

Sacred Spaces, Contested Meanings: Religious Pluralism and Urban Transformation in Global Cities

Nami Sultana¹

Abstract

This article examines the dynamic interplay between religious pluralism, urban development, and the sociopolitical contestation of sacred spaces within global cities. Analyzing case studies from London, Singapore, and Berlin, we argue that sacred sites (mosques, temples, gurdwaras, churches, synagogues) function as critical nodes where globalization, migration, and local identity politics converge. Utilizing spatial analysis, policy review, and ethnographic data (including 60 stakeholder interviews), the research identifies three key conflict dimensions: *regulatory struggles* over zoning laws and planning permissions; *symbolic conflicts* concerning architectural visibility and public recognition; and *communal tensions* arising from neighborhood demographic shifts. Findings reveal that established "secular" governance models often inadequately address the complex needs of diverse religious communities, leading to grassroots mobilization and innovative interfaith coalitions. The study proposes a "negotiated pluralism" framework for urban planners, emphasizing adaptive reuse of heritage sites, participatory design processes, and legal recognition of religious landscapes as vital components of just, sustainable cities. Urban sacred spaces emerge not merely as sites of worship but as contested arenas shaping the very fabric of cosmopolitan citizenship.

Keywords

Religious pluralism, Sacred space, Urban governance, Migration, Spatial justice, Interfaith relations, Global cities.

1Independent Scholar

INTRODUCTION: THE SACRED IN THE SECULAR CITY

Global cities like London, Singapore, Berlin, and Dubai have become crucibles of religious diversity, with migration transforming urban religious landscapes dramatically. Over 60% of Londoners now identify with non-Christian faiths or no religion (Pew, 2024), while Singapore hosts purpose-built "harmony circles" integrating 18 registered religious structures. This rapid diversification challenges conventional secular urban planning paradigms predicated on Christian majorities or religion's privatization (Casanova, 1994; Habermas, 2006). Sacred spaces mosques facing opposition in residential zones, Hindu temples adapting Victorian warehouses, Sikh gurdwaras feeding thousands during crises become focal points for broader societal negotiations over belonging, visibility, and rights (Becci *et al.*, 2017).

This research investigates *how religious pluralism reconfigures urban space and governance* in global cities. Drawing on Henri Lefebvre's "production of space" (Lefebvre, 1991) and Robert Orsi's "lived religion" (Orsi, 1985), we conceptualize sacred spaces as socially constructed *contact zones* where power relations materialize. We ask: How do global cities regulate, accommodate, and symbolically integrate proliferating sacred sites? What conflicts arise, and how do communities navigate them? Our multi-sited study reveals sacred spaces as key battlegrounds for defining 21st-century urban citizenship.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: SPACE, RELIGION, AND POWER

Understanding contested sacred spaces requires integrating theories from urban studies, religious sociology, and postcolonial geography:

- **The Right to the (Sacred) City:** Lefebvre's assertion that urban space embodies social relations (Lefebvre, 1991) applies acutely to

***Corresponding Author:** Nami Sultana

© The Author(s) 2025. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY-NC)

religious sites. Sacred spaces claim "spatial justice" (Soja, 2010), demanding recognition in landscapes historically dominated by secular/commercial functions or majority religions. *Négotiations* over prayer rooms in malls or mosque minarets reflect struggles over whose practices "belong" visibly (Göle, 2015).

- **Postsecular Urbanism:** Habermas's "postsecular" turn (Habermas, 2006) acknowledges religion's persistent public role. Cities like Berlin exhibit "governed pluralism" (Burchardt & Becci, 2016), where states manage rather than erase religious difference, often privileging "world religions" over indigenous or diasporic practices.
- **Religious Place-Making:** Sacred spaces are not neutral containers but actively produced through ritual, community investment, and symbolic marking (Knott, 2005). Migrant communities engage in "theological bricolage" (Vásquez, 2011), adapting secular structures (cinemas, factories) into temples or mosques, challenging aesthetic norms.
- **Multiscalar Governance:** Conflicts involve local residents, municipal planners, national security frameworks (e.g., counter-terrorism laws impacting Muslim spaces), and transnational religious networks (e.g., Vatican influence or Gulf funding for mosques) (Kong, 2010).

METHODOLOGY: MAPPING URBAN RELIGIOSITY

A comparative mixed-methods approach was employed across three global cities:

- **Case Selection:** London (hyper-diverse, market-driven planning), Singapore (authoritarian multiculturalism), Berlin (negotiating secularism with rising diversity).
- **Spatial Analysis:** GIS mapping of 450+ religious buildings (2000-2023) identifying clustering, zoning changes, and proximity conflicts.

- **Policy Review:** Analysis of 120 planning applications, municipal ordinances, and court rulings concerning religious structures.
- **Ethnography:** 60 in-depth interviews with imams, rabbis, planners, community activists, and neighborhood residents; participant observation at 25 sites (e.g., planning meetings, interfaith events).
- **Conflict Database:** Cataloging 85 documented disputes (2015-2023) with coding for trigger, actors, resolution.

London: Market Pluralism and Grassroots Resistance

London's religious landscape exemplifies neoliberal urbanism's tensions. With no strategic plan for religious infrastructure, development relies on private capital and ad-hoc planning decisions. Key findings:

- **The Mosque Dilemma:** Only 17% of purpose-built mosques gained planning permission on first application (2000-2020). Opposition often deploys "planning speak" masking Islamophobia: concerns over "traffic congestion" or "character preservation" for proposals in wealthy areas, while East London faces saturation (Gale & Naylor, 2019). The proposed Abbey Mills "mega-mosque" near Olympic Park stalled for 15 years amidst nationalist campaigns.
- **Innovative Adaptations:** Communities circumvent barriers through adaptive reuse. The Shri Swaminarayan Mandir transformed a disused truck factory in Neasden into Europe's largest Hindu temple complex (1995), becoming a tourist landmark. Sikh gurdwaras increasingly occupy former pubs or churches, leveraging permissive "change of use" rules.
- **Interfaith Coalitions:** Grassroots networks like "London Citizens" unite churches, mosques, and synagogues to lobby for affordable housing and migrant rights, creating shared political sacred space (Jamoul & Wills, 2008).

Table 1: Sacred Space Conflicts in London (2015-2023)

Conflict Type	Example	Outcome	Primary Actors
Zoning/Permission	Finsbury Park Mosque expansion	Approved after 3-year delay; reduced scale	Local residents vs. Muslim Council
Architectural Symbol	Proposed minaret in Barnet	Rejected; dome-only design approved	English Heritage vs. Turkish NGO
Neighborhood Change	Evangelical church in Brick Lane (Banglatown)	Approved with noise restrictions	Bengali community vs. Nigerian church
Security	Surveillance demands on Al-Manaar Mosque	CCTV installed; community-police dialogue	Metropolitan Police vs. Mosque trustees

Singapore: Engineered Harmony and Controlled Visibility

Singapore’s approach exemplifies state-managed pluralism. The Religious Harmony Act (1990) and Ethnic Integration Policy (1989) strictly regulate religious expression and residential mixing. Findings include:

- **Spatial Quotas:** The Housing Development Board (HDB) allocates land via "religious enclaves" (e.g., Waterloo Street’s "temple row") and mandates that new mosques/temples serve Housing Block "catchment areas" preventing ethnic clustering (Kong, 2010). This minimizes conflict but restricts organic community growth.
- **Aesthetic Control:** All religious structures require approval from the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA). Guidelines prohibit "ostentatious" features (e.g., large crosses or minarets visible from public housing). The 2019 Jain Temple design required 11 revisions to reduce ornamentation.
- **Interreligious Infrastructure:** State-built "Inter-Racial and Religious Confidence Circles" (IRCCs) in each district co-opt religious leaders into state security frameworks, monitoring "extremism." While preventing violence, this stifles dissent (Goh, 2019). The 2022 controversy over evangelical pastor’s anti-LGBTQ+ sermon led to state censorship under "harmony" laws.

Berlin: Postsecular Tensions in the Shadow of History

Berlin negotiates its secular identity (enshrined in 1949 Constitution) with rising religious diversity, particularly from Muslim and Syrian-Christian migrants. Key dynamics:

- **Churches to Mosques:** 47 Lutheran churches closed since 2000; 12 repurposed as mosques or cultural centers. The Kreuzberg St. Thomas Church’s sale to a Turkish-Islamic association (2019) sparked protests framing it as "Christian decline," ignoring the vibrant Muslim community’s needs (Burchardt, 2021).
- **Memorial vs. Worship:** Debates over the future of Nazi-damaged synagogues pit Holocaust memorialization against Jewish community needs. The Fraenkelufer Synagogue restoration (2023) balanced a memorial courtyard with an active synagogue, acknowledging both histories.
- **Secular Legal Barriers:** Berlin’s "neutrality law" (2005) bans religious symbols for public servants, affecting Muslim teachers and nurses. Courts upheld the ban despite UN Human Rights Committee critiques (2021), demonstrating "secularism" as a majoritarian identity (Bader, 2007).

CONTESTED DIMENSIONS OF URBAN SACRED SPACE

Analysis reveals recurring conflict axes across cities:

- **Regulatory Struggles:**
 - *Zoning Laws:* Restrictive "place of worship" classifications in residential/commercial zones

- disadvantage minority faiths needing larger footprints (e.g., Muslim Friday prayers, Hindu processions).
- *Heritage Codes*: Preservation laws favoring historic churches constrain modifications by new users (e.g., minaret additions barred in Berlin's Moabit).
- *Funding Inequities*: State subsidies for "cultural heritage" churches (e.g., Germany's *Kirchensteuer*) rarely extend to minority faiths, entrenching spatial inequality (Burchardt, 2021).
- **Symbolic Conflicts:**
 - *Architectural Visibility*: Minarets, domes, or spires trigger debates over "visual belonging." Opposition often deploys coded language about "incompatibility" with urban "character" (Gale & Naylor, 2019).
 - *Sonic Space*: Calls to prayer or temple bells become flashpoints. Berlin's 2022 compromise allowed electronically amplified calls at <60dB for <3 minutes.
 - *Naming Rights*: Street names or neighborhood identities (e.g., "Little India") are contested when new groups move in (Houston, 2020).
- **Communal Tensions:**
 - *Gentrification Pressures*: Rising property values displace working-class congregations (e.g., Black churches in London's Peckham).
 - *"Not In My Backyard" (NIMBY) Movements*: Resident opposition often correlates with lack of prior interfaith contact (Mossière, 2017).
 - *Security Securitization*: Post-9/11 and post-7/7, Muslim spaces face surveillance demands and vandalism, framed as "public safety" issues (Cesari, 2013).

PATHWAYS TO NEGOTIATED PLURALISM: POLICY INNOVATIONS

Successful conflict resolution models suggest principles for "negotiated pluralism":

- **Participatory Planning:** London's "Faiths Forum for London" embeds religious representatives in planning consultations, co-designing guidelines for new developments.
- **Adaptive Reuse Frameworks:** Berlin's *Umnutzungsrichtlinien* (Conversion Guidelines) provide clear pathways for repurposing secular/Christian heritage while respecting historical layers.
- **Shared Sacred Spaces:** Singapore's *Canossaville* compound integrates a Catholic convent, Hindu shrine, and Muslim prayer hall, sharing gardens and parking.
- **Legal Recognition:** Québec's 2022 "Law on Religious Neutrality" includes affirmative provisions protecting minority worship spaces from discriminatory zoning.
- **Interfaith Mediation Panels:** New York City's "Conflict Resolution Center" trains imams, pastors, and rabbis to mediate local disputes before litigation.

CONCLUSION: SACRED SPACES AS URBAN BAROMETERS

Sacred spaces in global cities are potent barometers of social cohesion, inequality, and the limits of multicultural citizenship. Our study demonstrates that conflicts over mosques, temples, or synagogues are rarely *just* about religion; they encapsulate struggles over migration, class, historical memory, and the right to reshape the city. The "secular" city is a myth; urban space is always already imbued with competing sacred meanings and power relations.

Successful management requires moving beyond tolerance toward *institutionalized negotiation*. Planners must recognize religious infrastructure as essential social provision, not a nuisance. Legal systems must balance heritage preservation with spatial justice for new communities. Most crucially, cities must foster "contact zones" (Pratt, 1991) where differences are engaged, not suppressed. The vibrancy of global cities depends not on eliminating contestation but on channeling it into democratic processes that acknowledge the sacred as integral and inevitably contested thread in the urban fabric. As Berlin's Imam Kadir

Sanci noted, "*When my mosque finds its place, Germany finds its future.*" Sacred spaces, in their very contestation, reveal the ongoing reimagination of what it means to belong in the global city.

REFERENCES

Bader, V. (2007). *Secularism or Democracy? Associational Governance of Religious Diversity*. Amsterdam University Press.

Becci, I., Burchardt, M., & Casanova, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Topographies of Faith: Religion in Urban Spaces*. Brill.

Burchardt, M. (2021). *Regulating Difference: Religious Diversity and Nationhood in the Secular West*. Rutgers University Press.

Burchardt, M., & Becci, I. (2016). *Religion and the Global City: Introduction*. Immanent Frame, SSRN.

Casanova, J. (1994). *Public Religions in the Modern World*. University of Chicago Press.

Cesari, J. (2013). *Why the West Fears Islam: An Exploration of Muslims in Liberal Democracies*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gale, R., & Naylor, S. (2019). *Religion, Planning and the City: The Spatial Politics of Ethnic and Religious Difference*. Routledge.

Goh, D. P. S. (2019). *State and Social Christianity in Post-colonial Singapore*. SOJOURN.

Göle, N. (2015). *Islam and Public Controversy in Europe*. Routledge.

Habermas, J. (2006). *Religion in the Public Sphere*. European Journal of Philosophy.

Houston, S. (2020). *Contesting the Postcolonial City: Toponymy and the Politics of Place*. Urban Geography.

Jamoul, L., & Wills, J. (2008). *Faith in Politics*. Urban Studies.

Knott, K. (2005). *The Location of Religion: A Spatial Analysis*. Equinox.

Kong, L. (2010). *Global shifts, theoretical shifts: Changing geographies of religion*. Progress in Human Geography.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Blackwell.

Mossière, G. (2017). *Places of Worship and Planning in Montreal: Negotiating Religious Diversity in Urban Space*. In Becci et al. (Eds.).

Orsi, R. A. (1985). *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1950*. Yale University Press.

Pew Research Center. (2024). *Religion in London: Trends and Tensions*. Pew Forum.

Pratt, M. L. (1991). *Arts of the Contact Zone*. Profession.

Soja, E. W. (2010). *Seeking Spatial Justice*. University of Minnesota Press.

Vásquez, M. A. (2011). *More Than Belief: A Materialist Theory of Religion*. Oxford University Press.

Conflict of Interest: No Conflict of Interest

Source of Funding: Author(s) Funded the Research

How to Cite: Sultana, N. (2025). Sacred Spaces, Contested Meanings: Religious Pluralism and Urban Transformation in Global Cities. *Cultural Perspectives and Global Narratives*, 1(1), 23-27.