

URBAN SPACES AS SITES OF POLITICAL CONTESTATION: A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY INTO CONFLICT AND CO-EXISTENCE

Adewunmi Samuel Olori

Doctoral Candidate

National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN), Abuja

Email: adewunmi.olori@outlook.com

Abstract

Urban spaces are inherently dynamic and often contested arenas where diverse interests, identities, and power relations converge. This paper posits that understanding the persistent presence of conflict within these environments necessitates a philosophical inquiry into the conditions for genuine coexistence. Drawing inspiration from Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action, we argue that, just as rational discourse provides a normative basis for a legitimate social order, so too do disparate urban actors necessitate a shared commitment to communicative rationality to foster intersubjectivity and a sustainable social order. This framework contrasts sharply with models of passive coexistence, emphasising instead an active and deliberative process. It is recommended that principles such as procedural and distributive justice, mutual recognition, inclusive participatory deliberation, shared responsibility, and systemic transparency serve as the foundational relational principles. These principles are not merely aspirational ideals but are indispensable preconditions for urban communicative action, through which authentic coexistence can be actualised. This inquiry bridges abstract philosophical constructs with the concrete realities of urban

social relations, demonstrating how the insights from discourse ethics can inform and shape the pursuit of sustainable peace and well-being in contested urban fabrics. The paper reveals that urban conflict arises from distorted communication, while genuine coexistence requires an active and deliberative process rather than passive tolerance. It therefore concludes that sustainable urban peace is achieved through the conscious cultivation of communicative rationality and a collective commitment to relational principles that enable genuine, deliberative coexistence.

Keywords: coexistence, communicative action, conflict, intersubjectivity, urban space

Introduction

The contemporary city, far from being a monolithic entity, functions as a complex mix of diverse populations, competing interests, and varied aspirations. Rapid urbanisation, driven by global economic forces, migration, and technological advancements, have transformed metropolitan areas into crucibles of intense social, economic, and political activity. This hyper-diversity, while often lauded as a source of innovation and cultural vibrancy, simultaneously generates significant pressures, including strained resources, escalating inequalities, and proliferation of distinct and conflicting worldviews. This inherent heterogeneity profoundly shapes urban life, transforming its physical and social spaces into dynamic and highly sensitive sites of political contestation. These conflicts are not merely isolated incidents but consistently reflect underlying power imbalances, fierce struggles over the allocation

and control of resources, and fundamental disagreements among various groups about the very nature, purpose, and future direction of urban existence. While conflict is an undeniable and persistent feature of urbanity, the enduring presence of diverse ethnic groups living in proximity also compels a deeper philosophical examination of the conditions that enable coexistence. This paper undertakes a philosophical inquiry into this critical duality, seeking to understand how urban environments, despite being arenas of strife, can simultaneously foster forms of shared living and, indeed, dynamic social peace.

The philosophical challenge at the heart of this inquiry can be conceptualised by drawing initial inspiration from the problem articulated by concerning Leibniz's notion of windowless monads. These fundamental entities, in Leibnizian metaphysics, cannot genuinely interact; yet they mysteriously constitute a harmonious universe through a pre-established harmony. Transposing this abstract dilemma, how do fundamentally disconnected entities achieve order and coherence? This concrete urban realm allows us to frame a crucial question: If individual urban actors (i.e. individuals, communities and institutions) are, by analogy, fundamentally self-contained in their interests and perspectives, how then can genuine inter-subjectivity (i.e. a shared understanding and mutual recognition) and the requisite social interaction for a viable urban social order be achieved?

Crucially, however, our inquiry extends beyond the deterministic implications of Leibnizian metaphysics. To explore the active, dynamic nature of human interaction and social order in cities, we turn to Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action. Unlike Leibniz's concept of a pre-established harmony, which, while demonstrating a divinely ordained order, operates without any genuine interaction between entities, Habermas provides a robust and normative framework for understanding how social order and intersubjectivity can emerge not through predetermination, but through rational discourse and mutual understanding (Roderick, 1986). Habermas distinguishes between strategic action, oriented towards achieving specific goals through manipulation or coercion, and communicative action, oriented towards reaching understanding and consensus through reasoned argumentation.

Urban conflict arises when strategic action dominates and distorts communication by prioritising profit and efficiency over community values. This suppression of genuine deliberation creates a sense of injustice and resentment, making conflict an inevitable result of this communicative failure. Conversely, the potential for urban coexistence lies in fostering conditions that allow communicative action to flourish. Furthermore, Habermas's distinction between the lifeworld (the realm of shared understandings and culturally transmitted values) and the system (economic and administrative spheres operating by their instrumental logics) provides a powerful lens through which to analyse urban contestation. Urban spaces

frequently manifest pathologies arising from the 'colonisation of the lifeworld' by systemic imperatives, where bureaucratic or market forces undermine the communicative processes essential for social integration.

Therefore, our central question becomes: How can communicative rationality facilitate intersubjectivity and a legitimate urban social order, moving beyond mere co-presence to genuine shared living, through active and deliberative processes? To address this, this paper first delineates the philosophical underpinnings of urban political contestation, drawing on contemporary urban theory and situating it within Habermas's critique of distorted communication. Second, it examines the conceptual necessity of intersubjectivity for urban coexistence, detailing how communicative action serves as the mechanism for achieving shared understanding.

Finally, it proposes a matrix of relational principles as the philosophical fulcrum for fostering sustainable coexistence in diverse and contested urban spaces. The overarching aim of this paper is to make these philosophical constructs tangible by demonstrating their relevance to human relations and well-being in contemporary cities. This work contributes to discourse and the applied field of peace and conflict studies by providing a robust framework for analysing urban conflict and proposing pathways towards sustainable peace.

The Nature of Urban Political Contestation

Urban space is profoundly more than a neutral backdrop; it is a dynamic outcome of intricate social, economic, and political processes, inherently reflecting, producing, and reproducing power relations. As such, the city transforms into a primary site in which various, often intense, forms of political contestation manifest. From a Habermasian perspective, these conflicts frequently signify a breakdown or systematic distortion of communicative processes, where the pursuit of strategic, instrumental goals by powerful actors overrides the potential for communicative action aimed at mutual understanding and consensus (Roderick 1986).

One significant and pervasive source of urban conflict stems from the pervasive logic of neoliberal urbanism. This paradigm prioritises market mechanisms, private interests, and capital accumulation as the primary drivers of urban development (Brenner, 2019). The consequences are often stark inequalities, the commodification of urban life, and the systematic displacement of marginalised communities. Gentrification, for instance, dramatically transforms neighbourhoods, enhancing property values and attracting new, wealthier residents, but often at the steep cost of dispossessing long-term residents, eroding established community ties, and obliterating cultural heritage. From a Habermasian standpoint, such economic restructuring processes frequently exemplify the colonisation of the lifeworld by the system. Decisions regarding urban development, often driven by purely economic or administrative imperatives,

bypass genuine public deliberation. They reflect strategic actions by developers, investors, and complicit public administrations, thereby undermining the capacity of residents to engage in communicative action about their shared living spaces and collectively define their needs and aspirations. This suppression of open discourse inevitably fuels a sense of injustice and resentment, leading to widespread contestation.

Furthermore, the philosophical and political claim of the "right to the city" underpins much urban contestation. This concept asserts a fundamental entitlement of all urban inhabitants to shape and control their city, not merely to occupy it as passive consumers. When access to vital resources, participation in decision-making processes, and the overall benefits of urban life are unevenly distributed, various social groups inevitably mobilise to assert their collective claims. This assertion frequently plays out in contested public spaces, which become critical arenas for protest, counter-hegemonic cultural expression, and symbolic struggles over who belongs, whose narratives dominate, and whose voices are heard. From a Habermasian perspective, these struggles represent attempts by marginalised or disempowered groups to reclaim and re-establish authentic public spheres, that is, spaces where citizens can engage in critical and rational debates, challenge dominant discourses, and collectively articulate their validity claims against powerful interests that seek to instrumentalise urban development. When these public spheres are suppressed, co-opted, or excluded from decision-making

processes, conflict is an inevitable outcome.

Identity politics further complicates the urban fabric, creating additional layers of contestation. Cities, as vibrant mosaics of ethnic, religious, and cultural groups, often experience spatial segregation, whether inherited from historical patterns or actively reproduced in contemporary urban dynamics. Competition over scarce resources, political representation, and the demand for cultural recognition can intensify along these identity lines, frequently leading to social friction, prejudice, and even violence. When groups become insulated within their own social networks and experiences, communication across these divides becomes increasingly difficult. The 'individualistic, non-communicative' nature of these group identities, when unmediated by shared communicative principles, can lead to a state where each group perceives the urban environment solely through its own 'window,' making genuine, empathetic interaction fraught with misunderstanding and distrust. This insulation creates communicative deficits that prevent the formation of a broader consensus on urban issues.

Finally, development agendas and environmental justice issues frequently ignite profound conflicts. Large-scale urban projects such as new infrastructure, megadevelopments, or seemingly benign greening initiatives and the unequal distribution of environmental burdens (such as pollution from industrial zones, lack of green spaces and inadequate waste management) disproportionately affect

vulnerable communities, often along ethnic or socio-economic lines. These struggles highlight deep philosophical questions of distributive justice and recognition in urban planning. From a Habermasian standpoint, such conflicts frequently arise from a fundamental lack of deliberative democracy or ideal speech situations. Decisions concerning these projects are often made by technocratic elites or private interests, without the genuine participation and reasoned consent of affected communities. This demonstrates a clear failure of communicative action, where instrumental rationality dictates outcomes, bypassing the need for collective will-formation based on open and fair discourse. The challenge, therefore, is to move beyond a mere 'pre-established harmony', a passive, potentially illusionary state and instead, to understand how urban actors, despite their inherent differences and often conflicting interests, can actively engage in meaningful inter-subjectivity through communicative rationality to construct and sustain a viable social order.

Inter-subjectivity and the Quest for Urban Coexistence

The pursuit of urban coexistence necessitates a profound understanding of inter-subjectivity, which is not merely the physical proximity of diverse individuals but the shared understanding and mutual recognition that enables them to live together constructively. While traditional philosophical thought, as seen in Leibniz's monads, might conceptualise existence as fundamentally self-contained, urban reality, as described by , underscores humans as

intrinsically 'beings-with-others.' This fundamental social embeddedness is amplified in the urban setting due to its density, complexity, and sheer diversity. However, unlike Leibniz's deterministic monads, urban actors possess a high degree of free will, agency, and often conflicting interests, leading to a dynamic environment where conflict is a perpetual possibility.

From a Habermasian perspective, inter-subjectivity is not a pre-given state, but an active accomplishment achieved through communicative action (Roderick 1986). Communicative action, therefore, is a form of social interaction oriented towards reaching understanding among participants. Unlike strategic action, which aims at success through instrumental means, communicative action is guided by a commitment to validity claims: participants raise claims to truth (about facts), rightness (about norms), and sincerity (about intentions), and are prepared to justify these claims through reasoned argumentation. When these claims are mutually accepted or a rational consensus is reached, inter-subjectivity is fostered, and coordination of action becomes possible. This sharply contrasts with any notion of passive harmony; instead, it demands an active, deliberative process where shared meanings and norms are continually negotiated and affirmed.

The 'quest for urban coexistence' thus moves beyond simply avoiding overt conflict or achieving a minimalist tolerance. It requires actively building robust mechanisms for shared

understanding and cooperation through the rigorous practice of communicative action. This demands a philosophical grounding that can account for the inherent individualism and often conflicting interests of urban actors while simultaneously providing a normative framework for their reconciliation and mutual flourishing. Without an underlying basis for inter-subjective relations rooted in genuine communication, urban life risks devolving into a collection of isolated, fragmented, and potentially 'solipsistic' enclaves. In such a scenario, different groups would lack direct awareness or concern for the 'mental states,' lived experiences, or legitimate claims of others, leading to mutual misunderstanding and the erosion of social cohesion. This poses a fundamental threat to the very fabric of urban social order and human well-being.

The challenges to achieving genuine inter-subjectivity in urban contexts are multifaceted. The "idiosyncrasies, biases, prejudices, and individual points of view" as posited by are amplified in the dense urban crucible of urban actors. These subjective perspectives, when not subjected to open discourse, can lead to intractable disagreements and even hostility. More significantly, systemic power imbalances often operate as profound barriers to communicative action. The ideal conditions for rational discourse, such as equal opportunities to speak, to challenge, and to participate in decision-making processes, are rarely met in practice. Socio-economic inequalities, cultural hierarchies, and entrenched political structures frequently translate into communicative inequalities,

where some voices are privileged, others are marginalised, and yet others are silenced altogether. When the system (such as market logic, administrative control) colonises the lifeworld (the realm of shared understandings), decisions are imposed through instrumental rationality rather than derived from communicative understanding, leading to social pathologies and alienated social relations.

Therefore, the 'quest for urban coexistence' is fundamentally a communicative project. It is about designing institutions, fostering social practices, and cultivating a civic culture that actively encourages and protects communicative action. This involves creating accessible and inclusive public spheres where diverse urban actors can engage in reasoned debate, articulate their concerns, challenge injustices, and collectively seek solutions to shared problems. The goal is not to eliminate differences, but to provide the communicative means by which differences can be navigated, transformed, and integrated into a broader, legitimate social order based on mutual understanding rather than coercion or strategic manipulation. This active construction of intersubjectivity is the indispensable prerequisite for any sustainable urban peace.

Relational Principles as a Basis for Urban Coexistence

Given the limitations of a passive, 'pre-established harmony' in the human realm, and acknowledging that urban actors cannot rely on a single, transcendent 'Supreme Monad' for synchronisation, it is proposed that urban coexistence must be anchored in a robust matrix

of relational principles. These principles, akin to the utopian ideals suggested by serve not merely as aspirations but as the ethical and practical fulcrum for intersubjectivity among diverse urban populations. From a Habermasian perspective, these principles are the constitutive preconditions for an ideal speech situation and the fundamental ethical prerequisites for legitimate communicative action. They are paramount for organising the thoughts, beliefs, and actions of urban actors, enabling meaningful relationships with one another that transcend individual biases, narrow self-interest, and strategic aims.

It is therefore apt to rationalise that there are key relational principles for fostering urban coexistence among groups of diverse interests. These are justice and equity, mutual recognition and respect. Participatory governance and deliberation, shared responsibility and solidarity, as well as transparency and accountability. These principles espoused below are of high social import, as their meanings and significance are most fully realised within the context of robust social existence and continuous communicative engagement. While they may appear utopian in their full realisation, their adherence is crucial for moulding individual and collective character in the urban landscape and for guiding effective governance. According to , a city where individuals actively embody these principles in their relationships would demonstrably yield an environment conducive to sustainable social order and human development. They provide the necessary 'synergy' and 'harmony'

not through divine pre-establishment, but through a conscious, ongoing, collective commitment to ethical interaction and communicative rationality.

Justice and Equity

This principle demands procedural justice, towards ensuring fair processes for deliberation and decision-making as well as distributive justice, which requires a fair distribution of urban resources, opportunities, and burdens, alongside the redress of historical and systemic injustices. The commitment to justice within a Habermasian framework is not about always achieving a flawless state. Instead, it functions as a critical benchmark against which urban realities can be measured. These aspirational ideal guides the deliberative processes required for building a more just and peaceful urban environment, acknowledging that the pursuit of justice is an ongoing, conscious effort rather than a static outcome. Procedural justice underpins the very possibility of communicative action by guaranteeing equal opportunities for all voices to be heard, to question, and to challenge arguments, regardless of their social or economic standing.

Mutual Recognition and Respect

Coexistence fundamentally requires acknowledging the inherent dignity and legitimate claims of all urban groups, including their unique cultural practices, identities, and narratives. This principle extends beyond mere tolerance to genuine appreciation of difference

and a commitment to understanding diverse perspectives. In the context of communicative action, mutual recognition means that participants actively acknowledge each other as rational, competent speakers capable of raising validity claims. This is essential for overcoming identity-based conflicts and building bridges across cultural and social divides, as it fosters an environment where diverse claims can be genuinely entertained and debated.

Participatory Governance and Deliberation

For urban actors to feel a sense of ownership, belonging, and political efficacy, they must have meaningful and inclusive avenues for participation in decision-making processes that directly affect their lives. This includes designing and implementing accessible public forums, fostering community-led planning initiatives, and establishing transparent governance structures that facilitate dialogue and consensus-building across divides. These mechanisms are crucial for establishing and maintaining authentic public spheres within cities, enabling citizens to engage in collective will-formation through rational and critical discourse. Such spaces, when genuinely deliberative, move beyond mere information sharing to involve reasoned argumentation, collective learning, and the formation of shared understandings on complex urban issues.

Shared Responsibility and Solidarity

This principle emphasises the collective ownership of urban challenges and the mutual obligation to contribute to the common

good. It transcends individual interests to foster a deep sense of interconnectedness, where the well-being of one group is understood to be intrinsically linked to the well-being of all (Senghor, 1966, cited in). This solidarity is not a pre-existing state but a communicative achievement, arising from successful discourse where participants identify with collective outcomes and a shared future. It can manifest in concrete actions such as collaborative problem-solving, the formation of mutual aid networks during crises, and cross-community initiatives aimed at addressing systemic inequalities.

Transparency and Accountability

Trust, a critical component of any functional relationship, is built fundamentally on transparency in governance and accountability for actions. When urban institutions and actors operate with openness, when decision-making processes are clear, and when those in power are genuinely responsible for their decisions, it significantly reduces suspicion, combats corruption, and fosters a more reliable and predictable environment for inter-group relations. In the context of communicative action, trust ensures that all relevant information is freely available to all participants, enabling rational argumentation, while accountability ensures that decisions reached through legitimate discourse are implemented and their effects reviewed. This minimises the potential for strategic action to undermine the outcomes of communicative processes and reinforces the legitimacy of urban governance.

Conclusion

Urban spaces, by their very nature, are dynamic and complex sites of political contestation, where diverse interests, identities, and power relations frequently clash. It has been argued that understanding and fostering sustainable coexistence within these complex environments necessitates a philosophical inquiry into the underlying relational principles that can bridge individualistic tendencies and conflicting perspectives. Drawing a conceptual parallel from the challenge of disconnected entities to the practicalities of urban life, it is contended that the key to urban social order lies not in an improbable pre-established harmony, but in the active, deliberative processes inherent in Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that urban conflict often stems from the distortion or suppression of genuine communicative processes, where strategic or instrumental rationality displaces the pursuit of mutual understanding. The path to coexistence, therefore, involves creating and protecting the conditions for authentic communicative action within the urban public sphere. To this end, a matrix of essential relational principles is recommended, as they are not merely aspirational ideals but serve as the normative preconditions for an ideal speech situation and the indispensable ethical foundations for legitimate communicative action.

In all, by consciously cultivating a culture of communicative rationality and embedding these relational principles into urban

governance and social practices, cities can move beyond mere uneasy co-presence to genuine, actively constructed coexistence. Nonetheless, this requires continuous effort, vigilance against the colonisation of the lifeworld, and an unwavering commitment to democratic deliberation.

References

Amin, A. (2002). Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. *Environment and Planning*, 34, 959–980. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3537>

Bolton, R. (2005). Habermas's theory of communicative action and the theory of social capital. *Meeting of the Association of American Geographers*, 1–39.

Custers, G. (2021). *The divided cities: class transformation, civic participation and neighbourhood context*. Rotterdam.

Fashola, J. O., & Offor, F. (2020). Monadologism, Inter-subjectivity and the Quest for Social Order. *LASU Journal of Philosophy*, 3(1), 1–10.

Fraser, N. (2009). *Justice interruptus: critical reflections on the “postsocialist” condition*. Routledge.

Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. Verso. <https://doi.org/10.1521/sis.2006.70.4.566>

Habermas, J. (1986). The Theory of Communicative Action. A Critique of Functionalist Reason. Beacon Press. Vol. 2.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, trans. William Rehg. MIT Press. 22-23

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Blackwell Publishers.

Honneth, A. (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition: The moral grammar of soial conflicts* (J. Anderson, Trans.). Polity Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell.

Ley, D., & Dobson, C. (2008). Are There Limits to Gentrification? The Contexts of Impeded Gentrification in Vancouver. *Urban Studies*, 45(2), 2471–2498. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098008097103>

Magsino, M. A. L. (2014b). Jürgen Habermas ' Between Facts and Norms. *Synergeia*, 5(1), 75–98.

Mitchell, D. (2003). *The Right to the City Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. The Guilford Press.

Roderick, R. (1986). Review of *The Theory of Communicative Action*, by J. Habermas & T. McCarthy. *Political Theory*, 14(1), 152–156. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191315>

Sassen, S. (2012). *Cities in a World Economy* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.

Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. Oxford University Press.

Waribugo, S., & Eketu, C. A. (2016). Solipsism in Social Inquiry: Revisiting A Redundant Paradigm. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 2(1), 18–25.