

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

Giacomo Costa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

"Economic Rationality" not "Economics Rationality" as it is spelt at the moment.

The title forebodes the text.

I think that there are too many spelling mistakes in the present version of the article to make it readable. The English is also often dubious. For example, line sixth of p. 4 reads

Not quite realistic to affirm that people are constantly really do take full advantage of their self-interest",

a sentence that wouldn't probably make any sense even if the grammatical errors were removed.

In the third line of p. 5 we find

Strikely Hacking...,

where perhaps the writer meant "Strikingly".

In line 9 of the same page we find

Hackingreveal

ok, this was to be read

Hacking reveal

But Hacking is just one person, so we should wish

Hacking reveals

which is properly spelt and grammatically correct. But of course there is no revelation! What the author meant was

Hacking reports.

So it seems to me that the paper needs a thorough revision in spelling, orthography, grammar, vocabulary.

In spite of all this, I have tried to read it. The statements made in the Abstract are highly questionable. For example, it is not "rarely known that Sen's ideas are expounded as part of his dialogue with moral philosophy and epistemology", it is

well known. The article is probably mainly expository. It offers an account of Sen's thought. If it contends that Sen aims at broadening the standard economic notion of rationality rather than jettisoning it, or providing an alternative to it, isn't this not only what Sen does, but what he clearly says that he does, most clearly perhaps in his Nobel lecture? One more point, on a matter on which perhaps Sen is not crystal clear, but the author might and perhaps should be. Self-interest has nothing to do with rationality as conceived by non-Senian economists, and even less by Senian! Standard rationality does not recommend self-interest rather than altruism. It does not offer criteria to select ends. Does Senian rationality suggest otherwise?