

Scientific, Philosophical, and Practical Elements of Two New Philosophical Group Practices: Dialectic into *Dialogos* and the Socratic Search Space

John Vervaeke¹

Rick Repetti²

Christopher Mastropietro³

Taylor Barratt⁴

Abstract: In this paper we focus on describing two group philosophical practices, Dialectic into *Dialogos* (“DiD”) and the Socratic Search Space (“SSS”) (“these two practices”). In the discourse domain of philosophical practice, the closest analogue for purposes of contrastive understanding of these two practices is Nelsonian Socratic Dialogue (“NSD”). NSD aspires to reach consensus by extracting a targeted virtue concept from participants’ personal experiences of the virtue, only after which the consensus definition, if attained, is exposed to Socratic cross-examination, with the continued aim of attaining consensus understanding. It is thus primarily a ‘cataphatic’ or ‘positive’ practice. By contrast, DiD aspires to lead participants into an aporetic engagement with a targeted virtue concept. It is thus an ‘apophatic’ or ‘negative’ practice. Lastly, SSS integrates elements of NSD and DiD, forming a hybrid cataphatic/apophatic balance. Both DiD and SSS, but not NSD, are specifically designed to bring about conditions under which participants will enter dialogical flows states (“*Dialogos*”), affording them

¹ University of Toronto, Canada, Email: john@johnvervaeke.com

² City University of New York, USA, Email: rick.repetti@kbcc.cuny.edu

³ Socratic Counseling, Manchester, USA, Email: christophermastropietro@gmail.com

⁴ Emergent Developmental Concepts, Mississauga, Canada,
Email: taylor@emergentdevelopmentalconcepts.com

transformative experiences of distributed cognition that many practitioners have described as functioning like a “secular séance” that ignites the metaphorical fire that Heraclitus associated with the *Logos*, the intelligibility of ultimate reality. The cognitive science, philosophical, practical, and related supports for these two practices will be presented, along with some ethical considerations about facilitating them, and considerations about their relevance at this time of the advent of the AI revolution during the already existing meaning crisis.

Key-words: philosophical practices; Socratic Space; Dialogos; AI; Nelsonian Socratic Dialogue;

Introduction

This paper focuses on two novel group philosophical practices, Dialectic into *Dialogos* (“DiD”) and the Socratic Search Space (“SSS”) (“these two practices”), developed by the authors with help from colleagues Christopher Mastropietro, Ryan Barton, Taylor Barratt, and Ethan Hsieh. In the philosophical practice realm, the closest comparison for purposes of understanding these two practices is Nelsonian Socratic Dialogue (“NSD”). SSS exercise was conceived as a way of integrating a positive, “cataphatic”, or consensus-seeking exercise, such as NSD, and a negative, “apophatic”, or open-ended exploratory practice, such as the Dialectic into *Dialogos* (DiD) exercise, each to be described shortly.⁵

NSD aspires to attain consensus understanding, or at least a degree of experiential certainty. Here, participants each share a personal experience of a pre-selected virtue concept, they choose one example thought to most exemplify it, and then they draw out details from the person whose experience it was, through a process of reasoning about the

⁵ The terms ‘cataphatic’ and ‘apophatic’ are generally employed in theological contexts for positive or negative approaches to describing God, e.g., a positive approach would be describing God as omniscient and omnipotent, and a negative one depicts as indescribable or beyond conception.

details of the experience, to extract criteria of the virtue from the experience. Once they have a working definition of the virtue based on the criteria visible in the person's actual experience, they apply the definition to each other participant's experience of the virtue, revising the definition as needed to match their experiences, ideally arriving at a consensus definition of the virtue based on all the participants' experiences. Lastly, they expose the consensus definition to Socratic cross-examination against other actual or hypothetical cases, revising it as needed. The process may or may not end in consensus (or *aporia*, an informed, intelligent awareness of uncertainty, as with the historical Socratic dialogues), but it aims at consensus. DiD, conversely, ideally leads to a greater appreciation of the complexity of a given virtue concept, if not an aporetic uncertainty about its ultimately somewhat indescribable yet increasingly intelligible, knowable nature, as will become clear in the more detailed description and explanation of DiD below. Recall that Socratic wisdom begins in uncertainty or awareness of our own ignorance, of knowing what we don't know. Vervaeke originally conceived DiD as an attempt to reverse engineer the process Socrates employed to bring his interlocutors to this aporetic appreciation of the extent to which the virtues, and also the three transcendentals, the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, exceed and escape capture in definitive language (2019, 2023/2024).

When Repetti first introduced NSD to Vervaeke (Vervaeke 2022), Vervaeke was enthused about how a practice like NSD might fill a need for a cataphatic (positive, certainty-seeking) practice to balance out his apophatic (negative, uncertainty-generating) DiD practice. We decided instead to combine DiD and NSD, forming SSS. Let's turn to describe these two practices in some detail.

Dialectic into *Dialogos*

DiD is a group practice designed to reverse engineer the role of Socrates in the Socratic dialogues, namely, as 'midwife' to help others 'give birth to' their tacit knowledge and/or innate wisdom. Socrates seemed to believe everyone possessed these innate abilities, but we are often confused between what we know and merely believe (*cf.* the metaphor of the blind men and the elephant, discussed below). Socrates' midwifery

proceeds by a process of questioning his interlocutors' statements, drawing out their implications, presenting them back in clarified form, working to reason together with them, and view the ideas in question from multiple perspectives. His tacit aim was ultimately to attain a greater understanding, often in the general form of a humble wonder about the greater complexity of the ideas in question, if not the ultimate insufficiency of language, despite (or perhaps due to) its increasingly accurate – yet nevertheless inadequate – refinement throughout the process, and often with an awareness of the limits of our knowledge, if not the awareness of our own ignorance, which Socrates considered the seed of wisdom: knowing the difference between what you do and don't know. Socratic midwifery, which we aspire to replicate in DiD, is ideally focused on attempting to understand a particular virtue concept, e.g., honesty, courage, etc., as opposed a vice or other type of concept, since using a virtue concept as the focal point tends to elicit the best in participants.⁶

DiD begins by dividing the two roles of Socrates and his interlocutor into four roles: Socrates' interlocutor is the proposer, who first proposes what the virtue seems to them, and Socrates is divided into three Socratic elements – a midwife, a scribe, and a vibe. The midwife exemplifies the main aspect of Socrates, midwifing his interlocutor. The latter two functional roles are auxiliary or ancillary aspects of the midwife within the one person of Socrates: the scribe is the element of Socrates that keeps track of the interlocutor's proposal if and as it changes, and the vibe is essentially the scribe of the nonverbal elements of the dialogue, e.g., in the case of Socrates, what may be observed by the vibe can be expressions of perplexity, humor, enthusiasm, and the like, and in the case of the interlocutor/proposer, the vibe may notice expressions of confusion, signs of cognitive dissonance, frustration, acceptance, and the like. By distributing these three functions of Socratic Method across three individuals, this facilitates the maieutic functioning of the dialectical process, taking the full weight of it off any one individual. The DiD procedure is more complex than just this trifurcation and redistribution of Socratic roles across three distinct individuals.

⁶ Similarly, most facilitators of NSD prefer to use a virtue for NSD, rather than a vice, as the former works better particularly insofar as the process tends to invoke and exemplify the virtue, and the latter equivalently threatens to invoke the vice in the process.

There are specific guidelines for each role. For the proposer, for example, they are proposing what they think about the virtue, what it means to them, not what some text, expert, or other authoritative source said. They are proposing it to the midwife, while facing them. They are not declaring a definitive final assertion as a complete truth, but only an initial impression. The midwife doesn't just imitate Socrates, but rather follows a set of guidelines designed to help the midwife educate or give birth to aspects of the virtue proposal from the proposer's perspective. For example, the midwife is to paraphrase what the proposer says, to check that they heard it properly, and to ask clarifying questions if needed. The midwife is to inquire into ways in which the proposal is like and unlike similar ideas, to ask for examples, and to inform the proposer of the extent to which their proposal seems to be changing, whether it seems to land or to leave something out, among other instructions. Similar instructions guide the scribe and the vibe. After each have spoken and the round has reached a point of completion, the participants switch roles and enact the same procedure, three times, until all four participants have engaged all four roles. Each iteration is understood as contributing metaphorical logs and sparks to eventually ignite the Heraclitean *Logos*, the transcendent intelligibility of the virtue, which hopefully catches fire by the next and final round, in which all roles and algorithmic sequences are dropped and the participants enter a dialogical flow state, *Dialogos*, experiencing what Plato might describe as anagogic ascension to a state of pure philosophical intuition into the essence of the virtue.

Importantly, DiD facilitates a heightened form of distributed cognition or collective intelligence, an emergent shared consciousness, formed by shared attention, shared intention, and shared resonance with the emerging intelligibility being drawn out and incrementally built on, integrating multiple perspectives. This ability to explore and integrate multiple perspectives in dialogical fellowship is correlated with the emergence of insight and the ability to 'break frame' (e.g., to solve the nine-dot problem)⁷.

⁷ In the nine-dot problem, nine dots form a box-like pattern, and we are tasked with drawing four straight lines through all the dots without lifting the pen from the paper. Most frame this as a box, since the dots seem to form an imaginary one, and so we assume we cannot draw the lines outside the parameters of the box, but that assumption is not entailed by the directions. Only by literally "thinking outside the box" can we solve it.

Participants virtually universally find it intrinsically, meaningful, enriching, and rewarding, if not also transformative, spiritual, or even sacred.

Socratic Search Space

SSS is more complex than DiD, since it incorporates DiD into its larger framework. Whereas DiD is purely philosophical, like NSD, SSS is also philosophical, but it is ultimately more pragmatic. Just as NSD begins with participants' personal experiences, SSS begins with participants' personal experiences, but not with a virtue, as in NSD, but with a problem. The participants each present a problem, and then one is selected, with its author as "Spark" for the rest of the process. The process moves through stages, with the other participants questioning to pull out different perspectives from the Spark on the Spark's problem, to draw the Spark's orientation to the problem out from their 1st person perspective, frame, or limiting perspective. Next, the group entertains more abstract, shareable versions of the problem in the form of a universal dilemma anyone can identify with, and then chooses one dilemma to work on. Next, the group considers potentially applicable virtues, and identifies one it would be appropriate to develop in response to the dilemma. Next, the group enacts a condensed version of DiD to enter *Dialogos* on that virtue. The process culminates in a procedure designed to help participants apply the virtue to their version of the dilemma, applying insights from the flow state into an action plan, which they then share.

Why is this useful? Consider the so-called Solomon Paradox and the Solomon effect. The paradox is that King Solomon was a judicious sage when it came to solving others' problems, but not in terms of navigating his own life. We are all vulnerable to this paradoxical asymmetry. The Solomon effect is that, like Solomon, we are all much better at solving problems when they're framed in 2nd or 3rd person perspectives, e.g., when I'm advising you (2nd person perspective) or him, her, or them (3rd person perspective), even in terms of solving my own problems when they're framed in 2nd or 3rd personal terms. (Grossman and Kross 2014, Xu, Zhang, and Wang 2022)

SSS was designed to capitalize on the Solomon effect by leading us out of our 1st personal framing of our own problem, through the 2nd person framing about how others will be affected by and thus view our decision, to how a sage (like Solomon) might see and respond to the problem, a 3rd person perspective. We then go a step further away from being locked into our own perspective and imagine a more abstract version of our particular problem, with help from the other participants, and explore a more universal, shareable dilemma, one anyone can face or has faced. Once we frame the problem in universal terms, these are about as 3rd personal as they can become. Then, instead of *me* just trying to 'solve' *my* personal problem, limited by the Solomon effect, *we* explore together – distributed cognition – a virtue we all agree would be wise to cultivate for each of us to respond wisely to the dilemma. To immerse ourselves in a further distributed-cognition-enriched, frame-shifting understanding of the relevant virtue, we then engage in a condensed version of DiD, exploring the relevant virtue from multiple perspectives. Following the DiD, we then contemplate how to apply the virtue in a way that will facilitate responding to the dilemma in our lives, which we then share, further expanding each of our understandings by hearing each other's proposals. Not only is the Spark now much better equipped to address their initial problem, but so are all the other participants much better equipped to address their version of the dilemma, if not also their original problems.

In the most abstract philosophical terms, we have moved from a particular to a universal. We have ascended out of a narrow framing of our own original problem, like originally viewing the nine-dot problem as if it is limited within an imaginary box, to a far broader version of it. We have escaped our own framing-confined cave of ignorance, where we took the shadows cast by our own framings as immutable, immovable obstacles, and come to know what we did not know.

In the Indian philosophical tradition, there is a metaphor of the blind men and the elephant. This metaphor has many uses (e.g., in Buddhism, it is used to integrate the many forms of Buddhism as accessing the one Dharma, in henotheistic strands of Hinduism, it is used to integrate the many avatars and other manifestations of the deity, etc.), but in the original Jain use the elephant represents ultimate reality and each blind man represents an epistemic vantage – whether of an individual, religion,

worldview, etc. – relative to which some aspect of that reality is at least partly validly apprehended, supporting the Jain doctrine of *anekāntavāda* or non-one-sidedness doctrine. This is a pluralist perspective, not a relativist one: reality exists, is multi-faceted, and is partially accessed differentially from multiply distinct vantages. Thanks to the distributed cognition enacted by SSS, we metaphorically blind folks – collaborating together, circumambulating the dilemma and the relevant virtue, entering dialogical flow states together, ascending apagogically into a shared, transcendent communion with the universal fire of the *Logos* – are better able to take in much more of the metaphorical elephant. What is distinct about SSS relative to DiD and NSD, which it combines but exceeds, is that it culminates with a Platonic return to the cave, armed with liberating insight, new frames, and inspiration. This is a very practical form of philosophy to the people.

There are additional reasons to think these two practices matter. These two practices are designed to help practitioners break frame, to look at and see beyond their operating frameworks, their cognitive lenses and *modus operandi*. “Frameworks” here includes the set of habitual assumptions, perspectives, or boundaries that guide how we see a situation and evaluate what’s possible, including our habitual ways of responding – the metaphorical muscle memory of our *modus operandi* as agents, which includes tacit knowledge, belief, intuition, gut instinct, and a host of not-so-conscious rules, algorithms, heuristics, dispositions, orientations, self-images, introverts, subterranean motives, shadows, etc. Our general frameworks, in this broader operating system sense, are necessary: They help sort out relevant from irrelevant features of our cognitive landscape, conserve metabolic energy, and act intelligently. But they can function as blinders, filter too much, shut down key options before they even surface for consideration. Sometimes the cage that previously locked us in is unlocked, unbeknownst to us. Consider some examples. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the U.S. permits farmers to label chicken and eggs “free range” if there is a 12 by 12-foot patch of grass accessible to the chickens via a little doggy-type door. Unfortunately, most of the chickens never push against the door, and never discover the grass. It is said that baby elephants chained to a post will remain chained long after they grow beyond the capacity to pull the post out with little effort.

Einstein once said that imagination is more important than knowledge (2009, p. 97). Imagining counterfactual possibilities – e.g., assuming X is the case, what if not-X was the case? – is a step in the direction of distributed cognition that we can practice on our own, as he did when he imagined things like riding a bicycle on a beam of light. Imagining what an issue looks like from another’s perspective is a simulation of distributed cognition we can practice alone, where we take our perspective off-line, and simulate bringing another person’s vantage point, beliefs, intentions, etc. on-line in our own psyche: What would it look like to me if I took on their frame? Can they see something I don’t? Do I see something they don’t? But the whole point of distributed cognition is that more minds – collaborating – are better than one mind (Hutchins 1995, Laughlin et al. 2006).

Socrates almost always questioned his interlocutors about some key virtue concept thought to be at the center of their expertise; e.g., for a prophet it might be holiness or piety, for a politician it might be justice, etc. These are *virtues*, excellences of character that experts exemplify. Like NSD, DiD is designed to explore a selected virtue and bring participants into deep engagement with its nature, but unlike NSD, DiD and SSS are specifically designed to bring participants into *Dialogos*, a dialogical flow state. Csikszentmihalyi’s seminal work (1990) is the first comprehensive account of the scientific research on flow states across multiple domains, e.g., among star athletes, chess masters, meditation experts, etc. Vervaeke et al. (2018) analyze the flow state as a paradigm case of spontaneous cognition in which insight and implicit learning combine. Parvizi-Wayne et al. (2024) analyze flow states, arguing that the paradoxical loss of self-awareness linked with the highly efficient yet effortless agency reported in flow states are results of dynamic precision weighting within the brain’s predictive processing framework.

These studies combine to support the idea that entering dialogical flow states – *Dialogos* – can enact distributed cognition processes yielding frame-breaking insights. Flow states alone, and distributed cognition alone, each improve performance, but combined in the form of distributed cognition flows states – *Dialogos* – the transformative phenomenological impact is almost always experienced as significantly greater than the sum of their parts. There is another, very practical, reason for many of us

philosophical practitioners, if not also our clients, students, and workshop participants, to devote considerable attention, effort, and training to the cultivation of distributed cognition networks and the practices that strengthen them and increase the likelihood that they will trigger dialogical flow states that ascend into communion with the *Logos*, such as these two practices: the AI revolution. The AI revolution is fueled by a virtually omniscient distributed cognition digital network against which almost no individuals working in silos can compete. It seems intuitively plausible, and consistent with the above-mentioned research and reasoning, that anyone participating in reliably collaborative distributed cognition networks and the practices supporting them will fare better than any individuals operating in the functional equivalent of a silo.⁸

Ethical Considerations and Cautions

Two related ethical caveats are in order here. First, we have intentionally and very conscientiously left out several crucial details in the descriptions of DiD and SSS that function as facilitator principles, procedural details, instructional guidelines, and a host of related elements of important information that would be necessary in order for anyone to, say, read about these two practices and then try to replicate them on their own. The reason for that is directly explained by the second caveat: Second, we advise against “practicing this at home”, so to speak, that is, without the guidance of a trained facilitator, and even after that, prior to experiencing it several times under the guidance of one, and even after all of that, prior to successfully training in the practice under the supervision of a recognized, certified practitioner or within an equivalent training program. There are a number of ethical reasons why we would emphasize the second caveat. As with philosophical counseling in general, there is a potential risk of clients and practitioners slipping into transference, counter-transference, and various elements of psychotherapeutic work with emotions, traumas, etc., without proper training, potentially doing damage to both parties. One of the central ethical justifications for philosophical counseling, from its modern inception, that defends it

⁸ It has become a meme – in the basic sense of an idea that replicates because it works – that most of our jobs will not likely be replaced by AI’s, but by someone who does our job better by using AI better than we do.

against the charge of “practicing medicine (psychiatry or psychotherapy) without a license”, is its insistence on being a purely *educational* endeavor: Philosophy is educational.⁹ Before any leading organization, e.g., the American Philosophical Practitioners Association (APPA), will certify anyone as a philosophical counselor, they need to have internalized that axiomatic ethical principle about the scope of practice being restricted to the educational. Similar risks accompany leading or teaching meditation, which can uncover traumas, borderline psychological pathologies, or engender disorienting depersonalization and related mystical experiences for which someone who took a short course on mindfulness or who attended a mindfulness retreat will likely be ill-prepared to manage wisely. Similar risks apply to almost any group dialogical practices, such as Circling and other forms of Authentic Relating. Similar concerns apply to Nelsonian Socratic Dialogue, for which APPA restricts trainings.

Since we created these two practices, and designed protections into them and into the curriculum for facilitator trainings, we do not accept responsibility for any irresponsible uses or adaptations of them, on the one hand, nor would we want to have our ethically-designed practices’ reputations – and thus their potential value – undermined by them, on the other hand. Thus, we emphatically advise against attempting to facilitate these practices without proper training.

Conclusion: Public Philosophy Optimism

These two practices are part of a relatively recent but increasingly growing movement, not just in the philosophical practice space but in philosophy more broadly, to do what Socrates did, namely, to bring the best of philosophy – which he construed as about trying to figure out how we should live – to the people, what one of us calls “philosophy to the people” (Repetti n.d.), and which another of us believes to be an important component of an ecology of sapiential practices needed to help us address the meaning crisis resulting from the rise of science, the collapse of faith in legacy religions, and other meaning-undermining elements of modernity

⁹ Repetti argues, nevertheless, that if done well, and especially with proper training, philosophical counseling can function in such a way that its results can be incredibly therapeutic, but that these are collateral benefits (2025).

and post-modernity (Vervaeke 2019, 2023/2024, 2025). Whereas one is not eligible in some philosophical practice institutions for training in certain practices (like NSD) without a Master's degree or higher in philosophy, or the equivalent, this is not the case for training to become facilitators in these two practices. Since these are highly procedurally-structured *practices*, however, it suffices to train by *practicing* the procedures themselves, cultivating the requisite skills, what philosophers call procedural knowledge, *knowing how* to do something, as opposed to propositional knowledge, or *knowledge that* something is the case.

Vervaeke has emphasized two other forms of knowledge that are relevant here, namely, participatory knowing and perspectival knowing, together what he calls “the four P’s of knowing”: propositional, procedural, participatory, perspectival. Procedural knowing is knowing how to do something. Participatory knowing is knowing by belonging, that is by being coupled to someone or something such that one’s development and that of the other are interpenetrating. For example, when we participate in love, we know someone by how our development is interwoven with theirs and vice versa; we know them in our “soul”. This is based on the biological concept of niche construction in which organisms shape the environment that in turn shapes them. Perspectival knowing is knowing what it’s like to perceive from a standpoint, to orient in a particular way and size up a situation accordingly, i.e., what do we foreground and make salient, what do we background, and what do we ignore. This ability to do this for ourselves also affords us taking the perspectives of others to have insight into their behavior, e.g., to walk in someone else’s shoes. Participatory knowing gives us a sense of connectedness and perspectival knowing give us a sense of presence. Being connected and present are important contributors to our sense of experiential meaning.

These two factors are emphasized in both DiD and triple SSS and may help to explain why participants find the practices so meaningful. Vervaeke has advocated extensively for the need for us to escape from our contemporary cultural framework’s propositional tyranny, its reliance on propositional knowing since the scientific revolution, which has eclipsed our other ways of knowing, and to cultivate the other three ways of knowing, and he has advocated cultivating ecologies of practices designed to facilitate this. (Vervaeke 2019, 2024, Vervaeke and Mastropietro 2024).

DiD and SSS are primarily *dialogical* practices, but they fall primarily into one of four major categories suggested for such an ecology, the other three being *imaginal* practices, *mindfulness* practices, and *embodied* practices, together forming the “DIME” acronym.¹⁰ Imaginal practices are practices that simulate alternate possibilities, such as in role play, but may include thought experiments, contemplative exercises and, among others, visualizations.

By now, mindfulness (and related meditative) exercises are so popular they need no explanation at this level. Embodied exercises are activities employing the body, such as yoga, Tai Chi, etc., important for restoring the unity of mind and body in an era in which propositional tyranny has virtually disembodied our minds. While DiD and SSS do not engage the body explicitly or directly, they do engage it to an extent when participants notice bodily engagement in the form of tension, anxiety/excitement, and related visceral/somatic expressions, and when the Vibe draws attention to the nonverbal communication that occurs in these two primarily dialogical practices.

While these two practices are primarily dialogical, imaginal and meditative elements are specifically included in the instructions and procedures enacted in these exercises, as participants imagine each other’s proposals, simulate and reflect back how the virtue appears to each other, etc., and there are meditative, contemplative, and related imaginal transitions between the various steps in these practices. Together, the practices provide a fairly robust ecology of practices, on the one hand, and they enact all four P’s of knowing, a sense of which is the case for each type of knowing which should be intuitively imaginable to the reader by now. (Repetti 2023). The point of this foray into the four P’s of knowing and the DIME framework as an example of an ecology of practices is that the best way to train in the ability to facilitate DiD and SSS is to practice them, as engaging in the actual practices constitutes the best way to cultivate the level of skill in them that is prerequisite to facilitating them properly and ethically for others – as is the case with almost any other skill, as Aristotle famously argued: practice makes perfect.

¹⁰ It should be noted that the authors have explored the issue of whether or not meditation should be treated as a form of mindfulness or vice versa, and have not come to an agreement. The DIME framework, however, was crafted with the idea that the term “mindfulness” was the more inclusive term, so we are sticking with that usage here.

The majority of the trainings for these two practices, therefore, consists in engaging in the practices themselves, under supervision, along with preliminary practice in exercises designed to cultivate the relevant component skills, such as mindfulness, one-pointedness of attention, mindful listening, paraphrasing, role-switching, contemplation, frame-shifting, cognitive empathy, ability to sit with *aporia* (uncertainty), etc. Not only is a Master's degree or higher in philosophy not required for these, but it can function as a handicap if, for example, one has developed a default interactive modality of the sort of critical debate that often renders certain philosophical forums more like the philosophical version of martial arts competitions.

These new, transformative, sapiential directions in philosophical practice that bring them "to the people" may be precisely what is needed as we are on the edge of the AI revolution, in which a significant majority face occupational displacement that threatens to exacerbate the meaning crisis, given the extent to which many of us derive our sense of meaning from our societal roles. Up until now, most human beings derived their sense of self-worth from their occupation, avocation, unique skills, expertise, and the like. As AI's and robotics become exponentially superior to us in all these respects, we will need novel ways of meaning-making, self-cultivation, and value-generating. These two practices, and many others like them, promise to bring human beings into more wholesome relationships with themselves and each other, at a time when these things will soon be most needed.

Note: A version of this paper was presented at the 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP) in Zagreb, Croatia in June, 2025 (Repetti, Vervaeke, Mastropietro, and Barratt 2025a). Elements of this paper were also presented there in one keynote lecture by Vervaeke (2025) and another by Repetti (2025a).

References

- Csikszentmihalyi, M., 1990. *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper.
- Einstein, A., 2009. *Einstein on Cosmic Religion and Other Opinions and Aphorisms*. New York: Dover.
- Grossmann, I., & Kross, E., 2014. "Exploring Solomon's Paradox: Self-distancing Eliminates the Self-Other Asymmetry in Wise Reasoning About Close Relationships in Younger and Older Adults." *Psychological Science* 25(8): 1571-1580.
- Hutchins, E., 1995. *Cognition in the Wild*. MIT Press.
- Laughlin, P.R., Hatch, E.C., Silver, J.S., & Boh, L., 2006. "Groups Perform Better Than the Best Individuals on Letters-to-Numbers Problems: Effects of Group Size." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90(4): 644-651.
- Parvizi-Wayne, D., Sandved-Smith, L., Pitliya, R.J., Limanowski, J., Tufft, M.R.A., and Friston, K.J., 2024. "Forgetting Ourselves in Flow: An Active Inference Account of Flow States and How We Experience Ourselves within Them". *Frontiers in Psychology* 15, p. 1354719. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1354719>
- Repetti, R., n.d. Website. <https://www.rickrepetti.com>
- Repetti, R., 2025a. "An Argument for Philosophical Therapy". Keynote lecture. 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP). Zagreb, Croatia.
- Repetti, R., 2025b. "An Argument for Philosophical Therapy". *Philosophical Practice* 20(2), pp. 3532-3546.
- Repetti, R., 2023. "A Sampling of Philosophical Counseling Frameworks, Tools, and Practices". *Interdisciplinary Research in Counseling, Ethics and Philosophy* 3(7): 136-195. <https://ircep.eu/index.php/home/article/view/60>
- Repetti, R., Vervaeke, J., Mastropietro, C., Barratt, T., 2025a. "The Platonic Cave Elevator: Dialectic into Dialogos & the Socratic Search Space". Panel presentation. 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP). Zagreb, Croatia.
- Repetti, R., Vervaeke, J., Mastropietro, C., Barratt, T., 2025b. "Dialectic into *Dialogos*: Reverse Engineering Socratic Dialogue".

Workshop. 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP). Zagreb, Croatia.

Repetti, R., Vervaeke, J., Mastropietro, C., Barratt, T., 2025c. "Taking the Platonic Cave Elevator: The Socratic Search Space". Workshop. 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP). Zagreb, Croatia.

Vervaeke, J., 2025. "Dialogical Reason and Non-propositional Knowing within Metanoetic Argument as Central to Socratic-Platonic Practice". Keynote lecture. 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP). Zagreb, Croatia.

Vervaeke, J., 2023/2024. "After Socrates". YouTube, lecture series. <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL2kTFP8Xh6D2R2P6bFXGMZH700-ZRv4JY>

Vervaeke, J., 2022. "The philosophy of meditation, transformative experience etc, w/ Rick Repetti - Voices with Vervaeke". YouTube: youtu.be/VSURwG1f_U8?si=ciWDxSykK6EwGIBK

Vervaeke, J., 2019. "Awakening from the Meaning Crisis". YouTube, https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLV1Jm3VhP2gzP_ArQztVuZofqAia7wX0v

Vervaeke, J., Repetti, R., Mastropietro, C., and Barratt, T., 2025. Presentation and Workshops on Dialectic into *Dialogos* and on the Socratic Search Space. 18th International Conference on Philosophical Practice (ICPP). Zagreb, Croatia.

Vervaeke, J., Ferraro, L., and Herrera-Bennett, A., 2018. "Flow as Spontaneous Thought: Insight and Implicit Learning". In: *The Oxford Handbook of Spontaneous Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 309-28.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190464745.013.8>

Vervaeke, J. and Mastropietro, C., 2024. *Awakening from the Meaning Crisis: Part One: Origins*. Story Grid Publishing.

Xu, W., Zhang, K., & Wang, F., 2022. "The Psychological Mechanisms Underlying Solomon's Paradox: Impact of Mood and Self-Transcendence." *Frontiers in Psychology* 13: 901012.