“The bourgeois public sphere may be conceived above all as the sphere of private people come together as a public; they soon claimed the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in a debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatized but publicly relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labor. The medium of this political confrontation was peculiar and without historical precedent: people’s public use of their reason” (Habermas STPS 27).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifeworld</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>PUBLIC SPHERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Habermas prizes conversation, reading and plain speech as worthy forms of discourse for a democratic culture and is frankly hostile to theatre, courtly forms, ceremony, the visual, and to rhetoric more generally. The brief flowering of the bourgeois public sphere is sandwiched, in STPS’s narrative, between two moments of ‘representation’: feudal pomp and modern PR.” (Peters 1993, 562)
“Actually Existing Democracy”
1. the assumption that it is possible for interlocutors in a public sphere to bracket status differentials and to deliberate "as if" they were social equals; the assumption, therefore, that societal equality is not a necessary condition for political democracy;

2. the assumption that the proliferation of a multiplicity of competing publics is necessarily a step away from, rather than toward, greater democracy, and that a single, comprehensive public sphere is always preferable to a nexus of multiple publics;

3. the assumption that discourse in public spheres should be restricted to deliberation about the common good, and that the appearance of "private interests" and "private issues" is always undesirable;

4. the assumption that a functioning democratic public sphere requires a sharp separation between civil society and the state. (Fraser 1992, 62–63)
subaltern counterpublics (67)
1. An adequate conception of the public sphere requires not merely the bracketing, but rather the elimination, of social inequality.

2. A multiplicity of publics is preferable to a single public sphere both in stratified societies and egalitarian societies.

3. A tenable conception of the public sphere would countenance not the exclusion, but the inclusion, of interests and issues that bourgeois masculinist ideology labels "private" and treats as inadmissible.

4. A defensible conception would allow both for strong publics and for weak publics and that it would theorize the relations among them (Fraser 1992, 77)