

THE CONCEPT OF 'RATIONALITY' IN THE PRACTICAL SPHERE

EL CONCEPTO DE 'RACIONALIDAD' EN EL ÁMBITO PRÁCTICO

CARLOS ÉMILIO GARCÍA DUQUE*

Universidad de Caldas, Universidad de Manizales, Colombia. carlos.garcía_d@ucaldas.edu.co

RECIBIDO EL 25 DE FEBRERO DE 2019, APROBADO EL 30 DE JULIO DE 2019

ABSTRACT RESUMEN

In this paper, I shall attempt a characterization of Smith's concept of 'rationality' in the practical sphere. My goal is to show that Smith's requirements of rationality (as inspired by Williams) cannot provide a good and workable account of what it means to be a fully rational agent. To this end, I shall examine Williams' internalist requirement on reason and discuss the main shortcomings of such account of rationality. I shall try to show, also, that Smith's and Williams' views on rationality are too restrictive and thus cannot be applied to ordinary agents who deliberate in real life.

KEY WORDS

The internalist requirement on reasons, rationality, practical sphere, Fully rational agent, Less than fully rational agent, Smith, Williams.

En este artículo intentaré ofrecer una caracterización del concepto de 'racionalidad' en el ámbito práctico de Smith. Me propongo mostrar que los requisitos de racionalidad que él establece (en tanto se basan en Williams) no logran proporcionar una explicación apropiada y funcional de lo que significa ser un agente completamente racional. Para este fin, examinaré el requisito internalista de la razón en Williams y discutiré los principales defectos de esa versión de racionalidad. También trataré de mostrar que los planteamientos sobre la racionalidad de Smith y los de Williams son demasiado restrictivos y que, en consecuencia, no se pueden aplicar al caso de agentes ordinarios que deliberan en la vida real.

PALABRAS CLAVE

El requisito internalista de las razones, racionalidad, ámbito de la práctica, agente completamente racional, agente no-completamente racional, Smith, Williams.

*  orcid.org/0000-0002-9248-8095 Google Scholar



Introduction

There is no doubt whatsoever that when an agent involves herself in practical action she must have some reasons¹ that impel her to perform the aforementioned action while guiding the course of her doing. We can assume that reasons for action lie on facts that constitute a case for (or against) the performance of an action or come from previously accepted propositions that are the product of deliberation. Epistemic reasons are reasons for believing in a proposition through being facts which are part of a case for belief in its truth (taking into account 'truth-related' considerations). These two claims are controversial and their clarification may help the work of meta-ethicists.

To begin with, it is far from clear whether available epistemic reasons are sufficient to warrant belief since not only truth-related considerations figure among those determining the sufficiency of a specific case. In fact, the factors or principles which determine whether the case for the truth of a proposition is adequate to warrant belief are not necessarily reasons for belief. On the other hand, it has been argued that simplicity, elegance, explanatory power, or other such considerations govern rational belief or theory acceptance. But this is so, while theory acceptance is understood for what it is: acceptance of theories, regardless of belief in them. On these considerations, the simplicity of a proposition or a theory is not always a reason to believe it, although it might suffice to their acceptance. In this context, accepting a proposition is conducting oneself according to the belief that there is sufficient reason to act if we assume the true of that proposition. Aside of the known difficulties of formulating a satisfactory theory that combines appropriately epistemic reasons and practical reasons, capable of explaining in a rational way actions in the practical sphere, we have to deal with the problem of correctly identifying the source of such reasons. Acceptance of the proposition that *P* furnishes a good reason to act implies the claim that one is justified to act as if *P*; that is, that one has good reasons to act. But, as Williams argues, it is convenient to refine the treatment of reasons and be aware that they

¹In what follows the word 'reasons' is used, in general, to refer to normative reasons (with the adjective added only occasionally to underline the point). As customary, reasons are treated as relational. 'P is a reason' means that there is someone and some action or belief so that P is a reason for that person to have that belief or to perform that action. However, recent literature introduces several kinds of reasons that can be of use for a better understanding of the key problems in practical reason. For example, Alvarez distinguishes among three kinds of reasons: normative, motivating and explanatory (Alvarez, 2018).

can be internal or external (Williams, 1981).² In what follows, I shall examine Smith's interpretation of the so called "internalist requirement of reasons" and discuss the construal of rationality surrounding such interpretation.

According to Smith's interpretation of the "internalist requirement on reasons", this requirement states that the desirability of an agent's Φ -ing in certain circumstances C depends on whether or not he would desire that he Φ s in C if he were fully rational. The internalist theorist distinguishes two models, namely the example model and the advice model, that might explain how a less than fully rational agent, who finds himself in circumstances in which a decision to Φ can take place, may deliberate in order to act in a way or another. In his paper "Internal Reasons" Michael Smith contends that the example model is wrong and makes an argument for the advice model (Smith, 1995). He also endorses Williams's suggestion as to what being a fully rational agent amounts to. As previously announced, in this paper I will pursue a threefold goal. I shall argue that Smith's criticism of the example model is not conclusive, I shall make some critical remarks on Williams's characterization of fully rational deliberative agents and, finally, I shall offer a formulation of the requirements a rational agent must meet to Φ in certain circumstances.

The example model and the advice model

To begin with, let us take a look at the differences between the example model and the advice model. Consider two worlds: the evaluating world and the evaluated world. To make things easier suppose the evaluating world is inhabited by the agent's fully rational self (hereafter FRS) and the evaluated world is inhabited by the agent's less than fully rational self (hereafter LFRS). We can reformulate now the internalist requirement in terms of this construal by establishing that the desirability of the agent's

² In his "Internal and external reasons" Williams explains this in the following way: "Sentences of the forms 'A has a reason to φ ' or 'There is a reason for A to φ ' (where ' φ ' stands in for some verb of action) seem on the face of it to have two different sorts of interpretation. On the first, the truth of the sentence implies, very roughly, that A has some motive which will be served or furthered by his φ -ing, and if this turns out not to be so the sentence is false: there is a condition relating to the agent's aims, and if this is not satisfied it is not true to say, on this interpretation, that he has a reason to φ . On the second interpretation, there is no such condition, and the reason-sentence will not be falsified by the absence of an appropriate motive. I shall call the first the 'internal', the second the 'external', interpretation. (Given two such interpretations, and the two forms of sentence quoted, it is reasonable to suppose that the first sentence more naturally collects the internal interpretation, and the second the external, but it would be wrong to suggest that either form of words admits only one of the interpretations.)" (Williams, 1981: 101)

Φ -ing in the evaluated world is fixed “by some processes and decisions that occur in the *evaluating* world.” (Smith, 1995:2). According to Smith, we have to imagine that the agent’s FRS looks from his world across the world of the agent’s LFRS, and forms a desire about what the agent’s LFRS should do. Presumably, the agent’s FRS takes into account his own set of desires (which should be rational) and the circumstances in which the agent’s LFRS finds himself. However, for the sake of discussion, we have to keep in mind that there is only one agent, although we have agreed to consider two aspects of him separated in two communicated worlds³.

The kind of separation instantiated in the two-worlds metaphor, though somewhat artificial has proved illuminating for the explanatory purposes of cognitivists and philosophers. It allows them to explain phenomena like metacognition and reasoning techniques like *soliloquium*. Let us see if it has the same positive outcome in theory of action.⁴ In the advice model, the agent’s FRS gives advice about what to do to his LFRS. In this model, the desirability of the agent’s Φ -ing in the *evaluated* world depends on whether his fully rational self in the evaluating world would desire that he (the agent) Φ s in the evaluated world. By contrast, in the example model the desirability of the agent’s Φ -ing in the evaluated world depends on whether his FRS (which is in the evaluating world) would desire to Φ in the *evaluating world*. Notice that in this model the agent’s FRS is not giving advice to himself, but rather setting his own behavior (in his own world) as an example to be followed by the LFRS that inhabits the evaluated world.

Smith argues that the example model is wrong. Since he presents his case by reworking an example by Watson (1975/1982), let me quote the situation *in extenso*:

Suppose I have just been defeated in a game of squash.
The defeat has been so humiliating that, out of anger and
frustration, I am consumed with a desire to smash my

³On the other hand, it can be argued that such an agent is an idealization which represents the fully rational deliberative agent par excellence, but I believe this claim will not affect my discussion.

⁴ It is far from clear that issues in the theory of action are related exclusively with meta-ethics and moral philosophy. Some thinkers, like Schroeder, classify their problems in the field of the philosophy of mind. “There is a topic (...) that should be receiving regular attention from philosophers of mind but is not: practical rationality. The philosophy of mind bears directly upon what can be called the ‘meta-theory’ of practical rationality, and meta-theories of rationality likewise impose constraints on the philosophy of mind. Philosophers of mind who do not engage with work on practical rationality risk developing theories that are blind to important theoretical demands.” (Schroeder, 2010: 394)

opponent in the face with my racket. But if I were fully rational, we will suppose, I wouldn't have any such desire at all. My desire to smash him in the face is wholly and solely the product of anger and frustration, something we can rightly imagine away when we imagine me in my cool and calm fully rational state. The consideration that will motivate me if I were fully rational is rather that I could show good sportsmanship by striding right over and shaking my opponent by the hand. In that case, does it follow that what I have reason to do *in my uncalm and uncool state* is stride right over and shake him by the hand? (Smith, 1995: 3)

Smith grants that a FRS might have the desire of shaking hands with the victorious opponent, but he denies that a LFRS could have a reason to do this, *even* if his FRS sets that desire as an example. Smith feels that, on the contrary, given the state of anger and frustration which precisely originated the desire of smashing the opponent in his face, the LFRS must avoid physical proximity with his opponent, so that he can avoid acting upon a desire that was created out of anger and frustration. What the LFRS has reason to do in this case, Smith argues, "is to smile politely and leave the scene as soon as possible." (Smith, 1995: 4) On Smith's account, apparently the example model fails because the LFRS would be incapable of following his FRS example, due to the particular circumstances in which he finds himself.⁵ The advice model would prove workable, since what the FRS would advise his LFRS on the spur of the moment would probably be to leave the scene quickly.

Several precisions need to be made here. First of all, let me call to your attention the distinction that must be established between an agent's FRS and the same agent's LFRS. Although neither of those is adequately defined in Smith's paper, we can agree that the FRS is free of emotions, is always in a "calm and cool" state; deliberates rationally (this will be discussed later on) and is capable of reasoning in such a way that his decisions and desires can be set out as examples to be followed by his LFRS. On the other hand, the latter can have desires that stem from

⁵ There are several kinds of practical irrationality, including those instances in which the agent's behavior fails to conform to a guiding directive and reveals an inconsistency between her acts and her practical reasons. "People who do not act on her judgments regarding what they ought to do – their practical judgments – are often considered weak-willed, especially when the judgment is made in a time when the act if favors is plainly possible" (Audi, 2013: p. 1). For a detailed discussion of the main kinds of practical reason and an examination of the criteria to assess them see also Audi (2004).

emotions; that is, can have desires and act according to them, in a way that would not be approved by the FRS. Let us put aside for the moment the fact that human nature precludes the possibility of a world of purely FRSs, or even the possibility that we can desire and consequently act all the time as one of them. Let us focus on Smith's example. What prevents the FRS from advising his LFRS that he shakes hands with his opponent? Smith contends that the FRS would advise his LFRS to leave the scene quickly because the physical proximity might tempt him to act upon his previous (irrational) desire, that is, that the former would give such advice for practical reasons, a plausible account. However, nothing prevents the FRS from advising his LFRS to show good sportsmanship. After all, if the agent is deliberating; that is, if the LFRS is giving a second thought to his violent initial desire, why he could not follow the best possible advice? Smith seems to believe that the LFRS is so irrational⁶ that his FRS has to compromise and settle up for a less undesirable desire, instead of conveying the best one in his advice. Furthermore, he seems to think that deliberative rationality (including evaluation of background conditions, for example) will lead to the FRS to forget what he would do (were he to act) and advise something intermediate. But Smith's distinction between the example model and the advice model is not sharp enough if it is going to be grounded only on what the FRS would do if he were to act in certain circumstances and what he would advise his LFRS in the same circumstances.⁷

⁶ Perhaps, this could be grounded on the fact that, as Hume convincingly argued, reason is always the slave of passions. Those who follow Hume's views often conclude that irrational action (or practical irrationality) is not possible since we always match our accounts of rationality and motivation. However, "What determines what it is rational to do should be the agent's dispositional desire strengths. Our normative intuitions about rationality concern these states. Since the action that desire motivates us most strongly to do at the moment of action may not be the action that would best satisfy our dispositional desires, irrational action is possible." (Sinhababu, 2011)

⁷ The source of the problem with Smith's distinction between the example model and the advice model is the fact that neither the FRS acts in the evaluated world nor does he act in the evaluating world. Strictly speaking, the FRS is not an agent who might act empirically, though he is capable of deliberating and of considering statements of the form "If I were in the LFRS's situation, then ... I would do X or I would desire that the LFRS did X". On the other hand, in both models the FRS considers what should be done in the *evaluated* world. In the example model, the FRS reasons out of counterfactuals by considering what he, the FRS would do if he were in the circumstances in which his pupil, the LFRS, finds himself, and he, the FRS, sets his own behavior as an example. In the advice model he seems to give consideration to the actual possibilities open to the LFRS (given his particular weaknesses) and gives an advice which might be not fully rational or moral, but which can be (practically) followed by the LFRS. But this leads us to accept that whereas in the example model the FRS is consistent with his own assessment of the situation, in the advice model he would do one thing, but he advises another quite different. My general impression on this matter is that the distinction is flawed and needs to be reworked in a way that eliminates the problems it has or be replaced by another one capable of doing the same job, without the shortcomings identified.

Notice that Smith's argument presupposes that either the FRS or the LFRS might act (there is not doubt as to the fact that they both can have desires). Even granting that the FRS's acts are merely counterfactual⁸ as they appear to be in both models, some problems arise. Let us go back to the squash game for a moment. We devote a lot of time in our culture to teaching the rules of social games. Although we promote competence we also point out sportsmanship, and we expect the principles of good sportsmanship to hold everywhere, from school to the professional fields. It is true that we see a lot of violent, irrational or uncivilized behavior in sport games but we condemn such instances of irrational behavior. We expect good sportsmen to act according to the most rational desirable attitude (shaking hands). To foster this kind of behavior, we insist on self-control, which is an alternative name for deliberation in the case we are discussing. Probably the defeated contender in a squash game would have (momentarily) the desire of smashing his opponent, but if he is capable of deliberating, there is nothing that prevents him from shaking hands instead of smashing the face of his opponent. If the FRS is in control of the situation, that is, if he can act *after* deliberation, he would surely shake hands, but if he is not in the position to actually act, nothing prevents him from advising his LFRS of doing what he, the FRS would do in the same circumstances. If this account is correct, the distinction between the advice model and the example model becomes artificial, a matter of mere ways of presenting the facts, since we can have the same story we have been telling with the two models, just by appealing to instances in which the agent shows good sportsmanship and self-control and instances in which his behavior betrays a total lack of self-control.⁹

In the practical sphere (real world) many people act exactly as the FRS would do. Take the cases of politicians, professional sportsmen, and many more public figures. It could be argued that the motivation for their actions stems from wrong or selfish desires (keeping a good public image, for instance) but this does not prove that there are no cases of good rational deliberation. Smith argues that the FRS would advise

⁸ This will be problematic any way, since there is nothing in Smith's argument that precludes the FRS of desiring and acting. Such acts could be exceptional but they are not ruled out by the conditions of the internalist.

⁹ According to Velleman, the dichotomy between "internal reasons" or those reasons that count as reasons by virtue of someone's antecedent inclinations and "external" reasons or those which count as reasons for someone independently of his inclinations is a false one (Velleman, 1996). Smith and Williams seem to endorse the Humean conclusion that implies that all reasons are internal. Examining our present problem in the light of externalism exceeds the scope of this paper.

his LFRS to leave the scene of the game, regarding the circumstances in which the LFRS finds himself. I already suggested that, on Smith's account, this might be so because upon rational deliberation the FRS thinks that leaving the scene is the best thing to do. However, we can conjecture different reasons to support such a conclusion, and not every reason will be compatible with Smith's view. We can conjecture, for example, that the FRS knows that his LFRS is incapable of doing what he would do because his LFRS can hardly control his emotions; we can conjecture that the FRS does not trust his LFRS willingness to follow hard or unpleasant advices, but we can also speculate that from the fact that an advice is something that one is not forced to follow, the FRS gives the one he thinks his LFRS is more likely to accept.

The two worlds metaphor

It appears that the two worlds metaphor in which the example and the advice models are developed is misleading. Smith says that the FRS looks across his world (the *evaluating* world) to his LFRS (who is located in the *evaluated* world). Both, the FRS and the LFRS have desires, but the LFRS's desires are subject to evaluation, and the criterion of evaluation should be the FRS's own desires. The first inconsistency that strikes me in the example model is that the FRS's desire takes place in the evaluating world but it is also aimed to the evaluating world. But presumably, the *evaluating* world is not a world in which anyone, not even the FRS, can act. Acts are carried out only in the evaluated world. One can only wish that the LFRS would act following the example. However, things are not better on the side of the advice model. In this model the FRS would form a desire (in the *evaluating* world) about what his LFRS should do in the *evaluated* world, and then he advises his LFRS to act accordingly. It is obvious that in both models we have cross-world communication, so this fact cannot account for the difference between them. How are they different anyway? We lack a clear-cut answer, but it is obvious that at the end of the day both models can mix up together. Perhaps the source of this confusion could be the fact that in both models we are dealing with the case of a self who deliberates by reasoning with himself, that is, with one self who sometimes behaves up to the highest standards of rationality and sometimes behaves less rationally, regarding the circumstances, but who could do his best given enough time and right training in rational deliberation. It seems, then, that the separation of the self into such components is not that productive for the theory of action.

Before moving on to the last section, let me make one more comment. On Smith's account the "example model of the internalism requirement thus gives us the wrong answer in cases in which what we have reason to do is in part determined by the fact that we are irrational" (Smith, 1995:4)¹⁰. In a charitable reading of this paragraph we would have to understand that he is considering the LFRS desire of smashing his opponent in the face as a desire formed out of sheer irrationality. But we have to remind ourselves of the fact that though we are not fully rational, this does not entail that we are irrational, *simpliciter*. We may act, sometimes, in irrational ways but that does not make us irrational beings in the same way that failing to reason in a fully rational mode (or committing mistakes during the process) does not entail that we are incapable of engaging in good reasoning practices. Quite differently, rationality and irrationality are not the horns of a dilemma, they are the standards with which we judge and classify actions and processes which we perform and that we consider worth of critical analysis.

Rationality and acting rationally

Let us deal now with the characterization of rationality. As mentioned it earlier, nothing has been said about the meaning of the expression 'fully rational'. Smith fills up this gap by endorsing Williams's similar analysis of the subject of internal reasons. Any agent that we are to consider fully rational in the practical sphere has to meet three conditions:

- (i) the agent must have no false beliefs
- (ii) the agent must have all relevant true beliefs
- (iii) the agent must deliberate correctly (Smith, 1995:4)

Smith believes that Williams's conditions (i) through (iii) provide a fairly accurate account of the idea of what it means to be practically rational.¹¹

¹⁰ The situation is a little bit more complex, since Smith stipulates that the circumstances in which a FRS finds himself and forms desires do not include his own irrationality.

¹¹ But sooner or later, conditions (i)-(iii) will bring into the picture the normative requirement of knowledge, since having only true beliefs is a key component of its canonic definition. Gao argues that we might be in a better position renouncing the stringent requirements of knowledge and trying to combine epistemic and doxastic conditions. As a matter of fact, the claim that knowledge is the norm of practical reasoning is defeated by instances in which "we use "knowing" in a loose sense, meaning "being certain" or "truly believing" (...). Moreover, in some cases the knowledge norm seems to fail to deliver the right verdict. For example, it seems that the knowledge norm cannot accommodate intuitions in Gettier-style cases in which the subject is blameless in treating a justified true belief that *p* as a reason for acting, even in the absence of knowledge." (Gao, 2017: p. 1902)

However, he disagrees with the role Williams's account confers to imagination in the process of deliberating correctly, and for this reason he thinks those conditions require supplementation and amendment. I am not going to enter into the details of Smith's argument for this contention since my main interest here lies in the characterization of practical rationality that both Smith and Williams share.

At first sight this characterization seems to work fairly well. There is a glass in front of me that contains gin and petrol (a rather unusual mix, but certainly a possible one), but I mistakenly believe it contains gin and tonic and I form the desire to drink from it. Here condition (i) is violated. To Φ in this case (*i.e.*, to drink from the glass) would be objectively undesirable, and my desire to do so can be explained solely because of the fact that a false belief misleads me into desiring what I should not if I were not mistaken.¹² But suppose I do not risk myself into guessing what the glass contains, and consequently I do not form any desires (in particular, I do not desire to drink from the glass). Does this mean that drinking the stuff in the glass would be objectively undesirable? Absolutely not. Because it may turn out that the glass contains "the most delicious drink imaginable" and my failure to desire to Φ in this case has to be attributed to the fact that I lack the relevant true beliefs. In this instance, violation of condition (ii) explains why I may fail to desire something that I would, if I were fully rational in the sense of (i) through (ii). Finally, deliberation aimed to the formation of new desires requires the interaction of beliefs and desires and condition (iii), because even meeting conditions (i) and (ii) we may fail to Φ in cases in which Φ -ing will still be desirable.¹³

Nevertheless, conditions (i) and (ii) indeed require some clarification. If they are to be considered workable, then they have to be relativized to particular cases. We cannot seriously hold (i) and (ii) in a general non-relativized way simply because there is no human agent that has all

¹² In a parallel way to the Gettier counterexamples it is not difficult to show that an agent acts in the wrong way in deception scenarios. Logins has challenged the role of justification in these cases and has showed that justification norms of action and practical deliberation yield unacceptable results very often. Accordingly, he calls for a rejection of such norms (Logins, 2014).

¹³ Smith believes that the abnormal conditions that a deliberating agent might face (anger and frustration, for instance) are not precluded by conditions (i) through (iii). Of course, he knows it is important to decide the role we will allow to emotions in a theory of rational decision. I think he rightly shows the solution to this problem. It is clear that condition (iii) (the condition of correct deliberation) does preclude the effects of emotions on deliberation. Besides, conditions (i) through (iii) provide a characterization of a fully rational agent, and by definition only a FRS can act like that.

relevant true beliefs (about all possible objects of desire) or that totally lacks false beliefs about some thing or another. But conditions (i) and (ii) are still problematic, even in a relativized construal. Let me suggest two ways in which this problematic feature can be illustrated: 1. No matter how simple a possible object of desire might look, the set of beliefs about it seems to be always open-ended. It may be the case that we cannot have all the possible true beliefs about such an object just because some tiny aspect of it has escaped our attention. In other words, whether or not a human agent has all the relevant true beliefs about something is always a disputable fact. 2. Condition (i) seems to contradict the basic tenets of some widely accepted theories of rationality. *Mutatis mutandis*, in Popperian critical rationalism, for example, rational deliberation is a process in which the deliberating agent tests his beliefs against experience.¹⁴ If there is a conflict between the belief and the relevant part of experience then the agent rejects the false belief and replaces it with a new one, which in its turn has to be tested again. There is a long and ongoing process of correction (elimination of error) that refines the set of beliefs and that provides the agent with the best possible set of beliefs (one containing as few false beliefs as possible). But in all stages of this process we might still have (or form) false beliefs. To sum, a working definition of rationality does not have to exclude false beliefs, on the contrary, it has to accommodate them and provide a working method to suppress them. Granted, false beliefs might mislead the agent and lead him to make the wrong choice or desire what is not desirable. But in the long run, the agent will be able to refine his set of beliefs and make better choices, desire what is desirable, and act accordingly.¹⁵

This way of looking at the question of rational deliberation seems to give a better account of two well known facts. The fact that we devote a great amount of time trying to teach our children to desire and act in ways we consider right, and the fact that in certain circumstances even mature individuals sometimes hesitate and look for advice, not from

¹⁴ Strictly speaking a Popperian would not feel comfortable with my use of the word "belief", since critical rationalism deals with statements (true or false) which are objective, and not with subjective mental states. But I think I am entitled to this loose way of speaking because my point does not hinge on this aspect of the doctrine.

¹⁵ Recent literature (quoted above) indicates that we can formulate a working account of practical reason (as well as one of rational motivation) without epistemic constraints like truth and full undefeatable knowledge. This suggestion is perfectly compatible with a Popperian view on reasons and rationality (like the one I sketch in this paper) given the insistence of Popper's on the objectivity of knowledge and his rejection of subjective epistemic values and the reduction of epistemological discussions to an examination of mere mental states. I have discussed at length the particularities of this theory in Garcia (2006) and Garcia (2019).

their FRSs but from someone who might have more experience, more knowledge or simply more ingenuity about practical matters. Regarding the distinction between a FRS and a LFRS, it seems that the qualifier “fully” could be dropped out with no harm to the overall argument. If one is reluctant to do that, then I suggest to interpret that qualifier in a weak sense (which anyway would be compatible with Smith’s account since he attributes a certain degree of irrationality to the FRS). In this weak sense, a fully rational agent is one who is able to test critically his reasons (through rational deliberation) and upon reflection is able to make the necessary changes in his subjective motivational set, form the right desires and act accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, Maria. Reasons for action, acting for reasons, and rationality. *Synthese*, 2018: 195, pp. 3293–3310
- Audi, Robert. The Practical Authority of Normative Beliefs: Toward an Integrated Theory of Practical Rationality. *Organon*, 2013: F 20 (4), pp. 527-545
- Audi, Robert. Reasons, Practical Reason, and Practical Reasoning. *Ratio (new series)* 2004: XVII, 2, pp. 119-149
- Garcia, C. E. Popper. El conocimiento objetivo y el mundo tres. Manizales: Universidad de Caldas, 2019.
- Garcia, C. E. Popper’s theory of science. An apologia. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Gao, Jie. Rational action without knowledge (and vice versa). *Synthese*, 2017: 194:1901–1917
- Logins, Arturs. The problem of massive deception for justification norms of action. *Acta Analytica*, 2014: 220, 1, pp. 1-20
- Schroeder, Timothy. Practical rationality is a problem in the philosophy of mind. *Philosophical Issues*, 20, *Philosophy of Mind*, 2010: pp. 394-409
- Sinhababu, Neil. The Humean Theory of Practical Irrationality. *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy*. 2011: 6,1, pp. 1-13
- Smith, Michael. Internal Reasons. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. 1995: LV, No. 1.

Velleman, J. David. The possibility of Practical Reason. *Ethics*, 1996: 106, No. 4, pp. 694-726.

Watson, Gary. "Free Agency". (1975) Reprinted in Gary Watson, ed., *Free Will*. Oxford University Press. 1982

Williams, Bernard. "Internal and external reasons." In: *Moral Luck*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. p. 101-113 109

Como citar:

García Duque, Carlos E. "The concept of 'rationality' in the practical sphere". *Discusiones Filosóficas*. Jul.- Dic. 20 (35), 2019: 31-43. DOI: 10.17151/difil.2019.20.35.3.