

Addendum Two — Tribes And Clans Unite Us And Divide Us In Many Settings

Tribes are extremely important at many levels in many areas of the world.

The basic organizational model that people use in most of the world to define who each person is, and to define what basic group based alignment each person has, is the tribe that each person is a member of.

Tribes do not exist in all settings, but where they do exist, tribes very often give people their most important group related alignment and their most relevant sense of group identity.

Americans tend to seriously underestimate the role that tribes play in many other parts of the world.

Most nations have a legacy of tribal behavior. Many nations today have large numbers of people who define themselves more as members of their tribe, rather than defining themselves primarily as citizens of the nation they live in.

Tribal behaviors and our entire sets of basic tribal instincts are hugely important in major parts of the world. Anyone who looks at Iraq, Pakistan, Syria, Nigeria, the Congo, the Ukraine, Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Philippines,

Russia, China, or India who doesn't understand how much of the internal conflict that exists in all of those settings today is actually simply conflict between clearly defined tribes, doesn't understand at all what is really happening to create very real and very important intergroup issues in all of those countries.

People tribalize in almost every area of the world. People who are in tribes in every setting tend to identify at a very basic level with their tribes. Tribal membership activates several levels of basic instinctive behaviors. Those basic behaviors tend to shape people's lives and can even give purpose, direction, and meaning to people's lives.

Tribes give us an instinct-linked sense of group identity — and loyalty to our tribes gives people clear channels for our instinctive need to have a level of allegiance to a group larger than ourselves.

Tribes help us define who we are and then also help us define who we should be aware of and who we should dislike or fear.

People in tribes tend to feel a clear sense of alignment and loyalty to their own tribe and people in tribes tend to feel a clear sense of separation and opposition to people from other relevant tribes.

Tribal alignments everywhere trigger basic and very primal us/them intergroup instinct thought processes and behaviors.

Those instincts can create very negative intergroup behaviors that have very close alignment and ties to people's tribal affiliations and to people's tribe-linked belief systems because we define our own tribe to be "Us" and we define the other tribe to be "Them."

Tribes fill both those organizational and alignment roles, and those intergroup interaction divisiveness roles in significant ways in all multi-tribal settings.

Our News Media Usually Misses The Point

Our news media usually very badly misses and does not see or understand the existence and relevance of tribes in reporting about local intergroup conflicts.

Our media is capable of giving abstract and often very confusing labels to what are clearly tribal conflicts and tribal wars.

They seem to believe that political parties are at the heart of many conflicts and that religions are at the heart of others.

When you drill down into the actual political parties in each setting, they tend to be tribes — with all of the people in one tribe in one party, and all of the people in the other party actually members of the other tribe.

In a very similar vein to our usual journalistic approach, our diplomats and governmental leaders often go to great lengths to avoid naming tribes that are relevant to the conflicts in the various intertribal settings.

Government Officials And Diplomats Also Avoid Naming Tribes

Our news media and our diplomats both sometimes mention “sectarian” issues relative to local conflicts. But neither media nor the government officials seem to clearly understand what the actual “sectarian” issues are when they use that term.

In fact, some government officials speaking about conflicts in various settings make disparaging, negative, and intentionally vague remarks about the existence of “sectarian issues” as though sectarian issues are an inferior category of issues that doesn’t deserve to be acknowledged by civilized people in polite conversation.

They make vague reference to sectarian issues. But they never describe those issues or give us the names of the relevant sectarian components of those particular conflicts.

That low public visibility of the role of tribes for the media and for the public has no impact on the actual importance and role of tribes in all of those conflicted settings.

But that low visibility for the role of tribes in those settings does tend to confuse people in other settings about why people in those particular settings are in a state of conflict

When you look at who is actually at war in all of those conflicted settings, there is no doubt that tribes fight tribes — and that tribes in a wide range of settings are in a state of conflict with the other tribes in their settings.

Tribal Conflict Is An Almost Universal Pattern

That is a common and almost universal pattern. The tribes in almost every multi-tribal setting tend to be in at least mild conflict as well as a state of perpetual and ongoing intergroup tension relative to other relevant tribes in their setting.

Some nations — like ours — have very few pure and actual tribes. We are not currently a tribal nation. Because we do not have tribes here, we tend to not perceive the role of tribes in all of the settings where they exist and where they play major roles.

We do have significant and highly relevant racial and ethnic intergroup issues in our country — but those racial and ethnic issues don't manifest themselves in actual tribal contexts or in tribal structure in our communities and settings.

Because we don't have tribes here, we tend to have a hard time seeing tribes in those settings where they do exist.

Many People Align With Their Tribes Instead Of Their

Nations

The reality is that for many other nations, large numbers of people align more directly with their tribes than with their nation. The people in many of those multi-tribal nations who align primarily with their tribes tend to be in a state of constant intergroup stress and almost continuous intergroup conflict relative to the other tribes in their settings.

To understand the important role that tribes play in those settings, we need to recognize the very clear and very powerful set of instincts that

support tribes and tribal behaviors. We all want to be in an “us.” Tribes very effectively help us achieve that goal of being “us.”

Being in a tribe gives people an instinct-triggered group identity context and gives people a clear and positive sense of being in a group with other people like themselves.

We have a strong instinctive need to be part of a group of people who we perceive to be “us.” The *Primal Pathways* book and *The Art of InterGroup Peace* book both discuss the very powerful instincts we have to divide the world into "Them" and “Us.”

Tribes are one of the very best and most effective functional tools we have for creating that kind of linkage and that personal identity as an “us.”

Tribes are also one of the very easiest ways for people in any setting to define who is a “Them.” Tribes lend themselves to being perceived as a “Them.”

In multi-tribal settings, the overwhelming tendency is for people to perceive the people from other tribes to be some category of “Them” with all of the negative instinctive connotations and consequences that can result from being perceived to be “Them.”

There are clear risks to having people perceived to be “Them” in any setting and those are even clearer benefits for being perceived to be “Us.”

Tribes help people be an “Us.” People in tribes generally feel a clear sense of being “Us” as tribal members with other members of their tribe. People align with “Us,” feel comfort in being with “Us,” and tend to feel direct loyalty to whoever is included in that “Us.” Tribes give people a context for both personal security and comfort, and for group allegiance and group loyalty.

People clearly choose to be in tribes when that opportunity exists. The few people who still live in isolated settings in the rain forests of Brazil and the few people who still live in isolated settings deep in the jungles of Sri Lanka where groups continue to exist in their purest forms still clearly function every day in those settings in what are very basically and clearly tribes.

Tribes Have Identity, Language, Culture, and Turf

Tribes have a clear set of characteristics that define them as tribes and allow them to function as tribes. Tribes each have their own identity, their own name, their own history, their own hierarchies, their own cultural components, and their own sense of tribal turf.

In some settings, tribes actually achieve national status. Some tribes function as single tribe nations. Much of Europe has been tribally organized as nations into the historic ethnic tribes of Europe for many centuries.

Some of the nations in modern Europe are multi-tribal, but a number of current European nations were created as tribal nations — and those tribal countries have created, defined, protected, and used what is essentially a purely tribal national identity for a very long time.

The French have functioned for a relatively long time as the French tribe. The Swedes have functioned even longer as the Swedish tribe. Danes are Danes. Finns are Finns.

Those original functioning tribes in all of those European settings each tend to have their own identity, their own culture, their own collective history, their own tribal language, and their own sense of tribal destiny and tribal purpose.

The tribal turf for each of those tribe-based countries became the national turf that constituted the geography and boundaries of each nation.

The legal boundaries of Sweden, the nation, are identical to the turf boundaries of Sweden, the tribe. The Finnish tribal turf became Finland. The Austrian tribal turf became the national borders of Austria.

Many tribal countries were named after their founding tribe. Ireland is named after the Irish. Japan is named after the Japanese.

People have historically believed that national boundaries made inherent sense because many of the first national boundaries were also the functional boundaries of the founding tribe for the nation and those particular boundaries did, in fact, make functional sense.

It felt very right to protect and respect national boundaries, because those boundaries were also the homeland turf of each tribe and tribes all protect their turf.

That pure linkage of tribe to national boundaries has faded in many settings, but the international law that grants inherent and permanent status to each national boundary once the national boundary has been created has not faded.

We tend to have an almost obsessive commitment to protect, perpetuate, and continue any national boundaries that exist once those national boundaries have been legally created for any reason. The chapter on turf instinct explains those issues in more detail.

Because we all have strong turf instincts that tie closely to our tribal instincts, the issues of border modification or boundary change can be

extremely difficult — and the dominant tribe in each national setting is often willing to go to war to protect whatever boundaries exist for the setting.

We Also Align In Clans

Tribes and tribal boundaries are not the only basic on-going group alignments we see in multiple settings that tend to trigger our various sets of intergroup instincts.

People in many settings also organize into clans. Clans play an important role in a number of settings. Clans tend to exist as component parts of tribes. People in those settings tend to identify themselves by both their tribe and their clan. Clans in many settings can create their own more focused group identity for people inside the context of a nation or a tribe.

Clans and clan-like groupings can and do also activate our basic tribal and intergroup sets of instinct packages for both positive and negative purposes.

Clans tend to be separate subsets of tribes who also have their own group identity and group history — but usually not to the extent of having their own clan language. Clans tend to share their language with other clans from the same larger tribe.

Clans in a number of settings function very much like tribes to create a clear collective identity for sets of people that serve to generate another layer of group identity for a defined set of people.

In many settings, the clans that exist can trigger their own intergroup instincts in both positive and negative ways — and it is not uncommon to see settings where clan feuds and clan warfare are the result of us/them behaviors that are tied very directly to clan interactions.

We Are Born Into Both Clans And Tribes

Both tribal membership and clan membership tends to be hereditary. That is an important fact to understand relative to those alignments. We are born into our tribes and we are born into our clans.

There are some voluntary ways of people joining tribes or clans — sometimes through marriage processes — but most people acquire their personal clan or their tribal linkage at birth and that linkage generally continues for each person's entire life.

American Indian tribes usually had clans inside each tribe. Similarly, Somalia has very powerful clans that define the internal population alignments within that country today.

Albania has very clear internal clan alignments that often trigger negative intergroup interactions in that country.

Scotland has a very visible and long-standing legacy of strong clans inside the overall Scottish tribe.

The Bogandan people in Uganda have three dozen basic Bogandan clans that clearly define the overall governance and leadership structure for that ancient, history rich and carefully organized multi-clan tribe.

In each of those settings, clans function much like tribes to give people a sense of group alignment and an attachment point for their group loyalty.

They are, in effect, mini-tribes for much of their functionality.

Tribes Give People A Sense of Group Protection And Support

Tribes are a useful organizational model for people in many settings because having people in tribes also clearly offers individuals both the protection that is created by being part of a larger group, and a strong personal sense of shared identity as a group member.

Tribes create various levels of support systems for their members. Tribes, clans, and equivalent organizations each generally create a setting where life is functionally easier for people than it would be if people were

alone and if people lived as individuals in those settings with no group context, group support, or group functionality.

Our tribal instincts are extremely powerful and they cause us to create tribes or tribe-like organizations and do tribal things in very consistent ways across the planet. Those instincts cause us to identify with our tribe and to feel allegiance and loyalty to our tribal group and to our tribal identity.

We Americans Tend To Be Less Tribal And More Racial

In our own country, we continue to have a number of very distinct Native American tribes. But that is a relatively small portion of our entire population. Our various other groups tend not to take on the full infrastructure and the functionality of either tribes or clans.

We tend to experience our intergroup instinct activations in our country by race, ethnicity, and by legacy ancestral connections rather than by tribe.

We tend to be hyphenated Americans. We basically tend to have America as our functional core tribe name and then we use various hyphenated names to describe what subset of the American people we are each part of. We use African American, Native American, Chinese

American, Japanese American, and various kinds of Hispanic American as our group identification labels.

As a rule, for our primary intergroup identification process and to structure the various levels of intergroup interactions that we have, we tend to use race and ethnicity in our country as our group labels rather than tribes.

In most other parts of the world, however, tribes are the key identifier for each person. People in many settings relate to their tribe — not to their nations — and tribal loyalties create the key alignment factor for people.

We Americans often miss the point of how important those tribal alignments are in countries like Iraq or The Sudan or Sri Lanka because those particular intergroup differentiations are not functionally relevant or important to us here.

Some nations — like Norway or The Netherlands — were created by their dominant tribe and those countries continue to function primarily as self-governing tribes.

In those kinds of tribe based national settings, those ethnically concentrated nations tend to collectively activate what are basically tribal instincts for themselves as a nation.

Those single tribe nations are a minority of the nations that exist today. Most nations today are multi-ethnic and multi-tribal settings.

The end of colonialism and the collapse of the Soviet Union ended powerful governing empires and gave independence and self-governance to people in dozens of countries. Ending empires was a good thing — but both empires and dictators tend to suppress local ethnic conflict.

That ethnic conflict reappears when the powers that suppressed it disappear.

When the police powers that had very intentionally suppressed local ethnic conflicts in all of those settings disappeared, then local ethnic problems reemerged and began to dominate intergroup behaviors in many settings.

In some areas, like India, there were massive intertribal conflicts. More than 1 million people died as the tribes of Indian and the tribes of Pakistan separated into their new national configurations.

Other settings had less dramatic initial intergroup conflicts, but they reopened old intertribal wounds and people are facing serious intergroup conflicts in many multi-tribal nations today.

People in many of those multi-tribal nations align with each other as tribes and do not have a strong internal national identity for all of the people in the nation. People who live in those multi-tribal settings generally do not feel their priority group allegiance is to each other as a nation.

Instead of a national identity that aligns all of the people in those settings into a single group, those countries have multi-tribal identities that divide their people at multiple levels and keep the country from functioning well as a nation.

Every nation tends to work hard to protect whatever national boundary it has come to have.

The national boundaries for many of the more recently created multi-tribal nations exist more to define and confine the relevant intergroup and intertribal battlegrounds instead of defining and supporting any kind of functional intergroup common national turf that gives people a collective sense of being a national “Us.”

Pakistan, Kenya, Sri Lanka, and Syria all have internal tribes that are the primary group identity trigger for each of their citizens. A number of ethnically divided nations function much of the time as situational and

clearly dysfunctional political anomalies rather than as self-focused and self-supporting nation states.

The people in those artificially created multi-tribal settings are forced to continue to function as a nation by a variety of external factors that strongly supports the continued existence of nation states once any nation state has come into existence.

External forces tend to oppose the breaking up of existing nations into their component parts. For a number of reasons, international law strongly supports the continuation of even the most problematic multi-tribal, multi-ethnic internally conflicted nation states as entire nations, regardless of the problems that are created for people from multiple groups by being forced to continue as a single nation.

National Leaders Do Not Want to Encourage Separatism

That international law that protects all current national boundaries is strongly and explicitly supported by the leaders of almost all other nations because so many other nations are multi-ethnic themselves and many of those nations have their own internal separatist groups that the leaders of the country tend to squash in their own settings.

Government leaders in Mexico, Canada, and Sri Lanka do not want to allow separatists to succeed anywhere if that separation in other settings encourages the separatist groups that exist in their countries.

The Zapatista separatists in Mexico have been opposed with force of arms for years by the Mexican government — so the Mexican government is not likely to endorse ethnic autonomy or separatism for equivalent groups in Nigeria or in The Ukraine. Leaders from all countries with internal separatist movements clearly do not support the separatists in The Ukraine.

Us/Them Instincts Exist In All Settings

The reality that needs to be faced is that people in those arbitrarily created multi-ethnic nations tend to feel their personal loyalty to their tribe or their ethnic group, rather than to the nation itself. That is highly unlikely to change.

It is wishful thinking — or even magical thinking — to assume that the separatist tribes in all of those settings will spontaneously give up their tribal identities and choose instead to be Syrian or Nigerian.

There is almost no imaginable set of circumstances that will cause the people in any situation or setting who are tightly linked to their tribal

loyalties in those settings to somehow give up their tribal lives and their tribal culture in favor of loyalty to their newly invented nation.

Tribes tend to last forever. Any solutions to the issues that exist today in each of those multi-tribal settings needs to take that reality into account.

That can be done. Those tribal diversity issues can be addressed successfully by nations who recognize how seminal and critical those tribal issues are and then create solutions that reflect those tribal realities.

It is possible to take a multi-tribal nation and have that nation structured and governed in ways that create Peace and keep the local tribes from doing damage to one another.

That can be done — but it takes very careful structuring to make it happen.

Belgium And Switzerland Dealt With Tribal Realities

Peacefully

Belgium, for example, is a multi-ethnic nation that clearly has people who personally identify more with their own ethnic group instead of identifying with Belgium as a nation. Belgium is clearly two separate tribes — each with their own tribal turf.

But people in multi-tribal Belgium manage to live together today without being at perpetual war with one another because Belgium has set up a structure that gives equal political power to all residents, creates safety for all residents, and gives very clear governance role and legal control to each tribe in Belgium relative to their own tribal turf.

The two key tribes of Belgium speak separate languages. They each have sections of that country where their tribal language is spoken.

They very intentionally and structurally respected and protected each language in that country rather than trying to eliminate either language.

People everywhere will instinctively fight to protect their tribal language. Belgium eliminated the fights by protecting each language.

Likewise, Switzerland has learned to be a multi-tribal and multi-lingual country that is very successfully at Peace with itself. Switzerland has three sets of purely tribal cantons. The people in each Swiss canton setting tend to feel strong loyalty to their own language group and to the tribe they each were born into.

Switzerland performs some key functions as a nation — and Switzerland assigns a number of key functions to each of the self-governing cantons.

Each language group in Switzerland fiercely protects its language on its own tribal turf and there are no language wars in Switzerland as a nation.

Switzerland and Belgium have both learned over time to create semi-autonomous local turf control for each of their relevant tribes in ways that allow those tribes to co-exist in functional ways in the context of a nation. Those approaches have allowed the tribes in those settings to be at Peace with each other for very long periods of time.

People In Many Multi-Tribal Nations Are Not Safe

The Congo, on the other hand, is a multi-tribal country that has major problems with splintered local tribal loyalties — with no people in that part of the world feeling that their primary personal identity is to be Congolese and many people feeling that they need to be fiercely protective of their own people and their own tribe.

Nigeria clearly also has various groups of people who are in a state of conflict with other groups of people inside Nigeria.

Sri Lanka has people in a state of tribal conflict who are very intentionally doing damage to people from other tribes in that country.

People in all of those multi-tribal settings are often not safe when they enter the turf of other tribes.

People in Switzerland and Belgium are safe everywhere, regardless of the specific language setting they are in. People in The Congo, Nigeria, and Sri Lanka, Syria, and The Sudan are being killed in mob settings and in local battles for being from the wrong tribe and speaking the wrong language.

Elections Don't End Tribal Conflict

Elections are not a magical process that can resolve those problems.

It is clear that the tribes who hate each other in The Sudan are not going to somehow find themselves holding an election of some kind and having Peace magically result from the elections.

Some people in the western world believe that simply holding local elections in those various troubled settings can be a pathway to Peace.

That clearly is not true when the local election simply functions as a tribal census count for those settings. In fact, sometimes elections that represent tribal votes put a local tribe in functional control of a country — and those tribes who gain control in any setting are often reluctant to surrender that control.

Sometimes A Dominant Tribe Doesn't Want To Lose Control

In many of those troubled multi-ethnic settings, a major barrier to having the local tribes split into more rational ethnicity-based smaller

nations actually is the fact that one of the local tribes has managed to gain control of the entire country and does not want to surrender that control.

In many countries, like Iraq or Syria, a dictator from one of the local tribes has seized power and has his own Alpha instincts activated to the point where he does not want either true democracy or any kind of functional ethnic autonomy and ethnic division to happen in his country.

A wide range of very negative us/them instincts can get activated in those settings. Tribes take us/them instinctive roles. We suspend conscience when we are in conflict with “Them.”

Fire bombings, poison gas, and other horrific weaponry are used with no sense of guilt when the other party in those conflicted settings is from the other tribe and perceived to be “Them.”

Those dictators in those settings tend to continue to rule with the worst kinds of unethical behaviors that our us/them instincts create relative to “Them.”

The other members of the dictator’s tribe who rule the country with the dictator tend to be very loyal to those dictators in ways that often puzzle the rest of the world.

The people from the dictator's tribes tend to anticipate that revenge and retribution is highly likely to be their fate if they lose those wars for control of their country — so those civil wars can drag on for very long times and they can hurt a lot of people.

Yugoslavia And Czechoslovakia Split Into Multiple Tribal

Nations

The solution in each multi-tribal setting needs to take tribes in the setting into account.

People in all of those conflicted multi-tribal settings will continue to be at war with themselves until they either split into separate ethnic countries — like Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia have managed to very Peacefully do — or until they create canton-like structures that function like the tribal groups in Switzerland and Belgium do to achieve intergroup Peace and safety for all residents.

Yugoslavia was a multi-tribal country that was at bloody war with itself. Yugoslavia resolved all of those issues and ended those internal stress points by simply splitting into half a dozen entirely tribal nations. They needed to be separate nations to create intergroup Peace.

Peace actually has been created in that setting.

There are very basic governance models that can work to create long-term Peace in those multi-tribal settings, but those models require careful work to put them in place. The solutions in each setting need to reflect the role of each tribe in the future governance process.

Each of those multi-tribal settings that is in a state of intergroup conflict today will need to work out its own future to create Peace — and successful approaches will need to very directly reflect the functional reality that is created by the tribes in each of those settings.

InterGroup Hatred Lasts For Centuries

Intergroup hatred can and does last for centuries. Simply hoping that those multi-tribal countries who are at war with themselves in some spontaneous way today will somehow achieve Peace with themselves is a foolish hope.

The tribal behaviors that tear those countries apart today will be a reality as long as there are tribes that exist in those settings.

The Kurds, as a tribe, have resisted purges, massacres, attempted genocide, and forced assimilation into other tribal groups for centuries.

A solution to the Kurdish tribal issues in each country where Kurds live today needs to reflect the fact that the tribe will not disappear and that

its desire for tribal autonomy at some kind at some level will last as long as there is a Kurdish tribe in existence in each setting.

We Americans tend not to understand those issues. We generally cannot even name the tribes that are in a state of conflict in all of those settings or explain any of their relevant tribal issues.

In fact, we are often very confused about those conflicts and think of them as being other types of conflicts.

Religion Tends To Label Tribes

When people look at the conflicts in Northern Ireland as if they were religious wars, and do not see the tribes that are in a state of conflict there as clearly being tribes in a state of conflict with other tribes, then that situation is clearly not being understood. As *The Art of InterGroup Peace* and *Cusp of Chaos* point out clearly, the tribes there use religious labels for their conflicts, but those conflicts in Ireland are very clearly tribal at their core.

Theology actually is used often as a label for the warring tribes in Ireland — it is not a functional division factor. People do not convert to a religion and then fight. People are born into a tribe and then fight.

Likewise, all of the Shiite and Sunni conflicts we see in all of the Middle Eastern countries have actual tribes in each setting who are fighting other tribes as tribes in every conflict.

The Shia tribes and the Sunni tribes are all Muslim tribes who function at every level as tribes and who fight each other as tribes. The tribes who are conflicted each have all of the elements that define a tribe to themselves and to each other.

Religion does play a significant role in those clearly tribal battles.

The Sunni tribes tend to reach alliances with other Sunni tribes — and the Shiite tribes tend to reach alliances with other Shiite tribes.

But those alliances that are created in those settings are not between individual people who have made personal commitments to each religious sect. Those alliances that are created are between the local tribes who are aligned with each sect.

Likewise, the Kurdish tribes are also Muslim peoples who do battle as tribes with people from other local Muslim tribes. Those warring sets of people all fly religious banners over their battlefields, but they arm each other and they kill each other as tribes.

ISIS Is Land Locked By Its Tribal Limitations

The new Islamic State — or ISIS movement — that is creating major problems in a number of Middle Eastern countries also has major tribal linkages that need to be understood to understand ISIS strengths and major ISIS weaknesses.

The major weakness is that ISIS is inherently land-locked based on its tribal linkages. ISIS cannot expand infinitely. Kurds will never convert to ISIS allegiance. The Shia tribes will never convert to ISIS.

The Iranians are a theocracy that has control over a set of tribes that will not ever convert to ISIS allegiance.

ISIS is not going to convert the entire Muslim world to its cause. Tribes are its asset and its limitations. It can only convert the portion of that world that is tribally compatible with ISIS.

That is still a lot of people — but it isn't even all of the local Muslims. People who oppose ISIS need to understand that weakness and need to exploit it fully to keep them from doing maximum amounts of damage.

The tribal alignments in all of those areas are the key to the problems and the solutions in those conflicted areas.

We Do Not Have Purely Tribal Issues In America

We are blessed with the fact that we do not have to deal with purely tribal issues in America.

We do need to deal with racism and we clearly need to deal with intergroup prejudice, but we all, at our core, want to be Americans.

We all want “American” to be the tribe that we can relate to. We want being American to meet the instinctive need we all have for a tribe-like affiliation and a tribal connection.

That basic overarching alignment of us all as Americans can fill the best roles and achieve the best functions of being a tribe for us all if we do it well.

We need to understand the strategies laid out in *The Art of InterGroup Peace* to make that outcome as an American “Us” to happen for us all.