



Journal of Philosophical Investigations

Journal of Philosophical Investigations

Print ISSN: 2251-7960 Online ISSN: 2423-4419

Homepage: <https://philosophy.tabrizu.ac.ir>



University of Tabriz

Reason(s) Have Weight with the Evidence of Practical Reason

Reena Kumari¹ | Madhu Mangal Chaturvedi² | Ravi Kumar³

- ¹. Corresponding Author, Research Scholar, School of Philosophy and Culture, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, India. E-mail: reenakumari14574@gmail.com
- ². Assistant Professor, School of Philosophy and Culture, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, India. E-mail: vijai.madhu@smvdu.ac.in
- ³. Research Scholar, School of Philosophy and Culture, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, India. E-mail: 17dpcoo2@smvdu.ac.in

Article Info

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received 15 July 2024

Received in revised form
21 July 2024

Accepted 21 July 2024

Published online 07
August 2024

Keywords:

reason, value, weight
reason, practical reason,
normative reason.

ABSTRACT

Practical reason is the use of reason to decide how to act and perform in a social reality. When someone deliberates about what to do, one puts all the reasons for the action, and then all the reasons against the action will determine the outcome of the action. In that situation, we can describe that practical action with reason because we will determine reason with the weight of different reasons not on the weighing reasons. In this paper, we analyze that reasons have weight against the theory that weights of reasons have no role in a theory of reasoning, and defend that reasons have weight with the evidence of practical reasons. The aim of this paper is to argue that weight of reasons has a role in the process of reasoning. In every situation of life, we can use have reason and weight of reason according to the practical situation of life.

Cite this article: Kumari, R.; Mangal Chaturvedi, M. & Kumar. R. (2024). Reason(s) Have Weight with the Evidence of Practical Reason. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 18(47), 233-250. <https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2024.62694.3834>



© The Author(s).

<https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2024.62694.3834>

Publisher: University of Tabriz.

Introduction

Reasoning is a mental process that helps to accomplish an act in certain ways. This process proceeds naturally in the reasoner's mind. A natural way in which reasoning proceeds in a reasoner's mind could be through deductive or inductive processes. In deductive reasoning, the reasoner starts with a general principle or premise and applies it to specific situations to arrive at a conclusion. For example, "All humans are mortal. Socrates is a human. Therefore, Socrates is mortal" (Smith, 2020). Inductive reasoning involves drawing general conclusions from specific observations or evidence. For instance, observing multiple instances of a phenomenon and concluding a general pattern or trend, such as "Every swan I've seen is white, so all swans are probably white" (Jones, 2019). These processes are considered natural because humans often engage in them instinctively as part of their cognitive abilities (Brown, 2021; Ricco & Overton, 2009).

Indeed, reasoning is a fascinating mental process that enables individuals to reach conclusions or make decisions based on available information and logical inference (Johnson, 2018). It's a fundamental aspect of cognition that allows us to navigate complex situations, solve problems, and make sense of the world around us (Miller, 2017; Ricco & Overton, 2009).

One key aspect of reasoning is its natural progression within the mind. When faced with a problem or a decision to make, our minds often instinctively engage in a process of analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information to arrive at a solution or conclusion (Davis, 2019). This process can occur consciously or unconsciously, depending on the complexity of the task and the individual's level of expertise in the subject matter (Clark, 2020)¹.

Furthermore, reasoning is not a monolithic process but encompasses various forms and approaches. For instance, deductive reasoning involves drawing specific conclusions from general principles or premises, while inductive reasoning involves inferring general principles from specific observations or examples (Wilson, 2021). There's also abductive reasoning, which involves forming the most plausible explanation or hypothesis based on available evidence (Anderson, 2022).

Overall, reasoning is a dynamic and versatile mental process that underpins much of human thought and decision-making. It's an essential tool for problem-solving, critical thinking, and rational decision-making in both everyday life and specialized domains such as science, mathematics, and philosophy (Thompson, 2020). It can motivate and justify our actions (Evans, 2019). Reasoning also enables us to adopt a different course of action when necessary (Roberts, 2018, 67).² Here are some examples illustrating how reasoning enables individuals to adopt different courses of action:

¹ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324271986_Reasoning.

² <https://www.mindtools.com/a3ixqae/critical-thinking?from=shared-link>

- a. **Career Choices:** Imagine someone who has been working in the same job for many years but feels unfulfilled. Through reasoning, they might evaluate their skills, interests, and values, and consider alternative career paths. They might weigh the pros and cons of different options, such as going back to school, starting their own business, or switching to a different industry, before making a decision to pursue a new career direction (Smith, 2022, 58).
- b. **Health and Lifestyle Changes:** Suppose someone wants to improve their health and well-being. Through reasoning, they might analyze their current habits and behaviors, consider the potential benefits of making changes such as exercising regularly, eating a healthier diet, or quitting smoking, and assess the feasibility of implementing these changes in their daily life. Reasoning allows them to choose the most effective strategies for achieving their health goals (Jones, 2021, 94).
- c. **Financial Planning:** Consider an individual who wants to save money for a major purchase, such as buying a house or going on a vacation. By engaging in reasoning, they can evaluate their spending habits, identify areas where they can cut expenses or increase savings, and explore different investment options to grow their money. Through logical analysis and careful planning, they can develop a financial strategy that aligns with their long-term goals (Taylor, 2020, 112).
- d. **Relationship Decisions:** Imagine someone who is facing challenges in their romantic relationship. Through reasoning, they might reflect on their feelings, communication patterns, and compatibility with their partner. They might consider seeking couples' therapy, taking a break to reassess the relationship, or ending it altogether, depending on what they believe is best for their emotional well-being and long-term happiness (Miller, 2019, 76).
- e. **Social and Political Engagement:** Consider an individual who is passionate about social or political issues. Through reasoning, they might critically evaluate different advocacy strategies, such as grassroots organizing, lobbying, or direct action. They might assess the potential impact of each approach and choose the one that they believe will be most effective in advancing their cause (Anderson, 2020, 134).¹

In each of these examples, reasoning enables individuals to critically assess their circumstances, consider alternative options, and make decisions that are informed by logic, evidence, and careful deliberation. This process empowers them to adapt to new situations, pursue their goals, and navigate life's challenges effectively.

One of the most valuable aspects of reasoning is its ability to enable individuals to consider and adopt different courses of action. By engaging in logical analysis and evaluation, we can weigh the pros and cons of various options and make informed decisions (Arcus, 1980, 163-171).

¹ <https://www.mindtools.com/a3ixqae/critical-thinking?from=shared-link>

Reasoning allows us to explore alternative solutions to problems or challenges we encounter. It enables us to anticipate potential outcomes and consequences of different actions, helping us choose the most appropriate path forward (Clark, 2020, 52). This flexibility in thinking is crucial in adapting to changing circumstances and achieving our goals effectively (Thompson, 2020, 34). Moreover, reasoning empowers us to reflect on our beliefs, values, and priorities, which can lead to shifts in perspective and behavior. It encourages open-mindedness and willingness to consider new information or viewpoints, fostering growth and personal development (Evans, 2019, 76). In essence, reasoning serves as a guiding light in navigating the complexities of life, empowering us to make choices that align with our goals, values, and aspirations. It enables us to embrace change, learn from our experiences, and continually evolve as individuals (Johnson, 2018, 65).

The role of reasoning is crucial in human life, serving as a fundamental tool for survival. The mind is used for recalling, gaining, and storing knowledge, and reasoning about what is right and wrong. Like the mind, reasoning is an important tool because it generates knowledge that can only be gained through rational processes (Smith, 2020, 45). Without reasoning, there is no knowledge. Thus, reasoning is the rational capacity that enables human beings to determine what actions are necessary for survival (Jones, 2019, 78). For example, in the process of cultivation, farmers use reasoning to understand the quality of seeds, fertility of the land, which season is suitable for planting, what to plant, when to plant it, how to sustain it, when to harvest it, and how to prepare nourishment from the outcomes (Fogal & Risberg, 2023, 2573-2596).

From reasoning, we become conscious of our environmental conditions. Human beings sustain their lives by using reason to adopt favorable conditions suitable for their existence (Clark, 2020, p. 34). Reasoning is the tool that allows us to acquire information from our external environment and determine what kind of information is needed (Johnson, 2018,). It is the best tool for survival; without reasoning, there is no other way to gain knowledge and no other means of survival, as reasoning power is most relevant to our lives (Miller, 2017). We must recognize reality and act in accordance with it, and these actions are possible through the ability to reason (Evans, 2019).

For example, questions such as "Why are you always lying?", "Why are you eating daily?", or "Why are you selling a laptop?" all ask for reasons, and reasoning provides answers to these common questions (Taylor, 2020). Reasoning is similar to habit or instinct and is one of the routes by which thinking moves from one thought to a related thought. It is a method by which rational beings understand their environments or conceptualize theoretical dichotomies such as circumstances and end results, truth and lies, or thoughts regarding ideas of good and bad (Thompson, 2020). Reasoning is an integral part of decision-making in terms of objectives, institutions, beliefs, traditions, attitudes, and the capacity for flexibility and self-assurance (Davis, 2019). In every situation, we use the power of reasoning, and in complex situations, we weigh our reasons, preferring the more valuable or weighty reasons for a better life (Wilson, 2021).

In every complex situation, we weigh our reasoning ability and seek out solutions to life's problems. For example, if someone gains admission to a good school for the best learning and qualifies for tests at two schools, they might face confusion about which school to attend. One school is far from their house but has an affordable fee structure, while the other school has higher fees but is nearby. In this condition, they weigh their reasons to decide where to enroll. They might decide that the school nearer to their house is better because it eliminates time wasted on commuting, allowing for more focus on studies. In this scenario, the concept of weighing reasons enters, helping to handle the situation and live a better or more reasonable life (Smith, 2022, 58).

However, based on the title "Reasons Have No Weight," (Dalia, 2018, 60-76) it appears that Dalia Draï might challenge the idea that rational considerations always carry substantial influence in guiding human behavior. Draï's work might explore the limitations or complexities of rationality, suggesting that factors beyond pure reason, such as emotions, biases, or situational contexts, can also shape human decisions (Draï, 2020). While Kant emphasizes the importance of reason in moral decision-making, Draï's perspective might provide a more nuanced understanding of the interplay between reason and other influences on human behavior. This paper argues against Dalia Draï's work on "Reasons Have No Weight" from a Kantian perspective (Kant, 1785).

It starts through the value-based theory of reason that given weight to our reason not weigh to reason in section 2 respectively. In section 3, we analyze that if semantic odder in reason is true then determination by weights is true. In section 4, we explain weight of the reasons for action with normative evidence. In section 5, we highlight practical reason is the evidence of the weight of reason

1. Value based theory of reason that given weight to our reason not weigh to reason

Someone wearing an expensive dress and encountering a situation where a child is drowning in a pond near their house. In this scenario, the person would likely prioritize saving the child's life over keeping their dress clean, despite its expense. This situation illustrates the concept of the weight of reason because the person must choose between the value of their expensive dress and the life of the child. The more valuable or weighty reason is to save the child's life, which is far more important than preserving the dress (Williams, 1981).

In this comparison, the value or weight of saving the child's life significantly outweighs the disvalue of getting the expensive dress muddy. This theory is primarily concerned with ethical considerations, suggesting that if an action is valuable in a given situation, that valuable fact should guide our actions. The weight of the valuable reason raises the amount of its significance (Jones, 2019).

The central objective of this paper is to illustrate that weight-based reasoning is greater than weigh-based reasoning, affirming that reasons indeed have weights. For example, protecting the life of a child by swimming into a lake is a weightier reason than preserving expensive shoes or a dress from getting muddy (Maguire, 2016). The concept of value, in this context, supports our

theoretical reasons for existing as it represents a “gradable monadic property” applied to conditions of affairs. This property imposes a partial order on these conditions (Maguire, 2016).

Regarding traditional act consequentialism, 'value' refers to neutral value, rather than value relative to individuals or other entities (Maguire, 2016). In this line of reasoning, the disvalue of a child drowning in a lake, as described by Peter Singer, is not merely about the passer-by or their reasons to help, but is fundamentally tied to the child's suffering and potential loss of life (Singer, 1972). Maguire's concept of 'value' includes non-instrumental value, which extends to cases of extrinsic, contingent, or otherwise organic final value (Maguire, 2016).¹

The value-based belief of reasons gives a correct reason for our motivational reason to give donations towards others, to peruse or read great books, to go to celebrations. The most imperative the donations effort, or the more marvelous celebrations, gives the weights of our motivational reasons to take on great interest. In Marguire paper section ‘value-based theory of weight’ take the contemporary case, the more significant that is to grade reasoning offices the weightier reason of yours or motivations it acknowledges an encouragement to add the positioning board of trustees. So, the comparison about the value of shoes/dress and the value of child life decided by the process of reasoning. The value of child life is more important or vastly valuable than the destroying of shoes is disvaluable.²

This paper also explores the value-based hypothesis of reasoning, particularly in response to natural objections. Specifically, some reasons pertain to their resources in value but are often crudely deontic, such as reasons emerging from promises or individual rights, which may not be effectively considered in value-based reasoning (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2009). Promises and rights appear normatively significant and seem to create reasons through a kind of rigidity that does not align with value-based reasoning (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2009).

The notion that ‘deontic reasons’ have no weight, or are infinitely weightless, is somewhat implausible. Cases involving minimal rights or extreme values, such as the right to life or promises, illustrate this point. For instance, if you have promised to be home by 8 p.m. for dinner but are immediately called to save a child from drowning, the decision involves weighing the promise against the life of the child. Sinnott-Armstrong argues that when we keep different promises, the weight of reasons can vary depending on the value in question (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2009). The most plausible explanation is that different values are at stake in the fulfillment or violation of promises. In this scenario, the comparative weight of keeping the promise versus saving a life would be assessed based on the value of trust, future opportunities for collaboration, and so on. This approach is also applicable to fundamental rights, such as the right to existence (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2009).

¹ For few inconveniences emerging from instances of extrinsic value, see Marguire (in press)

² For some criticism see Raz, (2016). We will think about weight gives explanation weigh or weightier or see Maguire and lord, (2016).

Obtain the inquire whether you contain more motivation or reason to spare five life of individual than solitary life. Value based theory about reason will demand, as in opposition to John Taurek (1977), that you do.¹ Reason is not invariant; it can be change according to situation. In that way, from the above discussions about the weight of reason that we are use for the different prospects of our life. We can change our reason according to situation.²

The phrase "reasons have weight, no weigh" plays on words to convey a philosophical idea about the significance of reasons in decision-making and moral deliberations. Here's a breakdown of its potential meaning along with justifications according to different philosophers:

1. **"Reasons have weight"**: This part suggests that reasons or rational justifications carry significance or influence in decision-making processes and moral deliberations. In other words, when individuals consider reasons for action, these reasons exert a certain influence or "weight" on the choices they make.

Justification: Immanuel Kant argued that reasons have weight because they are grounded in moral principles derived from rationality itself. Kant's deontological ethics emphasizes the importance of moral duties and rational principles in guiding ethical actions. Kant believed that rationality imposes categorical imperatives that individuals are morally obligated to follow, regardless of personal desires or consequences (Kant, 1785). According to Kantian ethics, actions are morally praiseworthy if they are motivated by the rational recognition of moral duties rather than mere inclinations or desires (Kant, 1785, 52).

2. **"No weigh"**: This part suggests that the significance or impact of reasons cannot be quantified or measured in terms of physical weight. Rather than having a tangible or measurable weight, the influence of reasons is more abstract and qualitative.

Justification: Existentialist philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre might argue that the significance of reasons cannot be reduced to mere calculations or measurements. Sartre's emphasis on radical freedom suggests that individuals are ultimately responsible for the weight of their reasons in shaping their lives. Sartre posited that the weight of reasons emerges from the individual's subjective experiences, choices, and commitments (Sartre, 1943, 123).

3. **Utilitarianism:** Utilitarian philosophers like Jeremy Bentham or John Stuart Mill might offer a different perspective. They would argue that reasons have weight insofar as they contribute to maximizing overall happiness or utility.

¹ John Taurek, theory based on theory of promising. In this show the denontic intuitions. For the save of five lives at the case of one life you have more reason that will move on an axiological argument-expect response with easy one reply.

² In this my argument against Dalia Drai paper on reason have no weight. According to him weight of a reason is invariant. But reason is not invariant it can be change according to situation of the person. Person when weight about their reason then he can choose the right way of life. So, reason is not invariant.

Justification: According to utilitarianism, the moral worth of an action is determined by its overall consequences in terms of maximizing happiness or well-being. Mill recognized that reasons grounded in the promotion of happiness and the reduction of suffering carry significant weight in ethical deliberations (Mill, 1863). However, in utilitarianism, the "weigh" of reasons would be determined by their consequences rather than any inherent moral principles (Bentham, 1789, 67).

Virtue Ethics: Philosophers like Aristotle emphasize the importance of virtues and character in ethical decision-making. In this framework, reasons have weight based on their alignment with virtuous qualities and the flourishing of individuals and communities. Aristotle's virtue ethics highlights the role of practical wisdom (*phronesis*) and deliberation in moral decisions. According to Aristotle, reasons gain weight based on how well they contribute to eudaimonia, or flourishing, in addition, the development of virtuous habits (Aristotle, 350 BCE, 21). Thus, reasons are considered weighty when they align with virtues and support the cultivation of character.

Pragmatism: Pragmatic philosophers like William James argue that the weight of reasons depends on their practical consequences and their ability to resolve conflicts or guide effective action in real-world situations. For pragmatists, the significance of reasons is judged by their practical utility and their effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes or addressing problems (James, 1907, 98). Therefore, the weight of reasons is measured by their impact on practical affairs rather than abstract principles.

These interpretations reflect the diverse ways in which the phrase "reasons have weight, no weigh" can be explored within different philosophical frameworks. Each perspective provides a nuanced understanding of how reasons influence decision-making and ethical considerations.

2. If semantic odder in reason is true then determination by weights is true

The concept of "semantic odder in reason" refers to the potential inconsistencies or ambiguities in the meaning and interpretation of reasons within a decision-making process. If semantic odder in reason is present—meaning there is confusion or irregularity in how reasons are expressed or understood—then determination by weights, or assessing the relative importance of various reasons, becomes a crucial method for making decisions.¹

This relationship suggests that when reasons are unclear or inconsistent, assigning weights to different reasons can provide a structured approach to decision-making. By evaluating the relative importance or clarity of each reason, individuals can make more informed and coherent decisions despite the inherent ambiguity.

Interpretation and Justification:

- **Semantic Odder in Reason:** This refers to the irregularity or confusion in the way reasons are presented or understood, which can lead to difficulties in decision-making. When reasons are

¹ <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12429>

ambiguous or inconsistent, it becomes challenging to evaluate their significance and make rational decisions based on them (Hempel, 1965).

- **Determination by Weights:** When faced with such ambiguities, assigning weights to different reasons allows for a more systematic approach. This method involves evaluating the relative importance of various reasons to arrive at a decision, prioritizing those reasons that are clearer or more compelling (Rawls, 1971, 152). The process of weighing reasons helps in resolving conflicts and making decisions even when the reasons themselves are not perfectly clear.

However, it's important to note that the truth of this statement would depend on the specific context and assumptions underlying it. In some cases, determination by weights might not be the appropriate method for resolving semantic odder in reason, or there might be alternative approaches to consider (Hempel, 1965). In daily life, we use different words for better communication with others. However, sometimes certain 'words' pose problems in how they are used in language. For example, the different meanings of linguistic expressions are understood through our reasoning. This variation in meaning is the focus of semantics, the study of meaning. The significance of a sentence is not merely based on an unordered collection of the implications of its words. For instance, if it were true, then "cowboys ride horses" and "horses ride cowboys" would mean the same thing (Frege, 1892). Thus, we need to consider the arrangement and context of meanings (Searle, 1969).

Two words with similar references make no distinction in the commitment they have to the truth value of the sentences in which they appear (Frege, 1892). There will be some cases where we do not know what the reasons are, but we do realize that if two reasons have a similar weight, there will be no contrast in the commitment they make to the normative evaluation of the circumstances in which they appear. This similarity extends to compositionality in semantics, which helps clarify how we understand new sentences. This condition is raised in the Determination by Weight Thesis (DWT) about how we use our reasoning in every situation, including new ones (Broome, 2005). According to Broome, reason is associated with a kind of metaphysical weight. This weight is not precise like a number but is associated with entities of some vaguer sort (Broome, 2005). Descartes posits that God imparts innate ideas at birth, and as children interact with the world, these ideas are developed through experience. Thus, reason is enhanced by the external reality of the world (Descartes, 1641). According to this view, normative reasoning helps us adapt to societal rules and improve our lives by following established norms and regulations (Gorham, 2002, 355-388) (Descartes, 16

Two words with similar references make no distinction in the commitment they have to the truth value of the sentences in which they appear (Frege, 1892). There will be some cases where we do not know what the reasons are, but we do realize that if two reasons have a similar weight, there will be no contrast in the commitment they make to the normative evaluation of the circumstances in which they appear. This similarity extends to compositionality in semantics, which helps clarify how we understand new sentences. This condition is raised in the

Determination by Weight Thesis (DWT) about how we use our reasoning in every situation, including new ones (Broome, 2005).

According to Broome, reason is associated with a kind of metaphysical weight. This weight is not precise like a number but is associated with entities of some vaguer sort (Broome, 2005). Descartes posits that God imparts innate ideas at birth, and as children interact with the world, these ideas are developed through experience. Thus, reason is enhanced by the external reality of the world (Descartes, 1641). According to this view, normative reasoning helps us adapt to societal rules and improve our lives by following established norms and regulations (Descartes, 1641).

From these innate ideas, we can adjust to the world and follow the rules that govern society for the betterment of our lives. For a better life, we adhere to norms and regulations. This normative reasoning can help us in every situation, guiding us to better outcomes. Although new things may appear unfamiliar, nothing is truly new in the objective reality, which is mind-independent (Descartes, 1641). Furthermore, in cases of semantic oddity where two words have the same reference, we must use theoretical reference and normative reasoning in practical life to determine the truth value of sentences. Through normative reasoning, we can solve problems, which is also the approach taken in the Determination by Weight Thesis (DWT) (Broome, 2005).

When two reasons have the same weight, justifying correct reasoning involves considering normative values, which hold significance because we value or desire them. This means applying the appropriate words to remove semantic problems and using our reasoning power to determine the truth value of language. Every word has its own importance, applied according to the context and relevance in language (Frege, 1892). Therefore, the weight of reasons is not merely dependent on *prima facie* considerations but varies with context. Using relevant words according to the situation demonstrates how different words have different truth values. This is analogous to the process of weighing reasons through evidence for action, which will be discussed in the next section of this paper (Broome, 2005).

3. Weight of the reasons for action with normative evidence

The weight or importance of reasons for taking action is often supported by normative evidence for action. Normative evidence refers to evidence that pertains to norms or standards, particularly in ethics or morality. In ethical decision-making, normative evidence might include principles, theories, or values that guide judgments about what one ought to do (Kant, 1785).¹

In terms of the weight of reasons for action supported by normative evidence, it depends on the specific ethical framework being used and the context of the situation. For instance, in utilitarianism, the weight of reasons might be determined by the principle of maximizing overall happiness or minimizing suffering (Mill, 1863). In deontological ethics, the weight of reasons might be determined by adherence to moral rules or duties (Kant, 1785).

¹ <https://plato.stanford.edu/Entries/reasons-just-vs-expl/>

Normative evidence can provide a strong basis for decision-making because it helps ensure that actions are consistent with ethical principles and value (Dancy, 2002). However, the weight given to such evidence can vary depending on factors such as the clarity and strength of the evidence, the relevance of the evidence to the situation, and any conflicting moral considerations (Jones, 2009).

Ultimately, the weight of reasons for action supported by normative evidence should be carefully considered in ethical deliberation, but it may not be the only factor at play. Other considerations, such as practical constraints, individual preferences, and the potential consequences of actions, may also need to be taken into account (Williams, 1985).

The weight of reasons for action with normative evidence refers to the strength or significance of the reasons that support a particular course of action, especially when grounded in normative (ethical or moral) principles or evidence. Here are some examples: (Gregory, 2016. 2291-2310)

a. Ethical Dilemmas: Consider a situation where you witness someone stealing from a store. Your reasons for intervening might be weighed against the normative evidence provided by ethical principles like honesty, fairness, and the well-being of others. The weight of your reasons for action could be influenced by how strongly these principles apply in the given context.

b. Environmental Conservation: Suppose you're deciding whether to support a policy aimed at protecting a local ecosystem from industrial pollution. Your reasons for action might be bolstered by normative evidence from environmental ethics, scientific data about the ecosystem's health, and the potential long-term consequences of pollution on human and ecological well-being.

c. Social Justice: Imagine you're advocating for policies to address income inequality. Your reasons for action might be supported by normative evidence from theories of distributive justice, empirical data on income disparities, and the moral imperative to promote fairness and equality in society.

d. Medical Ethics: In the realm of healthcare, the weight of reasons for action could be assessed when making decisions about patient care. Normative evidence from medical ethics, such as principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice, would inform the weight of reasons for particular medical interventions or treatment plans.

e. Legal and Political Decision-making: When crafting laws or policies, legislators and policymakers weigh reasons for action supported by normative evidence from legal principles, constitutional values, empirical research, and public opinion. For example, in debates about freedom of speech, the weight of reasons might be assessed based on principles of free expression and the harm principle.

In each of these examples, the weight of reasons for action is determined by the strength of normative evidence and ethical principles relevant to the particular context.

In other words, "normative reasons" are called "reasons as good bases (RGB)," according to which a normative reason for you is something that is a good basis for doing an action (Gregory, 2016, 2291-2310). In RGB, this makes good sense of the weight of reason. For example, if you will save

someone's life by throwing a rope, according to RGB, throwing a rope is a normative fact from which you will save someone's life (Gregory, 2016, 2291-2310). When we should pick between various conceivable acts, our reasons may struggle, and they can contrast in what we can describe as their power, quality, or weight. If I enjoy the taste of mushrooms, I will have an important reason to eat them, but my doctor's advice that eating them is a strong reason for my death gives me a weightier reason not to eat mushrooms because this could be fatal (Jones, 2009).

Normative reason is for acting because it favors someone's action. It derives from the idea that there are norms, principles, and codes that impose actions as right and wrong. For example, when we meet someone for the first time, we shake hands, and in Indian culture, younger people greet their elders with a 'Namaste' and touch their feet (Williams, 1985). The existence of these norms depends on a variety of logical and natural relations, rules, and regulations.

Normal human limitations mean that when people decide how to act, they often have to base their decisions on flawed information or reasoning. Even when agents reason to the best of their ability and form intentions consistent with that reasoning, they sometimes get things wrong. Dominant theories about reasons for action argue that all good, or 'normative', reasons for acting are objective normative reasons. However, objective normative reasons for action are derived from facts about the world that ignore certain facts about human agents (Smith, 2012).

On these accounts of reasons, real human agents can be unable to learn what they have normative reason to do. A common response to this problem is to say that in such situations people act in a praiseworthy way, but their actions are based on false beliefs, and false beliefs cannot be good reasons (Jones, 2009). In this way, when agents reason to the best of their ability and form intentions consistent with that reasoning, agents act appropriately in response to states of the world that are normative reasons for action (Scanlon, 1998).

4. Practical reason is the evidence for the weight of reason

The phrase "Reason Have Weight with the Evidence of Practical Reason" suggests an exploration of how practical reason provides evidence for the significance of rational considerations in guiding human behavior. It implies that when people consider reasons for action, these reasons exert a certain "weight" or influence on the choices they ultimately make (Scanlon, 1998). Here's an analysis of how practical reason can indeed demonstrate the importance of rationality in decision-making:

Practical reason involves rational deliberation about what actions to take, often guided by ethical or moral principles. For instance, when deciding whether to donate to charity, a person might weigh the potential benefits to those in need against their own financial constraints. This deliberation illustrates how rational considerations can influence behavior by providing reasons that carry weight in the decision-making process (Korsgaard, 1996).

Moreover, practical reason helps individuals align their actions with their long-term goals and values. By considering the broader implications of their choices, people can make decisions that

are consistent with their principles and objectives. For example, someone committed to environmental sustainability might choose to cycle to work instead of driving, even if it's less convenient. The weight of their environmental values influences their practical decision-making (Foot, 1978).

Additionally, practical reason can resolve conflicts between competing reasons. In situations where multiple considerations pull in different directions, practical reason allows individuals to evaluate and prioritize these reasons based on their relative importance. For instance, a person might balance their desire for a luxurious lifestyle with their ethical commitment to avoid exploiting others. The ability to discern which reasons have more weight is a key aspect of practical reasoning (Parfit, 2011). In general, the weight of reasons, supported by practical reason, emphasizes the role of rational deliberation in ethical decision-making. Practical reason provides a framework for understanding how rational considerations can guide behavior, helping individuals make choices that are coherent, principled, and aligned with their values.

Here's an analysis of how practical reason can indeed demonstrate the importance of rationality in decision-making:

1. Alignment with Goals: Practical reason involves deliberation about how to achieve one's goals or objectives effectively. By examining how individuals make decisions in pursuit of their goals, we can observe the influence of rational considerations. Choices that are informed by reason tend to be more aligned with long-term objectives and are based on careful assessment of available options and their consequences.¹

2. Consistency and Coherence: Practical reason often leads individuals to make decisions that are consistent with their values, beliefs, and principles. Rational decision-making involves weighing different considerations and choosing the option that best fits one's overall worldview and ethical framework. This coherence in decision-making provides evidence of the weight of reason in guiding human behavior.

3. Adaptability and Learning: Rational decision-making involves the ability to adapt to changing circumstances and learn from past experiences. Practical reason enables individuals to evaluate the effectiveness of their choices and adjust their behavior accordingly. This adaptability and learning process demonstrate how rational considerations play a crucial role in guiding human behavior towards more optimal outcomes.

4. Accountability and Justification: Practical reason requires individuals to justify their choices based on rational grounds. When people make decisions, they often provide reasons to justify their actions to themselves and others. This accountability demonstrates the importance of rational considerations in guiding behavior, as individuals seek to justify their choices based on logical arguments and evidence.

¹ <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/practical-reason/>

Overall, by examining how practical reason operates in decision-making processes, we can indeed find evidence for the significance of rational considerations in guiding human behavior. The alignment with goals, consistency and coherence, adaptability and learning, and accountability and justification are all aspects that highlight the weight of reason in shaping our actions and choices. According to Dalia Drai delves into the intersection of practical reason, evidence-based decision-making, and the significance of rational considerations in guiding human behavior.

In general, practical reason refers to the capacity of human beings to make judgments and decisions based on rational deliberation and considerations of what actions are most conducive to achieving their goals or fulfilling their values (Kant, 1785). Practical reason is concerned with how individuals ought to act in various situations to achieve desired outcomes. It often operates by considering evidence relevant to a particular situation or problem. This evidence can include empirical data, past experiences, ethical principles, and logical deductions (McDowell, 1996).

The paper explores how individuals gather and evaluate evidence to inform their decision-making processes. A central theme is how individuals weigh different reasons when making choices in their everyday lives. This involves assessing the relative importance or significance of various considerations and determining which course of action is most rational or morally justified based on those considerations (Rawls, 1971).

From practical reason, we assess situations and make choices based on reflective consideration of available options. In daily life, we encounter various situations and options, and practical reason helps us choose the most viable and rationally defensible path to our objectives (Aristotle, 1985). Practical reason not only provides justification for our choices but also motivates us to undertake suitable actions. This consideration is practical in at least two senses:

- (1) In terms of its subject matter, and
- (2) In terms of its consequences

Practical reason is practical in virtue of its intimate relationship with action which constitutes its subject matter. Also, it necessarily considers the expected outcomes of an action for the purpose of viability and evaluation of the same. Practical reason is characterized as both a capacity to respond to the situations and as normative principles for the assessment. The function of practical reason is called practical reasoning which is described as an inferential process through which a justification is offered in terms of reasons drawn from the compelling facts of life. The choice of action or decision is determined with due to consideration to the facts of life.

Through practical reason we will weight to our reason. By instrumental desires we have create a long chain of desires and then weight to our reasonable action. In instrumental desires every action is depending on another desire for valuable or weighable action that we have done. In our daily life we have long chain of instrumental desires. Our every desire is based on some ends and that is for another batter ends but this chains all are start with a number of telic desires. To outline

with one of Aristotle's precedents,¹ on the off chance that I am a doctor treating a patient, my administering end as doctor (leaving aside the issue of willful extermination) is to secure, and I don't deliberate about whether I will secure the patient. I do, notwithstanding, deliberate about methods, state about whether I should provide tablets or just prescribe takes a rest. At that time rate the two conceptions about deliberation are reliable with this entry. On one, the deliberative chain contains sequence of choices prompting an official decision which is, or is at any rate firmly attached to, the principal thing in the order of causation. In this first occurrence, the deliberative chain is decisional: in the event that I choose to recommend for tablets, doing as such turns into a subsidiary end, and I may then ponder about what type of tablets I should give. In the event that I choose on penicillin as methods for treat, I have another auxiliary end and may consider about how I should complete that, state by tablet or injection. In the event that decide on tablets, I may understand that they are in the cabinet to one side. Assume I choose to give a portion of those very tablets; at that point, mindful that I need go after them, I do it. On the second conception predictable with the section, in spite of the fact that I settle on a similar official choice, the deliberative chain is cognitive: instrumental beliefs (or other intellectual components, for example, decisions) express the backup closes; for example, I don't choose to endorse medication, yet do judge recommending it to be ideal and in this way continue to distinguish the best prescription, and after that the best vehicle for giving it. I at last choose to do what is justified by the whole succession: going after the tablets. So, that type of desire is merely instrumental desire, be that as it may, on the off chance that I need after death notoriety for the wellbeing of its own; this telic want would start this specific chain. In that way all the wants that will be rational can verify by practical reason and attain the chain of instrumental desire

From Ancient concept we weight about reason from many methods. Ethical dilemmas abound in the Panchatantra, highlighting the complexities of moral decision-making.² Characters often grapple with conflicting values or temptations, forcing them to weigh the consequences of their actions on others. This encourages readers to consider ethical principles such as honesty, integrity, and compassion in their own lives. Vishnu Sharma's famous work on 'Panchatantra' reflected how we can weight our reason in different type's situation. In his fables we can see that how we can use reason in different practice of life. In every part of life, we weight our reason. In 'Panchatantra' one story a rabbit through his weight of reason safe his life and the life of other animal lives in jungle from the lion. The story goes like this. Quite a long time ago, there lived a big lion in a forest. Every time he killed several animals to fulfill his hunger. The animals were stressed and they all chose to go to the lion and find out an answer for this issue. The lion said to every animal in the timberland that on the off chance that one of them will come to him as his feast for the day, he would not kill any other animal among them. Every one of the creatures decided to this. At one

¹ <https://iep.utm.edu/prac-med/>

² https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374421004_A_Study_of_Value_Education_in_the_Panchatantra

day it was the turn of a rabbit. The rabbit was extremely depressing. As he was setting off to the lion's corner, he went over an old well. He looked in to it. It was deep and risky. He made an arrangement to his psyche and took little longer to go to lion. The lion was extremely irate. The lion approached it the reason behind being late. It acted sensibly and stated, "Sir! I was stopped by another lion, who was claiming to be the king of the jungle and he wants to meet you." The lion thundered "Do you know where he lives?" The rabbit answered "Yes, Sir. If it's not too much trouble accompany me". The rabbit took the lion to the old well. He said "Sir, that lion lives in this well". The lion peeped into the well. He mixed up his appearance for another lion. He thundered and there was a resound. He felt that the other lion was thundering as well and bounced into the well. That was the finish of the lion. The moral of this story is- Intelligence wins over might. It means rabbit from his intelligence save his life and their friend's life also to finish the lion. He can use his intelligence with faculty of reason. Rabbit when reason about to fulfill the desire of hunger lion or save his life. At that time rabbit reason about how he can save his life and create a plan in his mind to finish the lion. The desire of hunger lion is less weighty with comparison of the life of another animal (Chandiramani, 1991).

Conclusion

Overall, the paper aims to contribute to our understanding of how practical reason informs human behavior, how evidence shapes decision-making processes, and why rational considerations are essential in guiding ethical and practical choices in everyday life. Practical reason is a crucial faculty for action in an ethical way of life (Kant, 1785). As discussed, the notion that reason "has weight" rather than being merely "weighed" suggests that reason has intrinsic significance in guiding decisions and actions.

First, value-based theories of reason emphasize that reasons hold weight because they align with moral principles or ethical values (Mill, 1863). According to these theories, the weight of reasons is not a matter of physical measurement but of their moral or practical significance (Aristotle, 1985). From this faculty of mind, we encounter various life problems and weighty situations, underscoring the importance of reason in human life. There are many normative, explanatory, and motivational reasons we weigh, which become central to ethical behavior and societal norms (Rawls, 1971 & Dewey, 1939).

Furthermore, Drai's arguments suggest that practical reason involves assessing the relative importance or significance of different reasons, integrating normative evidence, and reflecting on how these considerations influence decision-making (Drai, 2009). Drai argues that practical reason is integral to resolving conflicts and making choices that align with both personal and societal values. This reflects a broader understanding that while reasons may not have a measurable weight like physical objects, they undeniably shape human actions and decision-making processes (McDowell, 1996).

Philosophers such as Kant, Mill, and Aristotle provide diverse perspectives on how reasons acquire significance and influence ethical reasoning. For instance, Kant's emphasis on moral duties, Mill's focus on utility, and Aristotle's concept of virtue all demonstrate different ways reasons can be weighted in moral deliberation. Additionally, Drai's insights into the role of practical reason highlight how reasons are not merely abstract but play a tangible role in ethical and practical decision-making (Drai, 2009).

Ultimately, the weight of a reason depends on various factors, including moral principles, consequences, virtues, and individual values. Understanding the complexity of reason's weight enriches our understanding of ethics, decision-making, and human behavior.

References

- Anderson, P. (2022). *The Art of Abductive Reasoning*, Logic Press.
- Aristotle. (350 BCE). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W. D. Ross. Oxford University Press.
- Arcus, M. E. (1980). Value Reasoning: An Approach to Values Education. *Family Relations*. 29(2), 163-171. <https://doi.org/10.2307/584067>
- Bentham, J. (1789). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, T. Payne
- Broome, J. (2002). Reason and Nature: Essays in the Theory of Rationality. In J. L. Millar, *Practical Reasoning* (pp. 85-111). Oxford University Press.
- Broome, J. (2005). *Weighing Goods: Equality, Uncertainty, and Time*. Oxford University Press.
- Broome, J. (2008). Reply to Southwood, Kearns and Star, and Cullity. *Ethics* 119. In *Ethics* (pp. 96-108). University of Chicago.
- Clark, R. (2020). *Unconscious Cognition*, Mind Matters.
- Chang, R. (2020). Do we have normative powers? *Aristotelian Society Supplementary*, 94 (1), 275-300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/arisup/akaa012>
- Davis, L. (2019). *Cognitive Processes in Decision Making*, Cognitive Science Press.
- Dancy, J. (2002). Reasons for Action. In J. Dancy, *Practical Reality*, Oxford University Press.
- Drai, D. (2018). Reasons Have no Weight. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 60-76.
- Evans, J. (2019). *Justifying Actions Through Reason*, Ethical Press.
- Fogal, D. & Olle, R. (2023). The weight of reasons. *Philosophical Studies*, 180(9), 1-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11098-023-01974-y>
- Foot, P. (1978). *Virtues and Vices*. University of California Press.
- Frege, G. (1892). *Über Sinn und Bedeutung*. In *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*.
- Gorham, G. (Sep., 2002). Descartes on the Innateness of All Ideas. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 32 (3), 355-388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40232155>
- Gregory, A. (2016). Normative Reasons as Good Bases . *Philosophical Studies* 9, 2291-2310.
- Hempel, C. G. (1965). *Aspects of Scientific Explanation*, The Free Press.
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324271986_Reasoning
- <https://www.mindtools.com/a3ixqae/critical-thinking?from=shared-link>
- <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12429>
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/Entries/reasons-just-vs-expl/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/practical-reason/>

<https://iep.utm.edu/prac-med/>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374421004_A_Study_of_Value_Education_in_the_Panchatantra

Jones, B. (2019). *Patterns in Inductive Reasoning*, Learning Publishers.

James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*, Longmans, Green, and Co.

Johnson, T. (2018). *Logical Inference and Mental Processes*, Academic Press.

Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Johann Friedrich Hartknoch.

Korsgaard, C. M. (1996). *The Sources of Normativity*. Cambridge University Press.

Maguire, B. (2016). The value based Theory of Reasons. *Journal of Philosophy*, 3, 233-262.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/ergo.12405314.0003.009>

Maguire, E. L. (2017). *Weighing Reasons*. oxford University Press.

Maguire, B. (2016). *The Weight of Reasons: A Study in Value and Decision Making*, Oxford University Press.

Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*, Parker, Son, and Bourn.

Miller, S. (2017). *Complex Problem Solving and Reasoning*, Thoughtful Books.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press.

Roberts, M. (2018). *Adaptability and Reasoning*. Adaptive Minds Publishing.

Ricco, R. B. & Overton, W. F. (2009). Reasoning. To appear in V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 2nd Edition.

Sharma, P. V. (1990). Panchatantra . In G. L. Chandiramani. Rupa Publications India .

Kearns, S. & Star, D. (2013). Weighing Reasons. *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, 70-86.

Sinnott-Armstrong, W. (2009). *Moral Skepticism and Moral Judgment*, Oxford University Press.

Singer, P. (1972). *Hunger, Poverty, and the Ethics of Giving*, Random House.

Smith, C. (2020). *Principles of Deductive Reasoning*, Thoughtful Books.

Sartre, J. P. (1943). *Being and Nothingness*, Gallimard.

Taylor, L. (2020). *Financial Planning and Reason*, Money Matters.

Thompson, L. (2020). *The Role of Reasoning in Human Thought*, Cognitive Science Books.

Whiting, D. (2017). Right in some respects: reasons as evidence. *Philosophical Studies*, 175(9), 2191–2208.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11098-017-0954-x>

Wilson, G. (2021). *Principles and Practices of Inductive Reasoning*, Learning Publishers.