

Review of: "Economics Rationality in the World of Amartya Sen"

Romar Correa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Evi Mariani (EM) is to be complimented for accepting a hard, even if overworked, task. Not resting with appraisal, the author courageously ventures to critique and I am happy to support this endeavor.

Before proceeding, it is best to get the difficulties out of the way. EM will welcome the intervention of a good language editor. Also, recourse is taken to a lot of repetition which has some strategic appeal in such a study but there again, a wise economics editor would assist in parsimony. Expressions like "logistics economy" will be treated appropriately. Slips like Sen's "Rational Fools" not being a book will be corrected in a rewrite.

I will not be the first in advising distinguishing rationality from sister notions. Take 'Kantian optimization' in game theory for the present purpose. In a game played by EM and me, I would choose their choice variable to maximize my payoff function, EM mine to maximise theirs. Why would we do this? In equilibrium, thereby, we would escape the prison of Nash Equilibrium and the Prisoners' Dilemma and Coordination Problems. EM grimly reminds us that the unique equilibrium selected from the multiple equilibria might be a "hatred" equilibrium. Perceptive game theorists today are engaged with generating cooperative outcomes from noncooperative setups. EM's illustration of solidarity in production is perceptive. Formally, we will not have budged out of standard protocols. Also, macroeconomics is inefficient outcomes resulting from elementary exhibitions of rationality. Set up the maximization of utility functions and profit functions, introduce some spillover effects and we get a Keynes equilibrium. Furthermore, we can set up consistency axioms of choice for society. Adherence to them could be called social rationality.

On the subject, I find the selfishness-selflessness continuum of Peter Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* especially fertile.

Commitment must be fleshed out. Objective functions must be specified. Contracts, implicit or explicit, can be short-term or long-term. Marriage is 'till death do us part' or subject to a written prenuptial agreement. Commitment can be antagonistic or convivial. Capital and Labor are in eternal conflict in the Anglo-Saxon model. They cooperate over the life cycle of work in the German and Japanese models.

I embrace Sympathy with both arms and look forward to its elaboration like its connection with empathy. In both cases, it means being in sync with the other and society.

I welcome the subjection of means and ends to "reasoned scrutiny" and rather than scrutinize inwards would propose democratic dialogue with members of the community. I was pleased with the recommendation of sociology and anthropology and wistfully recalled Maurice Godelier's *Rationality and Irrationality in Economics*. Both specific topics and

general ideas would be the domain of discussion and debate. Thereby, “rationality (would be) the capacity to reconsider desire, belief and value”. Everybody would agree, for instance, that contending with climate change requires more than ‘nudges’ and a lot of fraternal arm twisting and loving pushes and shoves. EM rightly warns us of vagueness bordering on vacuity in an overly generous interpretation of Sen.