This episode is brought to you by Five Bullet Friday, my very own email newsletter.
It's become one of the most popular email newsletters in the world with millions of subscribers, and it's super, super simple.
It does not clog up your inbox.
Every Friday, I send out five bullet points, super short, of the coolest things I've found that week, which sometimes includes apps, books, documentaries, supplements, gadgets, new self-experiments, hacks, tricks, and all sorts of weird stuff that I dig up from around the world.
You guys, podcast listeners, and book readers, have asked me for something short and action-packed for a very long time, because after all, the podcast, the books, they can be quite long, and that's why I created Five Bullet Friday.
It's become one of my favorite things I do every week.
It's free.
It's always going to be free, and you can learn more at tim.blog.com forward slash Friday.
That's tim.blog.com forward slash Friday.
I get asked a lot how I meet guests for the podcast, some of the most amazing people I've ever interacted with, and little known fact, I've met probably 25% of them because they first subscribed to Five Bullet Friday, so you'll be in good company.
It's a lot of fun.
Five Bullet Friday is only available if you subscribe via email.
I do not publish the content on the blog or anywhere else.
Also if I'm doing small, in-person meetups, offering early access to startups, beta testing, special deals, or anything else that's very limited, I share it first with Five Bullet Friday subscribers.
So check it out, tim.blog forward slash Friday.
If you listen to this podcast, it's very likely that you'd dig it a lot, and you can, of course, easily subscribe any time.
So easy peasy, again, that's tim.blog forward slash Friday, and thanks for checking it out if the spirit moves you.
Hello, boys and girls.
This is Tim Ferris.
Welcome to another episode of The Tim Ferris Show, where it is my job to deconstruct world-class performers of all different types to tease out the routines, habits, and so on that you can apply to your own life.
This is a special in-between episode, which serves as a recap of the episodes from the last month.
It features a short clip from each conversation in one place, so you can jump around, get a feel for both the episode and the guest, and then you can always dig deeper by going to one of those episodes.
View this episode as a buffet to wait your appetite.
It's a lot of fun.
We had fun putting it together.
And for the full list of the guests featured today, see the episode's description probably

right below wherever you press play in your podcast app.
Or as usual, you can head to tim.blog slash podcast and find all the details there.
Please enjoy.
First up, Arthur C. Brooks, author of the number one New York Times bestseller, Build the Life You Want, the art and science of getting happier, with co-author Oprah Winfrey.
The reverse bucket list is something I do, oh boy, to ever do it.
And it took me too long to figure this one out.
When I was 50, I'm 59 years old, when I was 50, I found my bucket list from when I was 40.
Now, it was a classic thing.
On my birthday, I would make a list of my desires, my ambitions, and I would imagine myself, visualize myself consuming or experiencing these things, and it would fire me up and make me, well, kind of feel like a loser, quite frankly, because it was lowering my sense of satisfaction I subsequently found out.
And I looked at that list from when I was 40.
I checked everything off that list, and I was less happy at 50 than I was at 40.
And so I thought, I'm a social scientist, so I thought to myself, obviously, I'm doing something wrong.
What am I doing wrong?
And basically, this is the problem.
This is a neurophysiological problem, and a psychological problem all rolled into one handy package.
I was making the mistake of thinking that my satisfaction would come by having more.
And the truth of the matter is that lasting and stable satisfaction, which doesn't wear off in like a minute, comes when you understand that your satisfaction is your halves divided by your wants.
Haves divided by wants.
That's the model.
So, you know, it's like, I'll slow down because I know people watching you and like, I'm gonna write that down.
Haves divided by wants.
You can increase your satisfaction temporarily and inefficiently by having more or permanently and securely by wanting less.
I thought to myself, hmm, so what does that mean?
And the answer to that, what does that mean, is I need a reverse bucket list.
Not that I'm not gonna get nice things in my life, but like, I'm gonna be consciously detached from them by going through the exercise of writing them down and crossing them out.
So on my birthday now, my 59th birthday a couple of months ago, I wrote down all my ridiculous ambitions and desires of money or whatever, power, ambition, admiration, all these things that I want from other people that we all want because we're human and Mother Nature wires us to accumulate the rewards that will help us survive and pass on our genes.
I got it.
I know how evolutionary psychology works.

And I know that these things are going to occur to me as natural goals, but I do not want to be owned by them.
I want to manage them.
I don't want them to be like phantasms in my limbic system managing me.
I want to move the experience of these ambitions to my prefrontal cortex, which is my executive manager, the bumper of tissue right behind my forehead.
And the way that you do that is by looking at each one of these ambitions and saying, maybe I get it and maybe I don't, but I'm going to cross it out as an attachment and I'm telling you, Tim, I'm free.
And so you find that to work.
The exercise...
It works.
It does not because you don't care about it, but because you're not attached to it in the same way.
You've made the decision to have it not be a rootless desire or a ghost in your head.
You've made it into something that you will consciously manage by literally experiencing that ambition in a different part of your brain.
Next up, Sam Corkos, CEO and co-founder of Levels, an Andreessen Horowitz-backed startup that shows you how food affects your health.
The thing that almost always happens is they have this long to-do list and they say, all right, here's what I want you to do.
Take everything on this to-do list with the dates that you think they'll get done by, which is usually this week or next week.
And I want you to just put them on your calendar with the amount of time you think it's going to take.
And then we'll have another follow-up call next week and we'll see what happens.
And then we have the call and then they say, this process doesn't work.
They say, why is that?
I said, well, I tried to move it over there, but there's enough space in my week to fit all these items.
Yes, that's the point of the exercise.
There literally is not enough time.
Your time is finite and the number of digital items you can add to it to-do list is infinite.
You are working with the wrong constraint, which is like the amount of items you can fit in a database row, as opposed to the number of things that you can fit in your finite time of your calendar.
And so we then work on, all right, you probably need slack during the course of the day.
Usually like 50% is a good target because things come up.
Oh, I see.
Not the tool slack, but-
Yeah.
But-
Space, extra space.

Mm-hmm.
You need extra space in the day.
And so we work on things like, for me, I process a lot of email.
And when you say you need space in the day, could you just briefly say more about that?
Because the way I'm hearing that is that you have 50% of your time open.
Now is that, for instance, like tomorrow you would have 50% of your time open or does that mean that in advance of scheduling other things, like three weeks from now, each day is 50% open?
It's generally 50% open just fully.
Got it.
And as you get better at it, I would say I'm probably at 25% open because I've been doing this for many years, at least five years, probably longer, to the point where I can estimate how long it will take me to do something with maybe 90% accuracy.
It's like, I need to write a memo on this thing, it's going to take me three and a half hours.
And I just know, because I've written so many of these, I just know how long it's going to take.
And so-
It takes time to hone that, I would think.
Right?
If you ask most people, like, how many calories do you eat at lunch, they'll be like, six thousand million?
I don't know.
That's right.
Seven calories?
But then, over time, you can calibrate it.
Okay.
Especially if you retroactively update your calendar as well, which is how long did it actually take me?
And when you realize that your estimates were off, or they were right, you can start to hone that skill.
So I always try to have people put it at 50% open space because something's going to come up.
A friend calls you, something happens during the day, you get a message that kind of throws you off.
The problem is that it's way easier to pull something in from tomorrow into today because you had extra space than it is to have this cascading problem of just, like, disastrous.
It's like, then I have to push this to this day, then the next thing you know, you have this Tetris game that you're playing a month out because one thing changed in your schedule and everything breaks.
These concepts come from manufacturing, where you have this line, whatever the assembly line is, you need to have slack in the system in order to be able to operate effectively because something will come up.

And if there's one thing that comes up that breaks everything downstream, that's a real problem.
And over time, as you get better, you can reduce that amount of slack.
But 50% is a pretty good goal.
So you have, like, my goal for today, I'm going to have a four-hour block where I'm going to do X.
And then I have some time, for me, I know I need to process email or communications broadly for at least two hours a day.
So I just have those blocks every day, they're just repeated.
So when I start scheduling things, I can't actually fit this in because it's not like I can't do my email, because my role requires a lot of email.
And so it's just clear as day, I cannot do this on Thursday.
I can do it next week.
So from a process perspective, then, do you start with, I'm imagining not at this point, but just so I get a really clear understanding.
Let's just say you're looking at next week, you have these recurring blocks, email, that's already in there.
You may have other repeating blocks, and I would be curious to know what they are.
So let's bookmark that.
When you're looking at, say, the to-dos that will be converted into Calendar or not for the next week, what does that process look like?
Do you start with a to-do list, and then that goes to your EA, and he or she tries to slot them in for the anticipated amount of time?
What does that look like from start to finish?
Yeah, the answer is you just skip the to-do list step entirely.
So when I get a new task, a lot of my tasks effectively come in through email.
So I'll get an email, and this is also another thing that I worked with a couple of people on who really, really struggled with email.
And the thing they struggle with is using their email as a to-do list, which is a very common thing that people do.
The problem, it creates a lot of anxiety when you have this stack of uncategorized things.
It could be 15 minutes, it could be 50 hours, you have no idea until you open up each one individually to figure out how much work it is.
And so the same process of translating your to-do list into your calendar, you can do the same thing with email, which is, I worked with somebody recently where I said, all right, let's open each email, how long is this going to take you to respond to?
These are like the chunkier ones, it's like 30 minutes, great.
Market is done, copy the link, and put that link in your calendar.
So you're going to spend this 30 minute block responding to this email.
What's the next one?
It's going to take me a full hour because I have to write something for them.
That's interesting.
So the clearing of the inbox then is really in some capacity scheduling the proper amount

of time to reply to these things.
So you're not looking at this undifferentiated stack of shit that you are opening multiple times, marking is unread, going back to forgetting what you read, reading at the 17th time, whatever
that might be.
Yeah.
And it's a stress thing.
It is very stressful to have this list of things.
It's just an ambiguous amount of effort.
It is stress relieving to see, all right, I will do that on Thursday of next week.
I have nothing pending right now.
I have not dropped any balls because I know that anything that is time-sensitive that needed to be done today is already done, and there's no ambiguous deadlines looming that I'm not aware of because they're in my calendar.
And if you change it, this is where closing the loop is a helpful factor, which is if you say, I'm going to block this off for Thursday.
You can tell that person, hey, I'll get back to you on Thursday.
And then if you have to move it, you now know that you can say, hey, something came up.
I'll get it to you on Monday.
And you can just keep them in the loop on that as opposed to just ambiguously dropping the ball.
So for me, when I get a new task, it just immediately goes into my calendar.
So if somebody was to say, hey, can you write a memo on this topic so that this team has context on it of where this has gone over the last year, I'll say, sure, how soon do you need it?
I'll say, can you have it to me by Wednesday?
I'll go to my calendar and I'll block off two hours because I think that's about how long it'll take.
I'll block off two hours on Tuesday that I have open, and I'll say, cool, I'll have a two-by-Tuesday night.
And that's it.
The calendar is the to-do list.
Next up, Nassim Nicholas Taleb, author of The Black Swan, The Impact of the Highly Improbable, and Scott Patterson, author of Chaos Kings, How Wall Street Traders Make Billions in the New Age of Crisis.
Nassim, I have a question for you about a letter and then I have a question for you about personalities, Scott.
So temperament may be another way to put it.
Is it true that you wrote a resignation letter your first day at a trading job and put it in your desk drawer?
I read this on the internet.
I don't know if it's true.
You can't believe everything you read, but it was from the Guardian, so I thought it

might be credible.
One thing is actually, as I said, I recommend people do that.
I wrote that, but not on the day I started, but I recommended that people, because you feel relief when you do it, because then you can continue on your job without feeling like someone's controlling you.
You've got the gun loaded.
The whole idea, the plan behind it, you thought about that problem.
So you write the resignation letter and you don't date it, right?
I'm very fascinated by your ways of thinking, the way that you've embraced different philosophies, and you emailed me an aphorism in 2010.
And you can correct me if I get any of the wording wrong, but it stuck with me.
This is, in 2010, here's the aphorism of the quote.
Robustness is when you care more about the few who like your work than the multitude who hates it.
And then parentheses, artists, fragility is when you care more about the few who hate your work than the multitude who loves it, and then quotation marks, politicians.
Have you always had that type of robustness or resilience against criticism?
Is that something that is inborn?
Maybe because I was never really someone who took and established ideas at face value.
So you necessarily have, you know, violate some norms, some thinking norms, and often people protect those norms by, you know, attacking your reputation.
And I realized that while writing food by randomness, I say, hey, you're saying that what I'm doing is random or using wrong models, it doesn't work.
So they attack your reputation.
So I realized quickly, it was time that my reputation was going to be under some kind of fire.
And I decided that, no, my reputation is how a few important people or people who know something about the subject view me.
And it's not like I don't care about my reputation, I only care about my reputation in some circles.
And it was people I can talk to to try to explain what it's about and has worked out.
So if you have to go defend your reputation, and you're doing the right thing, it's too much energy wasted, and it's not going to help.
Haters are not going to hate.
This resembles another aphorism inspired by Charlie Munger's, that you want to be the most ethical person where people think that you're corrupt, or you want to be the most corrupt person where people think that you're ethical.
Make your choice and use it as a guideline.
That's the same thing.
So, except that there's something in between is that there are some people I care about, and I want them to not lose respect for me.
Of course, you start with your mother, your children, or whatever, your family members.
But there are also a lot of people on the planet, and I care about my reputation, but

in these circles, not with the general public.
So it allows you to take much, much more aggressive positions, which I've done over a long life, and Mark, for example, has a lot of enemies, and they're going to pick on something, and you don't care, so you're doing the right things.
And how do you know you're doing the right thing?
If people, you respect, approve of your action, not if the general public does.
So that segues to my question for you, Scott, which is in the process of doing all these interviews and interacting with these various players on the field, and these sort of practitioners, these investors, and so on.
Have you identified any patterns that you think, whether nature or nurture, that seem to recur in people who are good at what you describe in the book?
I would say, I mean, across all three books that I've written, which are generally focused on Wall Street trading hedge fund managers, I've met a lot of hedge fund managers over the years, none like this guy, I have to say.
We'll probably come back to that.
But I'm not telling you, I don't want to be identified as a fund manager.
Yeah, that's true.
It's an identity thing.
Many are very focused on making a lot of money.
That's a very common trait.
I mean, Mark, he talked to me about how he grew up in the 80s.
He identified with the Reagan era.
It was a time, you know, Wall Street agreed is good.
He told me he's liked it.
I have a little degree to me.
Yeah, I did.
It was the 80s.
And he grew up in a family that was his father was a he was a minister in a church.
He was sort of a hippie, didn't believe in pursuit of wealth.
Mark took the exact opposite view that that was constantly something driving him was the desire to make money.
A lot of other hedge fund managers I've met over the years, just they have that drive.
And it's something that many people look at these guys and think, you're worth a billion dollars, you're worth two billion dollars.
And yet you're a maniac.
You go into work every day and just go crazy.
You drive all your employees crazy because you want to be richer than the next guy.
I don't think Mark has that quite that sort of insane level of greed, as some do.
I've met King Griffin, founder of Citadel, disciple of Ed Thorpe, who we talked about.
We might talk about later, Cliff Asnes, who is a stark enemy of your friend, for initially, initially a friend.
Yeah.
And I have to say, Cliff is a nice guy when you when you meet him.

Not a nice guy, but his friends were not nice guys.
He's also got a dark side.
Also, somebody extremely focused on being wealthy, very smart.
They're all extremely smart.
And I think that's in personalities.
That's I think one of the things that has helped drive my books is these are interesting people.
You know, a lot of them are mathematicians, scientists.
They come out of university with a different expertise in making money,
but then they apply that on Wall Street to making money.
So it's a combination of they have to be leaders.
They are extremely driven.
It baffles me because I'm not like that.
You know, I have a degree in English, and I think that's actually why
sympathize with Nassim's writing so much is I came out of a tradition that,
you know, I love the works of Dostoevsky and existentialism.
And, you know, one of my favorite books is The Rational Man.
And I came in to Wall Street and started reading about how there's this
belief that people are irrational and the markets are rational.
And they are predictable because of this.
And I thought that is just crazy.
You know, to me, I look at financial markets and I see black swans.
I see fear and greed.
That, to me, is what drives markets, not rational behavior, rational expectations.
What are some of the things that make Nassim different or unique in those you've interacted with?
I have some of my own questions and thoughts on this, but I would love to hear yours.
He mentioned his contrarian nature.
It's not a contrarian nature.
It's independence.
Oh, I love it.
I mean, people think I'm contrarian.
I'm with a conspiracy theorist on many of the things.
I'm against him on many other things.
Some are just contrarian because they have a father problem.
So to me, contrarian is an explicit rather than an attribute.
So the other thing is I thought it was going to be about me.
It should be about the idea, the precaution.
He's a lot more interested in literature and philosophy and not financial market.
That's just his thing that drives him.
He doesn't look at the stock market page every day like some people do.
He's...
No, you have to figure out who are people envious of.
So, you know, if you're in a hedge fund business and you have $500 million in a bank
and someone else has $600 million, it's going to be envious of that person.

I was always envious of people who had more erudition than me.
OK, so more erudites.
And you realize that that's what makes me tick.
Being envious is not good, you see.
But at the same time, if you figure out who you come to envy, it's not...
I don't believe in this.
They say, oh, people having enough.
There's someone here from East Hampton, the fellow who wrote Cash22.
A lot of interesting folks out there.
Yeah, he met a financier at the time for hedge funds.
And the financier said, what is it that about you, because he was an author,
a very successful one, what is it that distinguishes you from me?
You know, look, he told them, I know the meaning of enough.
So, in other words, you know you're upper bound.
And effectively, I don't play that game.
I say, you know, there's a meaning that I may am literally, and I say envious of
people who are erudites, like if someone knows Latin
very well, I'm envious.
If someone knows Sanskrit, I'm envious.
All right.
So, and I discovered that early on.
So, I made money on Wall Street because I wanted to make money on Wall Street,
but I didn't think it was worth the effort.
And luckily, it was a combination of the universe.
I had so much leverage, you know, was marketing and all that stuff.
So, the spillover on me was more than satisfactory.
So, I have knock on the wood a lot more than I wished.
Next up, Shane Parrish, the entrepreneur behind Farnham Street,
and author of Clear Thinking, turning ordinary moments into extraordinary results.
I'd love to get your help defining a phrase, just I suppose explaining a phrase,
then segueing into a conversation around mental models and cognitive biases and so on.
So, ordinary moments determine your position and your position determines your results.
So, what is meant by that line and what is meant by position?
So, the counterintuitive insight that I had about decision making from studying sort of
Buffett and Munger and Peter Kaufman and a host of other people who've influenced my
thinking is that they almost never find themselves out of position.
And if you want to think of it as position as your circumstances, they're never forced
by circumstances into doing something that they don't want to do.
And often, that means they look like an idiot in the short term, but in the long term, they
win. And if you consider Buffett, for example, as we've talked about, you know, he closes
down his partnership during a bull market in the 60s because he doesn't know how to
invest anymore. He's lost touch.
He can't find what worked for him.

He reopens it later in terms of Berkshire Hathaway.
Time Magazine, I think it was 1999, he's on the cover as being out of touch.
2001, stock market burst.
Right now, today, I think as of last quarter, he's got $150 billion on the balance sheet.
And so, what he's always doing is he's, everybody thinks he's out of touch and he looks like an idiot, but he always wins because no matter what the outcome is, he wins.
If the stock market goes up, he wins.
If the stock market crashes, he wins because he's put himself in a position where no matter what happens, he can take advantage of circumstances rather than having circumstances take advantage of him.
And I think that that's a key element we don't realize.
If you put Warren Buffett in a bad position where all of his options are bad, it doesn't matter how smart he is.
It doesn't matter how Warren Buffett he is.
Everybody looks like an idiot when they're in a bad position and everybody looks like a genius when they're in a good position.
Do you then create that position by having a handful of commandments?
And I'm making these up.
I'm not saying this is what Buffett does because I haven't tracked him as closely as you have.
But for instance, I know someone who's of a similar cut from a similar cloth and he's like, no short positions, no leverage, and he has four or five rules that he follows, which means he doesn't always beat the S&P 500, let's say, but he's very rarely in a position where he's a distressed seller or is forced into a bad position.
So he is able to play a very long game.
So I guess I'm wondering how you consistently create that type of position.
So let me talk about it in terms of finance and then apply it to something else that's totally you would think it doesn't apply to.
So in finance, you can think of low debt, you can think of saving money, you can think of always having dry powder.
It doesn't matter if you have the best idea in the world.
If you can't take advantage of that idea, you might as well not have the idea.
You have to be in a position to take advantage of the ideas that you have.
And you have to be in a position where somebody can't call you in at the exact wrong moment because that's really expensive, as everybody sort of learned during the great financial crisis and is now forgotten.
We seem to relearn these lessons over and over again.
But positioning applies to so many other things that we don't think about.
You can think about it basically as in your sleep, right?
Did you work out?
Are you healthy?
Are you eating well?
Are you investing in your relationship with your partner?

What position am I in in the moment that I get into a fight or argument or disagreement with my partner or my spouse?
And we don't think about the position we're in at that moment.
But if you imagine that there's a patch of grass between you and them, is that grass dry or is it wet?
Have I watered that for months, in which case the spark isn't going to let it on fire or is this smallest little spark going to start this forest fire?
And the position that we bring into those arguments matters a lot in terms of the quality of the outcomes that we get.
I'll give you another example.
We were talking about kids earlier and I assume a lot of people listening have kids.
One of my kids came home with an exam and he got a really terrible mark.
And he hands it to me.
He's like a teenager, so he like hands it to me.
He's like, I did the best I could, walks away.
And normally the conversation ends there.
And I was like, OK, well, now is not the moment that we're going to talk about this because I know that this teenage attitude thing going on, but we're going to circle back to this.
And so later that night, I was like, talk to me about what it means to do the best you can.
And what he told me about the best he could was like, when he sat down to write that test from 10 to 11, he focused all of his energy and all of his effort on it.
He made the best decisions possible from 10 to 11.
But what he forgot or didn't really appreciate is what position was he in at 10 a.m. when he sat down to write that test?
Did he fight with his brother in the morning?
Yep, he did. Did he eat a healthy breakfast?
Nope, he didn't. Did he get a good night's sleep?
Nope, he was up late.
Did he study?
No, he sort of half-assed it.
And so what happened was he was in a bad position at the moment he sat down to write that test.
He was ill-prepared to write the test, but yes, he did the best he could in that moment.
And so often we think about life in terms of how do I do the best I can in this particular moment, rather than how do I put myself in the best position?
And part of that is like we're always predicting.
We're predicting creatures.
And so we're always trying to gauge what the outcome is and maximize towards that outcome.

I want to go all in on Tesla.
I want to go all in on whatever because I want to maximize my return.
And what we don't think about is like, okay, well, what is the cost of doing that? What if I'm wrong and how do I position myself for multiple possible futures where what if my idea is not correct?
Can I still survive and can I thrive on that?
And if you look back and you sort of like look back at Carnegie and Rockefeller and all these historical people who built these great businesses, including Buffett, they always take advantage of a weakness in somebody else's position when their position is strong.
Who else would you, and I know you mentioned a few names, but outside of Buffett and Munger, who else would you put on your short list and not to make you pick favorites?
I'm sure that you could give a very long list, but just off the cuff, if you had to pick five to 10 people, let's just say, could be four.
But you know, let's aim for five or slightly more people who you really respect as incisive, deliberate decision makers who would make that list.
So we have a mutual friend of all Ravikon.
He would be up there.
Patrick Collison would sort of be up there.
Cat Cole, who works at Athletic Greens, one of my favorite people.
She's always one step ahead.
She's amazing.
I think that there's very few people who are well positioned in everything.
Like if you look at somebody who's extremely good at one thing like Buffett, that comes with extreme weaknesses, you can have a list of exemplars in your head, almost of different people who are good at different positions, but you have to pick what direction you're going and then what positions do you need to be good at to be good in that direction.
And so for me, like I circle back to sort of like core things, which people don't really think about, but they're core to everything we do in terms of like health and relationships and friendship and purpose and community.
Am I working on something that I want to be working on?
Am I moving closer to my destination?
And is my destination the place I want to go?
And I think those questions are stuff that we don't really ask ourselves.
We're always so focused on like, how do we accomplish the outcome we want rather than what are the key elements to this process that allow me to play for a long time?
Am I going in the right direction?
And do I want to get to where I'm going?
So I am going to come back to just the broad question of how to incorporate thinking about cognitive biases, if I'm saying that correctly, and or mental

models, not really, I guess those are different.
I'd love to have you let's begin there.
How would you distinguish or define mental models?
Then I'm going to go micro and then we'll zoom out.
So a great way to think about mental models is the source of all bad decisions is blind spots.
Mental models allow you to see a problem through a different lens.
You can adopt a different persona.
A great example of a mental model is like, how would Tim Ferriss think about this?
And then I adapt what I know about you.
And I try to see the problem from your perspective.
And if I can see the problem from your perspective, now I've done the one thing that actually gets me out of cognitive biases, which is the source of all cognitive biases are basically we believe that what we see is all there is.
And we learn about this sort of in physics, right?
In grade nine, I think where you're standing on this train and you're carrying this ball and the train is moving at 60 miles an hour.
And how fast is the ball moving?
Well, relative to you, the ball is not moving.
But if you're watching the train go by, the ball is moving at 60 miles an hour.
And so the source of all of our problems is that we only see that we're this person on the train holding this ball.
And we can't see that there's a person outside who has a completely different view into the exact same situation that we see.
So we can mentally use these tools to sort of accommodate how we can look into the world from a different person's eyes or through a different lens, be that biology or through thinking or through.
I mean, the most useful ones tend to be like, and then what?
Just asking yourself that simple question, I accomplish this.
And then what then what happens in version?
How do I avoid all these negative outcomes that I don't want to get?
And the Stoics, you've talked about this in the past.
The Stoics have been doing this for a long time.
They call it a premortem.
I think that those are just really helpful ways.
And what they're really doing is they're just allowing us to put a different lens onto the problem and see it through a different light.
And by seeing it through a different light, we slightly reduce our blind spots into the problem. Yeah, totally.
I've found I haven't read these in decades.
So caveat lector for anyone who picks these up.
But some of Edward Debono's work, I think he's originally Maltese, but Debono's two words, but or actually he may just be a Maltese citizen.

I can't peg the nationality.
It doesn't really matter.
He wrote a book called Lateral Thinking.
He has another one.
I think it's called The Sixth Thinking Hats or something along those lines,
which similarly, very helpful just for forcing yourself as a portion of a
practice to look at the same situation with a different lens,
a different set of questions, a different perspective.
Last but not least, another unpredictable and entertaining
addition of The Random Show with technologist and serial entrepreneur Kevin Rose.
I'll mention something that's sitting outside.
I can see it from here that people might be interested in.
So I I've been and still am a fervent believer in cold therapy,
using ice baths as a means of controlling inflammation,
as a means of mood elevation that lasts on the mood elevation big time.
Unbelievable.
And generally, my approach has been to get a chest freezer of some type
and fill it with ice, etc.
And that works, but they get really disgusting really quickly.
And they all do that.
I bought one of the machines, the real pro.
Yeah.
And then you're stuck with this thing that is an eyesore and you don't know what
to do with it.
You can't move it.
I tried to sell it.
I couldn't.
Yeah.
So I ended up because I realized how significant a lever this is
for improving my quality of life just on a daily basis.
Like and I'll backstep for a second and just say one thing that I learned
from Tony Robbins to give him credit.
And I don't know if he came up with this, but is this sequence of state
story strategies?
So it's like, fix your state first.
Only then can you come up with an enabling story and only then can you
come up with an effective strategy.
If you're like feeling shitty and you're sleep deprived and you're kind
of depressed or anxious, whatever you try to come up with a strategy, meaning
how to fix something, you're not going to come up with a good strategy,
generally speaking.
So it's like, fix your physical state first, then you can come up with
an enabling story, then come up with an effective strategy.

So the state piece is very important.
There aren't that many ways I have found to change state.
Exercise is one, but it requires generally a fair amount of time.
Heat is also effective, but again, requires, say, it doesn't sound like
a much, but it's like 15 to 30 minutes, let's just say in a sauna, very effective.
Cold is the fastest.
It's just the fastest for me.
And I've gone without cold therapy because I've not wanted to get some huge
chest freezer or a pro model.
I am also going to be getting a pro model, but they get all scummy though.
And then you got to put chlorine in them.
Yeah, this is all that.
It's a lot.
But I went on Amazon and I found something called the cold pod, which you set
up in like five minutes, you fill it with water from a hose, you put ice in,
and it works perfectly well as a cold plunge.
And I ended up buying Yeti Cooler to store ice in.
So I have a few days of ice and it's, let's see, what would it be?
It would be like if you were standing, maybe it's hip height and it's probably
three feet in diameter and you get in, you just kind of crouch in there.
And it works fucking great.
It works really well and it costs like a hundred and fifty or two in a box.
Maybe, I don't know, maybe it's a hundred bucks.
It's not crazy.
One hundred and sixty nine.
There you go.
And I've been really impressed with this thing.
It's very basic and even when it's been very hot outside, like you put in two
bags of ice and you let it sit for 20 minutes, it's going to get pretty cold.
It's not going to be 30 degrees, but it's probably going to be mid fifties,
depending on how much water you have in there.
Pro tip, the more water you have in there, the more ice you're going to need
to cool it.
So don't fill it all the way up to the top.
Fill it up like halfway and then add the ice.
And it's been a game changer for me.
It's a plastic trash can.
Well, no, it's not a plastic trash can.
It is props to ever made this shake because it probably cost
of like 15 bucks to build one of these.
Yeah, it's not a trash can.
I just to be clear, I mean, it's look, it's we're not talking about a fucking
Maserati, but here's what's nice about it.

It's very easy to set up.
It's not a trash can.
Because that makes it sound like it's like mid chest height and hard.
It's easy to pack.
You can actually travel with it if you want to travel with it.
So I would just say for people who travel with it.
Oh, it's super easy, man.
You like it folds up.
Yeah, it folds up.
You sit, stick in a bag and take it with you.
It's super easy.
Put it in your hotel room.
Yeah, the hotel loves 50 gallons of water spilling out.
So for those people who have perhaps heard about the benefits of cold therapy,
but have avoided it because it's too expensive, it's too time consuming,
whatever, this is a way to test it.
And I would just say this is a low hurdle way to test it out.
And I used it earlier today.
It's fantastic.
Changed my day.
So that's the cold bud.
And there are a bunch of other options that look basically identical.
I just went with the one with the best reviews.
Nothing fancy.
And now here are the bios for all the guests.
Arthur C. Brooks is the Parker Gilbert Montgomery Professor of the Practice of Public
and Nonprofit Leadership at the Harvard Kennedy School and Professor of Management Practice
at the Harvard Business School, where he teaches courses on leadership and happiness.
He is also a columnist at The Atlantic, where he writes the popular How to Build a Life column,
mega popular.
And Brooks is the author of 13 books, including the 2022 No. 1 New York Times bestseller
from Strength to Strength, Finding Success, Happiness and Deep Purpose in the Second Half of Life,
which is a book I've actually recommended in my newsletter, Five Bullet Friday.
His newest book is Build the Life You Want, subtitled The Art and Science of Getting Happier
with co-author Oprah Winfrey.
He speaks to audiences all around the world about human happiness and works to raise well-being
within private companies, universities, public agencies, and community organizations.
We cover a lot of ground.
He is a fascinating character with a lot of fascinating frameworks and practices that he
implements in his own life and certainly those that he's studied for his class and for many
other projects.
You can find him on Instagram at Arthur C. Brooks, on Twitter at Arthur Brooks.
This is an old school Tim Ferriss conversation in the sense that we go all the way back to many

of the tools, many of the principles from the four-hour work week and that includes virtual assistance, delegation, processes, massive elimination, minimalism for maximum leverage, all sorts of great things.
And this time I was in the student seat because my guest today has mastered, I think it is fair to say, so many facets of everything I just mentioned and it was a pleasure to take so many notes myself to follow up on.
His name is Sam Corkos.
You can find him on Twitter at Sam Corkos, C-O-R-C-O-S.
Sam is the CEO and co-founder of Levels, an A16Z backed startup that shows you how food affects your health using continuous glucose monitors and other biosensors.
Fascinating company, incredibly, incredibly practical technology, easy to use, easy to learn from, changes your behavior, changes your life.
Check out Levels at LevelsHealth.com.
The first guest is Naseem Nicholas Taleb, who spent 21 years as a risk-taker, that is, quantitative trader, before becoming a researcher in philosophical, mathematical, and in his words, mostly practical problems with probability.
Taleb is the author of a multi-volume essay, The Inserto, and within that you find The Black Swan, Fooled by Randomness, Anti-Fragile, The Bed of Procrustes, and Skin in the Game.
Thanks to Matt Mullenweg for first introducing me to The Black Swan.
These all cover broad facets of uncertainty. His work has been published into 49 languages.
In addition to his trader life, Taleb has also written as a backup of The Inserto, more than 70 technical and scholarly papers in mathematical statistics, genetics, quantitative finance, statistical physics, medicine, philosophy, ethics, economics, and international affairs around the notion of risk and probability.
These are grouped in The Technical Inserto. Inserto is spelled I-N-C-E-R-T-O.
Taleb is currently Distinguished Professor of Risk Engineering at NYU's Tandon School of Engineering.
I believe he's retired. His current focus is on the properties of systems that can handle disorder. In other words, the properties of systems that are in his phrasing anti-fragile.
You can find him on Twitter at NNTaleb, and that's N-N-T-A-L-E-B, also Fooled by Randomness.com.
The second guest is Scott Patterson. Scott Patterson is an investigative reporter for The Wall Street Journal, currently based in Washington, D.C., working on climate and energy policy. His new book is Chaos Kings, subtitled How Wall Street Traders Make Billions in the New Age of Crisis, a profile of the rise of black swan traders such as Nassim Taleb and Mark Spitznegel,
as well as a survey of the many perils the world faces today and how we might fix them.
Scott has covered a lot. He's covered everything from Berkshire Hathaway to stock exchanges, to high-speed traders, to financial regulators. His first book, The Quants, describes the rise of mathematical finance and delves into its role in the 2008 financial blow-up. Dark Bulls, his second book, tells how computer traders took control of the U.S. stock market starting from the birth of computer trading in the 1980s to the explosion of high-frequency trading in the late 2000s. You can find him on Twitter at Patterson Scott and on his website, scottpattersonbooks.com. Lest you think this conversation is only about finance,

I want to emphasize that very refined thinking in the world of markets and investing really reflects clarity of analysis and concepts that then lend themselves to a very clear scoreboard. And for that reason, it is a fascinating arena within which you can refine your thinking toolkit for many, many, many other things. And we talk about many of these other areas where these things can be cross-applied.
My guest today is Shane Parrish. Shane Parrish is the entrepreneur and wisdom seeker behind Farnham Street and the host of the Knowledge Project podcast, where he focuses on mastering the best of what other people have already figured out. And he has many, many top investors and thinkers on his podcast. His popular online course, Decision by Design, has helped thousands of executives, leaders, and managers around the world learn the repeatable behaviors that improve results. Shane's work has been featured in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, and Forbes, among many other outlets. He is the author of the brand new book, Clear Thinking, Turning Ordinary Moments into Extraordinary Results. You can find him on Instagram at Farnham Street, that's spelled F-A-R-N-A-M street, on Twitter at Shane A. Parrish, last name P-A-R-R-I-S-H,
and all things Farnham Street, including the Knowledge Project you can find at FS.blog.
Hey guys, this is Tim again, just one more thing before you take off, and that is Five Bullet Friday. Would you enjoy getting a short email from me every Friday that provides a little fun before the weekend? Between one and a half and two million people subscribed to my free newsletter,
my super short newsletter, called Five Bullet Friday. Easy to sign up, easy to cancel. It is basically a half page that I send out every Friday to share the coolest things I've found or discovered, or have started exploring over that week. It's kind of like my diary of cool things. It often includes articles I'm reading, books I'm reading, albums perhaps, gadgets, gizmos, all sorts of tech tricks and so on that get sent to me by my friends, including a lot of podcast guests, and these strange esoteric things end up in my field, and then I test them, and then I share them with you. So if that sounds fun, again, it's very short, a little tiny bite of goodness before you head off for the weekend, something to think about. If you'd like to try it out, just go to tim.blog.friday, type that into your browser, tim.blog.friday, drop in your email, and you'll get the very next one. Thanks for listening.