

## Public sphere developments between Jürgen Habermas

and Nancy Fraser

تطورات الفضاء العمومي ما بين يورغن هابرماس ونانسي فريزر

Daboussi Sarra

University Tunisie (Tunisie), sara.daboussi@gmail.com

Received:06 /03 2023 Accepted: 05/04/2023 Published: 20/05/2023

## Abstract

## الملخص

As part of this research, we will work to present a comparative vision of the concept of public sphere as it is conceived by Jurgen Habermas, and pointed out for the bourgeois class since he published his book Major public sphere, and how his student Nancy Fraser's opposes this perception and bet on the need to establish a post-bourgeois public sphere that guarantees the coexistence of most segments of society and that is not limited to the only bourgeois class, based on the reality of American society with multiple identities and nationalities.

we will seek within this research to show the most important evolutions that have affected the concept of public sphere as formulated by Habermas according to the phased changes that contemporary societies are going through. Thus, Fraser strives to establish the concept peaceful coexistence between different groups.

**Keywords :** bourgeois public sphere - post-bourgeois public sphere - Western societies - the contemporary individual - Jürgen Habermas - Nancy Fraser.

سنعمل ضمن هذا البحث على تقديم رؤية مقارنة حول مفهوم الفضاء العمومي كما تصوره يورغن هابرماس وخص به الطبقة البرجوازية منذ أصدر كتابه العمدة ال فضاء العمومي وكيف عارضت تلمذته ناسي فريزر هذا التصور وراهننت على ضرورة إرساء فضاء عمومي ما بعد برجوازي يكفل تعايش جل فئات المجتمع ولا يكون حكرا على الفئة البرجوازية فحسب منطلقة في ذلك من واقع المجتمع الأمريكي المتعدد الهويات والقوميات.

حيث سنسعى ضمن هذا البحث إلى تبيان أهم التطورات التي طالت مفهوم الفضاء العمومي كما صاغه هابرماس وفقا للتغيرات المرحلية التي تمر بها المجتمعات المعاصرة لذلك سنبين كيف راهنت فريزر على تجاوز المفهوم الهابرماسي وراهننت على ضرورة إرساء فضاء يكفل تعايش جل الفئات الاجتماعية مختلفة الطبقات وليس حكرا على البرجوازية وبالتالي فإن فريزر تسعى جاهدة لإرساء مفهوم التعايش السلمي بين مختلف الفئات الاجتماعية.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الكلمات المفتاحية: الفضاء العمومي البرجوازي- الفضاء العمومي ما بعد برجوازي - المجتمعات الغربية - الفرد المعاصر- يورغن هابرماس - نانسي فريزر.

## 1. Introduction:

Reflecting on the concept of public sphere as understood by Habermas as a pioneer in its founding, although Hannah Arndt preceded it, they agree in establishing a new philosophical act based on the Kantian distinction between the public use of reason and its private use, many of the embarrassments and problems associated with public affairs. This is because philosophical thinking about the reality of human existence and its positioning on the line of criticism has become a common problem in contemporary political philosophy in particular.

This contribution seeks to identify Habermas' perception of public sphere as a founder of the bourgeois community and he has worked through it to fathom the structure and functioning of this sphere in order to understand the issues of contemporary societies and the limits of this perception drawn by the contemporary American philosopher Nancy Fraser's philosophical sparring between them derives its legitimacy from the tradition of Frankfurt school since its founding.

We do not seek through this research to provide a critical comparison between two inconsistent philosophical approaches to Frankfurt School fellows about their perception of public sphere. thesis on bourgeois public sphere in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to highlight its historic role in the social, political and economic development of Western societies and how Habermas' thoughts on this space has evolved in a time of globalization and the boundaries required by today's democracy after the crisis of the welfare State and the implications of the post-nation State reality.

The leftist American philosopher and the daughter of Frankfurt Nancy Fraser School did not devise a theory in public space but tried to revisit the most important pillars of her professor's public sphere concept through her critique of the bourgeois concept of public sphere.

I carefully chose to speak, first of all, about Jürgen Habermas's contribution in view of his leadership in establishing this concept, despite Arendt's previous thinking, but together they are founded to consider a new

philosophical pillar: the kantian distinction between the public use of the reason and the private use of the reason.

Although the sparring between them did not take the shape of a direct dialogue, it was advertised in a number of writings that were not written by each other, as well as the breadth of the idea between the second and third generations of the school, which was contributed by a group of generational philosophers such as Axel Honneth, Richard Rorty, Sylla Ben Habib, John Mark Ferry, Oscar Negt, etc. So how do Habermas and Nancy Fraser understand public sphere? What are the differences between them? What value addition did contemporary social philosophy actually enrich?

## **2. First Subtitle :**

Public sphere concept at Habermas In the last decade of the twentieth century, talking about public sphere and its role in building the democratic act has grown. The Habermasian vision is at the forefront of the contributions that addressed this issue in the early 1960s. It was therefore suggested that we approach his contribution to public sphere and his relationship to democracy from his readings of Kant principle of public use of reason , as well as the legitimacy of his ideas from the monetary legacy of the Frankfurt School.

Habermas " The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere : An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. The most important reference in which he thoroughly addressed his considerable contribution to the development of public sphere theory, in which he raised the close links between public sphere and civil society as political problems that in contemporary political philosophy would lead to a distinction between the area encompassing the state and its institutions on the one hand, and the private field , which relates to individuals' personal life and civil rights on the other in which he worked to determine the political and theoretical value of this concept together, And its development in the history of philosophy is followed by a focus on the real recovery of public sphere in the eighteenth century of Europe to which the rising third class and the bourgeois class contributed. And its need for this space to transcend the feudal order, by monitoring the areas of public use of the mind like literary Newspapers and magazines, public debates circulating at the time and simultaneous with

economic growth and the rise of the bourgeois at the production level and the development of industrial and financial capital.

As part of his research on public content, Habermas monitors two forms of public opinion that penetrated the European Community in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Public publicity is subject to the official. All citizens according to its purposes and who tried to justify the sum of his conclusions in his research of generality by returning to Greece, stressing that the separation between private and public spheres appeared only in modern . It forms the capitalist society and the bourgeois class that has gradually arisen within the ancient systems. (Feudalism), the bourgeoisie was characterized by the propulsion of public sphere to emerge as a political sphere aimed at freedom from the remnants of feudalism through ideological conflict in all fields (Cultural, intellectual, philosophical, scientific, economic...), Habermas - as in the case of Karl Marks - returns to developments at the ideological level To the changes taking place in the capital trade, that is, the economy, leading to the superstructuring of infrastructure, trying to invest this approach to examine the impact of production relationships, forms of exchange, and means of communication, in the emergence of the liberal pattern of bourgeois public sphere.

In his analysis of generality, Habermas criticized Hanna Arendt's idea that one of the advantages of seasonal modernity was the distinction between public and private; All human activities and daily practices, such as work, family and income, are defined by the separation of the public and political sphere from the private sphere, from the family sphere. However, it did not focus its efforts on the European capitalist society as Habermas did, it examine the issue of information (newspapers) and its role in deliberating on public affairs and discussing its issues and problems. It asserts that there is no freedom in the absence of public sphere, since freedom is the basis of this sphere in a common public space in which convergence, consensus and freedom are achieved by words and deeds. That is, public sphere is a condition of possible freedom, truth and style of thinking (especially in the Greeks), for which it is the Greeks who discovered this authentic construction of public sphere .

Public sphere penetrates into two patterns of authority, first the

prevailing and governing political power, and then the authority that derives from the social, political and economic dynamism, the institutionally unrecognized power, is not represented in official institutions, and means all kinds of social and political movements. If official political power interferes in the public space legitimately and legally and regulates citizens and guarantees them the exercise of their political and social rights and all matters relating to stability and peace Unofficial anti-power is pushing for more gains. This authority derives its legitimacy from the nature of its political, social and economic demands to ensure wider citizen engagement. And so this power is a necessary force of pressure in the vitality of the seasonal act and the movement of society, The official authority that exploits all resources, all means and all possibilities to ensure a public opinion is consistent with its practical and theoretical objectives. It can only ensure continuity and permanence with this external opposition. Although the latter should remain from a formal point of view with limited effect and not to extend its strength and dominance to all societal dynamics, thereby creating a threat to official authority.

Habermas bets that social dynamism is penetrated by three direct media that are employed to legitimize the act through authority as an intermediary employed by the State and the political community, and then money as an intermediary used by economic, commercial, financial and communication exchanges as an intermediary used by effective civil society in public sphere

Habermas stresses, therefore, that the seasonal dimension of generalism is grounded in people's everyday reality and in their conditions requiring the presence of democracy as a necessary requirement for the rationalization of the seasonal act, which has been lighted by its concern for the practical mind through its approach to the issue of democratic practice and social or political contracting, the freedom to use the public and private mind. This led to the public space being regarded as an anti-authoritarian cyber sphere calling for rights, decision-making and freedom of expression. Habermas, in his book "The Truth and Democracy" (1992) , went beyond the theory of truth as in modern philosophy, Oriented to the establishment of a new justice based on the act of communication Where he worked hard to examine the German federalism experience and the American experience in

the field of justice, He observed various contradictions in the experiences of the rightful state, thus rehabilitating the Kanti model of cosmopolitanism, recording the pioneers of American Sierra Leonean liberalism (Rawls specifically) . Public use of the mind, as viewed by John Rawls, is hampered by a number of obstacles linked specifically to impartiality in the direction of the world's visions and the attitudes of actors in constitutional institutions, which led him to reconsider the relationship between faith and knowledge in disregard of the role of debtors in public space, On the one hand, the modern right is based on clear principles. "The modern right, as I see it, is based on at least four functions in which it cannot be replaced by other media. Rights are adapted to individual freedoms. Modern right establishes this principle as follows: everything that has not been expressly prohibited is permissible. This principle reverses the morality that derives from the principle of duties, and that rights are inferred only through the convergence we assess with duties. It also has great potential, for example in the world of the economy, thanks to the actions of everyone in their own interests, On the other hand, the modern right presents itself, given that the State ratifies it as a means of cataloguing certain minimum requirements of an ethical nature and making them mandatory. Indeed, a right in force throughout a society means only a limited way of moral conduct expected of them, or of conventions we are obliged to respect.

Opinion is viewed in philosophical tradition as a general thought that has not yet attained the degree of meditation, because it is linked to the sense of everyday experience and stems from everyday practice. Its elements in Siasian thought are based on mainstream propaganda and culture, and all patterns of production based on ownership and resilience. In Habermas's view, opinions conceal the direct material interests of a class or social group that acquires the means of propaganda and production, and do not depart from the circle of individual and social interests. Public opinion, however, is associated with public sphere and cannot be isolated because public opinion is also a historical saying, as is public sphere, linked to modern circulation and is "directed by the will of the rationale of politics in the name of morality" The view from the kantian perspective is defined in the distinction between public and private use of reason, where Habermas says: "The public originally guaranteed the relationship that was established

by the general use of the reason with the legislative foundations of control as well as the monetary control of its practice. Since then, it has constituted a principle of control exercised through the ability to control a non-public opinion, leading to this unique confusion: The general public lies in the use of the public, at the same time as it is the means you use to justify ourselves towards it. «Thus, the general usage prevailed over the monetary generality» Habermas' analysis of opinion led to the affirmation of the principle of diversification that the Bourgeois took in its historical evolution over public opinion. The media and essentially the newspaper that stood on it had been transformed by market pressure, publicity and class propaganda into serving the direct material interests of the dominant class, but the Siasian press (the party newspaper), which was not linked to the pressure of propaganda, nevertheless. This shift from monetary to generic (general use). With the bourgeois public sphere, which has transformed the use of reason as an area of freedom into a propaganda and opinion-altering use for political purposes, Habermas insists that the public opinion he speaks about is the critical opinion that is formed by the public at large, since the public wanted here is « the judgement-bearing public with the ability to use reason ».

### **3. Second Subtitle:**

Critique of bourgeois public sphere theory Habermas' thesis on bourgeois public sphere occupied many of his contemporary second-generation and third-generation critical theoretical theorists, and received great attention given its both philosophical and political value. However, it found a bunch of stinging money from Nancy Fraser's side.

We will stand here on the criticism of the contemporary American philosopher Nancy Fraser of bourgeois public sphere. Its main focus was on trying to renew the thesis of critical theory, By reviewing the attitudes of the first and second generation of Frankfurt School In this context, I have reviewed the Habermas theory in public sphere or in what it calls the "liberal model of bourgeois public sphere", To demonstrate its relevance to contemporary critical theory, and to examine the political and philosophical foundations on which it was founded, In order to formulate a new thesis called "Public Sphere Beyond the Bourgeois" public sphere post-bourgeoisies.

It stresses that the first problem posed by the concept of Habermas' public sphere lies, on the one hand, in the relationship between the international community and its organs; Public expressions and citizens' associations on the other hand, the classic model of the State, socialism and Marxism, delegates economic control to the socialist State, which also monitors the total socialist citizens. The interconnectedness and ambiguity of the relationship between State agencies, public sphere and citizens' associations is due to the arbitrary and authoritarian form of the socialist State in all spaces and organizations social democracy itself, as applied by the Stalinist regimes, The same applies to the Bourgeois democracy that has encircled the political public sphere and framed it with national legal frameworks and legislation that no longer respond to citizens' needs today. in a world that needs universal citizenship in which Westphalian national boundaries are nullified.

Habermas' archeology demonstrated the greatness and degradation of bourgeois public sphere limited in history; On the other hand, he asked about the Standard Model Law for this institution, called the "Liberal Model of Bourgeois Public Sphere", whose goal, in Fraser's view, was twofold by examining the conditions that made it .

In order to establish a public sphere in which all manifestations of injustice and social justice among its various social sectors are abolished. Thus, individuals' social emancipation through this sphere is attained. "In order for public sphere theory to become relevant to the current constellation of dimensions, cultural and social studies of the media reflecting the existing communications flow map are insufficient. But critical theorists must be present, rethinking the infrastructure of institutional and normative theory. Only then can the theory of public sphere find its promising direction of emancipation " .

Thus, Fraser's interest in contemporary, dominated public sphere in various areas, especially cultural ones, thus pushing Fraser's attention to it widely, since the cultural and social studies embodied in the media seem to be insufficient to cope with the reality of public sphere, which is constantly ravaged by social problems.

From this point of view, the reality of cultural and social impoverishment embodied in capitalist regimes on the life of today's

individual and the resulting marginalization and degradation that led many people to suffer from marginalization and inferiority prompted contemporary philosophical thinking to seek solutions in line with the requirements of the current phase. So Fraser worked to address phase distortions by reintroducing the public sphere problem in line with the demands of today's humanity.

Fraser seems to have this critical outlook on public sphere, which went beyond its predecessors' second-generation view of the Frankfurt School, especially Habermas, and its formulation in this direction marked by the public sphere of individuals, on the one hand, On the other hand, it has opened a new horizon for thinking about public sphere from the perspective of multiple social problems rather than only linguistic communication, as Habermas pointed out.

Fraser's contribution to public sphere was not envisaged as Habermas did, when he was linked to the necessity of communicative action and the implications of discussion and dialogue within the public context of individuals. Because of his belief in guiding general practice towards public participation, he identifies communicative acts as follows: "Those acts where the levels of action for actors belonging to the communication process are not related to the needs of the policy, but rather to acts of understanding .

However, the current realities of contemporary societies and the transformations and changes they are witnessing at various levels have made the importance of the interdependence between public sphere and today's participatory action more urgent than ever. Today's humanity can confront complex problems that have distorted the reality of individuals and forced them to descend into immorality and ignorance. It is therefore incumbent upon contemporary philosophy to accelerate the search for solutions that will protect today's humanity from the evil of these distortions and embarrassments deep down.

We note here that Fraser did not establish a theory of public sphere in particular, but rather tried to reconsider Habermas' theory. It linked it to the contemporary realities of individuals within their current sphere and to the globalization and transnational technological phenomena of nations in time and sphere, thus giving Fraser the need to establish a post-bourgeois

public sphere that would replace the public sphere Habermas spoke of. " I oppose four hypotheses constituting the liberal model of bourgeois public sphere, identifying elements identical to the new post-bourgeois design " . Fraser's analysis of public sphere proceeds beyond the bourgeois sphere spoken by Habermas and in which Pradigm lays down the communication of communication and linguistic understanding between individuals leading to public debate between them. To speak of the far-bourgeois public sphere, which, in her view, seems to be conducive to ensuring the effective and equitable participation of women, thereby contributing to their democratization and eliminating most of the inhuman abuses committed by the bourgeois category preceding Fraser's philosophical moment.

Fraser thus argues that the Habermasian understanding of bourgeois public sphere must be overcome, perhaps mainly because of her left-wing intellectual affiliation, which is attracted to overcoming the bourgeois hegemony imposed on society's vulnerable and marginalized. We therefore find it going to the establishment of a post-bourgeois public sphere through which it aims to transcend the reality of dominance on the one hand and to protect the monetary function of this space on the other hand and within this level of writing. " a new form of public sphere must be established in order to protect the critical function of this space and the institution of democracy" .

Fraser's philosophical proposition leads us to a better human reality in which, on the one hand, the bourgeois view of current life is overtaken. Fraser thus transcends Habermas's linguistic perspective because, in her estimation, bourgeois thinking remains biased towards a social group at the expense of others who remain marginalized. and, in its estimation, linguistic communication seems unable to shape a participatory horizon within the public sphere of individuals that guarantees democracy, We between commas explicitly declare the need to go beyond that Habermaic view of public sphere and to establish a post-bourgeois social sphere that will provide justice and impartial democracy to all its members.

#### **4:Conclusion:**

The concept of public sphere has been an important philosophical

research into modern philosophers' theses since Habermas was put to the test when his book *Inspiration for Public Sphere* was published, as it constitutes the participatory sphere of individuals the sphere of living together.

Public sphere has occupied an important position in the research of contemporary social philosophy, which is what we find to be the case with modern philosophers who disagreed on it and agreed on another stage, which establishes the construction of a multiple public sphere that requires the realities of global and planetary changes. public sphere studies, so their respective contributions represented a value addition that enriched public sphere studies.

The contribution of the philosopher was to test each other's concept of public sphere. so we found a series of theoretical differences in their perception of each other. In our estimation, this is due to the living realities of both, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to some of the global changes that have taken place in public life, so that the examination of both differs from each other, which reaffirms that the concept of public sphere will continue and will change in relation to the necessity of individuals' public life.

## **5. Bibliography List :**

Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere : An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence, THE MIT PRESS , 1991.

Habermas, *l'espace public*, trad. Marc Buhot de Launay, Paris, Payot, 2006.

- Habermas, *Droit et démocratie. Entre faits et normes*, trad. R. Rochlitz et C. Bouchindhomme, Paris, Gallimard, 1997.

-Habermas Jurgan et Rawls Jean , *Débat sur la justice politique*, trad. Rainer Rochlitz ,Cerf, paris 1997.

- Habermas,Jurgen, *Théorie de l'agir communicationnel*, Trad. Jean Marc Ferry, Paris, 1987, T1.

- Fraser Nancy, *Qu'est ce que la justice sociale ?, reconnaissance et redistribution*, trad. Estelle Ferrarese, Paris, La Découverte, 2005.