

Is it too far-fetched to see in Whitehead's threefold distinction with respect to the art of life—i.e., (1) to live; (2) to live well; and (3) to live better—a basis for my (and Habermas'!) threefold distinction with respect to the function of reason between (1) making or implying claims to validity; (2) validating validity claims immediately, on the primary level of self-understanding and life-praxis; and (3) validating validity claims mediately, on the secondary level of critical reflection and proper theory?

I don't think so. For one thing, the whole point of consuetudinary norms, presumably, is not merely to live, but to live well, by living in accordance with norms defining what it means to do so. For another thing, the only way to better life is to be sure that consuetudinary norms themselves are valid; and this can be done, in the nature of the case, only by critically validating one's claims to validity mediately, on the secondary level of critical reflection and proper theory.

28 November 2000