

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

5.1 Conclusions

This study demonstrates that deliberative communication in urban agrarian conflicts in Indonesia operates under structurally non-ideal conditions characterized by power asymmetries, bureaucratic fragmentation, and the absence of inclusive institutional dialogue. Using the Dago Elos land conflict in Bandung as a case study, the research identifies three core findings that are relevant to the broader Indonesian context, where urban land disputes increasingly dominate patterns of agrarian conflict.

First, the study finds that the absence of formal and sustained dialogue forums between communities and state institutions represents a structural failure of deliberative governance. Urban land conflicts in Indonesia tend to be treated as narrow legal-administrative disputes, excluding affected communities from meaningful participation. This institutional avoidance forces residents to seek alternative spaces to articulate claims, negotiate legitimacy, and pursue conflict resolution.

Second, the research shows that counter-public spheres, exemplified by Forum Dago Melawan, function as alternative deliberative arenas. Through non-hierarchical organization and consensus-based decision-making, the forum enables equal participation, reason-giving, and collective will formation. These grassroots deliberative practices often operate more effectively than state-mediated forums under conditions of structural inequality.

Third, the study identifies hybrid communication strategies, combining rational argumentation, legal advocacy, digital campaigning, and mass mobilization as key mechanisms for sustaining deliberation when formal channels fail. Collective action does not negate deliberative principles but instead functions as an adaptive strategy that generates communicative power and compels institutional responsiveness in asymmetrical power contexts.

Theoretically, this study contributes to deliberative communication scholarship by extending deliberative democracy theory to urban agrarian

conflicts in the Global South. The findings support the concept of deliberation under non-ideal conditions, demonstrating that mobilization and disruption can perform deliberative functions by reopening blocked communication channels. Moreover, this research reinforces the role of counter-publics as democratic laboratories where communicative rationality can be practiced outside state-controlled arenas. The study also challenges the rigid separation between rational deliberation and contentious politics, showing that hybrid strategies are integral to deliberative systems in structurally unequal settings.

Practically, the findings suggest that local governments, including the Bandung City Government, need to institutionalize inclusive and cross-sectoral deliberative forums in urban land disputes rather than relying on fragmented procedural mediation. For ATR/BPN, the study underscores the importance of transparency and equitable access to land information as foundational conditions for deliberative communication. For civil society organizations such as LBH, the findings validate structural legal aid approaches that integrate litigation with community organizing and public advocacy as effective strategies in urban agrarian conflicts.

This study has several limitations. The number of informants was limited, which may constrain the diversity of perspectives captured. In addition, limited access to the developer's perspective restricts analysis of corporate deliberative practices and power dynamics. Future research should involve a broader range of stakeholders, including private developers and urban planners, and conduct comparative or longitudinal studies to assess the sustainability and transferability of hybrid deliberative strategies across different urban agrarian conflict contexts.