Divination Reality Synthesis (DRS) is a system made up of paper cards pinned to a cork board, connected with strings and thumbtacks. It is used to make decisions for you, as a third party that directs some part of your life.

Preface

  The very first ideas for Divination Reality Synthesis (DRS for short) came about in the morning, when I couldn't decide whether to drink coffee or tea. I am a very, very indecisive person at times; most of the time in fact. I really truly love both Coffee and Tea, and each have their beautiful and irreplacable qualities, each their immovable faults. It's one of the most trivial decisions one could imagine, but I spent many mornings well and truly contemplating it. And furthermore I found that even with all my academic consideration, I often ended up regretting my choice and thinking I should have chosen the other, and feeling extra, extra, supremely archaeically-brained for having taken on this huge decision making process, that couldn't even produce the right decision, to a problem where the correct solution seemed fickle and ever changing anyway. What I really needed to do, was to hire someone to stand at my sink every morning and just inform me "you're having coffee this morning sir" and I could just make coffee and get on with my fucking day. The butler solution to the coffee problem works because the decision is swift, and I have no say in it, meaning that I can let go of it being perfect. So I decided that my butler would be chance, and I would flip a coin to decide the coffee problem. I could obey the universe. And that got me feeling that the butler solution could work to larger questions. Much larger questions. What I really, really needed was a butler to tell me about all sorts of other different things in my life. I spend an incredible amount of time trying to delegate projects, decide what to work on, decide when to work on what, what's the best order, what is most important, when to persist, when to move on. Often I feel that this delegation and decision making is mostly what I do. If the butler could understand things about my goals for a given part of my life, he could just tell me what to do all day, and it would be out of my hands. And I could even tell him to surprise me sometimes, to shake it up. I would spend no time arranging the messy bits of my life into priorities. That entirely imperfect process would be replaced by another imperfect authority; The butler could answer questions of what to work on, eat, do, create, etc., with 100% decisiveness. I just had to folllow orders. DRS is my attempt at making a system that provides this kind of authority. An authority that doesn't waver, and informs you. "You're eating cornflakes for breakfast", "You're working on music today", "you're eating the recipe on page 230 of the leftmost cookbook in your cabinet for breakfast", "You're working to complete the unfinished work of a dead artist whose name starts with p this month", "you're spending the next year in Japan working as a botanist". DRS allows us to do things we don't *elect* to do given an open field of choice, and in that way it allows for decisions to be completely certain, and at the same time wonderfully non-ordinary.

Theory

///

WHAT IS IT

///

DRS as a method of decision making is partly logical, and partly illogical. It is partly based on wrote interaction, and partly on chance. You can use it to make decisions about anything. The reality synthesizer is infintely customizable and reconfigurable.

The system is made up of a set of discrete components, which can be connected to each other in many different ways. It is a physical system. Each component is made up of a small paper card (I find blank business cards work well). These cards are then arranged onto a cork board, and connected with pieces of string that have thumbtacks on either end (like in a detective movie).

The cards live on another board, or in a pile, etc. They can (and should) be re-used, like a library of small components that you can select at will when needed. Because elements of randomness (and non random, but changing attributes) are used, one arrangement of the board can be used used many times to ask the same question, with different outcomes each time. Additionally, each time you rearrange the components on the board, it will behave further differently. Tweaks to the arrangement will change how it behaves, while a full remake of the board may answer a completely different decision making question, or go about answering the same question in a completely different style.

You can use DRS to decide if you should take a walk or a bike ride, in which case the board will be configured especially to provide you with a useful decision to the question. You can use it to decide whether to work or relax, what genre of movie to watch, what to do with your week, or your year, or your career. Generally though, it works best for things that you do relatively often.

The DRS board is a broad and universal tool. It is purposefully built in this way. This guide may often seem vague when it comes to technicalities, or inconsistent. That is part of the purpose built form of DRS. As I walk through examples of my own boards, we will come across my own quirks and habits of board building. You will create your own quirks as well as you build your own board. They do not need to be the same. Each individual can interpret style and role of DRS differently, and the boards only need to be functional in the sense that *you* understand how they work. They are optimized based on their outcomes. If you are unhappy with the outcomes (long term speaking, meaning after many uses the pattern of outcomes is not what you want) then you modify the board. Making your own board is kind of akin to creating your own language. No one else needs to be able to understand it perfectly, it just needs to work the way you want it to work. Furthermore, when starting the process as a whole, it's a sort of jump in the pool thing, you just have to start, and then as you use the board in actual practice, your own process will start to form.

The concepts I introduce will be broad and overarching. They are meant to be the initial step towards imagining your own boards and the systems and interactions they will contain.

This guide will explore examples, but the guide overall is about the larger system itself. Eventually (or from the get go) your board won't be like the example boards, it will have its own purpose relevant to your life.

///

WHY PHYSICAL

///

So why make DRS a physical process? A computer simulated version of these boards would work very similarly, and would forgoe the process of rolling dice, following logic/calculations, and it make boards instantly shareable and universally useable.

// Freedom

~~The physical DRS board has the luxury of freedom. A digital version would require the restraints of computing. The boards would need to follow a set of rules to some extent. In the physical realm you can make up and add whatever you want to the board, and you can make up how it works. It doesn't need to be logical or techhnically correct. You can attach physical items to the board, reimagine how the whole system works, etc. The board can be yours, and operate on your own rules, regardless if they are extremely direct, or if they are only understandable to you.~~

Accesiblity to complexity

A digital version of DRS would have to provide digital tools for creating boards, and that opens DRS to the pitfalls of accesibility vs complexity. I chose to use the more familiar medium of language and office supplies because they are more accesible across most groups. Digital DRS tooling would need to be simple enough to get started easily, and at the same time allow for a very high complexity ceiling, which would logically introduce complexity at the user level. Language and office supplies, while very complex in potential, are understood at a complex level to more people. I can leave DRS completely open ended and unattended, and hand the user language and basic logic concepts, and they can extrapolate their own process and tooling from there, without me having to predict what type of infastructure they'll need to make their own versions of DRS. In some iterations of DRS I've tacked physical items in my house to my board, included something physically in my space as a variable element of the board. I like the idea that this is easy to do, and that my role in creating the system is one of suggesting not insisting.

// Single State Systems

The original idea for DRS came from modular synthesizers. When using modular synthesizers, you build a sound from the ground up by making connections between different sections of a system of smaller synthesizer parts (modules). Because the connections are made with physical cables and knobs these configurations generally cannot be saved. Every time you reset the synthesizer, and take all the cables out, that sound is lost forever. In order to make a new sound, the current one has to cease existing. This impermanence is one of the most exciting parts of working with those synthesizers. On other types of synthesizers you can load hundreds of saved sounds to be perfectly exactly the same each time you play them. You *can* make a sound from scratch, but its usually very tempting to just grab a familiar sound thats already the way you like it. This kills happy accidents, and happy accidents are the root of creativity and joy. When you are forced to confront a system that can only exist in one state at a time, that state becomes more precious, and at the same time, it is easier to allow it to fizzle away when you grow tired of it, allowing it to leave you. Single state systems reflect the impermanence of life, and help to push us to try new things out of necessity.

// Attachment

Phsycial systems take the manual work and physical space that digital systems do not. This creates attachment. The board has to sit in your actual living space. You have to go out and find thumbtacks and string. Maybe you sit and listen to an album while tying the string to thumbtacks in different lengths to create the cables. Phsyical systems allow for ritual, and these ritualized practices make the board more alluring. You're more likely to use the actual board that has been constructed, designed, and illustrated by you at your desk, rather than playing around with a small application a few times and then not thinking about it.

// Permanence

I like to imagine this text in several hundred years ending up in an obscure digital or physical archive library, sitting unknown. Someone coming across it would be able to build their own board from nothing, and actually use the system. Anything digital would at that point be incredible difficult to get running using legacy technology. Even if it was found past the point where string and cork boards are around, one could get the concept, and create their own version of it from a different set of physical or digital materials. The longest lasting work is work that conveys a concept, because the concept doesn't go out of date. And the date in which software ceases to work without upkeep is often measured in tens of years or less, not hundreds.

///

WHY DIVINATION

///

(2 parts - alleviates decision/reveals chaos + broadens/expands the experience set)

I don't belive in tarot cards, or divination in any traditional way

but all you have to believe, to give over, is that traditional ways of making decisions, of understanding the world, are so often inacurate, or wrong, or unconnected to outcome or state of mind, that they may be worth forgoing at times. There is a peace in giving over to a random system, because it alleviates you from the illusion that the rest of the world isn't chaotic anyways. It allows you to confront the chaos directly, rather than pretending to have control over your fate, the universe. It allows you to see that what you actually have control over is your perception at the other end of what happens to you, at the receiving, experiencing end. You are steering a boat over the waves, and practicing your mooring and rigging skills. Rather than trying to control the ocean, to will the universe into making the waves one way or another, you can simply cast your gaze away from the sea, and practice your sailing skills. Trying to change the tide won't do you much good anyway. One thing you must do however, is put your boat in the water. You must make yourself as available (sometimes actively) to the opportunities which might pass in front of you. Sometimes this will look like chasing, but it's merely the approach of an opportunity that comes to you in reverse.

Wonder comes from new experience, new experience comes from chance coupled with systems. Humans are very bad at creating their own chance. When governed by an outside system we are alleviated from our duties to choose, and turn over to chance. Which will inevitabely sometimes give less comfortable, or more bland outcomes than we would choose ourselves, but will ultimately also bring us to places that we wouldn't, couldn't have chosen to go, even if we were trying to be random about it, or thinking we were (ie exploring on the bus systemically).

Sometimes the outcome is going to suck. That's the biggest downside of handing control over to a system. But the upside is that it will take you places that you didn't expect to go. That you would never choose to go, perhaps that you *could* never choose to go, because choices can never be as adventerous as systems.

//NOTE

Often times the most common revelation of handing over choice to chance based systems is being surprised at the pleasantry of being forced to do something you're not in the mood to do. Even in the case where it's something that you like doing, but just aren't in the mood to do right now. I find a common experience I have while testing DRS is something along the lines of: "ugh, I actually don't want to do this right now, this time I don't, it's not going to be some novel cool surprise that I like what was randomly selected" and then I do the thing selected for me and am surprised that I actually liked doing it. Right now, on my board, I randomly picked into editing this document on DRS (yes I use DRS to write DRS) and I was not looking forward to it at all, and yet I'm finding it very pleasant. w

/// QUOTES

Anthropologist E. E. Evans-Pritchard refers to his personal adoption of the Divination practice of the Azande people wherein a bird is fed poison, and the answer to the question is determined by whether it dies or not:

> "I may remark that I found this as satisfactory a way of running
> my home and affairs as any other I know of,"

Pritchard in Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande (1937)

70 years later, Karl Warneryd, in his rather straight forward and starched collar game theory paper "Religion, Ritual, and Randomization" refers back to Pritchard's assertion and interprets it:

> Though the author himself may have intended this as a rejection of the idea that
> rationality (in the standard sense) has some special claim to superiority as a basis for
> making decisions, what he may really have discovered are the potential benefits of
> strategic commitment to randomization.

- Karl Wärneryd "Religion, Ritual, and Randomzation" Jan 20 2008

I tend to disagree with Warneryd in some sense. He seems to present his first and second halves of the above sentence as somehow opposing (ie, 'it's not that rationality isn't superior, Pritchard just discovered a different strategy of randomness, that has it's own benefits'). I think that the ideas logically partner as one. That 'the benefits of strategic commitment to randomization, reject the idea that rationality has some special claim to superiority as a basis for decision making'. Note that it only rejects that rationality has a 'sepcial claim' to superiority. This doesn't mean that rationality is bad, just that it isn't always the best tool for the job. And note here the use of a 'strategic' 'commitment' to randomness. Which I will mold a bit to our context and adopt as a reason to create systems in which determinism and randomness interlace

The tyranny of rationality

Rationality has a monopoly on our lives. It's effectiveness is rarely questioned and altneratives rarely breached as topic.

There is a little part of us that wants to be children and wants to be unfit for society and wants to do things that aren't in our rational realms. This can lead to destruction and outcast and all sorts of chaos in the bad sense. We supress the urges (concious or sub) because we need to pay rent and make our parents happy, and our parents' friends happy. We are swimming in a sea of rationality with an expanding view of schools of fish.

This supression of the non rational is not healthy. The non rational must be entertained, it must be fed, lest we go hungry for it. The non rational must have its turn with the talking stick lest it throw a tantrum. Or lest we ignore it so much that it gets up and leaves the circle all together. The rational is beauraucratic, it makes decisions that keep us from sleeping under a bridge, or the mental equivilants (or at least, that's what we think it does). It is chiefly a force of equilibrium. If given too much power rationality drives us to a grey mushy existence of ultimate compromise and dreariness. The non rational equilizes the equilibrium - it's the balancing force to the balancing force. It cuts through the mind's paperwork. The real thing that keeps us from sleeping under a bridge, is sleeping under a bridge occasionally. The excercise of the constrained chaotic is what keeps it from spilling out and over. It's why former addicts sometimes seem more alive sober than not. They have no more substance to bring the chaos for them, and so they must reintroduce it ala cart, to keep it in their lives, and stop from using.

The rational is powerful and important, and necessary. But it's not what we see it as from the angle of adolescence on. It's not the only system for dealing with things.

Practice

Divination Implementation

///

I suggest a corkboard as a medium, but if you don't have one you can use cardboard instead. The first version of Divination was made for around 3 euro using a nice piece of cardboard I found on the street, a ball of twine, thumbtacks, and a pack of blank business cards. This type of setup will do just fine

///

There is of course a gap between understanding and accepting the principles of DRS, and implementing into real life.

DRS Is not supposed to be a truly logical system. It stands in opposition to logic. It should maintain a level of absurdity. A purely practical DRS board misses the point of DRS.

Having said that, there is an inherent practicality in an external entity that is 100% decisive, which DRS is.

Keep in mind, as previously mentioned, DRS is meant to be an overarching completely customizable system. *All* of the content relating to practice in this guide is meant to only to kickstart your understanding of how a DRS board can be used. Rules are to be broken, systems tweaked, changed, reinvented, thrown out. This is my presentation of *one* version of how DRS works, not *the* version of how DRS works. So when I say "In DRS, data flows left to right" I mean "In *this particular expression of DRS that I'm currently presenting* data flows left to right" It's ust cumbersome to put all that in the text all the time.

we'll start with the simplest possible asnwering of a question, translated into a DRS board. Consider the examples:

[board diagram: title, breakfast = start -> starcard -> output/end]

for this guide, square brackets indictate cards, like this [START]

For the time being, it's helpful to think of a DRS board like a flowchart - you follow a path from start to finish that has information/questions/processes along the way (eventually we'll get past the functionality of flowcharts, but its a good basis to start from). Things flow from left to right. The flow starts at some *output* (a closed circle), then goes to some *input* (an open circle), then goes to some output, then to an input, and so on. The flow of the board starts with the card named [START] which has an output, and ends when we get to [END] which has an input.

// Control Data vs Content

You may have noticed that in the diagrams some cards have solid borders, and others have a dashed line. The solid border cards are 'Control' cards, which means they make up the technical systems of the board, the dashed cards are 'Content' meaning that they are specific items chosen by whoever puts the board together, to be chosen/manipulated by the system made up of the control cards. You could swap out the content cards for anything else, and the board would still follow the same technical function and flow, you'd just be choosing from a different pool of options, or making up options from different components than before. These cards don't need to be marked differently on the actual board, they are marked in the diagrams to show which parts are our made up options in the examples to clarify that they can be swapped out for anythingyou want.

//

Start with the 6 option, 1 card methods

1 - random breakfast choosing
2 - task list scrambling

give these a good shot and you can start to see what works about the core principles of DRS, or what doesn't (for you) before committing to creating a full board of your own

//
EXAMPLE BOARDS HERE

- path 1 (fig. A)
- path 2 (fig. B)
- split leading to either path 1 or path 2 (fig. C)
  ^^coin flip split
- introduction to persistence - replacing [FLIP] with [SWAP]

// Introduction to Persistence

Up to now, everything has been essentially like a flow chart, with just the added twist of using randomness to guide through it. Now we'll take a look at the second new element: Persistence. Persistence means that certain things about the board will be kept track of from one use of the board to the next. So far we've been starting at [START] and ending at [END] and previous uses of the board have not changed anything about how the cards in

between work. Let's look at the [SWAP] card, which uses persistence in a simple way. Persistent elements on cards are labeled with a square, and the current position/value of a persistent element is kept track of by sticking a small tack into a square. Let's look at the functionality of [SWAP]: we'll start with the pin on the left side square. When we get to [SWAP] we take the pin out, and put it on the right side square, then follow the right path. When we use the board the next day, the pin will be on the right side, and we'll switch it to the left side, and follow the left path. So put simply, every day we switch between 2 different paths that function differently. In this way, we start to control the functions of the board across a second degree; a longer time frame than just the individual use.

We can use other persistent module, like [6s rolled] to enact rarer changes. Every time we come to the [6s rolled] card, we roll a die, and if it's a 6, we move the pin forward one square. When the pin hits the maximum number of 6s (determined by another pin, placed by you or automatically placed by another module) the card outputs out to some other path than normal (normally we just roll the die and continue on to the default output) - the persistent value is then reset back to zero. In this way we can sprinkle in more intense, extreme, or demanding choices/systems, that only happen once in a while. Using persistence is better than simply randomly testing for a low probability event for the following reasons:

- it ensures that the event will eventually happen, in a manner that you can somewhat see coming, but is still unpredicatable enough to retain the benefits of randomness
- it ensures that the event will not happen too often back to back (with pure randomness, there's no garuntee that you won't pick the low probability number twice in a row etc.)

//

//

DRS probably works best in situations of life where there isn't much provided structure. Of course, the scope of any given board is up to you entirely, and you may find use in a board in any aspect of life, no matter how small. But generally DRS was created as a self sufficient way of handing over the burden of decisions to a system.

```
                                    ?
```

//TODO

/ starting with a random only card - plugged into output - w/board diagram

/ show default modules and explain you can do custom
/ explain IO/dataflow
/ explain star for random
/ explain data types - ie control vs content
/ explain carrying out a divination

(board diagrams for above!)

Diagrams

Fig 1A

roll a dice with weighted random outcomes that correspond to choices

Fig 1B

roll a dice with different weighted outcomes (set of 2, 1/6th and 5/6ths) with corresponding choices

Fig 1AB

Introduction of persistence - Here each time we use the board, we move a pin between the two squares on the [SWAP] card - which then outputs - This time the output doesn't lead to a specific result but rather steers us to one of two cards, where we then follow the directions on that card accordingly

ALT FIGURES

Here we're altering the content cards (dashed borders) to change the possible end results of the board's process - these can be anything you want, and will depend greatly on the aims of your personal board. For right now they are all 'authored' meaning we come up with them ourselves and write them on to the cards - in the future we'll see content cards that are written or changed dynamically when something else on the boards triggers them to do so

Note that there are 3 main ways to change things about the board. We can:

- edit the content cards (dashed borders)
- Change the connections between cards (where are the strings are plugged in to)
- Write new cards or edit existing ones (this happens whenever we want new mechanics, or we want to change how something works on a card itself)

EMILY'S LIBRARY (skippable section, will be ommited or included as an appendix)

///

Emily lives in a small town, unnamed, in the middle of nowhere. There's almost nothing to do in her town, its mostly just some banks, a restaurant or two, offices, etc. Emily can't leave the town. The one thing Emily loves in the town however is the library. The library is massive, it has 5 huge floors, with every type of book you can imagine. Emily has been living in the town for 20 years. She loves reading historical novels, and has read hundreds from the library's selection. She loves reading murder mysteries, and has read hundreds of those. There are a couple of other genres which she has read all of the best sellers of, and even the cult hits and a good chunk of the mediocre titles. A couple years ago she began to get bored of her usual reading habits. She starts to wander around the library. She wants to break her habits so she goes to the places that one would least expect to find her it. She takes out almanacs and books on flowers and biographies. She reads mostly non-fiction and finds a great new appreciation for these types of books. For some years she feels that her sense of adventure is satisfied, but as more time passes she feels again a bit of boredom as she chews through larger sections of non fiction. She wanders around completely randomly and picks books, which lasts another year or two, but eventually she even begins to feel that the excitement waning there

Emily knows that there are more books than she could ever read in her life in the library. There are more books

Emily knows that there are more books than she could ever read in her life in the library. There are more books than she could read in a long, long time. She does the math and estimates that if she read every book in the library in order, it would take 800 years (like I said, it's a big library, with lots of books). But she is up for anything! The thing she yearns for is variation. She would be happy to read any of the 100s of thousands of books in the library. How can she have exhausted this feeling of variety even when picking books at random?

Emily is like most of us (humans that is), in that she is bad at doing things without purpose. Her initial strategy is how most people live most of their lives: selecting things based on taste. Her secondary strategy is one that many try occasionally: selecting things in a way that subverts taste (trying new things, seeking new experiences etc.). At the beginning this introduces a lot of variety, but eventually you develop a sort of mirror taste to your real taste, and so 'random' selection becomes more like a mirror image of your preference. You see, when Emily was choosing randomly, she wasn't actually choosing randomly, most of us don't. She would stroll the stacks looking for a 'random' subject, but would never for example, 'randomly' choose a book from the historical fiction or mystery sections because those were part of her original preferences. Subconsciously she ruled those out: those wouldn't be 'random' enough, her brain told her. "Reading from the myster section isn't adventurous and doesn't serve variety, we want variety" her brain told her. And so the randomness was a decision in itself. The random selection had to be interesting and spontaneous. So she subconciously ruled out other sections that were similar to her preferences as well. Her random selections often brought her to the computer manuals, which were fascinating, but which she eventually grew tired of. The computer manuals were random in her mind but only because she (and we) thought of random as the furthest thing from expectation. And we can't help it. We can't decide things randomly. To do that we need systems

Systems have only the biases we choose to include within them. You can steer a system sometimes, but you never control it. It presents something to you, you don't have to seek it. Therefore when we try to do things randomly, or partially randomly, it lifts a great burden from us, which is trying to come up with something randomly. It lets us use our brains where they are useful instead of trying to make them do what they can't, but systems can

Emily gets a librarian to print a list of the name and call number of every book in the library. Its bound into a small book that she takes with her to a desk. She uses a random number generator on the computer to pick out a book from the list, picks it out from the shelf, reads it, then picks out another. She is giddy with the idea at first, but is dissapointed when the first book picked is a mystery novel that is pretty mediocre. Her next 2 books are also novels, one of which she had already read, the other just ok. Then a computer manual which is quite close to one she read before. But eventually she gets a really interesting Russian novel, which she passed many times before because it seemed samey. She comes back to the random list and picks two foreign language learning books in a row, which she hadn't even considered when passing their stacks. She picks a children's book which she finds oddly profound and leads her to read a biography on the author. In between all of these are more mundane books, some that feel too familiar, some that are just confusing or boring. But she reads every book that is chosen by the random number list because sometimes of course she is pleasantly surprised by a book that at first glance seemed uninteresting. Eventually she allows herself to take asides from the random list when she happens upon a really interesting author and wants to read the rest of their works. Sometimes she takes longer breaks from the list if she happens upon a new subject that fascinates her. Generally though, she lets the list guide her exploration.

So what exactly has this most basic of systems done here? It's main effects are two fold: It lowers the 'floor' of

So what exactly has this most basic of systems done here? It's main effects are two fold. It lowers the 'floor' of experience, meaning that the worst books that Emily reads from the random list, are in fact worse than the worst books she was reading before she started using it. Sometimes she is forcing herself through a complete slog of a book that it totally uninteresting and difficult to read, and this is a worse experience than she was having before.

On the other hand, the 'ceiling' of experience is also heightened. Meaning that the best books from the random books are better than the best books from when she was wandering around herself.

Overall its difficult to claim that the experiences as a collection are either better or worse when governed by a system. But they are certainly expanded, certainly more diverse. And that was what Emily was truly after, and what I am often truly after. And in my experience I find that the systemic approach has an oddly high success rate at producing marvelous experience

More narrative discussion (not sure where it fits)

Living

Life wants to tend towards normalcy - towards linear march. This is easiest seen when one takes a huge detour from linearity, and then returns to the people they knew before this detour. Most people, in most corners of the world, live in linearity - there are moments of exploration, of toe dipping, but generally things go to plan. That's not to say that things go well, but rather to say that the goods, bads, excitements, dissapointments, strange events, normal events, are all in relative magnitude to an even constant. This really isn't a bad thing - this linearity and consistency produces wonderful lives for many people, and there is a beauty in the mundane (I say this with complete sincerity). The normality of people's patterns is what produces distinct cultures and personalities of places and ideas.

But I have an aversion to all of this in some sense. There are infinite realities to experience - every place, person, idea, has a different linearity - a different normal of doing things, not to mention the linearities not yet created. I have an aversion to those linearities I've become familiar with in some sense. I see the infinite possibilities of reality, and I crave variety. That doesn't make better than anyone else, it's just what I like. I daydream about restaurants where you can order one bite of everything on the menu. And randomness, systems, an outside non human actor, deal with the decision paralysis of infinite realities, and allow you to peek into different ones freely. I'm writing in hopes of finding those like me that who are put off by the narrowness of one linearity. And this exploration into new realities can be done by anyone in any situation. I give some examples that inolve moving to new countries, taking on new lives, but internal changes to reality can be just as powerful, sometimes more so. If I were to move from the US to the UK lets say, with my ten closest friends and my family, and working the same job remotely, shopping at US import stores etc. - my reality would be less changing than if I decided to stay living in the same house but meditate 8 hours per day. Radical newness doesn't necesarily have to be impossibly grand. You could, having never written, theorized, or gardened in your life, write a philosphy book on gardening over the coming 6 months. You could probably keep your job even. You would just spend most of your free time gardening and theorizing about gardening and writing about gardening - you might invite friends to your new garden to fill your social life, etc, etc. And perhaps it would be a

gardening - you might invite friends to your new garden to fill your social life, etc. etc. And perhaps it would be a horrendous philosophy book on gardening. Perhaps it wouldn't, but that's essentially not the point. When we shift gears into different styles of thinking, of living, we learn more about ourselves and about what it means to exist. New life flavors may be odd, and some dissatisfying, but they present the opportunity for radical growth, and new directions, and a reconceiving of how we can be satisfied by life.

// Like a board game with real life implications - think benevolent jumanji