

types of users (whether customers, the business, shareholders or regulators) throughout the landscape.

But that conflict doesn't even require another person. Your own purpose can create its own conflict when faced with an evolving landscape. Take for example my map of mapping above (figure 69). My moral imperative was to rebel against the hordes of consultants that enslave us. By definition I wanted mapping to spread far and wide. But as mapping spreads then my ability to make revenue from teaching others how to map will ultimately diminish especially as basic guides on mapping become free. I could either pursue a path of *"it's not just a map, it's a special map that makes you popular with others"* or I would have to find another way of surviving e.g. selling context specific forms of gameplay rather than just teaching people how to map.

Fortunately, context specific forms of gameplay aren't just one thing. If I taught people how to exploit ecosystems with an ILC model ([see chapter 5](#)), then I should expect that model to become industrialised over time. However, mapping is itself a means of exploring and learning about new forms of context specific gameplay i.e. there should be a constant pipeline of new forms of gameplay as long as we are willing to learn.

I've drawn this map up in figure 71 below. Whilst teaching mapping will ultimately industrialise (*point 1*) there is also a constant pipeline of gameplay (*point 2*) with new forms of gameplay emerging. I could