

**Phil 321
Newcomb's Problem**

I. The problem

	\$1 M in box 2	\$0 in box 2
Take only box 2	\$1 M	\$0
Take both boxes	\$1 M + \$1000	\$1000

Assumptions:

1. Predictor puts \$0 in box 2 if he thinks you'll take both.
2. Predictor correct with 99% frequency.

II. Two arguments and two decision principles

Argument 2 (two-box): The Predictor has made his prediction; the money is there or not, and my choice cannot change this. So I ought to take both. *Dominance Principle:* if action *A* dominates action *B*, then *A* should be performed.

Argument 1 (one-box): If I take one, I almost certainly get \$1 million; if both, almost certainly \$1000. *Expected Utility* principle.

III. 1st attempt to resolve the conflict

Apply dominance reasoning if and only if states are probabilistically independent of the actions. Otherwise, use Expected Utilities.

IV. 2nd attempt: parallel problems

Example 1: (Evil-twin Pascal's wager!)

	Saved	Not saved
Sin	12 (#1)	-8 (#3)
Don't sin	10 (#2)	-10 (#4)

Example 2: (Medical Newcomb)

	<i>Sam is father</i>	<i>Tom is father</i>
A: academia	Short academic career (-20)	Long academic career (100)
B: baseball	Short baseball career (-25)	Long baseball career (95)

