

**THE NATURE OF MIMICRY:  
AN EVALUATION OF POLITICAL PARTY CONFLICT AND ITS  
IMPLICATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES**

Bridget M. Gallagher

A Nation Divided: Helms School of Government, 2022 Conference

Liberty University

**Abstract**

This paper seeks to examine the pattern of political party conflict and polarization that within the history of the United States. With this, it details the significant impact that the nature of conflict has on the individuals that reside under such parties. As emotion runs high within the nation due to injustice, Coronavirus, and economic concerns, hostility among leaders has its own substantial consequences. This paper proposes that as the American people are so often exposed to a lack of professionalism, dishonesty, and petty interaction by the individuals that are meant to be representing their best interest, they begin to take on that same nature towards each other. By inspecting events such as the founding era, the Gilded Age, and the modern area, the costs and consequences of political polarization appears a familiar entity. Disagreement is a valuable resource, not just in democracy, but in all related to the human experience. If leaders and communities alike are not able to conduct healthy debate for the sake of compromise, hopes of progress and the mending of societal differences are a lost cause.

*Keywords:* Conflict, Domestic Politics, American Political History, Compromise, Citizen Engagement, Political Polarization

Canadian American psychologist Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory assesses the nature of human development, learning, and understanding through cognitive and environmental experiences. He elaborates on the idea that human behavior goes beyond broader concepts, such as Ivan Pavlov's classical conditioning, which states a conditioned response is a matter of unconscious learning and stimulus association or B.F. Skinner's operant conditioning studies that propose that human behavior is learned to obtain either reward or punishment.<sup>1</sup> Bandura explains that in partnership with these notions, there is some mediating process that occurs between the initial activation of stimuli and response; behavior can be shaped by one's environment through, what he calls, observational learning.<sup>2</sup> In the earliest stages of development, children tend to observe the world, people, and interactions around them and use these subjects for developing their mannerisms based on that which they encounter most often. Young children are not the only group that can be highly influenced in this way, as the same instances can occur at age. Within society, individuals become exposed to environments that lead to the conscious or unconscious adoption of personality depending on who or what time is spent around, whether that is through family members, peers, or popular media. In studying these behaviors, one can assess and imitate what is considered socially acceptable in their conditions out of fear of judgment or the desire to assimilate to gain some form of approval. Like a majority of aspects in communities, especially concerning interaction, this can have equally beneficial and detrimental implications. When revisiting the initial theory and its relation to social and political culture, it is necessary to expand on the role of the parental figure. A study on interparental conflict and security notes: "Children are invested in feeling emotionally secure within the family unit; exposure to interparental anger and conflict, particularly destructive conflict resolution strategies, undermines their emotional security" and with this, hostilities ensue and potentially lead to 'maladjustment' and behavioral issues for the child.<sup>3</sup> Such research offers a relevant analogy for the state of political interaction and strife with and throughout the history of the United States. In this instance, the parental role is given to a political leader or authority figure within government, and the role opposite belongs to the citizen. Hypothetically, the "child" in a "family" is experiencing confrontation between the heads of household, two of which they rely heavily on for guidance and

---

<sup>1</sup> Banning, Lance., and Todd, Estes. *Founding Visions: The Ideas, Individuals, and Intersections that Created America*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Brock, R. L., & Kochanska, G. (2016). Interparental conflict, children's security with parents, and long-term risk of internalizing problems: A longitudinal study from ages 2 to 10. *Development and Psychopathology* 28, no. 1 (2016): 45-54.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579415000279>

understanding, and they are acting in questionable ways. With a significant intensity, they are looking to pressure the child into associating with their views over that of the other. In addition to outside forces amplifying the issue, a “child” becomes highly sensitive and aware of the moments of disparity. The concept of mimicry comes into play as they become accustomed to the atmosphere, eventually establishing frustration, stress, and hostility on their terms. Eventually, similar tendencies begin to take shape against those around them. In the twenty-first century, political polarization and conflict is a familiar entity to citizen and politician alike. However, this is not a new phenomenon as those during the founding of the country as well as other monumental events were exposed to toxic political conditions. History is a valuable and extremely accessible tool in learning, understanding, and amending the things that have inhibited schisms within the nation, and without it, the essence of such a community would not have been able to progress to the position to which the United States is in today. Unnecessary conflict between politicians has tainted the initial values and purpose that their authority is meant to offer, and these interactions have trickled down to influence the interactions between the American people themselves. There is strength in healthy discourse, discussion, and representation in the beliefs that one holds true, but the justification for these become invaluable if their universal purpose becomes lost.

The original colonies would see the spark of civil unrest after the global events of the Seven Years’ War concluded with a British victory in 1763. Despite successes, the status of the conflict would bring an absurd amount of debt plus interest to be owed by England.<sup>4</sup> For the colonists, this forced them to face trickle down consequences such as unstable relations with the Native American population, the establishment of a standing army in the colonies, overbearing regulations on trade, and westward expansion, all of which would become burdens. The tipping point was reached with the declaration of taxes, such as the Sugar and Stamp Act, placed on communities without initial consent. Protests arose as frustration with British processes and systematic proceedings were deemed an injustice by the colonists. By 1775, the Continental Army had been developed, and a year later, Thomas Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence would trigger the final push for American sovereignty. By 1783, the colonies had finally achieved victory and independence from the British. The underlying details of the war saw the colonists prototyping their own form of local and state governments and the development of the Continental Congress.<sup>5</sup> With the Articles of Confederation as the initial governing tool for the new country, a majority

---

<sup>4</sup> Bodle, Wayne. “The Mid-Atlantic and the American Revolution.” *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 82, no. 3 (2015): 282–99. <https://doi.org/10.5325/pennhistory.82.3.0282>.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

would decide that the document did not meet an acceptable standard for a nation in such a complex position. In 1787, a meeting in Philadelphia was held to correct debated issues and would eventually see the birth of the United States Constitution. Eventually, and after twenty years of serving American public interest, George Washington decided to resign as the President of the United States at the end of his second term in 1796. With this, he would provide the American people with a Farewell Address that emphasized the importance of unity among the people. He encouraged these individuals to stand true to the principles of the Constitution and all that which the country was founded. Additionally, Washington notes areas of warning, one of which states to remain vigilant when involved with foreign nations and, most significantly, the dangers of political factions. He feared that man will become dedicated to upholding only their party beliefs as “cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion” and neglect their role in representing the Constitution and spirit of the nation.<sup>6</sup> During his presidency, he saw the rise and conflict of two main parties, the Federalists, and the Democratic-Republicans, and feared the political transformation that conflict among them would impose on the country. Unification allowed the United States to acquire newly found freedom, and division could risk its downfall, especially amid such a delicate time in its developmental period. Despite his warnings, the first-party system would be born into American political life. The Federalist versus Anti-Federalist conflict would see its initial rise while the Constitution remained in its drafting stage as major figures intervened with structure proposals and laws that should be included in the document. The Federalists, led by Alexander Hamilton, advocated for a strong national government and commercial economy in alignment with tariffs and investments, and looked to develop healthy relationships with its former ruler, Britain.<sup>7</sup> Federalists emphasized that the educated elite should hold the highest ranks in government as they are less likely to be corrupted by financial gain. The opposition party, also known as the Democratic-Republicans, was led by Thomas Jefferson. This group supported republicanism, the emphasis of states and inalienable rights, and a strong agricultural system as a necessary entity in the success of the nation. Unlike the Federalists, they opposed a national bank and hoped to develop relations with France over Britain. History would see the Democratic-Republicans emerge as the dominant party in the mid 19th century, leaving the Federalist party to fraction further. Evidently, John Adams would be

---

<sup>6</sup> Washington, George, and W. D. Lewis. *George Washington's Farewell Address to the People of the United States*. New York, Cincinnati: American book company, 1910.

<sup>7</sup> Rohrs, Richard C. “The Federalist Party and the Convention of 1800.” *Diplomatic History* 12, no. 3 (1988): 237–60. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24911802>.

the only Federalist party member to hold a major position in government as President.<sup>8</sup> Despite the initial separation of the parties, a complete divide had yet to occur as both bases maintained highly similar motives in developing partnerships that were essential to upholding democracy. However, the continuation of transitional periods, as seen through Washington to Adams's presidential trade-off, presented a new issue that challenged the norms that initially guided the colonists to success during the Revolution.<sup>9</sup> Historically, large majorities were supporting a singular cause that was certain to transform the way of life in the colonies. With negotiations on the implications of the Constitution being put forth, citizens had faced several aggressive stances being promoted by the founders of their new era. With so much uncertainty and the idea that trial and error needed to occur for a new form of government to evolve, political leaders and citizens alike were aware that their greatest strength was to address the issue together. With this, the roots of the nation were laid, but the country soon faced a new challenge. A sound structure inhibited time and space for sub-branches of thought to be explored and with it, conflict, and debate. The spirit of the Revolution continued to run deep in the beliefs of the Founders, so it is no coincidence that intellectually and emotionally charged exchanges were to occur between leading figures. When considering the outspoken personalities of Hamilton and Jefferson that spearheaded the dominant parties of the era, it was inevitable that attraction to the individuals who essentially removed them from an oppressive monarchy would see a strengthening of loyalties. The people's commitment to supporting their heroes, and with said heroes refusing to back down despite the strain their disagreements put on society, hostilities would initiate riots, some of which involving violence, to occur between opposites.<sup>10</sup> Personal attacks, verbal abuse, and slander became the preferred method of conversation as the country moved into the 19th century. Even as Washington himself attempted to mediate the struggle, his efforts were futile as political strife had already secured its adoption into American political culture.

---

<sup>8</sup> Wilson Carey McWilliams, "Symposium: Roads Not Taken: Undercurrents of Republican Thinking in Modern Constitutional Theory: The Anti-Federalists, Representation, and Party." *Northwestern University Law Review*, 85, 12 (Fall, 1990). [https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/api/document?collection=analytical-materials&id=urn:contentItem:3S3T-W490-00CW-00JM-00000-00&context=1516831](https://advance.lexis-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/api/document?collection=analytical-materials&id=urn:contentItem:3S3T-W490-00CW-00JM-00000-00&context=1516831).

<sup>9</sup> Greenstein, Fred I. "Presidential difference in the early republic: the highly disparate leadership styles of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (2006): 373+. *Gale In Context: Biography*. [https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A151841410/BIC?u=vic\\_liberty&sid=summon&xid=21046088](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A151841410/BIC?u=vic_liberty&sid=summon&xid=21046088).

<sup>10</sup> Chernow, Ron. 2010. "The Feuding Founding Fathers - WSJ." *Wall Street Journal*, June 26, 2010. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704911704575326891123551892>.

Post-Civil War America brought about an unprecedented contradiction to what appeared to be a prosperous period in the United States. The uncertainty of the Reconstruction period was left entirely on the hopes that the Union and Confederacy could settle lingering hostilities for the future of the nation. Questions surrounding reparations and freedom would be conducted by the North and South across the entire spectrum. This period would finally see the end of slavery, as well as the adoption of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments that would guarantee freedoms and right to vote for African Americans.<sup>11</sup> In government, debate often revolved around ways to guarantee that these new opportunities were accessible to communities and what level of severity the South would or should be punished for their actions. Abraham Lincoln's successor Andrew Johnson would favor more sparing policies for the South, much to the displeasure of Northern Radicals, and harbor the split among groups after vetoing the Freedmen's Bureau: a plan that would allow African Americans to compete in a free-labor economy.<sup>12</sup> Power struggles between the presidency and congress would conclude Reconstruction and its moment of sweeping societal changes in 1877. The emergence of the Gilded Age saw the American economy evolve from agricultural methods to investments in the success of post-war production by factories. What followed was the construction of railroads, the growth of urban areas, and many other advancements for America. However, the booming economy would juxtapose societal tensions amplified by political corruption. Politics in this era would come to represent one of the purest examples of greed and exploitation by officials and policymakers in modern America through gifting government positions to individuals who only sought personal wealth and comfortability.<sup>13</sup> External forces, spanning from big business owners to media giants, stirred a partisan divide that left society in shambles. This period is unique in a way that can only be described as a political standstill. The Republican Party dominated the presidency and congressional areas, and the Democratic Party would continue to oppose, but both parties fell victim to the forms of similar scandal. The emergence of a third-party system, known as the People's Party, would bring recognition to the epidemic that the country faced. With the failures by a string of electees and representatives, the burden of correcting a struggling society would fall on the common man. This era would see the highest percentage of voter participation and turnout in American

---

<sup>11</sup> Ross, Michael A. "The Supreme Court, Reconstruction, and the Meaning of the Civil War." *Journal of Supreme Court history: yearbook of the Supreme Court Historical Society*. 41, no. 3 (2016): 275–294.

<sup>12</sup> Bernice B. Donald; Pablo J. Davis, "To This Tribunal the Freedman Has Turned: The Freedmen's Bureau's Judicial Powers and the Origins of the Fourteenth Amendment," *Louisiana Law Review* 79, no. 1 (Fall, 2018): 4-9.

<sup>13</sup> Zachary Taylor, Mark. "The Historical Presidency: The Gilded Age Presidents and the Economy." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (2021): 860-883.

history, making up for the incompetence of its leaders.<sup>14</sup> Labor strikes for the sake of reform and calls for strong regulatory laws for big business became all be decisive in lifting the country out of disorder. With this, the next phase of U.S. development would be ushered in by the start of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is important to note that though political conflict has inherently negative consequences within a nation, there are moments of clarity in which the importance of contention is made clear. The people unite under a common issue to discuss and dispute what action would be appropriate in shifting the gears of parties caught in a web of greed. Richard Hofstadter describes this manifestation best by stating “It was a rather widespread and remarkably good-natured effort of the greater part of society to achieve some not very clearly specified self-reformation” as the end of the Gilded Age would be brought about by the incoming Progressive Era.<sup>15</sup> For this period’s politics, both sides had fallen victim to their environment, leaving the responsibility in the hands of those caught in the crossfire. The drive of the people would eventually set those individuals straight, call attention to the faults of the system, and demand accountability.

The end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century up to the present day has seen an intense reshaping of what partisan standards and identity are meant to represent. It has become the nature of both citizen and politician to be caught in the notion that they must be either Democrat or Republican alone and subscribe completely to each affiliated belief. An increase in the matter of party institutions agitating this notion remains clear. The level of political polarization is one of the most complex in recent American history as “politics and diversity of opinion march together. But diversity of opinion readily escalates into conflict.”<sup>16</sup> In an age dominated by an emergence of social, economic, historical, and cultural transformations, all of which maintain an extraordinary level of depth and several sub-branches, is testing the nature of “America’s relatively rigid, two-party electoral system” by attempting to organize issues within strict categories in which they may not necessarily comply.<sup>17</sup> This ushers in confusion and

---

<sup>14</sup> Lee, Frances E. "Patronage, Logrolls, and "Polarization": Congressional Parties of the Gilded Age, 1876-1896." *Studies in American Political Development* 30, no. 2 (10, 2016): 116-27. <http://ezproxy.liberty.edu/login?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.proquest.com%2Fscholarly-journals%2Fpatronage-logrolls-polarization-congressional%2Fdocview%2F1822180735%2Fse-2%3Faccountid%3D12085>.

<sup>15</sup> Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform; from Bryan to F. D. R.* [First edition]. New York: (Vintage Books, 1955): 5.

<sup>16</sup> Moghaddam, Fathali M. and Rom Harré. *Words of Conflict, Words of War: How the Language we use in Political Processes Sparks Fighting.* Santa Barbara, Calif: (Praeger, 2010), 2.

<sup>17</sup> Dimock, Michael, and Richard Wike. 2020. “America is exceptional in the nature of its political divide.” Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/11/13/america-is-exceptional-in-the-nature-of-its-political-divide/>.

disorganization and, overall, handles the cleavages so poorly that competition becomes an entity caught in political limbo. Though many of the initial opinion areas to which people associate have derived from issues that have remained present since before the birth of the nation itself. Specifically, religion, race, and ideology, stay integral to the narrative.<sup>18</sup> In surveying the current political scene, the most common theme to be noted is that it has become customary to “fire back” immediately if one is on the losing side of an election or debate. No actual attempts at resolution are made, and all that remains is hostility. By reflecting on both the 2016 and 2020 Presidential Debates for example, instead of being utilized as a platform to discuss the goals that the electees, as potential leaders, have for the country, it was used to hurl insults on a national medium.

Lillian Mason highlights this dilemma in her work *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Become Our Identity*:

“Partisanship grows irresponsible when it sends partisans into action for the wrong reasons. Activism is almost always a good thing, particularly when we have so often worried about apathetic electorate. But if the electorate is moved to action by a desire for victory that exceeds their desire for the greater good, the action is no longer, as regards the general electorate, responsible.”<sup>19</sup>

The scope and rapid spread of these instances travel to impressionable individuals that would come to determine who would best represent their country. These moments ultimately set the standard for how professional and personal interactions will commence. Finding common ground when necessary, working with one’s situation for conflict resolution, even civil debate in its simplest form is and has continued to be substituted for an antagonistic hunger for one’s party, not the policies or well-being of the people, to be successful.

A statement that can be agreed upon in both local, national, and even international spheres is that the essence of American politics “is not harmonious in nature” and “a crucial and distinctive characteristic of American politics lies in the persistence of contention, in the adversarial style that is often deployed, and in the intensity of the feeling that this can produce.”<sup>20</sup> However, despite the characterization of the evidence proposed, the matter of the argument shows signs

---

<sup>18</sup> Dimock, Michael, and John Gramlich. 2021. “How America Changed During Trump's Presidency.” Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/2021/01/29/how-america-changed-during-donald-trumps-presidency/>.

<sup>19</sup> Mason, Lillian. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. Chicago: (University of Chicago Press, 2018), 6.

<sup>20</sup> Ware, Alan. *Political Conflict in America*. First ed. New York: (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 2.

of a healthy democracy. When committing to constructive debate and a willingness to discuss the topics with another, it should be a given that the initial approach should emphasize open-mindedness. It has been proposed that “moral disagreement shows that there is no objective moral truth about matters; there is merely subjective opinion. Further, no one has a right to impose his merely subjective moral opinion on those who happen not to share them.”<sup>21</sup> To clarify, this does not mean one should abandon their ideals as one hopes to engage in these conversations for a reason but rather recognize that the opposition has most likely developed their viewpoint based off experiences unique to them alone. Both sides are attempting to solve a problem to produce change, but an approach to methods in producing an answer is where paths collide. Furthermore, being educated on one’s personal position is significant; however, the debate becomes pointless if one cannot be bothered to educate themselves on what the opposing party truly represents, and not just the expected stereotypes placed upon them by others or the media. Differing opinions allow for a deepening of understanding and to inhibit decision-making. Diversity in thought initiates moments of observation where citizen and politician alike are encouraged to see issues from new perspectives. When understanding the role of policymakers and politicians in such instances, these individuals become elected to positions for a country that is so intricate to the point where it can become difficult to govern and to where complete consensus is extremely rare to come by. They are meant to stand as mediators or messengers between societal desires and policy implementation by using their party platform to “simplify voting decisions” as “the vast majority of American citizens are not, and cannot be expected to be, political experts.”<sup>22</sup> It is understandable to associate with parties as they maintain a core set of beliefs that can be used for categorization purposes, as well as the fact that they are human, and having an opinion is only natural. The fatal flaws within these individuals appear when they become consumed by the realization of how connected to the system they are, and how simple it would be to integrate their beliefs. Needs and initial grievances established by the citizens for policymakers to handle are disregarded and instead replaced by personal agendas or career politics dedicated only to determining that the opposition is unable to accomplish its mission. This very notion agitates and worsens the state of political polarization, causing the people to become frustrated and lose trust in those meant to serve them. A divide so deep no longer leaves room for debate, and conflict becomes a free-for-all, an

---

<sup>21</sup> George, Robert P. Review of *Law, Democracy, and Moral Disagreement*, by Amy Gutmann, Dennis Thompson, and Cass R. Sunstein. *Harvard Law Review* 110, no. 7 (1997): 1389 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1342176>.

<sup>22</sup> Mason, Lilliana. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. Chicago: (University of Chicago Press, 2018), 5.

“every man for themselves” situation with no room for difference, only judgment, and prevention.

Charles Dickens reflects on the politics of his time with words that remain relevant today:

“It is the game of these men...to make the strife of politics so fierce and brutal, and so destructive of all self-respect in worthy men and such as they, be left to battle out their selfish views unchecked. And thus, this lowest of all scrambling fights goes on, and they who in other countries would, from their intelligence and station, most aspire to make the laws, do here recoil the farthest from that degradation.”<sup>23</sup>

The state of political conflict in America is an entity that did not transform overnight. It went through centuries of construction that force society to inspect its values and faults and commit to change. It is foolish to suggest that a single moment will undo and correct 250 years of history, but there are certainly ways in which gradual change can be implemented. The very heart of this idea is a simple concept: awareness. Social awareness by policymakers in understanding that they must serve individuals, most of whom are highly impressionable; Political awareness by the people in being able to separate the unprofessional interaction from constructive debates, and most importantly, to draw their policy and party conclusions from their findings, not just mimicking the thoughts of another. The United States is a beautifully unique country in both its people, culture, and thought, but a rejection of such differences is what leads to the collapse of progress and civil transformation. A study on emphasizing “perspective-taking” over “side-taking” in understanding the other side of an argument before drawing a conclusion. It goes beyond mindlessly siding with one party to promote appropriate debate for democratic cultivation.<sup>24</sup> Additionally, it is suggested that political assemblies or meetings do not only need to be held by the country’s leaders. “Intergroup contact” within communities to discuss relevant issues is productive in that each side of the argument is familiar with the challenges faced because they are active participants in the same sphere of influence. These meetings are citizen coordinated and provide a platform that falls in the hands of the local community alone.<sup>25</sup> As political leaders, it is more necessary now than

---

<sup>23</sup> Ware, Alan. *Political Conflict in America*. First ed. New York: (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 133.

<sup>24</sup> Tannenbaum, David. 2019. “What Are the Solutions to Political Polarization?” *Greater Good Science Center*, July 2, 2019.

[https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/what\\_are\\_the\\_solutions\\_to\\_political\\_polarization](https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/what_are_the_solutions_to_political_polarization).

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

ever to focus on political conflict of the past and learn from those that held their positions before them. It is to be understood that the success of a nation and its people is founded by stable and functional political parties where strong where inter-party dialogue is made a priority. These efforts alone provide the necessary dialogue to reduce aggression and instability and emphasize that most conflict is drawn from the values and interests of the many. There are still strengths within these elements that can assist in bettering the situation. Leaders can commit to this by remaining vigilant in how positions are introduced or interactions with others verbally and through media platforms. By and large, these recommendations do not require any new policy or comprehensive change to be integrated, but rather only look to promote personal and public moral reflection by individuals for stability in the future.

In its most recent string of events, the state and stability of the country have been a topic contemplated by almost any universally aware individual. The parent-child relationship analogy emphasizes that the actions and beliefs of both political leaders and their citizens are tied to and have a significant impact on proceedings on each end. As seen through the history of the founding of the nation characterized by Hamilton's Federalist Party and Jefferson's Democratic-Republicans, to the corruption and social struggles incurred during the Gilded Age and into the modern era of politics, the United States has continued to remain associated with fragmentation. Healthy democracy has allowed for changes that return original rights to communities, defended the country, and created meaningful relations outside its jurisdiction. The future of American society is one that is prone to boundless evolution that ushers in its fair share of challenges, but with it accompanies new opportunities for recognizing the areas in which people and parties need to adjust. In utilizing the history of a nation that is familiar with encountering such errors, partnered with the experiences of those that came before, hope in conflict resolution and the mending of domestic relations continues to remain as relevant now as it did two and half centuries ago.