

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

Max Stephenson Jr.¹

¹ Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I enjoyed reading your thoughtful review of Amartya Sen's seminal thinking on the question of what constitutes an appropriate basis of imagining rationality in economic thought. I can offer perhaps a half dozen perceptions for your consideration. First, your premise appears to be that the foundations for Sen's thinking are not well known but I wonder if that is so? That is, I think the bases for his broadening of existing conceptions are well known as a feature of his thought? You may want to establish that they are not going forward or recast how you justify your piece in analytic terms. The question here is, of course, what you take to be your contribution to the literature-in your cases analyses of his thinking. Second, I, at least, could not follow your use of the child abuse analogy. While I understand undergirding assumptions matter, Sen is clear on his so I was not sure what your point was here, especially since you seem ultimately to lay the entire matter to a form of academic ambition and credentialism. Third, I would suggest you avoid formulations such as "In my opinion" or "I think" in favor of laying out your arguments for your judgments as clearly as you can and letting your readers evaluate those. I assuming you mean this piece to be an article rather than an op-ed as I offer that counsel. Fourth, I found any number of sentences here simply impenetrable and I wonder if you might work with an editor to review your piece ruthlessly to ensure its clarity in those terms? While you did not paginate your effort (please do!) examples appear throughout your article. Fifth, while it is clear you have read thoughtfully and widely on the question you treat, you are not always clear when you introduce authors into your analysis how they fit into relevant literature and into the arc of your argument. Putnam, for example, simply appears without contextualization in your analysis. Taking this step would certainly help to clarify your contentions. Last, you seem to suggest near the close that Sen has proposed "common sense" and I was unclear concerning why you raised the question. Why is this so? Is it a positive or negative for you? How does his conception relate to prudence in such terms? Is that idea too, "common sense?" I would be interested in understanding better where you come down on this apparent criticism and why.