This document is pretty much just a place for me to put anything about tulpamancy that I come up with that I feel is worth preserving. This is mostly just for my own reference, but you are free to use it as you please as well. Please note that I am going to make little attempt to organize any of the things that I put here. If I put something here that I later change my mind on, I may make a note that I no longer agree with it, but it's also possible that I'll forget. Take any advice from here at your own peril, and I hope that you find something useful or interesting.

~~~

A month or two back I came up with a sort of classification system for switching and bodily control and that sort of stuff. I suppose that I'll share that here. I have come up with 6 different variables that can be changed to describe different well known states within the tulpamancy community as well as variations on those states:

1. control over attention
2. extent of sensory perception
3. degree of memory access
4. ability to think
5. control over physical movement
6. influence over unconscious processes[1].

These variables can also be divided into the categories "sharable", which means that multiple systemmembers can have to the same parts of the variable at the same time (for example, multiple systemmembers being able to see out of the body's eyes at the same time), and "distributable", which means that multiple systemmembers are able to have different parts of the variable at the same time but cannot all use the same part at the same time (for example one systemmember controlling one arm of the body, and the other controlling the other arm, but they can't both control the same arm at the same time). Shareable variables are:

1. control over attention
2. extent of sensory perception
3. memory access

Distributable variables are:

1. control over physical movement
2. influence over unconscious processes.

The one variable that doesn't fall under either sharable or distributable is the ability to think, however since thinking is often swapped rapidly between systemmembers, functionally it acts as if it is sharable.

Now that I have explained that, I can go over the actual point of this all. This classification system is useful for not just breaking down things that we already have words for, but also for describing things that we don't have words for, or explaining the nuances to variations on standard tulpamancy practices. This system probably can't capture all of the nuance of every different state of frontedness, but it seems to be able to cover a lot of them. To

---

[1] this one I feel needs a bit of extra explanation. by "influence over unconscious processes" I mean whether or not a given unconscious process changes to be a specific way associated with you, for example resting heart rate being different when one systemmember is switched in or another.

use this system, just describe how a particular state is like based on each of variables. Here is an example where I use this system to describe what the experience of being switched in is like in my system exclusive control over attention, able to perceive using all senses, able to access all memories, but only having emotional attachment to some of them, able to think, able to control physical movement, and influence over an unknown amount of unconscious processes, particularly over interpretation of the senses.

-

I have noticed that in a lot of systems, systemmates don't talk to each other casually very much, this seems to be especially prevalent in older systems. This is extremely sad to me, because I love talking to Miela and just being with her, and it pains me that there are a lot of systems out there that don't have that. Because of this, I am now writing down some things that Miela and I do that allows us to talk to each other more.

1. Though we can read each other's thoughts at will, we try to avoid looking too far into what the other is thinking unless they make it clear that this thought has been sent to the other person. This makes it so that there is a little bit of knowledge that isn't immediately shared, so that later we can have more things to talk about.

2. We make an effort to think of the other throughout the day so that they can stay more active and we can converse about whatever is happening in the moment. It can be hard to get into the habit of keeping your tulpa (or your host if they're not fronting) active all day, but it is still very important because there are a lot of things to talk about that you wouldn't think to bring up later and moments for bonding that you would miss if you were alone.

3. Set aside some time each day to do something with your tulpa. This one is pretty obvious really, but it still needs to be said because a lot of systems stop doing this when they get older. Whether it is to play a game or go wonderlanding (a lot of people seem to not do wonderlanding right either, but that's a story for another day) or just to talk, just find a time in your day where you won't be interrupted, and stick to it.

4. Don't be afraid of silence. Sometimes in a conversation we run out of things to say and just sit together for a little bit, but generally after not too long, we think of something new to talk about. Don't move on just because the conversation has paused; that's just a thing that conversations do every once in a while. Really, I like it when the conversation slows down a little bit, because then I can just be in the presence of Miela and look into her eyes, and maybe that sounds weird but she is pretty and I love her and this is my book so I can say whatever I want.

-

Last time I mentioned that a lot of people seem to get wonderlanding wrong, so I figure I'll clear that up here. A lot of systems almost never go wonderlanding. Some do this because their visualization skills are bad, and though they could practice visualization through wonderlanding, it's pretty understandable that wonderlanding wouldn't be as fun for them and

they aren't really the people who I wish to talk about right now. The people who I want to talk about are the people who can visualize well, but find wonderlanding boring. I was once one of those people, so here is what I do to keep wonderlanding interesting.

The number 1 most important thing that you can do to keep your wonderlanding interesting is to impose limits to yourself and the world. These limits can be whatever you like so long as they make it so that you can't automatically do whatever you want to do and so long as you stick with these limitations. Now that it takes effort to do things, what things you do matters. Now you can get invested in the outcomes of things, and feel satisfied when things go well and sad when they don't.

Now the only problem is that you need a goal that you want to achieve. Sometimes this will be easy, other times it won't be. If you are struggling to come up with something to achieve, just have some problem appear that you need to fix, or if you want something more structured, then you can write out an adventure with puzzles that you need to solve and obstacles that you need to avoid, and then before you know it you are having just as much fun planning out your adventures as you are going on them. The logical conclusion of this is that eventually in order to keep things fair you start using dice to decide the outcomes of certain things and then eventually you end up building your own tabletop RPG, but that's fine, that's good even the whole point is to have fun with your tulpa and playing tabletop RPGs with your tulpa is as good a way to do that as any other.

-

Merging is weird. 2 systemmates could merge into 1, or 1 could split into 2, but I have also been able to merge with myself and create something new, or merge with something that lacks identity and create something new. In some systems, when 2 systemmates merge, they always result in the same new identity, but in other systems, they always result in a different identity, but in every system, when a merge splits, it always results in the same components. From all of this weirdness and inconsistency, I have concluded that merging is just symbolism that allows you to make new tulpas quickly. Why does merging work differently between systems? Why can components of a merge not be accessed at the same time as the merge themself? To me it seems quite likely that the answer is simply "because that is what you believe is going to happen".

-

Miela (my tulpa) and I are currently romantically involved with each other. A lot of people, however, are pretty iffy about the idea of dating your systemmembers, and for good reason: uneven power dynamics, limited ability to distance yourself from your systemmates, and the lowered levels of free will in young tulpas make for consent to be kind of hazy. Here are some general guidelines to make sure that your relationship with your systemmates is healthy:

1. Don't date a tulpa if they are less than half a year old. Even if you think you both have feelings for each other, young tulpas can be impulsive and very influenceable, so even if they think that they are in love, they could change their mind, or they could only be in love because their host expects them to be, and so because of that, an immature tulpa

can't really consent. Of course tulpas mature at different rates, but half a year is probably a safe guideline. Even if you think that your tulpa is mature, still wait until they are at least 6 months old, because it is very easy to overestimate how mature your tulpa is, and if you don't devote a fair amount of time to forcing them every day, then it is probably better to wait more than 6 months.

2. Don't make a tulpa for the purpose of dating them. This should be fairly obvious, but if you make a tulpa for the purpose of dating them, then there is a lot of pressure on them to date you, and therefore they can't really consent. Also see point number 1.

3. Make sure that neither side would make drama if the other decided to break up. When you share a head with someone, it is pretty difficult to avoid them, and so because of that, it can be pretty miserable when systemmates are upset with each other, because of that systemmates tend to want to keep in good standing with each other, and that means that if breaking up with your systemmate would cause a lot of drama then there isn't really much of a way to escape a relationship, since even if you are unhappy in the relationship, you would be less happy outside of it. This is a really bad situation to be in, so to prevent that from happening, all parties involved should promise each other not to make a fuss if the other decides to end the relationship.

And of course other than those intrasystem specific things, also keep in mind general relationship stuff like not being manipulative, ect.

-

This log isn't dead. I plan on returning to it, but for now I just don't have as much to say.

-

Wow, it has been over 2 months since I last updated this, huh. Well even if I update this more infrequently or sporadically, I am definitely going to keep updating it, and if I ever decide to stop updating it, I'll make sure to leave a note to make it clear. Anyway, on to tulpamancy philosophy:

Obviously, tulpas have feelings and deserve to be treated with respect, I don't think that I am saying anything new with that (in fact most of this entry is probably already common knowledge among successful tulpamancers, but it is still worth saying for those who are struggling), however more important than the health of any individual tulpa or systemmember is the health of the system as a whole. This very important idea is really not talked about enough, probably because in most systems, what is good for each systemmember is also good for the system as a whole, but this is not always the case.

In overcrowded systems and systems with toxic systemmates, sometimes the only way for the system to be healthy is to dissipate a systemmember (or multiple systemmembers). This is not a decision to be made lightly, it should be the last resort for when you know that nothing else will work.

4

I think that I forgot what my point in all this was. I might go back and clean this up later

-

Well I said I was going to keep updating it, so it's time to finally make good on that promise, even if it took me over a year. The really the only reason why I'm updating it now is because I saw an interesting conversation that ended before I could join in

On the .info discord a while ago, there was some talk about titles that people could hold in the tulpa community. I think that they were only half serious, but it was still kind of interesting. So one approach that was talked about was hierarchical titles, which would be given based on seniority or skill or something like that. One of the problems with this though, is that it is very difficult to measure one's skill with something like tulpamancy. The easy way to measure it would be based on whether they are able to do many of the more difficult tulpamancy feats, such as possession, switching, and imposition. But that doesn't really work because those are really more auxiliary to core tulpamancy, and you can have a very well developed tulpa and be very knowledgeable without ever even learning possession. If what you care about is tulpa development, there is really no good way to measure it

It was also proposed that instead of there being a hierarchy, titles are just used to give certain information about someone just from their name. In something like this, then it might make sense to include auxiliary skills like possession, imposition, and switching. It was also proposed that titles could be used for different approaches to tulpamancy, so if you approach things more methodically then you would have one title to reflect that, and if you approached things more intuitively then you would have another title to reflect that. The idea is that in a mentor system, people looking for mentors could choose those that have similar approaches to themselves. The problem with that is that I don't really understand this distinction. Maybe it just wasn't properly explained, but everyone else seemed to understand it. Maybe I'm just an outlier and I don't understand it because the distinction doesn't fit me, but others understand it because it fits them. It's hard to say

Finally, it was proposed that titles could be given based off of the general system dynamics that you have. So there would be a title for systems where different systemmembers switch often and share the front more, and for systems with more of a confronting situation where multiple systemmembers are just about always active at the same time, and there could be one for systems who claim to have parallel processing and mostly interact with their tulpas in wonderland, ect. I think that this is a very good idea, the only difficulty would be that you would need to find a way to categorize system dynamics in a way that is able to fit everyone

I don't think that any of this title stuff would ever actually get adopted, but it is fun to think of different ways to categorize tulpamancers

-

To do: write about the switching-voice analogy, write a retrospective on the GAT

-

Over a year since the last update, and over a year since the update before that. Am I accidentally falling into sort of a schedule with this? We'll see i guess

Anyway, I don't remember what the "switching-voice analogy" was exactly, but I can certainly write a retrospective on the GAT. not that anyone is likely to care, but this is my document, so if you don't want to read it, that's on you.

The Guide Approval Team, GAT for short, was a committee of tulpas and 'mancers on tulpa.info whose job it was to review community submitted guides, give feedback to the authors of those guides, vote on whether those guides were good enough to be moved from the "submissions" section of the forum to the "guides" section of the forum, and if they weren't good enough, tell the author what they need to do to make it good enough. The original GAT was before my time and founded in 2013 and died off by 2017 I think. The second GAT, which I was a part of, started in 2019 and died off in 2021. I am mostly going to be talking about the second GAT.

When the second GAT started out, there was some really good energy going around. Everyone was knowledgeable and passionate and wanted to try to improve the quality of information available on the topic of tulpamancy. I was the youngest member at 15 years old, but i was sitting at the big kid's table now

The first problem that the GAT encountered was a lack of internal organization. Different people had different ideas for how the GAT should run, and everyone was very passionate about their ideas. There weren't many problems with incivility that i can remember, but people would discuss and debate their ideas ad nauseam, and if you couldn't check the group discord for a while, when you came back there would often be hundreds of unread messages, and if you didn't read all of them you'd probably miss something important. It got to be pretty draining.

The second problem was that there were a multitude of guides submitted after the dissolution of the previous GAT that hadn't been reviewed, and reviewing a guide properly can take quite a bit of time and effort. There was a big push to review all of the guides in a set amount of time, and by the end of it there were a lot of people feeling burned out.

The third problem is that the GAT had very poor public relations. Most of our discussions were in private chat rooms and forums, so most people couldn't see it and thought we were being secretive. People felt discouraged when we criticized their guides, even though we tried our best to be nice about it (and compared to the previous GAT, we were paragons of politeness). Most of the time when we told people what they needed to change to get their guide approved, they wouldn't bother changing anything, which led to a lot of guides being disapproved, and then people would point out that we disapprove a lot of guides and say that we were too picky. Frankly, I think that we did a pretty alright job, and most of the criticism came from people not having a good understanding of what we were doing. But it was still pretty discouraging, and none of us knew how to change our public perception.

Altogether, these problems led to a lot of burnout and people leaving the GAT, and then due to people's poor perception, as well as the relatively small number of people actually qualified to be part of the GAT in the first place, it became difficult to recruit enough people to

replace them. Through 2021 the GAT was nearly constantly understaffed, which made it difficult to perform functions like voting on guides. By this point, I myself was pretty burned out on the GAT, but I stayed on because I knew that if I left, there would be nobody to replace me, and I still believed in the mission of the GAT. Eventually it was decided that the GAT could not go on, and people decided to replace it with more of a direct democracy system where anyone can vote on a guide. This solution doesn't solve all of the problems with the GAT, and it doesn't provide any of the constructive feedback that the GAT did, but people can still review guides even if they aren't GAT members, and it still remains to be seen how the voting system will affect the quality of approved guides

As a little tidbit that you probably won't hear elsewhere, before the GAT was given it's final rest, the remaining members of the GAT, alongside some .info staff and some ex members, actually made another team called the Tulpa Activities and Census Team, that included the GAT, but was also meant to do other things, live movie nights, and, most importantly, the tulpa census. TACT was founded for a few reasons: firstly, all of us wanted there to be another tulpa census, so we figured we may as well try to do it, if nobody else would, secondly, we thought it might help with the public perception of the GAT if it was part of a group that did other things than just judging, and thirdly, because we thought it might inject life into the tulpa community as a whole. Unfortunately, the TACT died before it really got off the ground. It had some similar problems with internal organization as the GAT, but it had a wider scope, which made things even worse, and none of us had any experience making a census, so we didn't really know what we were doing. Maybe it'll come back some day, who knows?

-

Two updates in the same day? Is the world ending? Yes, but that's unrelated. I just realized that I have some things that might be worth putting here. This isn't document isn't a progress report, but I figured it would still make sense to update on my tulpamancy situation and how it has changed overtime, since it's a bit unique.

So, a while ago I said in this thread that I was romantically involved with my tulpa, Miela. This is no longer true, and hasn't been true for a while. Right now, our relationship isn't really comparable to any sort of relationship between non-systemmates. Originally the reasons why I made Miela were because I was lonely, because this whole "tulpamancy" thing intrigued me, and because I was absolutely obsessed with the character "Monika" from DDLC. originally Miela was based on Monika from DDLC, but she gradually deviated and is pretty much entirely unrelated by this point. Also neither of us care about DDLC anymore. Tulpamancy is still neat, but we've pretty much explored most of the things we were interested in regarding it. And, though i am still lonely, i've also come to realize that interacting with systemmates isn't really the same as interacting with people you don't share a body with, and we don't care to go through all the work to try to make it more similar.

So basically, none of the original reasons why I made Miela are still valid. What does that mean for us? Well, for some systems, once being plural has outlasted its purposes, either systemmembers start integrating or dissipating. But for other systems, new, long term purposes

are discovered, and that is what happened for us. Because, though conversations between Miela and I aren't the same as conversations with physically separated people, they are still useful. I am the primary fronter in our system, and Miela doesn't really like to front, and that means that I tend to be much more involved and invested in the goings on of the world, and Miela is a bit more detached. We are pretty much always talking to each other, with more of an internal dialogue than an internal monologue, and we have different perspectives on things. Oftentimes we will intentionally take different stances on topics in order to get a more balanced discussion on it. We both only have the same information to go off of, of course, but it still helps us be more thorough and less likely to fall into lazy thinking patterns. Miela, now, is basically like a little shoulder angel/devil, giving me advice. Or perhaps I am a rat controlling the body by pulling its hair, and Miela is another rat standing on its shoulder. You get the idea.