

Dialectic essay – necessity of compromise

[Business](#)



Compromising means that both parties give up something in order to get what they want. A good compromise is one that suits all parties. A good compromise may also be defined as a deal that gives the most possible benefit to each party member whilst each undergoes the least amount of loss. It is possible for a compromise to heavily favor one party over the other(s).

Compromising can help persuade people to think and act a certain way. A stern view or strong immovable position is fine, but a little compromise may help others become a little less immovable. If you are willing to compromise a little and bend or adjust your position, then it is possible that the other party will do the same. Sometimes, only by compromising, are you able to make people think and act in a different way. You may have more to gain by compromising. A compromise does often mean you have to give something up or bend in some way in order to create and maintain a deal. The fact you have to give something up may mean a compromise is undesirable, but on the other hand, it may enable you to gain more than if you were to remain immovable.

By giving up a little or bending a little, you may strike a deal. With the deal, you may get more than if no deal was done at all. In other words, the compromise would be beneficial to you if your losses are lower than your gains. Not only that, but if you get more from the deal than the other parties do, then the benefits for compromise are even further in your favor.

Compromising a value can have pros and cons. Values are the most important assets we have, and poorly formed values, or those that are based on

feelings alone (and not logic) are doomed to create suffering and horror in our society.

Values taken from the wrong place may simply be a matter of opinion. For example, the Nazis didn't value human life (in their opinion), but the British legal system does (because of their opinion that capital punishment is wrong). Given that values are such an important part of ourselves and our society, it seems wrong to compromise them. However, there are times when a compromise is the morally sound thing to do. The oldest and most common example is how stealing is wrong, but how stealing may be justified if it is done to feed a starving family.

Yet, even that analogy is flawed because what if one steals from another starving family to feed his family, or what if all starving people stole from the rich, which would then make rich people starve and steal from the former poor. Conclusion As you can see by the numerous arguments listed, there are good and bad sides to compromise. The biggest negative is that if you were to strike a deal without having to compromise personally, then you would get all you want. However, as shown in my essay, that is rarely the case, and in many cases, it is a good idea to compromise except maybe when it comes to values. It is quite possible that being non-compromising when it comes to your values is the right way to go.