

🇺🇸 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
**GRIDLOCK IN
WASHINGTON DC:
YOU SAY IT'S DUE TO
"TRIBALISM"? ...
CUTE! 🗣️ BUT NO CIGAR! 🚬**



By Stephen L. Bakke 🇺🇸 July 14, 2015

Here's what provoked me:

Hey SB! I read an "interesting" analysis which attempted to attach a bizarre explanation to the current "conflict/gridlock" in Washington. It's all about "tribalism" according to this fellow. While it was great fun to read, I found it empty of any value for advancing the ball in understanding why we are so politically divided in America.

I think a better, and simpler explanation must exist which at least gives a framework of understanding which normal citizens can relate to, and perhaps can make inroads in improving cooperation in making important policy decisions. I need some help with this! Go read the analysis that I'm referring to and then tell me: What say you? – Stefano Bachovich – obscure curmudgeon and wise political pundit – a prolific purveyor of opinions on just about everything – SB's primary "go to guy."

Here's my response:

Gridlock in Washington DC: You Say it's Due to "Tribalism"?



Cute! But no Cigar! 🚬

Stephen Young had an entertaining Opinion Exchange offering on July 12, "The Global Triumph of Tribalism." He sees a long era of "right vs. left ideological conflict" devolving into what he describes as "tribalism." With "gridlock" as a backdrop, he observes that "where tribalism prevails, goodwill and innovative ideas are scarce ... when ideologies become fundamentalist ... they take on the vindictive character of tribalisms."

Reading this analysis brought me back several decades: experiencing a sociology course which studied bizarre research of a remote South-American tribe that uniquely described civilized human nature; and studying the novel "Lord of the Flies" in which a group of pre-adolescent boys are stranded on an island and attempt to govern themselves – with disastrous results as they descend into savagery.

Young has his “tribalism” model which rejects the concept of sincerity in favor of irrational and emotional behavior. Let’s back off from this “experiment,” and return to planet earth. I offer a different model – it’s called “Win/Win.”

In order to be an effective compromise, each party must gain something from the result, be able to brag about it, and come away with some feeling of satisfaction. That’s called “win/win.” Some of today’s issues just don’t lend themselves to this dynamic! If compromise requires a satisfying result for both sides, how do you get to “win/win” with: the abortion issue, Iran nuclear negotiations, Social Security reform, immigration, welfare reform, voter ID, Israeli/Palestinian conflict, and so on!

It’s becoming much tougher for both sides to win!