

A Case Study of Grimes' DPP When Applied to the Exploration of the Roots of Daydreams

Barbara Stecker

How can an exploration or even a series of explorations into such a common 'psychic phenomena' as daydreams have much impact on one's life and the pursuit of one's goals? In a conversation on October 25, 2002 about a month after the last of these talks John S. made the following comments when asked about the ongoing effect the explorations had had on him.

'I've noticed that I'm able to care for myself in the face of attitudes that were 'critical'. While I used to procrastinate when writing a paper - it used to take me two or three months to get into the right mood to write a paper - I recently wrote a paper in only three days. And, despite the fact that I had to dump eight of ten pages that I had written at 10:00 pm on the night before it was due, I was able to pull it together with new insights into the topic. In the face of the panic, I was still able to enjoy writing it and produce a paper that needs only a little polishing in a very few hours. This is a major difference that I've seen in my writing since the talks. I've never written a paper in this way.'

In this paper I set forth the content and the main stages of the first talk between Dr. Pierre Grimes and John S. using Dialectical Philosophical Practice (DPP). This session follows the dialectical methodology set forth in *Philosophical Midwifery: A New Paradigm for Understanding the Human Problem*, (Grimes and Uliana, 1998, pp. 73-6).

There are those who are puzzled by the form of DPP, that is, the use of past memories, of feeling states and states of mind. On the basis of these commonalities some philosophical counsellors are led to ask how this method differs from psychological counselling. When I tried to find a definition of psychology thinking to work from that side of the issue, I couldn't find the field unambiguously defined anywhere; the field is in flux. One might conclude from this that the line is blurry on both sides. I can say this, however: nowhere was there any mention of *understanding* as the solution to man's problems, not even in cognitive psychology where one would most expect it. I think that no psychologist would say that a false belief, a false learning, is at the root of one's present problems, or that our parents functioned as sophists to persuade us of clan beliefs that united us as a family and thereby ensured

survival for countless generations, but that only limit us in the present. DPP demonstrates that it is through understanding the roots of our present problems in childhood scenes that we are freed of our problems and can achieve our highest goals. By contrast, the use of past memories in psychology is largely purgative. Painful scenes from the past are reviewed again and again with a view to discharging the negative feelings rather than with a view to understanding them.

The method used here, the dialectic of DPP, is the very same as is practised in many of Plato's dialogues, the *Theaetetus*, and the *Meno*, to name two. The dialectic is used here to analyse a belief, its source and see its effect on the believer's life and thought so that they may be free of its influence. Plato himself saw the effect of childhood learnings upon the soul. In his *Republic*, Book VIII it is what the mother and the servant say to the child (in other passages it is what the nurse says), their negative opinion of the father and his philosophic pursuits, that cause the devolution of the aristocratic constitution to the oligarchic in both polis and child and so with each successive downturn. In the *Theaetetus* the false belief of the title character about the nature of knowledge is examined and dismissed not only in the form that Theaetetus holds it, but the source of the belief, his teacher and his teacher's beliefs are also examined, and dismissed. So to examine a false belief and its source, in this case the beliefs of the parents, has classical authority.

There are four levels to any DPP exploration: The *Puzzle*, or *Problem Statement*, the *Recollection*, the *Reflection* and the *Conclusion*. Often a single talk will extend to all four levels; if it does not, the next talk will usually bring the exploration to its conclusion. While a *Problem Statement* or *Puzzle* usually contains a statement of the blocks that the subject is encountering in the pursuit of a goal, the dream or daydream takes the place of the problem statement in this kind of exploration. The *Recollection* is a re-collection, a pulling together of scattered thoughts and memories that relate to the problem statement. In the *Reflection* scenes of past learning are compared with present scenes, or with the scene of the daydream or dream. In this comparison the terms or words used in the past are compared with the language used in the present. Seeing past and present

allows the subject to judge what he or she has never put into words. There is an unspoken belief, or pathologos, brought to light at this time that can be evaluated both in terms of how it fits with the past and how it limits the present and future. In the *Conclusion* 'subjects perceive the shallowness of their reasons for the acceptance of the pathologos, [and] are driven to find some reason why they would have accepted the belief. This is often the circumstance that presents the condition for seeing in a new way.' (Grimes and Uliana, 1998, pp. 107-8)

When Dr. Grimes began the session there was a short discussion of what a fantasy or daydream is - it is an imaginary rehearsal for an action that one may or may not ever take in the way of the daydream. We are attracted to our role in the daydream, we identify with it and through that identification we enter into the daydream. We often don't like the effect it has on our life: it draws our attention away from the pursuits we are engaged in. In fact we would rather have that same way of concentrating in our studies or our everyday life - an involvement so total that we don't even think about what's going on in the rest of the world. In an exploration into the nature of a fantasy, you find out how you got this thing that you are rehearsing - the model for this drama we are drawn to, and the self image we identify with so strongly that it becomes a transition away from our everyday states of mind, our everyday world to the world of the daydream.

I think it's worthwhile to note at this juncture that DPP is not carried on within a traditional counsellor/client relationship. In every session Dr. Grimes gives instruction about the methodology and, in this case, the nature of daydreams. When DPP students practice upon each other, they have in common the methodology and each can assist the other with the method as they move through an exploration. In this way this philosophical practice is distinguished from clinical psychological practice. Method and theory are always known and often practised by both. Hence the relationship is teacher-student rather than doctor-patient; the goal is that the student learns the method so that he/she may use it to resolve his/her own blocks.

I will set forth the first session in roughly the order that the dialogue proceeded, collecting the points together in order to shorten its length. The dialogue of the first session went through three of the four stages of the DPP method so I'll use this structure to present the content. The fourth stage was only touched upon.

The first level then of this talk is the Problem Statement. In this case we have not only the fantasy, but also the problem as John sees it in his life. When John came to the

session he had a concern about the way he had been relating in his life in general and with his friends and his lover. He said 'I've been really concerned with how I've been functioning and I've seen the ways I've been functioning in my fantasies have parallels to the ways I've been functioning in my relationships.' John was not only concerned about his way of being, but that the same way of being he disliked in his everyday life he likes in his fantasy life, in his daydreams. He saw that they had a similar dynamic. He had been keeping a journal of his daydreams, of the dramas they contained, the states of mind he went through in them and when they occurred.

In the exploration of a fantasy or daydream, the statement of the fantasy becomes the statement of a problem, that is, it contains the underlying structure, language and dynamic of the problem: it is the first level of the exploration. The statement of the fantasy is as follows:

John: I'm smoking a pipe and someone comes up and says, 'You are a poser.' I came right back at him and I was really hostile, but at the same time I was very cocky and commanding where I started to question him. Basically I wanted to make him look like a fool for saying that. I don't remember there being a response [to my questions]. I just remember that kind of like stopping him almost like a . . . It was like a stutter, unable to continue. That's where the daydream ended with him not being able to immediately respond to my comeback.

In the dialogue that follows this initial statement, John makes the point that the accusation of 'poser' immediately brings about a defence in him. Once that charge has been made he must answer it. It is the crux of the conflicts that occur in his daydreams.

In any session some of the language used by the client is unique to him; it has a special personal meaning. It is a pathologos or 'sick word', a fundamental piece necessary to surface the content of the belief. In John's first talk the 'poser' is a pathologos. As the dialogue goes on they return again and again to the attempt to understand it. The first time the question is put follows below.

Dr. Grimes: What does 'poser' mean? Like suppose someone were listening to your fantasy and came up, 'Wait a minute. What does that word 'poser' mean?'

John: Imitating, not real, fake.

Dr. Grimes: Imitating, fake. Oh, good, good. The first scene is a charge.

John: Often. I always find those charges really concerning and so I'm usually sucked in.

Dr. Grimes: Right. That sucks you in. That pulls you into it. We could say you accept that as you. You identify with it. You accept it as you.

John: In that sense I guess, sure. I'm really concerned that that charge is not me, so I can see it . . . It seems when I think of any of the versions of it that are confrontational, they always kind of end after my assault.

John makes two points here: to be a poser is to be unreal, to be fake, to imitate, and his fantasies often have the 'accusation' dynamic. At the end of the session John sees this role with much more precision and uncovers the personal significance as will be seen below.

Once the basic story or drama of the daydream has been related the next step is to get a description of the states of mind, and the appearance of those in the drama: this is the level of Recollection. As this discussion is going on there often arise seemingly random thoughts and memories connected with it; these in turn often reveal the interconnections between the daydream and the past learning scene that provided the underlying dynamics or the way these dynamics and roles function in the subject's everyday life.

In this fantasy there are two stages: the first, when John is smoking a pipe, he is charged with being a poser, and the second when he immediately responds to this charge by defending and by questioning the accuser. The accuser's state of mind is 'confronting, so confrontational . . . to the point I feel like I have no room and no options.' He adds to his own reaction in the daydream: 'I really want to rip open this space. That's more my reaction to what it's like. It's like being really tightly bundled in a blanket and wanting to move, I guess, and having a-what's commonly called claustrophobic. It feels very claustrophobic. And . . . my reaction is really dynamically wanting to move. We have John's state of mind when he defends against the charge, 'cocky and commanding'. John wants to 'make him look like a fool'. After John's comeback the accuser is described as 'defeated, disoriented, like he didn't know what to do.' John leaves the daydream feeling energised, the daydream is 'kind of an energising . . . The whole thing is energising'.

In the course of describing these states, the image of being 'tightly bundled in a blanket' emerges. A curious image, is it not? Dr. Grimes asks him if he has a past scene for that state/ image and John continues:

John: It's amazingly. . . I'm amazingly familiar with it.

Dr. Grimes: Because it awakens some memory?

John: Yeah. Lots of memories. It reminds me of when my brother was born when I was three.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah. I'll take that.

John: It reminds me of being stuck in a tree when I was playing basketball with my dad. So in all those things I have the same type of response to it.

There are two important points to note here: one is that John has many memories of this state in different contexts (two of which are noted here), the second is that he has the same response whenever it occurred. There is a pattern to the incidence of this state.

Dr. Grimes: What was that three-year old one when your brother was born?

John: I wasn't allowed to go to the hospital.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah, more.

John: I really wanted to go and I couldn't. I had no option to go. The whole time I thought I was going to go until I was being dropped off.

Dr. Grimes: When was that? Come on. You have a picture of that? When you were being dropped off?

John: The way I remember it was when my mom was going to the hospital to give birth. I was being dropped off at a friend's house, my Mom's friend's house. And that was already planned, but I didn't know anything about that.

Dr. Grimes: Hmm. How'd she do it? Do you recall? You know usually people are in some kind of a state of mind at the time they do things.

John: It seems so . . . Yeah, that's weird. It's like . . . I don't know what language to use right now because I think I'm seeing it the way that she appears to me right now. That's kind of strange, but what I mean by that like she's coming at me nervously as if she's doing something wrong. But that's not the language I would . . . I guess it's the kind of language that's coming up in retrospect.

Dr. Grimes: Could be, you know. It fits your experience: it's real. So there she is 'nervously' as if she's doing something wrong.

John: It has that type of quality. But at the same time, that's the way it's going to unfold.

This past scene above is explored above in the same manner as the daydream; the states of mind, the appearances, and the transitions between the scenes are drawn out. His mother's state is 'nervous, feeling as if she's doing something wrong', and yet 'that's the way it's going to unfold'.

At this point in the session Dr. Grimes set up an analogy:

Dr. Grimes: And no options, right! Right! Let me just, (Dr. Grimes begins to write on the blackboard) I don't want to lose this, for a moment. [He writes: 'Why are you doing something or in a state of mind similar to that of your mother?'] As we look at this fantasy, why is it if she did that, could there possibly be a connection why you're doing that in the fantasy?

John: Um-hmm. I don't know. I have that question.

Dr. Grimes: See, it's an analogy. (Writing, drawing out the scene on the board and speaking the following) As mother

was to the dropping off, when she did that she was in a state of mind. Make this 'dropping off' the state of mind. So now, you are _____, _____, _____. How would you finish that? Oh, while you're thinking about it, would you add something about her state of mind? Nervously as if she was doing something wrong. What words would you tag onto it?

John: Inevitable.

Dr. Grimes: Inevitable.

John: It was like this is how this is going to go.

Dr. Grimes: Definite then, huh?

John: Yeah, sure. That there wasn't really any options regardless of what any of us wanted.

'Why are you doing something or in a state of mind similar to that of your mother?' This is a fundamental puzzle for each DPP session, for each past scene that is explored. It isn't a theoretical question, but has a specific answer for each person, for each specific problem explored. It is the key to the acceptance of the family roles. Sometimes the question is not answered in a single session. In the Conclusion section of this talk, John will see how he plays his mother's role, what that role is like and the question is answered to a significant degree.

To see the significance of his mother's nervousness, the 'doing something wrong', and the 'no options', her state here must be contrasted with her usual state of being with John. This is called her milieu state.

Dr. Grimes: Hey, by the way, how was she normally before that with you? How would you describe her everyday world?

John: I would say largely it's a mixture of things. Everyone's kind of alone in our family, like we all did our own things a lot. She read often and did her housework and my dad was gone a lot. My brother and I played whether together or by ourselves. But I remember always like it being really pleasant to be with her.

Dr. Grimes: Pleasant. Um-hmm.

John: Yeah, like kind of light.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah, pleasant, light.

John: Almost joking.

There are two points to note here: the isolation of the family members from each other, and his mother's usual state, pleasant to be with, joking and light.

In the following four sections of the transcript, which continues from the above, the Reflection level of the dialogue begins. Consider how the subject is asked to make the connections between the milieu way and his mother's usual way of relating.

Dr. Grimes: Joking. Well, then would you say this scene jumped out of character for her?

John: Sure.

Dr. Grimes: That makes it memorable, you know, because now you have a question. Why did she change?

John: Sure.

Dr. Grimes: Where did this new image come from? Where did this new being come from that before wasn't there? How do you account for it? So that's what you're going to walk away with in that scene at three years old. You're going to try and figure it out. Yeah.

This kind of question is often the most difficult to answer in these kinds of explorations, so the dialectician will return to it again and again in a variety of ways. In general each time they return to the question more is uncovered.

In the following section John sees that he's playing out all the roles of the past scene in his own states of mind, yet there is a significant difference: John at three is 'quieted' but as an adult he can see himself playing a different role than he was able to play as a child.

John: I mean I can see the similarities in the states of mind in the scene and it's like I'm playing out all of them.

Dr. Grimes: Yes. You're playing out all of them.

John: And so, it's interesting the difference between. . . So then my fantasy is just a replaying out of the transmission scene.

Dr. Grimes: Ah, perhaps, I think we may need a little more, though. What would you be doing in the fantasy that you didn't do when you were three years old?

John: That's good. I'm confronting that situation for sure. But it's weird because it's like I have my Mom's state of mind. Like that I'm tiptoeing around my Mom's state of mind, almost afraid of the confrontation and then it comes at me, yeah, and I kind of hostilely react. And that's different than in the actual scene, I was kind of quieted.

Dr. Grimes: Quieted?

John: Well. . .

Dr. Grimes: Isolated.

John: I was given a blanket. (Laughing)

John sees himself as in his mom's state of mind - nervous, doing something wrong, afraid of the confrontation - when he is challenged, however, he defends: this is something new. In the end of the scene we see the blanket the key into the past emerge from this memory. He was quieted, isolated and 'given a blanket'.

In DPP each word of the subject has significance. In the present scene in the coffee shop he feared he was being 'judged as absurd and ridiculous'. It is the issue of judgement that Dr. Grimes next takes up.

Dr. Grimes: (Laughing) See, you wanted something, right? I thought I was going, right? You didn't know you weren't allowed to go. 'I planned on going.' So in some way, you're going to make a judgement about what do you think of the fact that you thought you were going? How good was your judgement? Did you need to look in some way that was similar to the fantasy or daydream?

John: My judgement was totally wrong.

Dr. Grimes: Wrong, hmm. So your judgement was wrong. Wrong!

John: Yeah. I totally just ... I guess I just assumed something - I don't really know how that came to be.

Dr. Grimes: Well, because she was open and pleasant and joking and light all around you all this time, therefore you felt ... go ahead. If she was going to be in that state while going to the hospital, and that's the state she was in when she was around you so much ...

John: I could see that ... well, I mean it's like relating in that way I'm not excluded, and the way my mom is functioning right now definitely excludes me, and her state of mind totally changed. Yeah!

There are two things of note here: John's judgement, his knowing was wrong yet it was based upon the milieu - up to the moment when he was dropped off he had been acting and was treated as if he was going, and at this point in the past he was excluded.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah, see you never know ... You walk away and you have to make sense of the scene and no one helps us and no one talks about it. If they only did that we wouldn't have this.

The child must make the conclusion from what he sees. The transmission is wordless. If the parents were to have discussed any event with the child, there would have been no problem. The child would have known what was happening and that the parents had a concern that he did understand.

In the next section of the transcript it is clear that for John the daydream has in fact been a rehearsal - the states of mind he experiences, the judgements he makes about himself had their origin in the daydream that immediately preceded his going into the coffee shop to write. Obviously this is not true of all daydreams - some could not take place actually - but here the effect of the daydream on John's pursuit of his goal can clearly be seen.

Dr. Grimes: Now, when you went in the coffee shop, remember that the impact of that daydream continued into the coffee shop. And how did you feel there, isolated and what else? You were judged as ...?

John: As being a poser. I was very conscious that I thought people were thinking that I wanted to look like a writer. It was very difficult for me to write.

Dr. Grimes: Sure, because if you write, you might ... whew! So you better not be a writer or you might have to change the fantasy/daydream.

In the succeeding section of the dialogue John is led to draw parallels between John's present state and that of his mother's in the past.

Dr. Grimes: But we'll go into that a moment later. Did you say before that when you were in the coffee shop and you were isolated and you had the impression of 'Who the hell does he think he is?' and you thought you were being judged as ridiculous? What kind of a judgement do you think your mother was making, a familiar judgement about your own thinking and what you thought was going to take place.

John: I don't see that.

Dr. Grimes: But what is most interesting is that we saw she was nervous, nervous as if she was doing something wrong. By the way you're smoking the pipe as nervously as if you're thinking you're doing something ...

John: (Together with Dr. Grimes) ... ridiculous, absurd and wrong.

Dr. Grimes: By heavens, that's another piece of the fantasy.

John: O.K.

Dr. Grimes: It looks like that as we're reading the fantasy for each thing. We're saying there's something parallel to it from the scene with your mother.

Even though John has made the point that there are parallels to the past in the daydream, it is worth relating a specific here. This section is also a transition back into the discussion of the problem of two mothers - one pleasant to be with, light and joking, the other nervous, feeling as if what she's doing is wrong yet inevitable. In what follows Dr. Grimes puts into words one reason why John or anyone would act and feel like the authority figure in a past scene.

Dr. Grimes: You know there's a line in Plato's *Republic* that's really great and if I knew exactly where it was I'd open up the book. I think I have it somewhere here, but Socrates raises a question, and he says, 'Do you think it possible for someone not to imitate someone that they highly admire?' And Glaucon says, 'Of course.'

John: He says that it is possible not to imitate?

Dr. Grimes: No, no. It's impossible not to imitate and they all agree. We don't have that as part of our culture. That one line of Plato's *Republic*, everyone agrees to it; no one takes exception to it. No one says, 'What do you mean?'

Our parents, or those who stand in *loco parentis* are admirable to us; they are beautiful, all powerful and awe inspiring. It is natural that we would love, admire and seek to imitate them. They are our world and our reality. Next Dr. Grimes asks John to consider his mother's state in light of her usual way of being as a model to imitate.

Dr. Grimes: Because if she's coming out in an unusual and powerful way, what does that do then to the past? If you think that's really her emerging, in a forceful . . . is it not? Forceful?

John: Yeah.

Dr. Grimes: Commanding way.

John: Um-hmm.

Dr. Grimes: And if that's really her. And she's the one we most admire, it may be that that's the condition for imitation.

John: Yeah. I remember distinctly that that stood out to me, like in the sense that I was shocked.

Next, they discuss what it means that they planned to leave him at the friends' house, that is what did John conclude about it.

Dr. Grimes: Um-hmm. See, you had a great line. You said that . . . later, I presume it was later, you realised that she had planned to drop you off, with or without telling you?

John: Without.

Dr. Grimes: Without. Um-hmm. And, therefore you're going to make another judgement in terms of that. What does that mean about you, her and your relationship, and what she thinks of you.

John: Hmm.

Dr. Grimes: What would you say it does?

John: I don't know. I can see that like . . . um . . . In a weird way like, I don't know what she's doing. I don't know where to answer that question from - like what I mean by that is, from now? I'm trying to understand how I understood it then.

Dr. Grimes: You did use a word before that was quite interesting. You said, 'Betrayed'.

John: Sure. Um-hmm. Yes, I . . . I don't remember if I . . . the way I think now that she planned it. Definitely obvious to me now, the whole thing just seemed like I was being scammed.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah, yeah.

John: Being treated a certain way so I would cause no problems.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah.

The exploration of the 'poser' problem continues to several interesting conclusions in the next section:

Dr. Grimes: We need just one word, poser. We're back to that one word now. Right? You're going to make him believe, what? There you are smoking the pipe, see. You are a poser means what?

John: That I'm presenting myself in some way that's false.

Dr. Grimes: Oh, by chance could you have presented yourself in that early scene as someone who naturally should be taken along to that hospital with your mother?

John: Well, that's definitely the way I was functioning when I saw it as inevitable. That's where I was going to be as what was going to happen.

Dr. Grimes: What did you discover then?

John: That that was wrong.

Dr. Grimes: Then were you . . . ?

John: Shocked and confounded by that.

Dr. Grimes: Were you perhaps 'posing' as if you were?

John: Sure, I definitely was posing as if. It just seemed so ingrained; it seemed so natural to function that way. It wasn't even a question for me whether or not.

Dr. Grimes: Let me put it another way. What is a poser? It's someone then who's trying to be something they're not. It's going along . . . Now, see, is it more than that? It's going along making a judgement now. See, being a poser means you're not authentic. You think you're something you're not. You're being presumptuous? You're being a poser.

John: It's a lie.

Dr. Grimes: It's a lie. 'What do you think you're doing?'

John: Yes.

Dr. Grimes: And what you expect you can get away with?

John: OK Sure.

Dr. Grimes: Is that all connected with the word with the word, 'poser'?

John: That's interesting. I think it's centred around being not really what you presented yourself as being, and as much as that, it's the accusation and the 'found out'.

Dr. Grimes: Hmm. Curious.

John is led to connecting the idea of posing with himself in that early scene. He judged it as natural to function as if he were going yet this is 'posing'. He had no doubts, but found out that he was wrong. What he saw as inevitable was mistaken. His conclusion is that posing is not being what you present yourself as being, being accused and being found out. Below John talks about what difficulties his having this particular problem cause for him. When he learns, when anyone learns certain kinds of things there is an imitation, and an 'acting like' or a 'functioning in the same way'. When John enters into these activities, which is often since he is a university student, he is assaulted by the poser accusations and must undergo these same states of mind.

John: Demanding for me especially in relationship to things that require like stages, learning something. Anything I'm learning about requires that I become more intimate. And in a weird way I feel like I am in the beginning of learning something imitating, imitating language, or imitating actions to become more acquainted with it. But it becomes very hard for me to learn when I'm judging myself as being . . . or when I get these type of assaults.

The dialogue that follows takes up the view John concludes that his parents had of him and it is this that he struggles with now.

Dr. Grimes: Therefore they must have had a view of you different than that view of you that you had of yourself.

John: Definitely. I feel in some ways I'm still struggling with that.

Dr. Grimes: Yeah, because this brought an image; they're making a judgement about you, about something vital to you because you really wanted to go.

John: It's interesting how that, like, once I have that perspective, that view, it brings up this whole way of relating as if I'm incompetent.

Dr. Grimes: Too young or something. Incompetent. You think I'm too young to do this - not that that's put in. How important is it that your brother is being born. Whew! Very important to you, the family and your mother. So what is she keeping you from?

John: Yeah, I don't know. It's weird. Now I think I'm finally starting to see that this is very mysterious because I remember really caring about what was going on, particularly not about my baby brother, but about my Mom. I remember being really concerned about what was going on with my mom. So then when she, when she came out with her wheelchair that really threw me off.

Dr. Grimes: Whew! That really threw you off. Now you have another puzzle. You couldn't help her; you weren't there to help. You could have been there. Whew! Well, all we're doing is just talking about something that could take less than a minute. A fantasy. A daydream and look what we have. It pulled together images, attitudes, states of mind - you see it everywhere . . .

The session concludes with an assignment: John is to observe the effect that this talk has, if any, on his daydreams. He comes to the second session with the result of this assignment and the first topic they discuss is this effect, which I will quote in full:

John: I've been a lot more sensitive to when daydreams are coming up, particularly when they come up in a situation and I'm kind of internally viewing different ways I can respond to that situation. And, well, they actually tend not to be so different. They tend to have, I

was noticing, there seems to be a certain way that I continually regurgitate, responding to a whole variety of situations, but there seems to be almost like a set thing going on that I internalise and I'm noticing those more. And noticing has allowed me to separate myself from them because what seems to happen to me is that I get really caught up in the internal images that are going on and it really effects how I'm handling myself and so by reflecting like we did last week, it's allowed me to separate myself from what was happening such that I could participate more fully in what was occurring, right?

In his recollection and contrast with the past he makes six points. (1) He is now naturally more attentive to the moment at which daydreams occur. (2) Now he is reflecting upon the ways he could respond, but (3) he has noticed that there is a single pattern in these options, a 'set thing' (4) in what used to appear in the past as different options. (5) These reflections allow him a space to reflect that he didn't have before. Before the talk he would get caught up in the internal images, now because he is not being caught up in these daydreams he can (6) 'participate more fully' in his real life. The impact of the daydream on how he handles himself; it affects how he handles himself and distances him keeping him from participation, thus, it isolates him. Now, freed to some degree, able to separate himself from them he can more fully respond in ways that were not open to him before. Now that he begins to see the false belief and the underlying dynamics: this is the 'set thing'. Now he has choices that differ from those imposed by the tyranny of the pathologos belief.

In the practice of DPP it has been observed that when you understand the roots of the daydream in the early learning scene, what draws you to it as well as see how you function, and see why your daydream takes the form it does, you will no longer be lulled by the sophisticated appearances, so no longer take the trip. The appearance is always attractive to you and when you understand why it is, the self-image in the daydream loses its appeal. In seeing it for what it is you move from false belief, picture thinking up the cognitive levels to understanding. When you understand the daydream for what it is and for what it is an image of you are freed from its influence. In John's second talk he states: 'Being in a situation where there's conflict. It's just not centred around whether or not I'm posing as something; I haven't had that kind of criticism being the source of a conflict.'

The 'poser' role is no longer occurring in his daydreams, nor does he undergo the assault of that criticism. What remains is the conflict dynamic. It is this that they explore in the next session.

Reference

Grimes, P. and Uliana, R.L. (1998) *Philosophical Midwifery: A New Paradigm for Understanding the Human Problem*, Costa Mesa: Hyparxis Press

Barbara Stecker (barbarastecker@earthlink.net) holds an MA in philosophy from Claremont Graduate University. She has also studied Platonic philosophy, the Golden Chain, and Dialectical Philosophical Practice with Dr. Pierre Grimes for more than 20 years.