

The Game-Changing Game—a practical way to craft the future

Dino Karabeg

University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

dino@ifi.uio.no

Abstract

The Game-Changing Game is not a conventional game but a game-changing way to live a life and pursue a career. As “a prototype solution to global problems”, The Game-Changing Game substitutes high-achievement career opportunities for strife and control. We (1) describe The Game-Changing Game and explain why it is a practical way to craft the future; (2) submit it as an answer to the quest of EAD10—i.e. as a way to use the specific knowledge of designers in the contexts of innovation, business development and social change; (3) use it as an example to illustrate how the definition of design that was proposed by this author at EAD06 leads to an agile social role of design.

KEYWORDS: global issues, role of design, systemic innovation

I have become increasingly convinced that even if people fully develop their potential, they cannot give direction to their lives, they cannot forge their destiny, they cannot take charge of their future—unless they also develop competence to take part directly and authentically in the design of the systems in which they live and work, and reclaim their right to do so. This is what true empowerment is about.

(Bela Banathy, *Designing Social Systems in a Changing World*)

Introduction

The Game-Changing Game (abbreviated as The Game) is not a game in the conventional sense, but a game-changing way to live a life and pursue a career. The Game is conceived as a practical way to craft the future.

This article is an invitation. Imagine The Game-Changing Game as a space or a terrain, on which there is a colorful banner suspended on a tall flag pole, waiving in the wind. The banner signals a possibility—to turn large contemporary challenges into similarly large opportunities. The space is where this possibility is being realized. The invitation is to the interested members of the design community to join us in this space. We are inviting you to apply your specific knowledge in designing an action space where our outstanding challenge to craft the future is turned into opportunities for innovation, business development and positive social change.

A challenge to the reader is that the presented ideas are on three levels, which are often conflated together into a single narrative. On one level we share an insight: That the global and other characteristic contemporary problems are *systemic*, or better said, that they need to be perceived and treated as such. On that level we call attention to the possibility of impacting those problems through systemic action, through the practice of design. (We will be calling various societal structures *systems*; interpreting this word as ‘institutions’ or ‘professions’ may make this text easier to read.) On the second level we talk about concrete design projects, which in our narrative assume the role of *prototypes*, while being examples of *systemic* design in specific areas such as journalism or education, those *prototypes* point at a much larger possibility—to apply the methods they exemplify to all other *systems* where substantive change might be needed. On the third level we talk about conceiving the *systemic* approach to crafting the future as a game. The Game-Changing Game itself is also a *prototype*. By developing it, we aim at a sweeping and global impact. To scale to this potential, The Game will need contributions of a number of dedicated people, representing a combination of backgrounds—not the least design.

In what follows we (1) outline The Game-Changing Game and explain why it is a practical way to craft the future; (2) submit it as an answer to the challenge posed to EAD10 (“How can the specific knowledge of designers be [...] used in contexts like innovation, business development and social change?”); (3) use it as an example of a renewed and agile social role of design—pointed at by the definition of design that was proposed by this author at EAD06.

The work presented here is a result of contributions of a number of gifted people; the ‘we’ who is reporting implicitly includes them.

The Game-Changing Game

Imagine that on a walk in a forest you meet a fairy who wants to grant you a career wish: Whatever you may wish to accomplish, or dream might be accomplished, will be granted! What would you choose to contribute to the world? What sort of success would you choose for yourself?

This was how we began our introduction to The Game-Changing Game at the Bay Area Future Salon (Karabeg, 2012 A). When the participants stated their aspirations, we introduced The Game-Changing Game as a loom that can weave everyone’s most audacious positive strivings into projects capable of bringing them to fruition.

The Game-Changing Game is a collaborative strategy game played in real life. There are two categories of players: The A-players play by ‘playing their career games’ within The Game, i.e. in a game-changing way (by changing or designing, rather than inheriting their professions). The Z-players enable the A-players to pursue their careers in a game-changing way, by acting as academic advisors, sponsors, inspirational figures and in other ways; or by co-creating The Game. Part of The Game is to create The Game; this creation is expected to continue indefinitely. Hence what we are describing is not a finished product but a *prototype*. While The Game is played in real life, an online map provides orientation. In the present prototype, this map is implemented on DebateGraph (Knowledge Federation, 2012). The Game consists of three parts — Welcome Node, Vision Quest and Action Quest (see Figure 1).

Welcome Node

The players begin at the Welcome Node, where a collection of life and career choices are offered. Each choice is followed by a hint or reflection, encouraging the players to aim uncommonly high, while suggesting that such high aspirations can be reached within The Game. Here are some examples:

- *Solve global problems.* The Game has been proposed as “a prototype solution to global problems.” What sort of thing could this be? What might it consist of?
- *Create an invention.* Inventions put into practice save time and effort. Imagine a domain where innovation can make the *greatest* possible difference; and where inventions and innovations have just been enabled by new technology. What could this be?
- *Make a large contribution to human knowledge.* We invite you to be bold: What is the *largest* contribution to human knowledge you can think of?
- *Make a fortune in business.* A century ago Henry Ford created an uncommonly large fortune by combining a new technology (the automobile) with a new way to organize work (the conveyor belt). Can you see a similar possibility today?
- *Save lives, reduce suffering.* The first thing that comes to mind is to become a medical doctor or a peace negotiator. But this is The Game-Changing Game, where you are encouraged to think beyond conventions. Can you think of a completely *new* way to save lives and reduce suffering? On a *very* large scale?

All choices lead to the Game Start node, where The Game-Changing Game properly begins. From there, two options are offered: Vision Quest, where a course of action through which such high accomplishments can be realized is sought and revealed; and Action Quest, where practical ways to pursue this course of action are crafted and pursued.

Vision Quest

Vision Quest begins with a way of looking at our contemporary condition and its characteristic ‘wicked problems’ that radically departs from the proverbial ‘thinking as we did when we created them’. At the outset of Vision Quest the players are asked to, metaphorically speaking, ‘put on a pair of X-ray goggles’. When we look at a problem through those goggles, its wickedness melts away. Indeed, we don’t even see the problem, because we see right through it—what we see are the underlying societal structures or *systems* that are either causing the problem, or failing to take care of it.

The current Vision Quest *prototype* offers a compendium of systemic views, which all point at a single general insight into the nature of our situation, and a way in which it needs to be handled. Specific views are offered as vignettes and reflections, as illustrated by the following example:

Charles Ferguson got a degree in mathematics from the UC Berkeley and a doctorate in political science from the MIT. As a post-doc at MIT he consulted for the White House, the Department of Defense and several leading IT companies. In 1994 Ferguson founded Vermeer, the IT company that developed FrontPage, the first visual Web page editor. Two years later Ferguson sold Vermeer to Microsoft for \$133 million, and continued to do research, consulting and writing in political science.

In 2005 Ferguson decided to use his wealth and insider’s knowledge of the US economy and politics to try to bring to public attention certain insights that he found urgently needed. He subsequently produced two feature length documentary films, No End in Sight and Inside Job. This latter film, which won the 2010 Academy Award as the best documentary, showed how the 2008 financial crisis was caused ‘from the inside’, i.e. by people and developments within the US financial services industry, popularly known as ‘Wall Street’. Ferguson’s first film, which was nominated for the Academy Award in 2008, showed how similar developments in the US government led to the present war in Iraq; how the reasons for this war that were given to the public did not reflect reality; and how after the occupation the country was mismanaged, which brought it into a condition of escalating chaos. In Inside Job, Ferguson also pointed at a relationship between the institutional protagonists of his two films, the financial services and the government, by an expert interviewee’s observation “It’s a Wall Street government!” made about the government that President Obama selected following his 2008 election.

To see how these large problems can be turned into even larger opportunities, we move mentally from the US to England, and take a brief look at David McCandless’ Billion-Dollar-o-Gram (McCandless, 2009). A selection of contemporary issues are represented as rectangles, and the number of billions of dollars that handling an issue might cost by the area of its corresponding rectangle. Two issues—exactly the ones that Ferguson chose to point at in his films—dominate this image; and indeed so overwhelmingly that the costs of other represented issues, such as to “save Amazon” or “to lift 1 billion people out of extreme poverty”, seem tiny in comparison.

A large opportunity that follows was pointed at by Buckminster Fuller in the early 1970s. Fuller claimed that by the end of the century we would reach what he called “the end of scarcity”—that science and technology would develop so much that we would have enough knowledge and resources to take care of

everyone's needs. What we have just seen shows that he may have been right—we may indeed have sufficient resources; our problem may no longer be the lack of resources, but the way those resources are used and distributed.

And this—the distribution of resources—is the systemic function performed by the US financial services and government. What Ferguson undertook to show us in his two films was that those two systems were evolving in a way that has brought them out of synch with the functions they need to serve in the larger system of the society—and how a variety of specific problems that we experience or witness daily resulted.

Through a series of similar vignettes, covering a broad selection of domains (corporate business organisation, healthcare, public informing, education, science, religion...), Vision Quest makes it transparent that the pattern exhibited by the US financial services tends to be a rule rather than exception. Other key *systems* have been evolving in a similar way, and now exhibit similar functional and structural deformities.

In the picture that emerges clearly before our eyes we see ourselves engaging in our careers competitively, in a similar way as when playing an engaging game. We see the *systems* that organise us together—which define the rules and the context in which our real-life games are played—evolving pathologically, being pulled in their evolution not towards their purpose, but by the desire of each of us to win in the game. We see our problems growing worse, and our competition becoming more fierce, as our *systems* drift further away from their function in other *systems*, that is—in our society and in our lives—for which they have been created.

The picture that emerges from Vision Quest is nothing like the conventional “1% vs. 99%”; we see that our real political issue is *all of us* against dysfunctional—and sometimes pathological—societal *structures*.

By transforming our conventional problems into *systemic* ones, Vision Quest empowers us to act. While each of our conventional ‘problems’ (such as the ones related to the economy, environment or poverty) has very many systemic ‘causes’, and is therefore difficult or impossible to ‘understand’ and to ‘solve’, each systemic problem points at a number of possibilities for *systemic* improvement—whose results can be well beyond the palliative removal of ‘problems’ that are conceived as symptoms. As we shall see next, the function of The Game is to develop projects called *game-changing games* by which *systemic* solutions can be accomplished.

Action Quest

Action Quest allows us to expand our field of focus and creative action. We talk about *systemic innovation* where invention and innovation are allowed scale—from material objects and services, to our various *systems*. In Action Quest we create methods and projects by which *systemic innovation* can be practiced. In what follows, *systemic innovation* will be illustrated by describing one such project—the journalism *game-changing game*, and we shall only point at others.

The Barcelona 2011 Good Journalism Prototype has been conceived at the Knowledge Federation Workshop Barcelona 2011, where a transdisciplinary community (academic and practicing journalists, knowledge media researchers, collective intelligence experts and other stakeholders) met to “co-create an innovation ecosystem for good journalism” (Knowledge Federation, 2011; Karabeg 2012 B). The public informing *prototype* that was conceived at this workshop differs from conventional journalism in a number of ways:

- *Journalism has an associated transdiscipline that re-creates it continuously.* Instead of being a result of historical practices modified by commercial interests, public informing is continuously created by a *transdiscipline* where journalists cooperate with knowledge media researchers, economists, sociologists, political scientists, entrepreneurs and other experts and stakeholders as needed. The journalism *transdiscipline* considers journalism as a core *systemic* component, and develops it accordingly—so that democracy may function, and so that solutions to complex contemporary issues may be found. The participants bring the relevant results and insights from their respective fields of expertise and apply them to this strategic *systemic* design task. Journalism becomes ‘alive’ (capable of adapting and evolving).
- *Citizens are given direct voice.* Public informing gives direct voice to the public (‘citizen journalism’, includes also scientists and politicians). A curatorial function is added, which organizes contributions into themes, and highlights the more urgent or important ones.
- *Systemic causes to perceived problems are sought and found.* Most relevant themes are brought further into a ‘systemic loop’, where experts in suitable disciplines, as well as media artists and others including the general public are engaged. The goals are to find underlying systemic causes (such as the malfunction of the monetary system; or a corrupt official); to explain them in ways that will be transparent to general public; to identify ‘leverage points’ i.e. strategies and actions that can lead to remedial systemic change.
- *Experts partake directly in the ‘collective mind’.* Consider again the financial services example: A perceived problem may be growing unemployment and recession; an economist or a political scientist (such as Ferguson) may identify the misconstructured financial system as the systemic cause; a mathematician may devise a simple way for common people to understand why the present monetary system may be ineffective, or even illegitimate; an animation artist may make the money flow transparent.

The Barcelona 2011 Good Journalism Prototype is scheduled to be implemented in practice by the ZIG Project, which is germinating at the University of Zagreb.

Compare the above public informing *prototype* with the still conventional state of affairs: Academic scientists (publicly sponsored experts) restricting their participation in our public sphere to writing articles which only their colleagues can understand; journalists struggling to find the next sensation that will occupy the public’s attention; social scientists raising a red flag—journalism’s *systemic* function has degenerated to “manufacturing consent” with the existing

politics and policies (Chomsky & Herman, 2010)—but this too remaining isolated in its epistemic ‘silo’. Already this single example may be sufficient to see why we sometimes talk about *systemic modernization*, namely about the possibility to bring to our institutions and professions the kind of change that has characterized modernization (think for ex. about the change from the horse-and-buggy to the train and the passenger jet; or from ‘the witches brew’ to scientific medicine).

In a similar spirit, other *game-changing games* are being developed:

- *Education game-changing game*. Education *is* systemic change; it re-creates our *systems* with each generation—or has the potential to do so. At the Knowledge Federation Workshop Dubrovnik 2012 an educational *game-changing game* has been conceived. The university course prototype that resulted from it functions as a design project, in which each generation of students designs the course and its learning resources together with the instructors, based on the prototype and the recommendations from the previous generation. This course contributes to the students’ and the educators’ ability to co-create *systems* (1) by developing in students the ethics and the habits of *systemic* co-creation; (2) by teaching *systemic innovation* (that is the subject of the course); (3) by developing a flexible education model so that the people who are already working can re-educate themselves when their education or profession becomes obsolete (instead of depending for their livelihood on systemic status quo); (4) by enabling the economies of scale—the course is co-created by experts and students internationally, and offered to learners worldwide. When an expert is responsible only for a single lecture or a part of a lecture, and when animation artists and communication designers are available for collaboration as members of the *transdiscipline*, then education can finally begin to draw benefits from the new media and from good design in a similar way as the gaming industry now does.
- *Entrepreneurship game-changing game*. Entrepreneurship has the capacity to create new ‘organs’ of the ‘social organism’. Yet the conventional ‘two college dropouts in a garage’ entrepreneurship model tends to be suitable only for adding pieces to existing systems. This project develops an entrepreneurship model where entrepreneurs join designers and other stakeholders in re-creating entire *systems*.
- *Tourism game-changing game* creates a model of tourism that is adjusted to its systemic role of maintaining cultural diversity and securing cultural cross-fertilization.
- *Corporation game-changing game* evolves a corporation model where financial interests are in synergy with the broader *systemic* ones.
- *Health game-changing game* creates a *prototype* healthcare that brings vitality to each ‘cell’ of the ‘social organism’. Cultivation of vitality is used as a theme for cultural renewal.

- *Politics game-changing game*. A prototype political agenda is co-created with a small but agile political party in Norway, to develop a systemic—as distinguished from ‘symbolic’ (Edelman, 1964)—approach to political action.
- *Science game-changing game* develops the *transdiscipline* to complement the conventional disciplinary organization. Systemic innovation in knowledge work (creating knowledge work that truly works) is conceived of as new ‘basic research.’
- *Religion game-changing game* re-evolves religion, in a way that may help us reconnect (*religare*) with our sense of purpose and with one another.
- *Design game-changing game* designs design, as explained in more detail below.

Each of those *game-changing games* reproduces the same basic structure, where a *transdiscipline* is developed around a *systemic prototype*, to re-create it continuously, and to make strategic moves to bring the envisioned ways of doing things and changes into real-world *systems* and practice.

The Game-Changing Game as a whole

The Game-Changing Game may now be simply understood as a generic *system* for *systemic innovation*.

To understand its principle of operation, imagine The Game-Changing Game (see Figure 1 at the end of this text) as a piece of socio-technical ‘machinery’. Imagine the A-players—characteristically young people or people who are at a point in their careers where they can easily make a shift—trickling into The Game from above, and flowing into the Welcome node. They enter with their own goals and ambitions. The message they receive is that whatever their positive strivings might be, they can accomplish a lot more by ‘playing their career game’ within The Game-Changing Game. In Vision Quest they find out why and how. In Action Quest they are given a chance to pursue the chosen course of action (*systemic innovation*) by joining or creating a *game-changing game* in a domain of their interest.

Each *game-changing game* is structured as a pair—a *systemic prototype*, and an associated *transdiscipline*. The purpose of the *transdiscipline* is to change the prototype continuously; and to make strategic moves to bring the associated systemic solutions into conventional, real-world practice. The A-players play by creating the *prototypes*. They become the human elements of the new *systems*.

The Game itself is also a socio-technical system. Its human elements are the Z-players. Since they have power positions within the existing *systems*, the Z-players are not as mobile as the A-players. Yet for the same reason they are capable of enabling the A-players to play their career games in a game-changing way *within the constraints of existing systems*, by acting as academic advisors, sponsors, inspirational role models and in other ways. Hence the Z-players play by “empowering the young people to co-create the world they will want to live in.” A and Z are of course only roles, and a single player can of course have both.

The Game-Changing Game has the same structure (it is a *prototype – transdiscipline* pair) as specific

game-changing games. The corresponding *transdiscipline* is called The Club of Zagreb. The Club of Zagreb is a re-design of The Club of Rome where the same interest—the global issues or ‘the world problematique’ as The Club of Rome called them—is responded to in the straight and simple way represented by The Game. The Club of Zagreb had its first meeting at Europe House Zagreb on September 27, 2012 (Bacic & Karabeg, 2012).

It would, however, be contrary to the idea of game changing to define The Game-Changing Game by a set of fixed rules. We conceived The Game as a ‘space’—where we do creative strategic ‘moves’ without bounds, which all synergize with one another, and where each move makes the pursuit of social-systemic game changing more likely to succeed. An example of a strategic move may be writing a grant application or composing a video or a media document explaining the advantages of the presented *systemic* or *proactive* approach to global issues—as compared to the conventional palliative or *reactive* approach.

To those of us who have grown accustomed to long and exhausting political battles through which the ‘solutions’ to climate change, financial crisis and other contemporary ‘problems’ are being sought, it may seem surprising that the problematic nature of our condition can be turned into career or achievement opportunities. But shouldn’t this indeed be just normal? If our society has an urgent and unfulfilled need, shouldn’t taking care of this need be a natural ground for success and achievement? This—the shift of focus from problems to opportunities, and the realisation of those opportunities—is the main reason for existence of The Game-Changing Game. We now illustrate this by revisiting the mentioned examples of life and career goals:

- *Solve global problems*. Vision Quest reduces the perplexing global problems to a single straightforward *systemic* one—How to make our *systems* ‘alive’ i.e. capable of evolving and adapting as their ‘environments’ change? Action Quest offers *prototype* answers to this question.
- *Create an invention*. The Game-Changing Game instantiates *systemic innovation*, where our focus in innovation and invention expands from things to *systems* (the corporation, governance, finance, public informing, education...). Think about inventing a new way for orchestrating science, or journalism, or governance, or all those systems together; since the *systems* decide what the effects of work of millions of people will be, it seems difficult to imagine another kind of invention that would make work *more* effective.
- *Make a large contribution to human knowledge*. Whatever we might choose to do in knowledge work (as scientists, journalists, communication designers...), we can only contribute one ‘person-lifetime’ worth of knowledge; unless of course we opt to improve the *systems* by which knowledge is created and shared, in which case we may be radically augmenting *everyone’s* contributions to knowledge (Karabeg & Lachica, 2008).
- *Make a fortune in business*. Prior to Ford’s creation of a way to mass-produce automobiles, investments into oil drilling, gasoline stations and automobile tires were not nearly as lucrative as they were subsequently. To see how *systemic innovation* may open up a variety of similar entrepreneurship opportunities in a variety of areas, think of Ford Motor

Company combined with those supporting businesses as a *game-changing game* in transportation.

- *Save lives, reduce suffering.* Here we talk about *systemic innovation* in public informing, by which the probabilities associated with known and unknown risks can be highly reduced; and with *systemic innovation* in healthcare—that would include its lifestyle-induced causes (Kollath, 1958). On a closer look, *systemic innovations* in other areas may turn out to have similar effects—when their consequences or ‘ripple effects’ are propagated through the system.

In sum, The Game is conceived as a *practical* way to craft the future. It first shows that the future cannot really be crafted without redesigning our *systems*, and vice versa (Vision Quest). It then offers a *practical* way to design *systems*—where the participants’ personal and career aspirations *synergize* with the larger goal to create *systems* that function to our best benefit.

An answer to the EAD10 challenge

How can the specific knowledge of designers be brought forward, articulated, made visible and be understood and used in contexts like innovation, business development and social change?

By inviting the designers into The Game, we provide a practical answer to this question as well. The effect of The Game is to operationalize or ‘gamify’ the answer.

There are several ways in which the specific knowledge of designers can be instrumental for the success of The Game—and through it to the purposes it serves:

- *By designing the Game-Changing Game.* As we pointed out, the present version of The Game-Changing Game is a *prototype*. Imagine it as a piece of modeling clay, ready to be remolded. The intended result is a piece of socio-technical machinery which undertakes to be ‘a practical way to craft the future’; and which operates by spinning off innovation and business projects, and by inducing social change.
- *By designing Vision Quest.* Help us create our ‘banner.’ Help us empower systemic change, give shape to *systemic modernization*, by contributing to the design of Vision Quest. An uncommonly agile message is waiting to be delivered in the medium of your choice—a poster, a video, a graphical profile, a board game...
- *By participating in a transdiscipline.* Conventional academic and media communication has not coopted designers nearly as successfully as advertising did. We are pointing at a way to correct that. The described journalism *transdiscipline*, for instance, includes message design as an essential part of its activity. Similarly, each *game-changing game* is open to receive the benefits of design in general, and of communication design in particular.

Designing design

We have seen that the solution to complex global and other contemporary issues may ultimately be a simple ‘rule of thumb’ or attitude—instead of treating our *systems* (institutions, professions, habitual ways of doing things...) as games with fixed rules within which we play competitively by optimizing our personal gain, we adjust what we do to the larger *systemic* purpose, aiming to make our *systems* functional and whole.

The question we consider next is—if we apply this attitude to design, what idea of design would result? In what way would this affect the design practice?

In the definition proposal made by this author at EAD06, the distinguishing characteristic of *design* is exactly the mentioned attitude (Karabeg, 2005). Similarly as Stanford University d.school did, we projected *design* as not only a profession, but above all as an attitude or an approach, applicable in any field and to any task.

In the mentioned article *design* was defined as ‘alternative to *tradition*’. Intuitively, *tradition* means relying on the inherited rules of the game without questioning them, as a prototypical traditionalist would. Implicitly, *tradition* means trusting that automatic, Darwinian-like evolution (‘the invisible hand’ of the market, ‘publish or perish’ in the academia...) will secure that our opportunistic moves lead to systemic wholeness. When we practice *design*, we take responsibility for systemic wholeness ourselves.

An accessible intuitive interpretation of that definition characterizes *design* by the sort of attitude one manifests when stopping the car to change the wheel that has a flat tire.

Design is a lot more than the solution to our problems; it is indeed an attitude that permits us to create a completely new cultural and social order. “*Design* is divine” is a pun shorthand for the pun formula: “Seek ye first systemic wholeness, and all the rest will be bestowed upon thee.”

Design also has a philosophical or fundamental side. To highlight it, we talk about *design epistemology*, where *epistemology* is defined as ‘what the creation of truth and worldview is based on’. *Design epistemology* allows us to approach the age-old ‘philosophical’ questions about truth, reality and meaning in a radically new, *design* way (Karabeg, 2012 C).

A characteristic element of conventional science is an experiment. A characteristic element of the *design* approach to knowledge is a *prototype*. *Prototypes* are placed into reality to alter it, and to collect information about how our ideas meet reality—and learn how to improve or create *systems*.

Conclusion

By pointing at *systemic modernization* as a way to craft the future, we have not really said anything new: Not only have many authors already elaborated on this point (for a summary see Banathy,

1996), but a group of leading sociologists even argued that *systemic modernization*, or “reflexive modernization” as they called it, *already* marks our era (Beck et al., 1994):

[What indeed] is ‘reflexivity’? To this question two answers must be given. First there is structural reflexivity in which agency, set free from the constraints of social structure, then reflects on the ‘rules’ and ‘resources’ of such structure; reflects on agency’s social conditions of existence. Second there is self-reflexivity in which agency reflects on itself. In self-reflexivity previous heteronomous monitoring of agents is displaced by self-monitoring. Beck’s Risk Society and Giddens’s Consequences of Modernity mainly address structural reflexivity. (Lash, 1994).

What The Game offers to add to this next stage of our modernization is to make it *practical*—through the use of *design* as attitude and approach.

To see how, consider again the flat tire metaphor by which the *design* approach has been informally defined; we manifest the *design* attitude by (1) understanding the nature of our situation as a whole, and the action it requires (“our car is having a flat tire”); and (2) by *doing* the action that follows (“changing the wheel”). In a similar manner, The Game invites us to look at our over-all condition and (1) identify that there too we have *systemic* problems that demand that we interrupt our business as usual and take care of them first (Vision Quest); and (2) identify and perform the suitable action (Action Quest).

We have seen, and this can be elaborated further, that specific *game-changing games* that The Game creates offer practical ways to engage in innovation, business development and social change; and that together they amount to The Game-Changing Game as a way to craft the future. Hence The Game offers to answer the EAD10 challenge in the *design* way (not in the conventional academic way)—by, metaphorically speaking, ‘changing the wheel’ (not by ‘sitting in the car and discussing what is to be done’).

The Game is not a finished product but a design *prototype*; The Game is a model and a sandbox. We invite the EAD10 designers to combine our two initiatives (The Game and EAD10) and to meet us in the ‘sandbox’, where we can together craft the future by *re-designing* this *prototype*.

References

- Bacic, R. & Karabeg, D. (2012) *Invitation to the Opening of The Club of Zagreb*. Retrieved February 1, 2013, from <http://knowledgefederation.net/Misc/TheCoZinv.pdf>
- Banathy, B. (1996). *Designing Social Systems in a Changing World*. Plenum.
- Beck, U. et al. (1994) *Reflexive Modernization*. Polity Press.
- Chomsky, N. & Herman E. (2010). *Manufacturing Consent*. Random House.
- Edelman, M. (1964). *Symbolic Uses of Politics*. University of Illinois Press.
- Karabeg, D. (2005) *Design is the Alternative to Tradition*. Proc. EAD06. Retrieved February 1, 2013, from <http://DinoKarabeg.info/ID/Articles/DIAT.pdf>

Karabeg, D. (2012 A). *The 10th Trintab (Welcome to The Game-Changing Game)*. Lecture at Bay Area Future Salon. Announcement etrieved February 1, 2013, from <http://www.futuresalon.org/2012/07/future-salon-10th-trimtab-with-dino-karabeg-july-16-sap-palo-alto.html>; Prezi <http://prezi.com/rxyggyvlepk/thegecgforfs/>

Karabeg, D. (2012 B). *An Innovation Ecosystem for Good Journalism*. Lecture at New Political Communication and EU. Recording <https://soundcloud.com/dinokarabeg/newmediaeutalk> and Prezi http://prezi.com/b_2fircozq-p/recreating-journalism-an-instance-of-a-paradigm/

Karabeg, D. (2012 C). Design Epistemology. *Information 3, no. 4: 621-634*. Retrieved February 1, 2013, from <http://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/3/4/621>

Karabeg, D. & Lachica, R. (2008). Knowledge Federation as a Principle of Knowledge Creation and Sharing. *Proc. First International Workshop on Knowledge Federation, CEUR-WS Vol.* Retrieved February 1, 2013, from <http://CEUR-WS.org/Vol-552/Karabeg-Lachica-KF08.pdf>.

Kollath, W. (1958) *Zivilisationsbedingte Krankheiten und Todesursachen*. Haug.

Lash, S. (1994) Reflexivity and its Doubles: Structure, Aesthetics, Community. In Beck, U. et al., *Reflexive Modernization*. Polity Press.

Knowledge Federation (2011). *Knowledge Federation Workshop Barcelona 2011*. Web page, Knowledge Federation Wiki. Retrieved February 1, 2013, from http://www.knowledgefederation.org/Knowledge_Federation_Workshop_Barcelona_2011

Knowledge Federation (2012). *The Game-Changing Game map prototype*. Retrieved February 1, 2013, from <http://DebateGraph.org/GameChangingGame>

McCandless, D. (2009). *Billion-Dollar-o-Gram 2009*. <http://www.informationisbeautiful.net/visualizations/the-billion-dollar-o-gram-2009/>

Figure 1

The Game-Changing Game structure diagram (from the Prezi by which The Game was introduced publicly for the first time, at the Future Salon in Palo Alto in July 2012).

