

Arif Ahmed on Newcomb's Paradox

1. Define *two* of the following terms in your own words. Use examples where helpful:
 - a. *Stochastic Independence*
 - b. *Causal Independence*
 - c. *(Horizontal) Dominance*

2. In Newcomb's problem, reasoning in terms of the agent's expectation about the outcome of various actions supports One-Boxing, while reasoning in terms of dominance supports Two-Boxing. In §2, Ahmed discusses more realistic scenarios in which these different argument strategies produce conflicting results.
 - a. Draw up an outcome table with two rows (actions) and two columns (world states) to represent the *Fisher Smoking* case as discussed by Ahmed.
 - b. Explain, in your own words, why reasoning in terms of dominance supports *Smoking* in this case.
 - c. Explain why reasoning in terms of the agent's expectations supports *Not smoking*.
 - d. What do you think the right answer is in this case? [*If you like, you can give a reason for your answer here, but you don't have to.*]