

Ideological fracking,
climate change,
immigration, school
vouchers, healthcare



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Ideological thinking has distinctly polarized, as a result, the ideological overlap between the two political parties has diminished. In America, 92% of Republicans were to the right of the median Democrat, and 94% of Democrats were to the left of the median Republican in the year of 2014 (Pew Research Center website, 2). This is a consequence of extreme competition. In benefit, competition makes the political market more systematic, efficient, and rewarding for superior political teams. However, this negatively impacts the government's ability to move forward, pass legislation, and continue to improve it's nation. Causing the senate to persist in a state of gridlock on some of the most critical issues facing it's nation.

Yet, the senators are alternately caught up volleying for superiority by arguing the people on the other side of the spectrum. Political asymmetric polarization manifests itself in political behaviors and causes partisan animosity, ideological silos, and mistrust within the government; which in turn prevents governments from effectively resolving social issues and in just cannot perform their role as an institution. Political partisan animosity is defined as highly negative views of the opposing party as well as its members. Partisan animosity has increased substantially over the past decades. Gun control, abortion, fracking, climate change, immigration, school vouchers, healthcare are all factors that contribute to polarization; and opinions on these controversial topics can cause partisan animosity (Campbell, 1). The number of highly negative opinions of the opposing party has more than doubled since 1994. Most of these extreme partisans believe the opposing party's principles " are so misguided that they threaten the nation's well-being" (Pew Research Center website, 3).

This causes the questioning of voters actual motivation to vote for their party. Majority of voters tend to be very politically active, and are extremely motivated by animosity to vote for the opposing party. The increase of ideological uniformity has been much more pronounced among those who are the most politically active (Pew Research Center website, 8). Although the goal of the electoral system is to empower the people's wants and needs; animosity causes citizens to engage merely to vote against the opposing side. Therefore, the most politically active citizens are also the most motivated by hatred. The government is a system that is influenced and almost fully controlled by the people. Therefore the result of voting for "revenge" is a system of government that is powered by a group of people that are focused on hating the opposing party. Since the government is a reflection of the nation's people; hatred is prevalent within the government as well.

These partisan sentiments not only affect politics but affect economic exchanges between individuals from opposing parties. Members from opposing parties within the real world also exhibit partisan animosity in various social exchanges. One of the most apparent examples is within the workforce.

A labor market experiment conducted by Pew Research Center; people were willing to work for less money for someone with the same political views. When presented with a purchasing opportunity, consumers were nearly twice as likely to engage in a transaction when their partisanship matched the seller's. In the survey experiment, three quarters of the subjects denied a higher paycheck to avoid helping the other party.

<https://assignbuster.com/ideological-fracking-climate-change-immigration-school-vouchers-healthcare/>

In other words, they preferred to make themselves worse off so that they would not benefit the other party (McConnell, Margalit, Malhotra, & Levendusky, 2017, 5). This theory is reproduced in the government where politicians make decisions to avoid helping the other party consciously knowing it could have negative or worsening effects for the nation. Which causes concern for the intention of well being of the nation. This proves that political polarization divides both parties in the government and the real world. Political partisan is not only prevalent in the government, but also in society where ideological silos divide the opposing parties in communities.

Ideological silos are communities populated exclusively with like minded people. Those who reinforce their preexisting views and biases. A familiar explanation for societies political division is Bill Bishop's Big Sort Hypothesis. He explains that over the past forty years, Americans have been sorting themselves into communities where people increasingly live, think, and vote like their peers (Pew Research Center website, 1). Exit polls from the 2016 presidential election give a precise insight on how society is divided. It shows that fifty nine percent of voters who lived in a city with a population greater than 50, 000 people voted for Hillary Clinton. Urban areas are scattered with ideas of liberty and equality.

Often populated with a wide range of religions, race, cultures, sexualities etc., and seen as diverse in a multitude of areas. While 62 percent of voters who lived in a small city or rural area favoured Donald Trump (Pew Research Center website, 1).

On the other hand, in rural areas diversity is usually not apparent. Evidence from the Pew survey conducted in August 2017 proves that ideological silos exist because sixty-seven percent of Democrats say that a lot of their close friends are also Democrats, while 57 percent of Republican voters surround themselves with Republican friends (Pew Research Center website, 1).

Ideological silos cause even more division between the two opposing parties and their voters. This encourages even more polarization. In 1976, for example, just more than a quarter of Americans resided in counties where presidential candidates won the election by a margin of 20 percent or more; but by the year 2004, nearly half of Americans lived in these more politically homogeneous counties (Tuschman, 2). People with similar political views tend to share similar socio-economic levels, race, and religious backgrounds. Causing more division within societies, and becoming the foundation to ideological silos. All humans share common moral guidelines regarding many controversial issues, however, the definitions of these issues differentiate.

Surprisingly, democrats and republicans have actually become more ideologically consistent in recent history (Bridges, 1). Simply explained, most people would agree that controversial topics such as discrimination are considered morally wrong. However, may argue upon what discrimination actually is, and have conflicting ways to resolve these issues. Discrimination exists and plays a fundamental role in the reproduction of all manner of social inequalities. Although, people have opinions about various forms of discrimination, even if they're unsupported by research or data (Bridges, 2).

The opposing parties cannot agree upon what is considered tolerable and what is not, and who should suffer for the rights of others. The opposing
<https://assignbuster.com/ideological-fracking-climate-change-immigration-school-vouchers-healthcare/>

parties cannot agree what is discrimination because most often they don't share the same race, economic power, sexual orientation, wealth, and in general perspectives based on experiences and perspectives. Demographic factors highly influence political and moral views. Therefore, many homosexuals, blacks, immigrants are on the left side of the spectrum. Whereas older white men are typically on the right end of the spectrum.

This is because elder white men are at a significantly lower risk of being affected by racism and homophobia. Therefore, they do not think it is a problem, and if they do not think it's a problem they do not want or have any motivation to fix it. The "new right" is composed of very strong ideologies that are found at its roots. Including, white nationalism, neo-Nazis and Klansmen. Over the past decades, the "new right" has moved further right than the liberals have left and "despite the widespread belief that both parties have moved to the extremes, the movement of the Republican Party to the right accounts for most of the divergence between the two parties" (Klein, 1). The problem with a political party being driven by strong ideologies is that compromise is difficult to reach. This is because the two political parties have become so divergent that they share completely different perspectives on controversial issues. When a party is strongly influenced by an extreme ideology the public can often develop a strong sense of mistrust.

The opposing partisans have created so much hatred for the alternate party that hate evolves into mistrust. Then, mistrust eventually turns into stagnation of progress within the government. Increased polarization can lead to more conflict in legal confirmation processes within the government.

<https://assignbuster.com/ideological-fracking-climate-change-immigration-school-vouchers-healthcare/>

The polarized debate in court can erode the public's confidence in judicial branch (Lee, 2). Partisans from the opposite party from the president's do not trust the government at all (Hetherington & Rudolph, 1). In a survey, over 50 percent of Republicans said they never trusted the government to do what is right at the end of 2010. While, 2 percent of Republicans chose, "just about always" or "most of the time" (Hetherington & Rudolph, 1). The opposing partisans have created so much hatred for the alternate party that the hate evolves into mistrust. Overall, mistrust eventually turns into stagnation of progress within the government.

This is because trust is key to resolving issues within society. Without trust the public and the government can resolve conflict, but rather causes it. Polarization causes the government to waste time bickering with the opposing party on how to make decisions rather than solving them. "The divisions between Republicans and Democrats on fundamental political values—on government, race, immigration, national security, environmental protection, and other areas—reached record levels during Barack Obama's presidency," Pew's report states. "In Donald Trump's first year as president, these gaps have grown even larger" (Pew Research Center website, 1).

The concerned with increasing elite polarization is the threat of the stability of democracy (Lee, 1). Secondly, polarization might lead to more gridlock in the national policy making process. Rather than solving national issues, the government is more concerned with bickering on how to resolve problems with the opposing sides rather than actually dealing with challenges. Most of the time consumed by bickering is arguing about how to go about or solve

issues. However, this actually causes more conflict than actual answers. In the end the government's energy is consumed by hatred to opposing parties.

This is a consequence of extreme competition. In benefit, competition makes the political market more systematic, efficient, and rewarding for superior political teams. However, this negatively impacts the government's ability to move forward, pass legislation, and continue to improve it's nation.

Causing the senate to persist in a state of gridlock on some of the most critical issues facing it's nation. Yet, the senators are alternately caught up volleying for superiority by arguing the people on the other side of the spectrum. Resolution of the most critical issues facing nations are postponed due to dispute on how to resolve them. Partisan animosity, ideological silos, and mistrust within the government are consequences of polarization and the leading cause of the failure of the government as an institution. Elite polarization divides the nation into distinct groups of strong ideologies.

As a result, parties differentiate in perspectives, class, race etc. causing more polarization. Ultimately creating gridlock within the senate.