment. A well-understood, bounded, and independently justified undertaking can accompany payment even when the relinquished activity has significant relational value. A condition that uses wrongful deprivation to obtain permanent control faces a distinct objection even if acceptance improves Mei's present circumstances. Between these cases, uncertainty calls for specification and proportionate safeguards. The amount of money remains relevant, yet the scope and grounds of the undertaking determine what that amount could legitimately purchase.

6 Capital, manufactured inadequacy, and commercial rescue

Capital-mediated consumption provides a fourth domain in which a useful exchange can coexist with a wrongful demand or claim of authority. This section constructs a luxury-consumption case, identifies the distinct sites of possible injustice, and examines the transition from selling an object to claiming authorship of the buyer's social worth. The analysis distinguishes the value of craft and symbolic participation from the responsibility for producing the vulnerability that a commodity promises to relieve.

6.1 Commodity value and the production of identity-based need

Consider a company selling a carefully made luxury object. Its materials, design, provenance, durability, and association with a valued tradition can provide reasons for purchase. The buyer may appreciate the work, enjoy its appearance, give it as a meaningful gift, or use it to participate in a shared practice. These reasons can be socially formed and still be intelligible, reflective reasons. A historical narrative can communicate real provenance; a symbol can have value because people collectively recognize it.

In a benign version of the case, the company describes the object accurately, allows independent criticism of its claims, and represents ownership as one possible form of enjoyment. The buyer has acceptable alternatives and can decline without losing access to basic participation. A high price may still invite questions about distribution, labor conditions, or fair terms. Yet the symbolic character of the good alone establishes little about the justice of this particular sale.

In the critical version, a coordinated campaign cultivates the judgment that people lacking the company's object are unworthy of love or belonging. The company repeatedly associates ordinary bodies,

DRAFT

homes, or ways of living with personal failure; promotes a narrow standard of recognition; and offers its product as the means of escaping the resulting inadequacy. The scenario stipulates evidence that these practices materially contribute to the targeted insecurity. The product can still provide enjoyment and improve the buyer's treatment within the cultivated hierarchy. Its usefulness and the wrongful formation of its necessity can coexist.

The distinction turns on the content and effects of the practice, not on the mere fact that advertising influences desire. A campaign can inform, invite aspiration, or introduce a new aesthetic. The critical case adds degradation of equal standing, deceptive claims about recognition, or manipulative pressure tied to vulnerabilities that the company helps create. Each ground needs its own evidence. A person's preference for a brand, a company's profit, or the existence of status competition alone establishes neither this causal sequence nor the wrongfulness of every purchase within it.

Illouz's account connects consumption and commercial imagery with romantic experience [5]. Richins's research addresses idealized attractiveness images, social comparison, and appearance satisfaction among young women [9]. These sources provide limited points of contact with the constructed case. They do not establish that commercial actors universally create insecurity, that the effects persist indefinitely, or that a particular firm intentionally organizes the complete sequence described here. The proposed mechanism remains an object for empirical investigation.

6.2 The sale of relief and the distribution of responsibility

The critical sequence contains several assessable acts. The campaign may wrongfully contribute to the buyer's insecurity. The sales process may make misleading claims about what ownership can secure. The price or financing terms may take unfair advantage of the resulting pressure. The company may also demand personal information, repeated engagement, or exclusive loyalty as conditions of continued participation. The location of each wrong matters because a change in price alone can leave the other practices intact.

Responsibility for manufactured need must be allocated among actors. A brand may commission the campaign, an agency may design it, a platform may amplify it, and retailers may sell the product. Some actors can control particular representations while others can only change their participation. Consumers may reinforce the hierarchy by shaming those who decline to buy. A complete analysis would distinguish contributions, knowledge, control, and obligations at these points. The existence of a commercial network does not make every participant equally responsible, and the network's complexity does not remove the need to identify responsible contributions.

The buyer's acceptance has its own rationale. Purchasing the object may provide a workable way to reduce immediate exclusion, express affection in an established idiom, or obtain a genuinely valued item. A critical account should avoid making refusal a test of the buyer's intelligence or moral worth. Requiring a targeted person to bear the entire cost of resisting a harmful hierarchy would reproduce an unequal allocation of responsibility. The buyer can reasonably choose relief while retaining reasons to contest the practices that made relief urgent.

Independent retailers create a further distinction. A retailer selling the same useful object may have played no role in the wrongful campaign and may present its goods truthfully. The original harm still calls for a response, but its connection to this retailer's demand requires evidence. The retailer may acquire obligations through active repetition of degrading messages, participation in wrongful exclusion, or another specified role. The simple fact that a customer arrives with commercially shaped insecurity gives a limited basis for assigning the retailer the campaign's entire debt.

Nor does proof of a wrongful campaign automatically imply that the product must be supplied free of charge. An appropriate response could concern corrective communication, withdrawal of harmful practices, compensation for demonstrable injury, fairer access to relevant institutions, or another specified obligation. Whether delivery of the object forms part of repair depends on the injury and the justified remedy. This distinction prevents criticism of manufactured inadequacy from becoming an unsupported claim to every desired commodity.

DRAFT

6.3 Savior claims and the scope of the buyer's authorization

The company's strongest claim arises when it represents itself as the source of love, dignity, or social inclusion that ownership supposedly confers. The claim moves beyond product promotion into moral attribution. A company that helped intensify exclusion describes the subsequent purchase as evidence that the company creates belonging and rescues otherwise deficient people. The commercial relationship then appears to warrant gratitude, loyalty, or deference because the provider presents itself as indispensable to the buyer's recognition.

Such attribution exceeds what an ordinary sale can authorize. A buyer can purchase an object and appreciate its contribution to a meaningful event. The buyer cannot transfer authorship of another person's affection to the seller. The seller can contribute materially to a celebration without becoming the source of the participants' worth or the owner of their future allegiance. Claims to these larger powers require grounds independent of the receipt of payment or the buyer's expressed satisfaction.

The historical connection strengthens the objection where the seller helped produce the deficiency it now claims to overcome. The company asks observers to treat relief as evidence of beneficence while leaving its contribution to the underlying pressure outside the account. If the transaction is then used to deny an outstanding responsibility, the fourth connection of the bounded transmission principle applies. If the company uses control over continued recognition to demand further concessions, the second connection may also apply. The exact diagnosis follows the acts and powers established in the case.

Savior claims can produce value for a company even without an explicit clause requiring gratitude. Customers may supply testimonials, defend the brand against criticism, accept repeated expenditure, or allow the company to define the standards by which future needs are understood. These effects are plausible pathways in the constructed mechanism, not measured results of the cited research. Some may arise through voluntary enthusiasm unconnected to wrongful pressure. Distinguishing these possibilities requires evidence about the campaign, its uptake, and the conditions of continued participation.

The recipient may nevertheless feel gratitude. Gratitude can respond to a real contribution while remaining compatible with criticism of other conduct. An account of transactional authority should protect that complexity. Its objection concerns the provider's demand for exclusive moral credit or the use of appreciation to extinguish claims. The buyer's actual emotions remain the buyer's own; a critical observer acquires little standing to prescribe the correct emotional response.

6.4 Structural reproduction and commercial counterfactuals

The capital case also has a structural form. Accumulation can depend on relations and capacities whose conditions it places under pressure. Fraser's analysis of capital and care examines this tension in social reproduction [3]. The present vignette concerns a narrower commercial configuration within that wider field: an actor contributes to a deficiency, sells a response, and claims special authority from that response. Structural dependence on care and deliberate manufacture of an individual insecurity require different evidence and can occur separately.

Useful counterfactuals therefore change particular elements of the scenario. Retaining the object while replacing degrading claims with accurate information isolates the role of representation. Retaining truthful marketing while removing exclusion from a relevant social institution isolates the role of the recognition hierarchy. Retaining a useful sale while acknowledging and repairing the company's earlier harm isolates the claim that commerce itself must cease. These comparisons permit a more precise account than a binary choice between celebrating consumption and denying its value.

The capital example contributes a distinctive result to exchange assessment. A transaction can transfer a valued object while leaving the seller's claims to moral authorship, the buyer's dependence, and the discharge of prior harm unjustified. The wrong can lie partly in the representations and institutional conditions surrounding the sale, partly in its terms, and partly in the authority subsequently claimed from it. Identifying those locations makes repair more specific and preserves the buyer's ability to value the object without endorsing the entire commercial narrative.

DRAFT

7 Family, workplace, and colonial applications

Family relations, employment, and colonial governance provide comparative tests of the same distinctions developed in the capital case. This section uses constructed vignettes to vary the source of responsibility, the resource offered, and the authority demanded. The comparison concerns a recurring structure of justification. The domains differ substantially in their institutions, histories, and the severity of the harms they can involve.

7.1 Family assistance and adult association

Consider an adult whose access to savings and outside support has been wrongfully restricted by a parent. The parent then offers housing and a monthly allowance on condition that the adult abandon an independent relationship and acknowledge the parent as the sole source of security. Stipulate that the restriction violates the adult's established rights and that the parent can remove it. The case contains useful assistance, an owed response, and a demand for personal control.

The adult's acceptance can be reasonable where immediate housing is necessary. The parent's responsibility for the restricted savings bears directly on any demand that makes their return conditional on submission. Housing supplied from the parent's independent resources raises an additional question about the conditions attached to that assistance. A fair contribution to household costs or an agreed allocation of chores can have grounds tied to shared living. A demand to surrender unrelated adult associations requires a different justification. Parental affection or past sacrifice alone provides an inadequate specification of that authority.

Some family responsibilities arise from dependency and care independently of any prior wrong. Those responsibilities require attention to the person's age, capacity, needs, and the caregiver's obligations. The adult case avoids assuming that the same authority rules govern care for young children. Even in adult relations, the appropriate arrangement can include reciprocal support and difficult resource limits. The principle permits these matters to be considered while distinguishing them from the use of wrongfully restricted assets to obtain personal compliance.

A contrasting case involves a parent who played no role in the adult's loss, has limited resources, and offers temporary accommodation under reasonable household conditions. The adult's difficult circumstances do not turn this parent into the author of the original deprivation. A demand for unlimited assistance would require independent grounds. This comparison preserves the possibility of familial generosity while identifying the particular powers and obligations that make the first arrangement objectionable.

7.2 Employment, development, and conditional recognition

Consider an employer who wrongfully blocks a worker's access to training and misrepresents the worker's performance to other employers. The firm then offers a promotion conditional on a broad promise to remain indefinitely, waive all complaints, and endorse the company as the creator of the worker's career. The promotion may improve income and provide valuable experience. The worker can have strong reasons to accept it. Those reasons leave the employer's control over the earlier exclusions and the scope of the new conditions available for criticism.

Anderson's account of private government directs attention to authority within employment relations [1]. The present vignette asks which authority a particular agreement can justify. A training arrangement may reasonably specify attendance, protect limited confidential information, or address documented costs under fair conditions. A demand for permanent control of the worker's career has a much wider object. Its assessment must also account for the worker's existing skills, previous effort, colleagues' contributions, and any resources that the employer had an obligation to provide.

The firm's claim to have created the worker's value can conceal these contributions. A promotion can enable new work without establishing ownership of the worker's capacities or authority to suppress

DRAFT

criticism of earlier mistreatment. If the employer corrects the false record and supplies owed opportunities, these actions can count toward repair. A newly negotiated project can then be assessed on its actual terms. The history continues to matter through outstanding duties, while adequately performed repair can change the current normative relation.

An independent employer supplies the comparison. A different firm offers the same promotion, makes accurate representations, and requests a bounded commitment needed for the role. The worker's earlier mistreatment can support claims against the first firm and institutional reform. Additional facts are needed to make the second firm's offer objectionable. Common industry membership, by itself, leaves the required connection unspecified. Evidence of coordinated exclusion or knowing enforcement of a blacklist would alter that assessment.

7.3 Colonial relief and political authority

Consider a colonial administration that wrongfully appropriates a community's productive resources and restricts independent organization. It later provides food, infrastructure, or technical support while demanding political submission and recognition as the source of the community's capacity for self-government. Stipulate the appropriation, the continuing restrictions, and the administration's relevant control. The case serves as a conceptual construction; it represents no single historical colony or empirical study.

The assistance can have immediate value. Accepting food during deprivation can be a defensible act of survival and care for others. The administration's demand raises separate issues of restitution, political standing, and the conditions of relief. If assistance returns resources already owed, describing it as discretionary beneficence obscures that obligation. If the arrangement purports to authorize indefinite rule, the assent of selected recipients cannot alone establish authority over an entire population.

Lu's work connects interactional and structural injustice with colonial legacies and reconciliation [6]. The distinction is relevant to the vignette because a relief transaction can occur within continuing structures of exclusion. Veneziani and Yoshihara analyze international exploitation through differences in productive assets and possible institutional changes [12]. Their model-based object differs from the justification of a particular relief condition. Together, these points of comparison support keeping structural assessment and the allocation of specific claims in view without assuming that one resolves the other.

The appropriate response can include returning control of resources, restoring independent decision procedures, and addressing demonstrated losses. Its design requires the participation of the affected population and attention to internal differences of power. A local representative's assent may be significant while leaving questions about mandate, exclusion, and future generations unresolved. The framework supplies reasons to investigate those questions; it offers no universal formula for historical settlements.

The comparison with an independent relief provider again changes the allocation of responsibility. An organization that neither caused nor maintains the relevant wrong can provide valuable assistance under justified administrative conditions. Its independence leaves the original reparative claims directed elsewhere. If it conditions relief on surrendering political agency or cooperates in continuing exclusion, those present acts create additional grounds of criticism. The same analytical distinctions therefore apply across domains while leaving their substantive duties and institutional forms to domain-specific justification.

8 Controlled comparisons and differentiated verdicts

Paired cases can test the proposed account by changing one morally relevant feature while retaining the others as far as the comparison permits. This section examines responsibility, duration, prestige, urgency, and repair. The comparisons identify which judgments should change and which require further grounds. They function as analytical controls, with their stipulations remaining explicit in the interpretation of each result.

DRAFT

8.1 Historical responsibility and the same present offer

The first comparison holds the current offer, resource quality, information, and practically accessible alternatives constant. It changes the provider's responsibility for the deprivation. In the restoration history, the offered resource forms part of what the provider already owes. In the independent history, it is a genuinely new service supplied by an actor with no relevant role in the wrong. Acceptance can remain reasonable in both histories. The justification of charging for the resource changes because the underlying entitlement changes.

This result does not establish that every difference in a provider's past changes every present exchange. If the provider committed an unrelated wrong, has adequately discharged the relevant obligation, and exercises no wrongful control over the buyer, the earlier fact may supply little ground for challenging the current fee. The comparison therefore tests a connection between history and an identified duty. That connection supplies the grounds for the judgment about the fee.

8.2 Duration and the same monetary payment

The second comparison retains the amount and timing of payment while changing withdrawal from a collaboration from one month to a lifetime. The longer condition reaches a broader field of future choices and creates a greater burden of justification. That conclusion concerns scope. It does not follow that the temporary condition is always acceptable or that every enduring commitment is wrongful. A short restriction can cause an irreversible loss during a critical period, and some long commitments protect legitimate interests.

The comparison needs to specify practical reversibility as well as nominal duration. A one-month pause that destroys the only available opportunity may have a larger effect than a formally long arrangement with an accessible release provision. The assessment consequently records the supported opportunities affected, the conditions of release, and the reasons for the restriction. Price can compensate for some burdens while leaving a claim to excessive authority unresolved.

8.3 Prestige and equivalent collaborative activity

The third comparison replaces a famous collaborator with an ordinary collaborator while retaining the actual work, reciprocal commitment, resources, and supported opportunities. Under this stipulation, the prestige label alone provides little ground for a different verdict about Mei's authority or Jun's condition. The relationship's value can arise through its activity and importance to the participants independently of public fame. An account that changes its verdict solely with the label risks converting status hierarchy into moral hierarchy.

In actual cases, prestige can affect access to resources, audiences, or employment. Those consequences can be described and assessed directly. Holding them constant in the constructed comparison isolates the label; it does not deny their possible empirical significance. The distinction helps separate a supported opportunity from reverence for an eminent person and prevents the argument from reserving relational protection for elite associations.

8.4 Urgency and the practical significance of cash

The fourth comparison introduces urgent deprivation while retaining the payment and the proposed undertaking. The cash can become more important to Mei's agency because it now secures immediate necessities. Acceptance may become more compelling even while the condition becomes more open to criticism as a use of acute vulnerability. These judgments move in different directions because they concern different actors and actions.

Urgency also changes the consequences of intervention. Preventing payment before an adequate alternative is available can worsen Mei's position. A protective institution therefore needs to consider immediate access and the timing of any remedy. The strengthened objection to a condition does not automatically justify a response that removes the person's usable resources. The institutional question

DRAFT

Table 2: Controlled changes and their implications for exchange assessment

Changed feature	Principal implication	Limit of the inference
Responsibility for need	A demand can condition an already owed response	Unrelated historical wrongdoing leaves the connection unestablished
Duration of withdrawal	Broader future control requires stronger grounds	Actual effects also depend on timing and accessible release
Collaborator's prestige	Status alone leaves authority and activity unchanged	Real differences in opportunities require separate assessment
Urgency of deprivation	Acceptance can become more compelling as pressure increases	Removing the offer can worsen the recipient's circumstances
Adequate repair	A past wrong can cease to undermine a new demand	Acknowledgment, payment, and full discharge require differentiation

concerns how to reduce wrongful pressure while maintaining or replacing the assistance on defensible grounds.

8.5 Repair, acknowledgment, and continuing commerce

The fifth comparison retains the current service and price while changing the status of an earlier wrong. In one history, the provider conceals the wrong and withholds an owed response. In the other, the relevant facts are acknowledged, the affected party participates in a valid settlement or receives adequate performance, and the provider has ceased the wrongful restriction. The second transaction can lose objections that applied in the first history without requiring a lower price for the new service.

Acknowledgment alone may leave material obligations outstanding. Material payment alone may leave continuing control or a disputed claim of discharge unresolved. The comparison stipulates adequate repair of the relevant obligation so that its effect can be isolated. Whether actual repair is adequate requires substantive assessment and cannot be inferred from the provider's preferred description of its response.

Table 2 gathers the comparative results. The pattern supports a differentiated account of exchange: the same price can accompany different duties, and the same adverse history can coexist with differently justified demands. Historical context matters through reasons that can be identified and challenged. It is neither an all-purpose verdict nor an irrelevant supplement to current terms.

9 Institutional responses to connected transactional wrongs

Institutional responses should address the wrong identified in the assessment and the practical consequences of intervention. This section develops limited implications for emergency access, the separation of obligations, evidential procedures, and the governance of continuing commitments. These implications are normative proposals. Their adoption in a particular setting requires domain-specific authority, resources, and evidence about effects.

9.1 Immediate access and the allocation of repair

A recipient confronting urgent need may require assistance before a dispute can be resolved. Where a duty-bearer is already obligated to provide a minimum response, that response should ordinarily be separated from demands for unrelated concessions. A procedure can record receipt while preserving a dispute about additional loss or responsibility. The distinction reduces pressure to accept a comprehensive waiver merely to secure immediate support.

Where provision comes from an independent actor, preserving access may require a different arrangement. Public funding, insurance, collective provision, or another justified source of support can pay for the resource while pursuing recovery from a responsible party. The moral appeal of continuity

DRAFT

alone does not identify who must bear its cost. A proposal should state the duty or institutional mandate supporting that allocation and consider burdens on others who also need assistance.

Interim provision can operate under uncertainty. A well-founded need for urgent support can coexist with an unresolved responsibility claim. The institution may fund temporary access without certifying either party's complete account of the history. Subsequent findings can guide reimbursement, repair, or correction. Such a design requires fair procedures for both the recipient and the alleged duty-bearer, as well as safeguards against delay that would make interim access ineffective.

This approach also recognizes the recipient's choice among feasible remedies. Reinstatement in an earlier role may be valuable to one person and burdensome to another who has already rebuilt a life elsewhere. Restoration of practical agency can require support for a new direction. The content of an established obligation constrains what is owed, while the affected person's priorities help determine appropriate performance within that scope.

9.2 The separation of restoration, new services, and settlement

Clear documentation can distinguish resources supplied as repair, resources supplied as new services, and transfers made under a settlement. The purpose is to make the parties' claims intelligible. A single payment can perform several functions, yet those functions should be specified. Otherwise the provider can describe the same transfer as a gift when seeking gratitude, a sale when seeking payment, and complete repair when resisting criticism.

Documentation by itself cannot cure wrongful pressure. A formally distinct waiver may still be imposed as the practical condition of receiving owed support. Institutions should examine how the components operate together, including deadlines, access barriers, and the consequences of declining one component. Independence of description needs corresponding independence where the moral reasons require it.

Settlement also requires attention to representation. A person may settle their own claim while lacking standing to release claims held by collaborators, dependents, or a wider community. A representative may hold a defined mandate that excludes the surrender of certain rights. The scope of settlement should track that authority. A broadly worded agreement acquires little additional moral force from extending beyond what the parties could legitimately decide.

9.3 Evidence, contestation, and the distribution of knowledge

The transmission principle creates an evidential task. A claimant should identify the relevant conduct, obligation, control, or excess of authority. An institution should also consider which party possesses the records needed to establish those facts. A provider that controls access logs, personnel files, campaign decisions, or payment records can have duties of preservation and appropriate disclosure grounded in its role and the need for a fair process. Specific confidentiality interests may require protected access through an authorized reviewer.

Fricker's account of epistemic injustice directs attention to harms involving credibility and interpretive resources [4]. In the present framework, a recipient's testimony about coercive conditions or the meaning of an association is evidence requiring fair consideration. The provider's formal records can also be probative. Neither a party's institutional status nor their vulnerability should substitute for examination of the claim. Procedures need to make disagreement possible without exposing the claimant to loss of indispensable support merely for raising it.

Evidence may establish a contribution more confidently than its precise magnitude. A campaign's harmful representation can be documented even when the exact amount of insecurity it produced remains uncertain. An exclusionary act can be established while the future collaboration it prevented remains speculative. Remedies should reflect these differences: ceasing a demonstrated practice can have stronger grounds than awarding a precise sum for an uncertain future outcome.

DRAFT

9.4 Review, release, and continuing institutional responsibility

Long commitments benefit from procedures for review when circumstances change. Relevant design choices include clear duration, bounded purposes, notice, access to independent advice, and realistic release terms. A repayment condition can recognize a provider's legitimate investment while remaining open to scrutiny for disproportionate burdens or attempts to preserve wrongful control. The choice among these measures depends on the activity and the interests they protect.

Institutional intervention should also examine the environment that makes restrictive exchanges recurrent. Accessible income support, public services, independent professional networks, and routes to alternative providers can reduce the pressure to accept particular conditions. These measures require their own distributive justification and evaluation. Their value cannot be established merely by observing that they would weaken one provider's bargaining position.

The allocation of tasks can therefore be plural. A wrongdoer may owe repair, an independent institution may owe fair process, a provider may owe truthful representation, and political participants may bear responsibilities for changing a harmful structure. Coordinating these tasks can support the recipient more effectively than requiring the next transaction to carry the entire burden of social justice. The distinctions also make failures identifiable: an institution's structural responsibility cannot excuse a provider's current wrongful condition, and a provider's compliance with its limited duties cannot by itself establish a just background.

10 Objections, scope, and the contribution of the account

The proposed account faces objections concerning redundancy, indeterminacy, agency, and practical effects. This section develops the strongest versions of those concerns and states the resulting limits. Its objective is to locate the contribution precisely: a structured argument about the justification of particular demands and their relation to history, with several substantive questions left to further theory and evidence.

10.1 Established duties and explanatory contribution

The redundancy objection holds that the results already follow from ordinary duties concerning injury, property, deception, coercion, and repair. If the wrongdoer owes restoration, charging for restoration is objectionable. If a person lacks standing to bind another, their agreement cannot confer that power. A vocabulary of generative relations might merely restate these conclusions while adding little theoretical content.

The objection correctly limits the claim of originality. This article does not derive a new foundation for all duties or establish a complete rival theory of exploitation. Its contribution lies in connecting established types of reasons to disaggregated objects of judgment. The resulting distinctions show how a single exchange can support permissible acceptance, an objectionable demand, limited enforcement, and an outstanding obligation at the same time. They also explain how an adequately repaired history can change the status of later commerce and how independent providers can retain legitimate claims within an unjust environment.

The generative element contributes to identifying the scope of the undertaking. An agreement concerning a person's present labor can also govern access to future associations, resources, and capacities. Describing these effects reveals what the demand purports to acquire. A restriction that appears small when described as a single refusal can have a broad object when its duration and institutional consequences are specified. The framework's contribution is consequently analytical and normative synthesis, with the paired cases providing tests of its usefulness. Its value as a separate article depends on whether these distinctions improve actual argument and assessment beyond the existing concepts it organizes.

DRAFT

10.2 Grounds of objection and conclusive verdicts

The transmission principle identifies grounds against a demand. Some cases involve decisive objections, such as a claim to exercise authority that the consenting person lacks standing to confer. Other cases involve reasons that must be weighed alongside legitimate interests, feasibility, and the rights of others. A justified administrative condition on the performance of an obligation can differ from an unrelated concession, even when both impose burdens.

The principle should therefore be read as identifying *pro tanto* objections: reasons counting against a demand within their specified scope. A conclusive verdict requires consideration of relevant countervailing reasons. Calling a condition connected to a wrong does not resolve every question about its modification or remedy. A responsible actor's finite capacity may constrain immediate performance, and an institution's remedy may impose burdens that require separate justification.

Some transactions also involve wrongful conduct by several parties. A recipient's valid claim to repair does not authorize injury to an unrelated person. A provider's prior wrongdoing does not erase every claim the provider can have concerning a new service. Disaggregation makes these mixed cases tractable by preserving the grounds of distinct claims and assessing each party's particular actions.

10.3 Paternalism and the authority of the affected person

The paternalism objection concerns an observer who claims to understand the recipient's real interests better than the recipient. A generative account can become intrusive if it treats every valuable future as something the person must preserve. It can also romanticize relationships and disparage ordinary material needs. The collaboration case addresses these risks by giving money and association symmetrical consideration and by distinguishing supported opportunities from imagined achievements.

The affected person's endorsement matters because the person has special access to their priorities, burdens, and experience. That endorsement should shape assessment and remedy. At the same time, endorsement alone cannot confer authority over another person's choices or discharge an obligation held by someone else. Nor does the person's decision to accept relief determine whether the provider had grounds to make the condition. Respect for agency can therefore coexist with criticism directed at the provider's conduct.

Pettit's account of freedom as non-domination provides a broader concern with the conditions under which power is held and exercised [8]. The present argument keeps a narrower focus on particular demands and enforcement. A person may freely prefer to continue a dependent relationship; the relevant institutional concern is whether the relationship's authority has adequate grounds and can be contested within the rights and duties at issue. An outside critic acquires no general mandate to choose the person's associations.

10.4 Price, incommensurability, and indeterminate comparison

The framework leaves a general theory of fair price unresolved. It cannot derive the acceptable price of every commodity, allocate every cooperative surplus, or assign a monetary equivalent to each future opportunity. This limitation matters in cases where the entire dispute concerns the division of gains between parties with acceptable alternatives and legitimate authority. Additional distributive principles are needed there.

Heterogeneity also leaves room for meaningful choice. People regularly compare goods with different kinds of significance and make decisions they can explain. A decision can be justified without identifying a common cardinal measure that captures every consideration. Conversely, the availability of a market price supplies information about exchange conditions without establishing the adequacy of every attached undertaking. The paper's main claims concern authority and obligation, which can sometimes be assessed before a complete comparison of values is available.

Where comparison remains uncertain, the response should preserve that uncertainty. A reviewer can identify an unsupported claim to another person's future while withholding a verdict about the best career

DRAFT

choice. A court-like institution can reject an excessive enforcement demand while leaving a limited monetary claim for further assessment. Differentiated judgment allows such partial conclusions to remain informative.

10.5 Intervention effects and the protection of useful exchange

Restrictions on exchange can reduce access to valuable resources. A provider may withdraw after a condition becomes unavailable, costs may shift to other participants, or a replacement program may fail to reach those who need it. These possibilities are relevant to institutional choice. The formal observation that removing a condition enlarges the continuations compatible with a fixed offer leaves open whether the offer remains supplied. The appendix states this restriction explicitly.

Policy therefore requires evidence about provider behavior, financing, alternative access, and burdens on affected people. The moral objection to a condition can remain well-founded while a proposed prohibition is poorly designed. Conversely, the usefulness of an existing arrangement does not establish that every feasible reform would reduce access. Both claims require support beyond the constructed cases.

The article's empirical program is correspondingly focused. Applications would need to trace the creation and control of relevant constraints, document the actual conditions of refusal, identify the authority demanded, and examine the effects of proposed remedies. The capital case additionally requires evidence connecting representation, insecurity, purchase, and claims to beneficence. These links may fail, occur separately, or be counteracted by other actors. The theory supplies distinctions for investigating them; it does not report their prevalence or causal magnitude.

11 The justification of exchange within continuing relations

The analysis of exchange justice developed here connects historical responsibility to the particular demands made through a bargain. Its central result is a differentiated assessment of acceptance, offering, demanding, enforcement, and discharge. A recipient can reasonably accept useful assistance while the provider lacks adequate grounds for a condition attached to it. An independent provider can retain legitimate claims within a background that still requires repair. These conclusions depend on identifying the relevant duties and connections. Present consent and harmful history contribute to this assessment through their specified implications.

The bounded transmission principle specifies several such connections: conditional performance of an owed response, use of continuing wrongful control, acquisition of authority beyond the parties' standing, and an unsupported claim that a limited transfer settles a distinct obligation. The principle supplies grounds of objection within this domain. It leaves the fair division of gains, the full content of reparative duties, and the design of legal rules to further argument.

Generative relations make the scope of exchange especially important. Money and collaboration can each support later agency, while conditions on either can govern a person's future associations. Their assessment requires symmetrical attention to practical use, reciprocal authorization, duration, and supported opportunities. In the capital case, the sale of a valued object can coexist with wrongful production of inadequacy and an excessive claim to the authorship of love or belonging. The buyer's appreciation of the object supplies a limited basis for those larger claims.

The institutional implications follow the identified wrongs: maintain urgent access on justified grounds, distinguish repair from new services, assess the scope of settlement and enforcement, and support fair inquiry into relevant histories. Such responses preserve the affected person's ability to choose among difficult possibilities while directing criticism toward demands that lack adequate justification. Exchange justice consequently concerns both what people receive and what others may claim the transaction authorizes within their continuing relations.

DRAFT

A Authorization scope and feasible continuations

This appendix provides a small formal clarification of the distinctions used in Sections 5 and 10. The first part represents the limit of what a specified assent can authorize. The second records the restricted effect of removing a condition while holding provision fixed. The notation supplies bookkeeping for stated assumptions; it does not derive moral authority or a policy recommendation from set theory.

Let U be a specified universe of possible claims concerning actions, permissions, or undertakings. For a consenting party a, let $S_a \subseteq U$ contain the claims that a has moral standing to authorize through this transaction. Determining S_a requires substantive judgments about ownership, promises, representation, and the rights of affected parties. Let $C_a \subseteq U$ contain the claims that the particular act of assent purports to authorize. The claims authorized by that assent, relative to the specified standing, are represented in Equation 1.

$$A_a(C_a) = C_a \cap S_a. \tag{1}$$

Equation 1 implies $A_a(C_a) \subseteq S_a$. Adding a claim outside S_a to the wording of an agreement leaves it unauthorized through that assent. The representation permits other sources of authority, such as a separate person's consent or an independently justified institutional mandate. Such sources require their own assessment. The formula concerns only what follows from the specified party's assent.

For example, suppose C_a contains a promise to pause the party's own work and a purported guarantee of an absent collaborator's future participation. If the first claim lies within S_a and the second lies outside it, only the first is authorized through this act. This result follows from the stipulated standing, not from a measurement of the relationship's value. Likewise, including a claim that all prior injuries have been forgiven does not establish that claim's authorization unless the scope and conditions of the relevant release fall within the party's standing and actual assent.

For the second clarification, let X be a set of possible continuations over a fixed period after a resource transfer. Fix the resource, timing, other parties' responses, available institutions, and every restriction except the condition being examined. Let $F \subseteq X$ contain the continuations feasible under these fixed circumstances. Let $K \subseteq X$ contain the continuations compatible with the additional condition. The continuations feasible under that condition are given in Equation 2.

$$F_K = F \cap K. \tag{2}$$

By Equation 2, $F_K \subseteq F$. The inclusion is strict exactly when a continuation in F violates the additional condition. This observation identifies the exclusionary effect of a condition at fixed provision. It establishes neither that all excluded continuations are valuable nor that every additional restriction is unjustified.

If removal of the condition changes provision, the relevant feasible set can change from F to a different set G. The comparison then concerns $F \cap K$ and G, between which inclusion need not hold. A supplier's withdrawal, a replacement subsidy, or changes in other parties' willingness to cooperate can produce this situation. An institutional recommendation therefore requires evidence and normative reasons beyond Equation 2. The same limitation applies to the number of options: cardinality alone leaves their quality, distribution, and legitimate governance unspecified.

DRAFT

References

[1] Elizabeth Anderson. *Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (and Why We Don't Talk about It)*. Princeton University Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc775n0.

[2] Benjamin Ferguson and Lavender McKittrick-Sweitzer. Moderate structural exploitation. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 42(5):1454–1475, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1111/japp.70034.

[3] Nancy Fraser. Contradictions of capital and care. New Left Review, no. 100, pp. 99–117, 2016. https://doi.org/10.64590/nt2.

[4] Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, 2007. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001.

[5] Eva Illouz. *Consuming the Romantic Utopia: Love and the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. University of California Press, 1997. Publisher's edition page.

[6] Catherine Lu. *Justice and Reconciliation in World Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781108329491.

[7] Karl Marx. Capital: A critique of political economy. volume 1, chapter 26: The secret of primitive accumulation. Online transcript, Marx/Engels Internet Archive, 1887. First English edition, translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, edited by Frederick Engels; German original 1867. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch26.htm.

[8] Philip Pettit. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford University Press, 1999. Paperback edition; first published 1997. https://doi.org/10.1093/0198296428.001.0001.

[9] Marsha L. Richins. Social comparison and the idealized images of advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(1):71–83, 1991. https://doi.org/10.1086/209242.

[10] Wendy Rogers, Catriona Mackenzie, and Susan Dodds. Why bioethics needs a concept of vulnerability. *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 5(2):11–38, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1353/ijf.2012.0024.

[11] Debra Satz. *Why Some Things Should Not Be for Sale: The Moral Limits of Markets*. Oxford University Press, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195311594.001.0001.

[12] Roberto Veneziani and Naoki Yoshihara. Unequal exchange and international justice. In Benjamin Ferguson and Matt Zwolinski, editors, *Exploitation: Perspectives from Philosophy, Politics, and Economics*, pages 161–186. Oxford University Press, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190256951.003.0009.

[13] Alan Wertheimer. *Exploitation*. Princeton University Press, 1996. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv10vm173.

[14] Iris Marion Young. *Responsibility for Justice*. Oxford University Press, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195392388.001.0001.

[15] Viviana A. Zelizer. *The Purchase of Intimacy*. Princeton University Press, 2005. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7s3t2.

[16] Matt Zwolinski. Structural exploitation. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 29(1):154–179, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026505251100015X.

DRAFT