

Real-Life Newcomb Problems?

Decision theorists have spilled much ink over the difference between causal and evidential decision rules, whose recommendations differ in puzzle cases. Recently, a class of rivals to causal and evidential rules, aimed at solving more complicated puzzle cases. But how realistic are the puzzle cases where these decision rules disagree? I argue that such cases are rare, and can often be handled without trying to resolve the disagreement between decision rules, by changing other parts of the problem description.