BURIDAN’S ASS

Authored by

mohammad looti

October 29, 2025

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammad looti (2025). *BURIDAN’S ASS*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=64884

BURIDAN'S ASS

Primary Disciplinary Field(s): Philosophy, Decision Theory, Rational Choice Theory

1. Core Definition

Buridan's Ass is a famous paradox or thought experiment in philosophy concerning the nature of choice, opportunity, and practical reason. The scenario posits an ass that is simultaneously and equally hungry and thirsty. This ass is placed precisely equidistant between two identical, appealing options: a pile of hay and a bucket of water (or sometimes, two identical piles of hay). Because the ass is perfectly rational and lacks any distinguishing reason to prefer one option over the other, it enters a state of perpetual deliberation, unable to initiate action, and consequently starves or dies of thirst.

The core function of this paradox is to challenge the philosophical Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR), which states that everything must have a reason or cause. In the case of the ass, if the rational agent is defined solely by its ability to choose the option with greater utility or sufficient reason, then when two options possess equal utility, the agent is paralyzed. The failure to choose demonstrates the impracticality and fatal flaw inherent in systems of choice that rely exclusively on rational differentiation.

The paradox vividly illustrates the concept of **equipollence** (equality of power or force) in decision-making. Unlike ordinary dilemmas where one option is slightly more favorable, the perfect symmetry demands that a purely rational agent remain static. The thought experiment forces consideration of what mechanisms--beyond strict, comparative reason--must exist in real-world decision-making, whether it be an arbitrary exercise of free will, or the intervention of non-rational biological or psychological imperatives.

2. Etymology and Historical Development

The paradox takes its name from the influential French scholastic philosopher Jean Buridan (c. 1300-1358). Buridan, who served as Rector of the University of Paris, made significant contributions to logic and the philosophy of motion. However, it is essential to note that Buridan himself did not formulate the paradox using the image of the starving ass. His writings dealt with the difficulty of human choice under conditions of equality, often involving a rational person facing two equally desirable moral or material goods.

Buridan's actual philosophical position used the idea of perfectly symmetrical alternatives to argue **against** determinism. He maintained that a rational human, when faced with equipollent goods, would indeed possess the capacity of the will to choose one arbitrarily, thereby demonstrating the necessity of free will to break rational stalemates. The choice is made not because of a preference

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

(a rational motive), but simply because the will must act to prevent the suffering caused by delay.

The specific, fatalistic variation involving the ass (a less sophisticated creature than a human, and thus one lacking the intervention of a complex, non-rational will) appears to have been developed by subsequent critics or commentators who sought to caricature Buridan's rationalist views. By presenting the extreme and fatal scenario of the ass dying, critics aimed to demonstrate that pure rationalism, when faced with perfect symmetry, inevitably leads to inaction and death, thereby suggesting that Buridan's framework was incomplete or dangerously rigid. This attribution became solidified in philosophical history, permanently linking the ass paradox to Buridan's name despite its critical origin.

3. Key Philosophical Concepts Illustrated

Buridan's Ass serves as a pivotal tool for exploring fundamental philosophical and ethical dilemmas, particularly regarding the limits of reason and the nature of agency. The paradox touches upon several distinct but related conceptual areas:

The Challenge to the Principle of Sufficient Reason: The paradox is often invoked as a counterexample to the PSR. If the PSR holds true, then there must be a sufficient reason for the ass's action. Since no sufficient reason exists to choose Hay A over Hay B, the only outcome consistent with strict PSR is no action at all--the logical necessity of inaction leading to physical death. This scenario forces thinkers to either reject the universal applicability of the PSR or accept the impossibility of perfect symmetry in the real world.

The Necessity of Free Will or Arbitrary Choice: For thinkers defending free will, the paradox demonstrates that reason alone is insufficient for practical life. To avoid the fate of the ass, an agent must possess a faculty (the will) capable of initiating an arbitrary choice when rational grounds are exhausted. This arbitrary choice, often called the "tie-breaker," is non-rational but necessary for survival and action.

Critique of Rational Choice Theory: In modern economics and decision theory, the paradox highlights the failure mode of rational choice models that assume agents always maximize utility. When faced with identical utility functions (U(A) = U(B)), the maximization rule offers no solution. The rational cost of infinite deliberation must eventually be recognized, leading to the conclusion that a rational agent must adopt an arbitrary tie-breaking rule (like randomization) to minimize the greater harm of inaction.

4. Solutions and Modern Interpretations

Various philosophical traditions and modern sciences propose different mechanisms to resolve the deadlock presented by Buridan's Ass, effectively saving the hypothetical animal from its logical

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

demise. These solutions typically involve introducing a factor that breaks the absolute symmetry.

One classical resolution, favored by thinkers like Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, involves rejecting the premise of perfect symmetry entirely. Leibniz argued that the universe is inherently structured such that perfect equality is metaphysically impossible. There must always be some infinitesimal difference--a dust particle, a subtle difference in light, or a tiny metabolic bias--that provides the ass with a reason, however small, to lean toward one side. Since perfect symmetry cannot exist in the contingent world, the paradox merely demonstrates a logical possibility that has no real-world application.

A second major solution, especially relevant in contemporary Decision Theory, is the introduction of controlled randomness or an arbitrary choice mechanism. A truly rational agent recognizes that the cost of deliberation (starvation) far outweighs the benefit of finding the "optimal" choice when options are equal. Therefore, the rational decision is to implement a mechanism--like a coin flip or a pre-set bias--to select one option quickly. This swift, arbitrary action maximizes overall utility by ensuring survival.

The paradox also finds relevance in computational models and concurrent programming, known as the "symmetry breaking" problem. When two identical processors simultaneously request the same resource, a deadlock (analogous to the ass's paralysis) occurs. Engineers must design systems where an arbitrary but swift mechanism--often involving time stamps or priority rankings--is implemented to grant the resource to one process, thus preventing systemic failure. The practical solution in technology mirrors the philosophical necessity of introducing asymmetry to ensure function.

5. Related Paradoxes and Analogues

Buridan's Ass is often grouped with other philosophical and logical quandaries that deal with forced choices, infinite regress, or the paralysis caused by conflicting rational imperatives. These analogues help contextualize the specific nature of the Buridanian dilemma.

The Dilemma of Königsberg: While mathematically distinct, the Königsberg bridge problem illustrates an imposed constraint--the topological impossibility of crossing every bridge only once--that similarly prohibits a successful action, not due to lack of will, but due to structural impossibility. Buridan's Ass presents a structural impossibility in the rational framework itself.

The Problem of Incommensurable Values: This relates to situations where choices are difficult because the options cannot be measured against a single scale (e.g., choosing between career fulfillment and family time). While Buridan's Ass deals with perfect commensurability (A=B), the dilemma of incommensurability similarly leads to difficult, often paralyzing, choices, though for reasons of qualitative difference rather than equality.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

The Symmetry Breaking Problem in Physics: In physics and cosmology, spontaneous symmetry breaking describes how a system in a perfectly symmetrical state can evolve into an asymmetric state, often triggered by a random, tiny fluctuation. This mirrors the philosophical solution that physical reality, through chance, inevitably resolves the intellectual stalemate.

6. Debates and Criticisms

Despite its enduring status as a teaching tool, Buridan's Ass faces significant criticisms, primarily centered on its overly simplistic representation of life and decision-making.

A primary critique focuses on the **biological implausibility** of the scenario. Critics argue that an ass, being a creature driven by instinct and biological urgency, would not operate under the strictures of formal, human-like rationality. Before the ass could engage in the infinite intellectual deliberation required for paralysis, the escalating pain of hunger and thirst would trigger an automatic, overwhelming biological impulse to move, likely resulting in a panicked, arbitrary dash toward the closest option, thus overriding the intellectual stalemate. The paradox, therefore, may only hold true for an abstract, purely rational (and non-biological) agent.

Furthermore, many philosophers argue that the paradox rests on an **unrealistic logical premise**: the existence of perfect equivalence. As mentioned by Leibnizian thinkers, true, perfect symmetry is an abstract mathematical concept rarely, if ever, realized in the messy reality of the contingent world. Even if the haystacks appeared identical to the human eye, the ass's sensory apparatus would detect differences in smell, texture, or temperature, immediately introducing the necessary asymmetry required for a rational preference to emerge.

Finally, critics often argue that the paradox misrepresents the role of **practical reason** itself. Practical reason is designed not just to identify the best outcome, but to guide action. If deliberation leads to inaction and death, then that deliberation is practically irrational. Therefore, practical rationality demands the implementation of a meta-rule: when optimality cannot be determined, choose arbitrarily to maximize survival--a choice that renders the paradox logically null in any practical context.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

Further Reading

Jean Buridan
Principle of Sufficient Reason
Rational Choice Theory
Free Will
Symmetry Breaking