Nicolina Gallo (415) 265.0116
August 18th, 2026

Email: nicolina.gallo@berkeley.edu
LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/nicolinagallo/
Portfolio: https://www.nicolinagallo.com/portfolio



Discourse in Rapprochement: Transcending Agreement in a Divided Society

Sharp sociopolitical, socioeconomic, and bitter cultural conflicts rarely yield to total surrender of identity. In reality, maintaining coordinated partnerships requires a far more complex recognition of contentious demands, that preserves fundamental values, while continually allowing for enough flexibility to discover a shared humanity together.

Surprisingly, people on the most extreme edges of divisive conflicts share a great deal. Famously, the 1971 school desegregation effort in Durham, North Carolina brought together two of the most unlikely to collaborate: Ann Atwater, a fiery Black female activist, and C.P. Ellis, an eminent KKK leader. Constructed to design the operations that would ultimately desegregate American schools, and alleviate the extreme racial hostility against the endeavor, the two entered from seemingly irreconcilable positions. Yet their respective political identities obscured what became a sustained concrete experience. The regular, intensive dialogue required to complete the undertaking, allowed the collective challenges of poverty, insecurity, powerlessness, and unyielding fear they'd both faced to become the cornerstone for an enduring camaraderie. The poignant moral differences between them were not immediately erased. They were, however, eased as the caricatures through which each had understood the other. That foundation created a new blueprint from which a much more empathetic perception emerged.

That distinction matters. A moral equivalence is not necessary for constructive dialogue, and true compromise should not require abandoning conviction. Rather, what *is* essential is resisting the very natural reaction of reducing another human being to the position they hold so fiercely.

Contemporary polarization has made this process extremely difficult. Rising socioeconomic insecurities, the increasing resurgence of extremist racial and cultural segregation, is infused each day with partisan political rhetoric, creating fragmented information that reinforces the divisiveness. Civic engagement has little meaning anymore as interactions become progressively more susceptible to simplified narratives. Mounting economic frustration ignites gaslighting toward immigrants, minorities, or other perceived competitors. Uncertainty and fear become identity, and that identity becomes the opposition that ultimately defines a worldview.

This is how systemic conflict is born. Yet complex societies cannot formulate resilience through isolated interventions alone. Dialogue and systems thinking must converge, and institutions must tangibly acknowledge their role in exacerbating vitriol, and instead establish how information, identity, economic conditions, historical grievances, political incentives, and relationships impact cooperation.



My work on humanitarian stewardship is the culmination of decades of research, overseas humanitarian aid, and years witnessing some of the most unspeakable acts of bigotry growing up in the deep south. My lived experience is proof that trust is integral to social infrastructure. Humanitarianism cannot effectively operate through technical competence alone; its legitimacy depends upon community engagement, cultural humility, local agency, legitimate communication, and the resulting trust that manifests to preserve dignity.

That very principle is just as critical for community collaboration outside of humanitarian campaigns. Instead of imposing outside narratives, cohesive partnerships require allowing participants the freedom to be fully themselves. To interrupt the feedback loop, rapprochement discourse evolves into a genuine conversation.

Reflection slows assumptions. It leads to critical listening that can then introduce information that offsets stereotypes. Personal narratives restore complexity to identities that are otherwise flattened by political mind frames. Creating structured participation allows those who might otherwise retreat, or dominate, the space to be heard. Ultimately realizing that antagonists on respective ends of extremism actually share a majority of challenges, culminates in opportunities to recognize overlapping interests without pretending that the profound disagreements have disappeared. Simply being able to understand the other's beliefs, and what lay at the core of those tenets, is how compromise is possible.

With the increasing polarization procreating in modern society, however, that capacity is not simply sentimental. It is legitimate civic infrastructure required to build the necessary community resilience to organically communicate across disagreements. Societal institutions capable of adapting to this complexity, must expand narratives enough to recognize adversaries as fellow human beings.

Surrendering core principles is not required for a shared future. But understanding one another well enough to build that perception is fundamental. The objective need not be consensus. Sometimes the more realistic achievement is just coherence.

