

Final
Tribal Narratives
Daniel Bar-Tal

Tribalism began to be used as a synonym to authoritarianism, indicating a regime that has anti-democratic characteristics (e.g., Antonio, 2019; Hobfoll, 2018, Shilaho, 2018 and the present book). This chapter is dealing with tribalism. Taking this point of departure, I would like to claim that it is possible to present a nature of a regime as evolved from a narrative¹ that represents it. In view of this premise, we can think on tribal narrative as a foundation of tribalism that serves as a basis to different autocratic regimes. Tribal narrative is very old. Its simple scheme based on primary needs appeared with prehistoric homo-sapiens and survived until present time.

Along the same reasoning, we can think on democracy as being based on a narrative that specifies the needed condition, principles and values for its construction. Many individuals supplied parts of the puzzle from which today is structured a democratic regime. It began in ancient Athens as an idea of Cleisthenes, and then contributed to it many -beginning with Hobbes, Montesquieu, Locke, Rousseau, and it continued till modern times with Schumpeter, Dahl, Diamond and Laclau to name just a few, who supplied narratives of democracy's principles. structure and values (see for example, Clarke & Foweraker. 2001). Eventually appeared a few narratives that portray democracy and as result there are differences in the implementations of the proposed narratives in different states (Dahl, 2000: Diamond 2008; Gabardi, 2001). But, Ill put this

¹ Narrative is defined a social construction that coherently describes, explains, and/or justifies an event or issue. •

important point aside and focus only on the commonality of the different democratic narratives.

The democratic narrative is on the one side of the dimension. On the other end, I see tribal narrative that presents a very different narrative. On its basis, different regimes are structured, which limit the principles of democracy. The structured regimes have one feature in common: they all are authoritarian. Between the two ends are hybrid societies that have a mixture of these two narratives. Thus, as pointed, I use tribal narrative (tribalism) in its negative meaning, focusing on its discriminatory beliefs of the outgroups, blind loyalty to the ingroup, reliance on fear in the prejudice of outgroups and supporting a strong leader (Wilkerson, 2020).

The democratic narrative applies equal standards of attitudes and behaviors to every human being in the society regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual preference. It is hold by great majority of society members in countries like Denmark, Sweden, or New Zealand. Tribal narrative is preferential, differentiating in its attitude and behavior among members of different groups: as for example according to ethnicity, or gender, seeing own group as distinguished and superior. It can be found in many countries, even with dominating democratic narrative. But the power of the narratives differs in different states. In few states, only slight minority hold the tribal narrative, but in some other countries, the tribal narrative has a grip in a significant part of the society like in USA, leading to major polarization in American society. In some societies, leaders with tribal narrative govern, in spite of the large-scale division in a society like in Poland or Israel. In other states, tribal narrative is dominant and the rulers, usually in authoritarian system, govern with the support of most society members like Hungary,

India, or Turkey. We can also find countries with dominating tribal narrative that do not pretend to be democracy and even the elections are not free. These countries are on the other end of the classification on the democratic-authoritarian regime as China, Oman, Saudi Arabia, or Turkmenistan. The present chapter does not deal with these cases because in full authoritarian regimes, without free elections, we do not know whether the citizens prefer democratic or tribal narrative, or the mixture of them.

Tribal narratives are still dominant in many societies and cause them damage by limiting spaces of pluralism and equality and freedom of the citizens. This chapter will present the tribal narrative in contrast to the democratic narrative, provide its examples, describe its underlying needs and describe empirical research that validates it. I'll begin with the democratic narrative that provides the evaluating ruler to the tribal narrative.

Democratic narrative.

Contents.

The democratic narrative tells about the fundamental assumption suggesting that every individual in a society is a person in his/her own right. That is, an individual is the basic element of any society, that he/she and his/her freedom are of supreme value, and that the individual is a goal, and not a means at the hands of a government, nation or state. The narrative further tells that democracy requires free elections every fixed time interval in which every citizen can vote without threats, payment, or manipulations. A democratic government rules with the consent of the majority of the citizens. But the narrative qualifies that a country is not democratic, even in view of the free election that receives the support of the majority, if it harms individual freedoms, violates the equality

among citizens and breaks the democratic principles. Democracy therefore limits the power of majority for fear that it may become a tyrannical majority that tramples on the respect of minority rights, the human rights and the entitled freedoms.

Also, the narrative does not end at the important principle of rule of the majority, the narrative emphasizes other structural conditions like, separation of powers (the executive, legislative, and judicial branches), the existence of an autonomous and fair judicial system, obedience to the law by the government, transparency and acceptance of responsibility of the government for its citizens, and the absence of state corruption.

This complex narrative that has been told in its essence is based on universal values that underlines democracy. The three most important values are human rights, freedom, and equality. The democratic narrative distinguishes between human rights, as fundamental rights, and civil rights. Human rights are natural and eternal norms, originating in human nature. Such are the right to life, freedom, happiness and dignity, as well as freedom of conscience and freedom of belief. Civil rights are rights that one obtains by being a legal member of a certain political state as they protect individuals' freedom from infringement by governments and social organizations. They ensure one's entitlement to participate in the civil and political life of society and the state without discrimination or repression.

The equality value is another principal value according to the narrative. It assures equality before the law; in a democracy everyone is subject to the same laws and everyone is equal before these laws. According to the democratic narrative, the law allows each person to live according to his own way, provided that the right of the other person is also recognized and protected. The role of the law is to ensure a fair and stable

coexistence between the members of a democratic society. It safeguards human, civic and minority rights, and pluralism (see the details in for example Dahl, 2000 or Diamond, 1999).

Characteristics of the democratic narrative.

Is complex.

Complex means that the narrative is not obvious but challenging for understanding. It requires contemplation, thinking and most of all putting together the different parts of the narrative, after considering them separately. The complexity characterizes the democratic narrative because it is counter intuitive and consists of elements that do not derive from the primary needs and the stereotypic thinking.

Is multi-faceted.

Multi-faceted narrative has a number of layers, aspects and parts. Only by considering each of them and then all of them together it is possible to grasp the meaning of the narrative. The layers of the democratic narrative presents required values, structures, principles and conditions. It specifies the nature of the needed relationships between human beings and regime, between citizens and regime, and between collectives and regimes.

Based on tolerance.

The democratic narrative demands tolerance: The ability to accept different persons, irrespectively of their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual preference. Also, it requires the existence of opinion or behaviors that one does not necessarily agrees with and considering new or different ideas. Gibson (1992) argued that intolerance

constrains the liberty of individuals through culture of conformity and therefore tolerance is one of the requirements for democratic thoughts.

Requires reflective thinking.

As a complex contents, the democratic narrative is based on higher cognitive processing, reflective thinking, requiring mental representations of positively valued future situation. More specifically, it requires processing of many facts, understanding them, evaluating them and then setting an objective to have such regime, planning how to achieve it with the use of imagery, creativity, cognitive flexibility, mental exploration of novel situations and even risk taking. Dewey defined reflective thinking as “active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends (1933, p. 9).” This type of thinking plays a significant role in enabling individuals to better understand their complex realities and to make rational, balanced, and merited decisions on individual and societal issues (Dewey, 1933). Reflective thinking is opened minded thinking (Baron, 2018) that provides a prescription for individual thinking about political decisions, it serves as a norm and most importantly it provides a standard for knowing which sources to trust.

Based on critical thinking

Democratic narrative requires critical thinking that denotes continuous questioning the practices of the structured democratic system. This is the “must” of observing and supervising the functioning of the regime in reality, because people realize it and they have a tendency to bias the system, to use it to their political and personal interests and corrupt it.

Furthermore, individuals' ability to think critically allows dynamic changes of opinions, facilitates development of tolerance and open-mindedness, and increases the value of diversity and of freedom of expression (Cammara, 2011). In fact, it is rather axiomatic in modern-democratic societies in the 21st century to encourage critical views to be freely expressed by all, to allow the free flow of information and thoughts, and to grant full and free access to information. Therefore, critical thought—with its free expression—provides a set of criteria to evaluate the functioning of a democratic society, and serves to guide, evaluate, supervise and control the ways in which decisions are made and the society is managed (Dahl, 2000; Raz, 1991).

It prioritizes the wellbeing of the citizens and the collective.

The democratic narrative has an objective to benefit the society members with the best regime that takes into account the needs of the different individuals and collectives. It suggests a way to organize political life that allows functioning with the differences in one system and guarding the system before its abuse, corruption and misuse of power by an individual, or a group. Specifically, the narrative provides rules of the political arrangement which guarantees freedom, equality, entitled rights and harmonious existence of diversity as expressed through political representation, political participation, and rules of the law. The democratic system exercises freely expressed will of people and people have a say in decisions and can hold decision-makers to be transparent, responsible, and accountable.

Requires learning.

Because the characteristics of the democratic narrative are complex and multi-faceted, the narrative requires learning of the relevant values, attitudes, skills, and

knowledge to comprehend it. Learning is required in order to respond appropriately and effectively to the demands, challenges and opportunities that are presented by democratic situations. Moreover, the democratic narrative demands continuous mobilization and activism to guard its proper implementation in the public spheres. Thus, the educational system needs to take the responsibility to impart the narrative from an early age with experiential learning and the mass and social media together with the civil society have the duties to maintain this learning.

Tribal narrative

In contrast to the democratic narrative that is complex, multifaceted, requires higher mental cognitive functioning, and many conditions, the tribal narrative is relatively simple and appeals to primary needs of society members. It is thus more persuasive than the democratic narrative to society members who are not satisfied with the democratic regime for various reasons (Dunn, 2015; Wilkerson, 2021).

Contents.

The tribal narrative includes the following elements of contents. *Ethnocentric elements* emphasize the importance of belonging to the ingroup. This is the most important element. Human beings from the early prehistoric time have a need to belong to a group which is of surviving importance. As a result, human beings characterize the ingroup in glorifying terms and view it as superior to other groups. Of special importance is an attribute of distinguished identity that is presented often by leaders as unique and special.

As an opposite, the tribal narrative has *discriminatory elements*. They have formal and informal prescriptions of racism, prejudice and discrimination of the outgroups. That is, while adhering to the ingroup, its members tend to reject members of the outgroups. First, they stereotype them negatively and develop negative attitudes towards them with negative emotions and practices (Fiske, 2000). They also have in the narrative often directives of discriminating women or sexist norms that guide chauvinistic behaviors of men. Tribal narrative also opposes immigration that brings out group members to their territories under the pretext of various reasons; turning the society heterogonous, spending money for absorption, or the immigrants' competition for working place.

The tribal narrative emphasizes *patriotism and loyalty* to the ingroup as an important value. The implication is that ingroup members are required even to sacrifice their lives for the benefit of ingroup safety. The tribal narrative encourages blind patriotism, supporting the tribal societal beliefs, ideology, and the leadership (Staub, 1997). It reflects unquestionable acceptance of group goals, means, ideology, policies, norms, practices and formal leadership, without tolerating criticism of possible failings or violations of moral codes.

Anti-pluralistic elements include negative attitudes, delegitimization and even incitement against the liberal opposition of the tribal narrative, which negates the tribal narrative. This phenomenon is called monopolization of the patriotism as patriots are considered only those who support a particular leader, beliefs, or ideology. Other ingroup members, who do not accept this condition are viewed as outcasts (Bar-Tal, 1997). These elements of the narrative prevent criticism of the ingroup or its policies by mass media, social media, artistic performances, and exhibitions and by activists of civil

society. Such practices put barriers and limitation on free flow of information in society because of the prevailing censorship that comes to defend the tribal narrative.

Security elements refer to the threats and danger that exist and that may occur in the future because of external or internal forces. They include a different kind and range from symbolic dangers, existential to cultural and religious through economic, global warming and epidemic threats.

Interest of the group refers to placing needs of the society in the prime place and ignoring world or regional solidarity and goals. On a practical level this element may include carrying preferential legislation for treatment of the own group and blaming the other groups for misfortunes of the ingroup.

Tribal narrative presents *conservative beliefs* that prescribe traditional behavior. Very often it means adherence to religious doctrine of the ingroup. The traditional and religious creed negates often modern present patterns of life like free sexual preferences with positive attitudes towards LGBT. They present negatives views about them, abortion, or the same gender marriage.

Most tribal narratives support *strong leader*. This reflects yearning for charismatic leader who can lead the society. Often this means cultivating his/her personal characteristics and giving the leader unrestricted authority.

In many cases the tribal narrative also includes *anti-democratic structural elements*. They mean interfering with the rule of law and democratic norms; disrespecting rules and regulations; weakening and controlling the legal system and law enforcement

agencies; disempowering institutions that serve as guardians of democracy; harming the system of checks and balances, limiting and controlling the opposition. Also, the tribal narrative includes often *populistic elements* that include spreading discourse of fear, using xenophobic messages, focusing on external threats and enemies, appealing to personal and collective basic needs (Forgas, Crano, & Fiedler, 2021).

The present description of the tribal narrative depicts the maximal characteristics, though it is possible that different societies have tribal narrative which include less elements (Bar-Tal & Magal, 2021). Tribal narrative can be formed by leaders who formulate it, disseminate it, mobilize society members for support and lead them (Forgas, see the chapter in the book; Harms, Wood, Landay, Lester, & Vogelgesang Lester, 2018; Hobfoll, 2018). They usually are charismatic and populist, and the narrative appeals to segment of the society or to majority. But in all the cases, the leader builds the narrative either on the basis of the needs of the society members and/or societal tradition. In some cases, the narrative serves as ethos of a society and is deeply entrenched in its collective memory and cultural practices.

Characteristics of the tribal narrative

Is simple.

Tribal narrative is simple because it refers to uncomplicated and minimal principles that are easily understood. It cannot be broken down any further into more basic concepts and it is easily understandable because it appeals to primary human needs.

Is intuitive and automatic.

Tribal narrative is carried without mediation of analytic conscious appraisal and insight. It is based on spontaneous and automatic thinking, instigated by human needs. The primary needs appear and then a person formulates rationalization and ideological justifications. It is based on holistic modes of information processing that is absolute and unchangeable (Fischbein, 1987). The narrative is self-evident and accepted as unitary representation. It generally is expressed in a selection process which tends to eliminate the discordant informative clues and to organize the other so as to present a specific compact meaning (Gigerenzer & Selten, 2001). Kahneman (2011) called this way of thinking as fast one. He pointed out that the short intuitive judgment *'has been shaped by evolution to provide a continuous assessment of the main problems that the organism must solve to survive....The human beings inherited the neural mechanisms that evolved to provide ongoing assessment of threat level.'* (p. 90). The situations are constantly evaluated as good or bad requiring escape or allowing approach –thus the speed and ease of thinking provide assessment of safety and familiarity.

Is based on fear and insecurity.

Tribal narrative is based on fear and insecurity because it arises in situations of threat and danger to the organism (the person) and/or his/her environment (the society), and enables to respond to them adaptively (Gray, 1989; Kinnvall, 2014; Öhman, 1993; Rachman, 1978). In other words, the fear and insecurity are related to the fundamental human motive to protect ourselves. The sense of fear and insecurity are not just a result of real and concrete threats, but also of the way these are mediated by various agents of authority. Due to the ambiguousness of most situations evoking fear, and the fact that most of the public are not exposed to non-institutional sources of information, society

members depend on information coming from official and unofficial sources—these sources mold their beliefs about insecurity and their sense of fear. Feelings of fear and insecurity are conditions for conformity and obedience, reverence towards the security forces, internalization of narratives, and eventually submissive acceptance of decisions taken by the leaders.

In fact, fear dominates and controls thinking, because it floods consciousness and leads to automatic behavior, preparing the individuals to cope with the threatening situation (Jarymowicz & Bar-Tal, 2006). It prioritizes information about potential threats and causes extension of the associative networks of information about threat. (Clore, et al., 1994; Gray, 1989; Isen, 1990; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; LeDoux, 1995, 1996; Öhman, 1993). In addition, it tends to cause adherence to known situations and avoidance of risky, uncertain and novel ones (Clore, et al., 1994; Isen, 1990; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Le Doux, 1995, 1996; Öhman, 1993).

Defends against uncertainty.

Tribal narrative provides a route to escape uncertainty which is an important motivation to many people in their psychological functioning (Moghaddam, 2019). Most researchers conceptualized the need to avoid uncertainty as a disposition with unpleasant affective, cognitive and behavioral reaction (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982). It is aroused in response to situations that involve novelty, complexity, unfamiliarity, and unpredictability (Bhusahan & Amal, 1986; Furnham & Marks, 2013). Tribal narrative provides a way to avoid uncertainty because it is based on simple assumptions that

provide meaningfulness by simplifying a complex world in “Manichean” terms (Blokker, 2021).

Examples of tribal narratives

First I'll bring one example of a leader who was responsible for construction of tribal narrative and successfully disseminated it among members of own societies. The leader is Victor Orbán in Hungary (Antal, 2019; Lendvai, 2017; Szelenyi, 2023)). He came with a creed of tribal narrative that became a platform of political party Fidesz which transcended from a radical liberal student organization to a right-wing populist party that he leads and won four elections (1998-2002 and 2010 -present). In the 2022 parliamentary election, Fidesz won a majority, taking 135 of the 199 seats in the National Assembly.

Here is a speech that propagates the tribal narrative given by Victor Orbán on June 14, 2019 in Hungary²

“Perhaps it’s just my generation, but I still feel as if we’re burdened with a sense of inferiority, which is completely at odds with the economic performance we’ve achieved in recent years.... Undoubtedly there are also the bureaucrats in Brussels: many of them, an entire army, sitting in a bubble. we mustn’t allow Brussels bureaucrats to direct the lives of the peoples of Europe. I made three undertakings. I undertook that we would only support documents and leaders clearly representing the conviction that migration must be stopped. From this it also follows that we must fight to marginalize those people who support migration, such as George Soros and his mafia-like network: these NGOs

² Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio programme “Good Morning Hungary” June 16, 2019.

<https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-the-kossuth-radio-programme-good-morning-hungary>

must be driven back and forced further away from the heart of European decision-making... The second important thing is that we must not forget Christian culture. This isn't about the kind of personal relationship anyone has with God, but about the culture that Europe has produced and built over the course of two thousand years, and which has given rise to a specific European way of life.... We must protect our communities, the family, the dignity of the individual and the nation, which are all the products of Christian culture. The third important matter is that there must be respect for the independence of Member States in the field of economic policy. ...

Because we're a national party and we've created a national government, for us Hungary comes first.... So we're not one of those parties which wants to represent in Hungary something that's been conceived in Brussels. There are parties like that in Hungary: they're the opposition parties. ...So there are some who believe that it's better if the question of how Hungarians want to live their lives is not left to the Hungarian people to come to a conclusion for themselves.... We, however, are not such a party: we believe that Hungary has its own interests, and only the Hungarian people are able to say what is and isn't good for Hungary.... Hungary is a country, it is a homeland, and there are people here – European people – who must be respected.

This speech represents the archetypical tribal narrative with almost all its elements: The ethnocentric, discriminatory, patriotic, ant-pluralistic, interests of the collective, and conservative -religious components.

Tribal narrative for the benefit of the subgroup

The tribal narratives are not always directed towards entire citizens of the state. Sometimes they appeal towards a particular segment of a society. The tribe is defined by

certain characteristics and the leaders of the tribe and its members do not care about whole population of the state that could be considered as a tribe, but only to the members of the particular subgroup. An example is the ultra-orthodox sector in the Israeli society which consists of about 11% of the population and about 14% of the Jewish population. This sector is extremely unique and differs greatly from the secular population. Ultra-orthodox sector comprises three major traditions: Lithuanian, Hasidic (both of European origin), and Sephardic (of Eastern origin). Despite some differences, all ultra-Orthodox Jews share common features such as a highly conservative outlook on life, rejection of the Zionist national ideology, total faith in the Jewish religion, strict compliance with the required commands of Halacha (the Mitzvot), living in isolation from the rest of the Jewish community. holding Torah study as a superior value, strict gender segregation from early childhood, discrimination of women, and finally, observing a distinctive dress code (Caplan, & Leon, 2023; Stadler, 2013). This minority, of which 55% of the men do not work but study holy books. pays hardly any taxes and benefits most from public aid, since 60% of the members live on the poverty line. They also do not serve the mandatory service in the army (Malach & Cahaner, 2019), The sector does not identify with a specific political current, but rather supports initiatives that benefit their community, which is why this population is playing an increasingly decisive role in the world of Israeli politics (Efron, 2003; Elizur. & Malkin, 2013).

The tribal narrative of ultraorthodox sector of Israel contains all its elements. Belonging is one of the most important demands. The life is communal with very strong control of the shared life and the patterns of behavior. The ethnocentric element is also very salient and is related to belongingness. The Jews are seen as the “chosen people” with

the feeling of superiority. But also, the secular Jews are seen as "empty" secularists. The sector does not recognize pluralism, and even the orthodox-Zionists are viewed with suspicion, whereas the reform and conservative Jews are viewed with hostility (Heilman, 2000.).

Members of the community hold very constative beliefs regarding most of the issues that are at the public interest based on their religious beliefs. They object to gender political participation, abortion, LGBT, use of internet, study of secular subject matters, and so on. The religious beliefs are of total importance- they thus practice total subjugation to the authority of the great Rabbis and religious councils that make decisions on every aspect of their life. even in relation to individual conduct (Baumel, 2006).

In addition, the community because of the particular conditions of life (most of the men do not work with families of birth rate of about 6.5%) is all the time living with economic insecurity. The leaders must resolve this existential problem. Thus, in order to keep the community alive their leaders have to take care of the exclusive interests of their group, disregarding the interests of other groups in the Israeli society (Elizur. & Malkin, 2013).

It is possible to find subgroups in heterogeneous societies as for example in many African countries like Kenya. There. the tribal loyalty is of greater magnitude than the loyalty to a nation that was artificially built by British on the basis of existing tribes in the principle of divide and rule (Shilaho, 2018).

In view of the situation one can ask what are the primary forces that drive people to the tribal narrative?

Tribal narrative corresponds the primary needs.

The tribal narrative is in line with the primary needs of human beings. It reflects behavioral tendencies which were of survival value to our ancient ancestors yet these dispositions not only remained vibrant in modern humans but influence human thinking and behavior at present. Sense of fear, insecurity, aggression, group-ness, ethnocentrism, prejudice, and loyalty influence our view of the society, governance, and relations with others. It first of all emphasizes the importance of belonging to the ingroup, loyalty to the ingroup, rejection of the outgroup members and a wish for a strong leader.

To belong to a collective is a very basic drive of every homo sapiens; It means to be in a safe entity that is supposed to defend the individual. According to Maslow (1954) the need to belong is a primary need after physiological and safety needs. Belongingness refers to a human emotional need for affiliating, connectedness, and being part of a group. The group has the responsibility to protect group members. It was done in the past and it is done today –in every circumstance –in everyday life, in crisis, in natural disaster, and in war- the group acts in protecting group members. Thus, individuals feel strongly the need to belong to an entity—to tribe, to a nation. This need is connected with having a defined social identity (Tajfel, 1981). This self-categorization denotes being a member of a particular collectives either a tribe, a nation, a religion or other ethnic group.

Tribal narrative also refers to a patriotism that a person is feeling towards his/her group: that is an emotional attachment. Johnson (1997) conspires patriotism as one of the fundamental forces in human nature and sine qua for organized social life. In his view,

patriotism, which benefits people across generations even if it involves immediate phenotypic sacrifice, is based on evolutionary forces of nepotism and reciprocity. The former refers to kin selection and is product of natural selection and the latter explains how individuals who are nonrelatives engage in altruistic exchanges. But Johnson does not consider the development of patriotism solely in evolutionary terms. He acknowledges that socialization plays an important function in forming patriotic attachment. Societies develop social responsibility through mechanisms as common language, custom, collective memory, cultural products like literature ceremonies and other symbols. Often society members are ready to carry sacrifices “whether my country right or wrong”. This means that they practice blind patriotism that requires obedience, conformity and deference to the norms of the group, its ideology and its leader.

At the same time, the other, the different has been met with suspicion and even hostility. The encounter with the stranger awakens fear and insecurity that are fundamental sources of negative stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination today (Fiske, 2000). According to Yilmaz (2021) “*groups that showed stronger ingroup favoritism and outgroup discrimination were more likely to survive in the past selective pressures. Therefore, prejudice can be seen as a reflection of our evolved tribalist psychology*”. This view is imparted by agents of socialization and then internalized by people. It is maintained by group norms, ideology or/and leaders. The other can be even a member of a society who does not agree with the particular ideology or certain leader. Then he/she is marked as an enemy. But more often “the other” are out groups members of different race, ethnicity, religion, --a different tribe. Then “the other” is attributed with negative

characteristics, rejected, viewed as a source of evilness, responsible for the unfortune of the ingroup, and so on.

Tribal narrative also reflects the need to have a strong leader who guides and leads the group in the darkness. Graeber and Wengrow (2021) in their seminal book “The dawn of everything: A new history of humanity” wrote that “*there were tiny bands who could get along mainly they shared a common interest in the survival of their offspring, but even these were in no sense founded on equality . There were always in this version some alpha male. Hierarchy and domination, and cynical self-interest, have always been the basis of human society*”. Later, the agriculture brought about transition from “bands” to “tribes”. Accumulation of food surplus led to population growth, leading some tribes to develop into ranked individuals known as “chiefs”. With time, inequality developed, and hierarchies began to emerge with leaders called princes, kings, ceasars, sultans, tsars, and so on. They were glorified and worshiped, some viewed as gods other as tyrants. But they were leaders for good or bad.

Today many people express a wish to have a mighty leader that solves problems, can stand against the challenges that appear and can lead the “tribe” into benefiting future. This need becomes salient especially in times of crises and emergency. People then do not want a complex democracy but prefer a strong leader that can make quick decisions and save “the tribe” from the deterioration.

Lima, De France et al (2021) after an extensive study of a wish to have a strong leader in 27 countries summarized their findings. Threat increases the quest for a strong leader. But this pattern of results suggests that decrease of support of democracy is

associated with enhanced concerns about basic needs and this is linked to greater support for strong leaders.

Hobfoll (2018) in this respect pointed out that with threats and losses, people become more tribal, and a profound and disturbing aspect of this is the emergence of the authoritarian father-leader. The tribe becomes more dogmatic and authoritarian, seeing the world in black versus white without shades of gray. When mixed with dogmatism and its own push toward rigid interpretation of events and solutions, a leader who speaks in clear, simple, and usually simplistic terms about solutions and about aggressively protecting the tribe gains affinity. The archetypal leaders of extremist movements must be strong and a fighting force toward the threatening outsider but are often loving and compassionate to their loyal followers.

Empirical evidence

A question can be raised what kind of empirical support it is possible to offer to the presented conceptual framework. In my view two directions of empirical research provide such support: a. Studies that analyze the tribal narrative of the political and social groups and b. studies that investigate the relationship between characteristics of the supporters of the tribal narrative and the attributes of this narrative. I'll provide only few examples to the vast amount of empirical studies in these two directions.

Tribal narrative of groups

Reviewing literature of tribalism, radical right and authoritarianism, we find a very common thread of findings in this line of studies. Thus, Art (2011), Mudde & Kaltwasser (2014), Muis and Immerzeel (2017), Rydgren (2018) and Williams (2010) presenting the

literature of populist radical right (PRR) parties discuss the foundations of what can be called tribal narrative. All these studies found a very salient exclusionist and ethno-nationalist theme with slogan “own people first”. The narrative of the parties articulates explicitly threat to homogeneous society advocating anti-immigration policies. They clearly differentiate between “us” and “them”, where “them” are minorities and the opposition to rightist ideology. They also stress in the narrative “law and order” that can prevent chaos and assures security. In addition, the narrative favors a strong leader and the narrative conveys submission to traditional-conservative authority. Rydgren (2007) added that narratives of the radical rightist parties "share a core of ethno-nationalist xenophobia and antiestablishment populism” (p. 242) with hostility to representative democracy. Also Betz and Johnson (2004) found that the tribal narrative of the radical right-wing parties is exclusive, openly discriminatory, ethnocentric appealing “national preference”, objects to immigration, and presents racist arguments. In short is antiliberal. Finally, a series of studies carried by Jost and his colleagues investigating conservatism, which reflects tribal narrative, found that that it consists of two core component: resistance to change and opposition to equality. “It serves as a means to reduce the uncertainty and threat” (Jost, & Napier, 2012, p. 92).

In more specific case, Ruzza and Fella (2011) showed how the tribal narrative of the Italian right presents extremely (ethno-) nationalistic, anti-European integration, authoritarian, and xenophobic themes. In addition, it opposes globalization and immigration. In this vein, Blee and Creasap (2010) reviewed the main themes of the USA tribal narrative of conservative right-wing movement, They include blind patriotism, conservative traditionalism, male chauvinism, desire of social and ethical order, beliefs in

moral strength, racism, xenophobia, exclusionary vision of the national community, and anti-immigration. More specifically, Kivisto (2017) and Neiwert (2017) who analyzed the tribal narrative of Donald Trump pointed that it included exclusion of minorities, threats to the white supremacy, danger of immigration, supreme interests of the nation, misuse of power by the ruling elite, glorification of the American nation, and identification with the contentions of the Christian white people. Finally, Messanga and Ngonguey (2021) in their analysis showed the relationship between tribalism and right-wing authoritarianism in Cameroon. Tribal narrative is closely related to the right-wing authoritarianism as noted in the beginning of the chapter, The researchers pointed out that tribal narrative is another way of representing authoritarian right wing.

Antecedents and correlates of tribal narrative.

Numerous studies investigated the antecedents and correlates of tribalism as was defined in the present chapter. Ill bring only few examples to solidify my claims.

Dunn (2015) on the basis of 2008 European value survey concluded that those who support tribal narrative are more likely to be authoritarian and/or exclusive-nationalist. In addition, he found a positive correlation between support of tribal parties and cultural and economic insecurity and/or threat. Similarly, Klicperova-Baker and Kostal (2017) found that acceptance of the authoritarian (tribal) narrative was caused by general feeling insecurity and lack of fulfillment of basic needs as well as decline of civility (rudeness, envy, and ethnic intolerance). Also, Rooduijn, van der Brug, and de Lange (2016) found that the existing feelings of political discontent contribute to the support for populist parties which maintain tribal narrative. Art (2011) showed that individuals who supported tribal narrative revealed negative attitudes toward asylum seekers, legal and illegal

immigration and multiculturalism. And Freedman, Kaner and Kaplan (2014) using Israel national election studies micro-data for the 2009 elections, found evidence that political dissatisfaction and security issues significantly contribute to support for extreme right parties that support tribal narrative.

Regarding feeling of threat, Pettigrew (2016) showed that holding prejudice against out groups is most highly associated with authoritarian narrative. But this prejudice is mediated by feeling of collective threat that involves the ingroup. For example. “Foreigners living here threaten our freedom and rights...our prosperity...our culture...and our security” – in short, “they” are threatening “us.”. Fritzsche, Jonas and Kessler (2011) found that feelings of personal and collective threat breed ethnocentrism and intergroup conflict. Moreover, the empirical evidence reveals that perceived lack of personal control of important aspects of one’s life induces people to support and defend social in-groups. Also, Berning and Schlueter (2016) demonstrated that those who hold tribal narrative hold views of threatened group interests.

With regard to religious beliefs, Doebler (2015) found that the religiosity dimension that matters most for racial intolerance in Europe across 47 countries is fundamentalistic religious beliefs. Ben-Nun Bloom and Arikan (2012), using heteroskedastic maximum likelihood models and data from the fourth wave of the World Values Survey for 45 democratic countries, show that religious personal belief contrasted with democratic principles, generate opposition to democracy. Allen and Barter (2017) found in Indonesia that religious individuals are relatively inclined to support policies that benefit their own ethnic group.

Conclusion

In this chapter was presented the tribal narrative that reflects authoritarianism. Its contents were depicted, its bases were elucidated and the empirical studies that support the present analysis were presented. Of special importance are findings that show that this narrative appears especially in the context of dissatisfaction of basic needs, threats, and uncertainty. That means that the tribal narrative is based on primary needs that have to be satisfied.

It all implies that contextual factors play a significant role of being antecedents in its appearance. Indeed, the present era is characterized by the above features that challenge humans: Economic crises, terrorism, waves of immigration, covid epidemics and global warming -all bring dissatisfaction of basic needs, threat and uncertainty Add to this the proliferation of the social media, populist leaders, fake news media and you have the perfect context for dissemination of the tribal narrative.

Democratic narrative requires the citizen to be very well acquainted with its rules, principles, and values, understanding its nature, internalization, and protection against forces which aim to minimize it. These requirements are beyond the interest of most of the citizens who are indifferent, ignorant about democratic principles and values and easily are persuaded about simplistic principles of democracy. The democratic narrative does not follow from primary needs but contradicts them. Thus, one of the major challenges of the democratic narrative is to impart it from the early age to young generations of society and maintain this learning through later age. Democratic regime is not a perfect one but in words of Winston Churchill “it is the worst form of government – except for all the others that have been tried.”. This includes the regimes that are based on

tribal narrative. They satisfy the needs of some but are destructive to the human rights, equality and freedom.

References

- Allen W. N., & Barter , S. (2017). Ummah or tribe? Islamic practice, political ethnocentrism, and political attitudes in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 25, 45-67
- Antal, A. (2019). *The rise of Hungarian Populism: State autocracy and the Orbán \ regime*. Bingley, England: Emerald Publishing.
- Antonio, J R, (2019). Reactionary tribalism redux: Right-wing populism and de-democratization, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 60, 20- 29
- Art, D. (2011). *Inside the radical right: the development id anti-immigration parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1997). The monopolization of patriotism. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the life of individuals and nations* (pp. 246-270). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Magal, T. (2021). Socio-psychological analysis of the deterioration of democracy and the rise of authoritarianism: The role of needs, values and context. In *Forgas, P. J., Crano, B., & Fiedler, K. (Eds.), The psychology of populism: 21st Volume of the Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology Series* pp. 42-61). London: Routledge.
- Baron, J, (2019) Actively open-minded thinking in politics. *Cognition*, 188, 8-18
- Baumel, D. S. (2006). *Sacred speakers: Language and culture among the ultra- - Orthodox in Israel*. New York: Berghahn Books
- Ben-Nun Bloom, P., & Arikan, G. (2012). A two-edged sword: The differential effect of religious belief and religious social context on attitudes towards democracy. *Political Behavior*, 34, 249-276. DOI 10.1007/s11109-011-9157-x
- Berning, C. C., & Schlueter, E. (2016) The dynamics of radical right-wing populist party preferences and perceived group threat: A comparative panel analysis of three competing hypotheses in the Netherlands and Germany. *Social Science Research*, 55, 83–93.

- Betz, H. G., & Johnson, C. (2004) Against the current – stemming the tide: The nostalgic ideology of the contemporary radical populist right. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 9(3), 311–327.
- Bhushan, I. L., & Amal, B. S (1986). A situational test of ambiguity. *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient*, 29, 254-261.
- Blee, K. M., & Creasap, K. A. (2010). Conservative and right-wing movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 269–286.
- Cammarota, J. (2011). The value of a multicultural and critical pedagogy: Learning democracy through diversity and dissent. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 13(2), 62-69. doi:10.1080/15210960.2011.571546
- Blokker, P. (2021). Populism and illiberalism. In A. Sajo, R. Uitz, & Holmes, S. (Eds). *Routledge handbook of illiberalism*. New York: Routledge
- Caplan, K., & Leon, N. (Eds.) (2023). *Contemporary Israeli Haredi society: Profiles, trends and challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Clarke, P., & Foweraker. J. (2001). *Encyclopedia of democratic thoughts*. Milton Park, England : Taylor & Francis
- Clore, G.L, Schwarz, N., & Conway, M. (1994). Affective causes and consequences of social information processing. In R. S. Wyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 323-417). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dahl, A, R. (2000). *On democracy*. New Havens, CT; Yale University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston, MA: D.C. Health & Company. \
- Diamond, L. (1999) *Developing democracy: Toward consolidation..* Baltimore, MD; John Hopkins University Press.
- Diamond, L. (2008) *The spirit of democracy..* New York: Henry Holt.
- Doebler, S. (2015). Love thy neighbor? Relationships between religion and racial intolerance in Europe. *Politics and Religion*, 8, 745-771.
- Dunn, K. (2015). Preference for radical right-wing populist parties among exclusive-nationalists and authoritarians. *Party Politics*, 21(3), 367-380.

- Efron, N. (2003). *Real Jews: Secular versus ultra-orthodox-the struggle of Jewish identity in Israel*. New York; Basic Books
- Elizur, Y., & Malkin, L. (2013). *The war within: Israel's ultra-orthodox threat to democracy and the nation*. New York: Overlook Press
- Fischbein, E. (1987). *Intuition in science and mathematics*. Dordrecht, DE: Reidel
- Fiske, T, S, (2000) Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the seam between centuries: Evolution, culture, mind, and brain, *European Journal of Social Psychology*,30, 299-322.
- Forgas, P. J., Crano, B., & Fiedler, K. (Eds.) (2021), *The psychology of populism: 21st Volume of the Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology Series*. London: Routledge.
- Freedman, M., Kaner O., & Kaplan, J. (2014) Voting for extreme right parties in Israel: Evidence from the 2009 elections. *Electoral Studies*, 34, 68-77.
- Fritsche, I. Jonas E., & Kessler, T. (2011). Collective reactions to threat: Implications for intergroup conflict and for solving societal crises. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 5, 101-136.
- Furnham, A., & Marks, J (2013). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the recent literature. *Psychology*, 4, 717-728.
- Gabardi, W. (2001). *Contemporary models of democracy*. New York: Polity
- Gibson, J. L. (1992). The political consequences of intolerance: Cultural conformity and political freedom. *American Political Science Review*, 86(2), 338-356
- Gigerenzer, G., & Selten, R. (2001). *Bounded rationality: The adaptive toolbox*. MASS, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Graeber ,D., & Wengrow, D. (2021). *The dawn of everything: A new history of humanity*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux
- Gray, J. A. (1989). *The psychology of fear and stress* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harms, D. P., Wood, D., Landay, K., & Lester, B. P. (2018). Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 105-122.

- Heilman, C. S. (2000). *Defenders of the faith: Inside ultra-orthodox Jewry*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hobfoll, E. S. (2018). *Tribalism: The evolutionary origins of fear politics*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer
- Jarymowicz, M., & Bar-Tal, D. (2006). The dominance of fear over hope in the life of individuals and collectives. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 367-392.
- Johnson, G.R. (1997). The evolutionary roots of patriotism. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 45-90). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux
- Kinnvall, C. (2014) Fear, insecurity and the (re) emergence of the far right in Europe In P. Nesbitt-Larking, C. Kinnvall, T. Capelos.& H, Dekker. *The Palgrave handbook of global political psychology*, (pp.316-335). New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- Kivisto, P. (2017). *The Trump phenomenon. How the politics of populism won in 2016*. Bingley, England: Emerald Publishing
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Boyatzi, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality and democracy. *Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society, 24*, 217-232
- LeDoux, J.E. (1995). Emotion: Clues from the brain. *Annual Review of Psychology, 46*, 209-235.
- LeDoux, J. E. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lima,, O. E. M. et al (2021). Materialist and post-materialist concerns and the wish for a strong leader in 27 countries. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 9*, 207-220
- Malach, G., & Cahaner. L. (2019) *The statistical report on the ultra-orthodox society in Israel: 2019*. Jerusalem; Israel Democracy Institute.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York:: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Messanga, A. G., & Ngonguey, N. S. (2021). Tribalization of politics in authoritarian regimes: Analysis of the link between political tribalism and

- right-wing authoritarianism in Cameroon. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Sciences*, 5, 15-24
- Moghaddam M. F. (2019). *Threat to democracy: The appeal of authoritarianism in an age of uncertainty*, Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2014) Political leadership and populism. In R. A. W. Rhodes & P. Hart (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of political leadership* (pp. 376–388). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muis, J. & Immerzeel, T (2017) Causes and consequences of the rise of populist radical right parties and movements in Europe. *Current Sociology Review*, 65, 909-930
- Neiwert, D. 2017. *Alt-America: The rise of the radical right in the age of Trump*. London: Verso
- Norman, S D., & Hanley. E. (2018). The anger games: Who voted for Donald Trump in the 2016 election and why. *Critical Sociology* 44(2), 195–212. doi:10.1177/0896920517740615.
- O’Doherty, M. (2018). *The legacy of Viktor Orbán and the Fidesz party- A dictatorial government facilitating rule of law violations, ethnocentrism, Islamophobia and disregard of basic human rights*. Morrisville, NC; Lulu Press
- Öhman, A. (1993). Fear and anxiety as emotional phenomena: Clinical phenomenology evolutionary perspectives, and information-processing mechanisms. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (p. 511-536). New York: Guilford.
- Pettigrew, F. T. (2016). In pursuit of three theories: Authoritarianism, relative deprivation, and intergroup contact. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67,1–21.
- Rachman, S.J. (1978). *Fear and courage*. San Francisco. W.H. Freeman
- Raz, J. (1991). Free expression and personal identification. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 11(3), 303-324.
- Rooduijn, M., van der Brug., W., & de Lange, L. S. (2016). Expressing or fuelling discontent? The relationship between populist voting and political discontent. *Electoral Studies*, 43, 32-40
- Ruzza, C., & Fella, S. (2011). Populism and the Italian right. *Acta Politica*. 46(2), 158–179.
- Rydgren, J. (2007). The sociology of the radical right. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 241–262.
- Rydgren, J. (2018). The radical right: An introduction. In J. Rydgren (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of the radical right* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Shilaho, K. W. (2018). *Political power and tribalism in Kenya*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer
- Stadler, N. (2013). *A well-worn tallis for a new ceremony: Trends in Israeli Haredi culture*. Boston, MASS: Academic Studies Press.

- Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 213-228). New York: Nelson-Hall.
- Szelenyi, Z. (2023). *Tainted democracy: Victor Orbán and the subversion of Hungary*. London: C. Hurst & Co Publishers
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkerson, I. (2020). *Caste; The origin of our discontents*. New York, NY: Random House
- Williams, M. H. (2010) Can leopards change their spots? Between xenophobia and trans-ethnic populism among West European far right parties. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 16(1), 111–134.
- Yilmaz, O. (2021). Prejudice as an expression of tribalism. In T. K. . Shackelford, & V. A . Weekes-Shackelford (Eds). *Encyclopedia of evolutionary psychological science* (pp. 6146-6148). Cham, Switzerland: Springer

