

The Epistemology of Logic-Based Therapy

Elliot D. Cohen, Ph.D.

Elliot D. Cohen is Executive Director of the National Philosophical Counseling Association (NPCA) and inventor of Logic-Based Therapy & Consultation. His recent books include Logic-Based Therapy and Everyday Emotions (Lexington Books, 2017) and Counseling Ethics for the 21st Century (Sage, 2018).

Abstract: This article describes some core elements of Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation and examines some of their epistemic properties.

Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation (LBT&C) is a leading modality of philosophical practice derived from Rational-Emotive Behavior Therapy (REBT), the world's first cognitive-behavior therapy invented by Albert Ellis. As cognitive approaches impart knowledge, the question naturally arises as to the epistemic status of key elements of LBT&C. This article attempts to systematically address this question.

The Six Steps of Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation

LBT&C is a philosophical counseling and consulting modality that I developed beginning in the mid 1980s. It is a philosophical version of the first form of cognitive-behavior psychotherapy, known as Rational-Emotive Behavior Therapy invented by Albert Ellis in the 1950s.¹ LBT&C consists of six steps:

1. Construct the client's emotional and behavioral reasoning;
2. Check its premises for "Cardinal Fallacies";
3. Refute any fallacies;
4. For each fallacy identified and refuted, identify its "Guiding Virtue";
5. Adopt a set of uplifting philosophies that promotes the identified virtues;
6. Apply the latter philosophies by constructing and acting on a plan of action aimed at attaining the guiding virtues.

The Cardinal Fallacies

LBT&C recognizes eleven kinds of Cardinal Fallacies. The following Table displays each fallacy and its definition:

FALLACY	DEFINITION
1. Demanding Perfection	Commanding, demanding, and dictating the terms of external reality based on premises about one's own subjective desires or preferences.
2. Bandwagon Reasoning	Blind, inauthentic conformity of belief and/or action often deduced from the demand for approval of others.
3. The-World-Revolves-Around-Me Thinking	Thinking that one's own beliefs, values, desires, and preferences are the only true, right, or acceptable ones and that, therefore, everyone else must accept them.
4. Awfulizing/Catastrophizing	Reasoning from bad to worst or exaggerating the badness.
5. Damnation	Devaluation of self, others, and the universe.
6. Can'tstipation	Obstructing one's creative potential by holding in and refusing to excrete one's emotional, behavioral, or volitional can't.
7. Dutiful Worrying	Dutifully and obsessively disturbing oneself.
8. Manipulation	Using force, intimidation, threats, deception, chicanery, or other manner of control, instead of rational argument, in order to get a person/s to act, think, or feel in a certain way.
9. Oversimplifying Reality	Overgeneralizing, pigeonholing, and stereotyping.
10. Distorting Probabilities	Making predictions about the future that are not probable relative to the evidence at hand.
11. Blind Conjecture	Advancing explanations, causal judgments, and contrary-to-fact claims about the world based on fear, guilt, superstition, magical thinking, fanaticism, or other anti-scientific grounds.

The first eight of these sets of fallacies tend to be found in the major premise of the client's emotional or behavioral reasoning; the last three are inductive fallacies typically found in the minor premise. LBT&C refers to the first eight as Emotional and Behavioral Fallacies, and to the last three as Fallacies of Reporting.

The Epistemic Status of *Musts* and *Shoulds* in Demanding Perfection

Demanding Perfection tends to be the major premise from which further Cardinal Fallacies are deduced. For example:

1. Everyone must always approve of me.
2. If so, then if I don't get the approval of everyone, then I am unworthy.
3. Everyone doesn't always approve of me.
4. So, I am unworthy.

Here, the client deduces Self-Damnation in (4) from Demanding Perfection in (1). My clinical findings have been that almost invariably, clients deduce their other Emotional and Behavioral Fallacies from Demanding Perfection.

Demanding Perfection (hereafter DP) typically formulates in terms of a “must,” as in Premise 1 above; and sometimes in terms of an “ought” or “should”—for example, “Everyone should always approve of me.”

As illocutionary acts (acts performed *in* saying things), DP *musts* are always or almost always unrealistic *demands* that reality conform to some state of reality that does not exist. Modally, they make claims about necessity. Thus, in stating that “Everyone must always approve of me” the client makes the claim

□Everyone approves of me.

This claim entails that everyone does, in fact, always approve of me:

□Everyone approves of me → Everyone always approves of me.

Clearly, the antecedent of the latter statement is not likely to be true because almost invariably someone does not approve of me. Hence it can be refuted by showing that not everyone does in fact approve of me:

\square Everyone approves of me \rightarrow Everyone always approves of me.

\sim Everyone always approves of me

$\therefore \sim \square$ Everyone approves of me

Thus, LBT&C practitioners help their clients to refute their DP *musts* by helping them identify at least one individual who does not always approve of them.

In contrast, DP *shoulds* do not formulate in terms of necessity as do DP *musts*. It is therefore a weaker statement than a DP *must*. In saying that “Everyone *should* (or ought) always approve of me” what is stated or implied is that, while it is not necessarily the case that everyone approves of me, there is at least one *compelling reason* to approve of me, that is, a reason (R) for always approving of me that cannot possibly be defeated (D). Thus:

Everyone should always approve of me $\rightarrow (\exists x) (Rx \ \& \ \sim \diamond Dx)$

In the case of DP *shoulds*, it is the consequent of the above statement, $(\exists x) (Rx \ \& \ \sim \diamond Dx)$, that is refutable because it is possible for there *not* to be any compelling reason for everyone always approving of me. Thus, the refutation of the client’s DP *should* proceeds by helping the client to construct a modus tollens inference:

Everyone should always approve of me $\rightarrow (\exists x) (Rx \ \& \ \sim \diamond Dx)$

$\sim (\exists x) (Rx \ \& \ \sim \diamond Dx)$

$\therefore \sim$ Everyone should approve of me

For example, applying John Hick’s well-known “soul building” argument for the existence of evil in the world, one could say that a world in which not everyone approves of me is one in which I have an opportunity to grow stronger in character. For instance, I have the opportunity to persevere in doing good deeds even if I do not get the approval of everyone for doing them. More generally, the imperfections in the world provide the occasion for cultivating virtues such as courage, benevolence, creativity, tolerance, and many other admirable qualities that would be absent in a perfect universe.

Typically, it is clients’ preferences or wants from which they deduce their DP *shoulds*:

I prefer (or want) that everyone always approve of me (even though they often don’t).

∴, Everyone should always approve of me.

However, that I prefer or want that everyone approve of me is not a compelling reason for everyone to always approve of me because it is possible for there to be defeaters, such as the freedom of others to approve of whomever they themselves prefer. For, clearly, if my preferences count as compelling reasons then so do theirs, which is a *reductio absurdum* of the idea that my preferences are compelling (i.e., indefeasible) reasons.

THE EPISTEMIC STATUS OF THE GUIDING VIRTUES

Each Cardinal Fallacy in LBT&C has a respective Guiding Virtue.² The below table lists each Cardinal Fallacy and its Guiding Virtue:

CARDINAL FALLACY	CORRESPONDING GUIDING VIRTUE
1. Demanding Perfection (in this imperfect world)	Metaphysical Security (security about reality)
2. Jumping on the Bandwagon	Authenticity
3. The-World-Revolves-Around-Me (ego-centric thinking)	Empathy
4. Awfulizing (Catastrophizing)	Courage
5. Damnation (of self, one's others, or the universe)	Respect (for self, others, or the universe)
6. <i>Can't</i> stipation Emotional Volitional Behavioral	Self-Control: Temperance Tolerance or Patience Decisiveness or Assertiveness
7. Dutiful Worrying	Prudence
8. Manipulation	Empowerment
9. Oversimplify Reality	Objectivity
10. Distorting Probabilities	Foresightedness
11. Blind Conjecture	Scientificity

The guiding virtue of DP is Metaphysical Security, which is security about reality itself notwithstanding its unavoidable imperfections.³ This is the most basic virtue since all the other virtues are ways of rationally coping with specific imperfections. For example, Courage involves responding rationally to the possibility of bad things happening; while Foresightedness is the virtue of rationally assessing risks. *Can't*stipation involves your use of *can't* to falsely deny your ability to control your emotions, will, or behavior (“I can’t help feeling discouraged”; “I can’t stand being ignored”; “I can’t do public speaking”). So, there are three types of *Can't*stipation corresponding to each of these types of “can’ts,” each with its own corresponding virtues of Self-Control (see line 6 of above table). Dutiful Worrying involves thinking you have a duty to upset yourself about perceived problems until you find a perfect or near-perfect solution. Its virtue is

Prudence, which is the ability to make, and act upon rational, moral judgments. A brief description of all eleven guiding virtues follows:

Guiding Virtue	Description
<p>1.</p> <p><i>Metaphysical Security</i></p>	<p>The ability to accept imperfections in reality. The metaphysically secure person accepts his <i>human</i> fallibility and limitations as well as those of others and does not expect the world to be perfect. He remains hopeful about realistic possibilities, is humble in the face of the uncertainty of the universe, and has a strong desire for knowledge but is not frustrated by his inability to know all. Such a person does not attempt to control what is beyond his ability to control but stays focused on excelling in what he <i>can</i> control.</p>
<p>2.</p> <p><i>Courage</i></p>	<p>Confronting adversity without under- or overestimating the danger. It means fearing things to the extent that it is reasonable to fear them and, in the face of danger, acting according to the merits of the situation. The courageous person perceives evil as a <i>relative</i> concept according to which things could always be worse and are never <i>absolutely</i> bad (the worst thing in the world). Such a person tends to learn from and derive positive value from his misfortunes and is willing to take reasonable risks in order to live well.</p>
<p>3.</p> <p><i>Respect</i></p>	<p>Transcends the tendency to rate reality, including human reality, as utterly worthless or totally shitty and instead looks for goodness and dignity. Global respect avoids rating the whole according to the part and looks favorably on the larger cosmic picture. Self-respect involves unconditional, self-acceptance based on a deep philosophical understanding of human worth and dignity. Respect for others consistently extends this profound respect for unconditional human worth and dignity to other human beings.</p>
<p>4.</p> <p><i>Authenticity</i></p>	<p>Autonomously and freely living according to one’s own creative lights as opposed to losing oneself on a bandwagon of social conformity. An authentic person is no cog in a social establishment. She values her individuality, cherishes a democratic life style and its inherent personal freedoms, and does not hide her responsibility for life choices behind deterministic excuses.</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>Self-Control:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperance • Decisiveness, Assertiveness • Tolerance, Patience 	<p>Rational control over one’s actions, emotions, and will. By telling oneself one can’t do otherwise, one can defeat one’s own prospects for happiness. For example, you easily lose your temper, cave to pressure, eat or drink to excess, and keep yourself from advancing by refusing to try. In contrast, a person with self-control can take control of one’s life (body, mind, and spirit) by cognitively and behaviorally overcoming such self-stultifying can’ts.</p> <p>Temperance = Taking responsibility for emotions and not making excuses for feelings. The truly temperate person does not need to calm irrational emotional tendencies such as anger, but instead does not become irrationally upset in the first place.</p> <p>Decisiveness, Assertiveness = Realistic trust in one’s ability to accomplish goals one sets for oneself. She avoids procrastination and decision by indecision, and adheres to her values in making decisions.</p> <p>Tolerance, Patience = Avoiding extremes of weakness of will and dogmatic perseverance. The tolerant person does not confuse “can’t stand it” with “won’t stand it,” welcomes alternative perspectives, even if they are not in agreement with his own.</p>
<p>6.</p> <p><i>Prudence</i></p>	<p>Philosophical grasp of morality and moral standards; tolerance for the ambiguity and uncertainty of moral choices; an ability to frame life in constructive, unproblematic ways; a willingness to try out novel ways of resolving concerns; and a consideration for the welfare, interests, and needs of others. The use of proactive thinking instead of procrastination, dilemma thinking, and decision by indecision in confronting the uncertainty and ambiguity of moral problems.</p>
<p>7.</p> <p><i>Empowerment</i></p>	<p>Treating others as rational, self-determining agents in contrast to trying to get what you want through power plays, intimidation, and deceit. This means advising rather than goading, using rational argument to convince rather than making threats, recognizing the right of others to informed consent, and respecting the right to just treatment, even when serious conflicts arise.</p>

<p>8.</p> <p><i>Empathy</i></p>	<p>Transcending one's own ego-centered universe by connecting (cognitively, emotionally, and spiritually) with the subjectivity of others. It means giving up the self-defeating idea that only one's own values, interests, preferences, and beliefs carry import and validity. It is a condition of such other virtues as beneficence, friendship, and gratitude.</p>
<p>9.</p> <p><i>Objectivity</i></p>	<p>The ability to make objective unbiased discernments in practical matters. In cases of judging other human beings, it means equitable and sympathetic judgment in contrast to stereotypical and prejudicial judgment. An objective person is realistic, perceptive, open minded, creative, and constructive.</p>
<p>10.</p> <p><i>Foresightedness</i></p>	<p>The ability to make generalizations about the material world and predictions about the future that are probable relative to the facts as known. A person who has this virtue is able to use it successfully in making life decisions. Such a person is able to cope effectively in this material universe, where there are degrees of probability, not certainty.</p>
<p>11.</p> <p><i>Scientificity</i></p>	<p>The ability to apply a critical, scientific method in accounting for the whys and wherefores of existence. A scientific person recognizes that scientific and religious explanations can be compatible but is disinclined toward superstition, magical thinking, religious fanaticism, and other antiscientific ways of accounting for reality. Such a person tends to rely on confirmatory evidence rather than on personal emotional reactions (like fear and guilt).</p>

Intellectual and Moral Acceptance of Refutations

These eleven virtues form a mutually supportive network of reality management. So, for example, in working on Courage, one may also be working on Self-Control, as in not being too afraid of things. In this manner, the Guiding Virtues provide ways to avoid such pitfalls and to aspire to happiness.

The Guiding Virtues are entailed by the intellectual and emotional acceptance of the refutations of their respective Cardinal Fallacies. For example, as discussed, the refutation of my demand for approval demonstrates that

- ~ Everyone should always approve of me.

and that,

- ~ □ Everyone approves of me.

Thus, in intellectually and emotionally accepting the above conclusions, I become more metaphysically secure about a world in which people do not always get others' approval.

Intellectually accepting these conclusions means that I now see that there are no compelling or indefeasible reasons for believing that everyone always approve of me, and/or that the existence of others who do not always approve of me contradicts that everyone *must* approve of me.

However, intellectual acceptance does not entail emotional acceptance. Thus, I may see that there are no compelling reasons to believe that everyone should always approve of me. I may appreciate that I am deducing this demand from my preference for the approval of others, which I see is not a compelling reason, and one that, in fact, applies equally to others who prefer *not* to approve of me. But I may still viscerally feel uncomfortable about the existence of others' non-approval. Such a conflict is what LBT&C calls *cognitive dissonance*.

Cognitive Dissonance

LBT&C holds that *cognitive dissonance is a necessary step in making progress toward a guiding virtue*. This is because, in order for constructive change to occur, I need to first realize, cognitively, that there is warrant for change. However, as Aristotle perceived, human beings are imperfect and often suffer from weakness of will. We know what is right yet don't always do what is right. So being in a state of cognitive dissonance is no guarantee that one will resolve the conflict in favor of seeking virtue. As Aristotle also emphasized, *progress toward virtue is achieved through practice*. This is perhaps among the most important insights to guide development of contemporary psychotherapy. Any dichotomy between cognitive and behavioral therapy is largely ill-founded. The fusion of the one to the other is generally the most efficacious route toward constructive change. From Freud to Skinner, the mistake was to overlook this profoundly important insight of Aristotle. *Guiding Virtues are accordingly habits acquired through practice*. Knowing and doing work synergistically.

Knowing that and Knowing How

Here, my knowledge (de dicto) extends to the *refutations of my fallacies*. Thus, I can know the following:

- My “should” or “must” does not necessarily follow from my preference (as Hume would remind us);
- Other people need not share my same preferences;
- My preferences cannot be a compelling reason for other people approving of me;
- The existence of other people who do not approve of me contradicts the statement that everyone must always approve of me.

These are logical and empirical truths of which I can have propositional knowledge. In contrast, there is a category mistake in saying that I can know the virtues themselves, for I can, strictly speaking, only know propositions, but virtues are *habits* arising through practice. Here *knowing how* as distinct from *knowing that* applies. Thus, I can know *how* to be metaphysically secure, respectful to self and others, exercise self-control, exhibit foresight, and be objective.

The Guiding Virtues’ Prescriptions

Prima facie, being virtuous does appear to commit the agent to general prescriptions such as “Accept the imperfections in reality”; “Act courageously”; “Be empathetic”; “Be Prudent”; “Be respectful”; “Use foresight in making predictions”; “Be objective in making practical judgments”; etc. Arguably, a person could not be said to possess a guiding virtue unless the person has accepted its respective prescription. For example, one could not be an empathetic person unless one were committed to being empathetic in the first place. But, even here, the sense of “being committed” is vague. A dog or cat may habitually act affectionately; but it

would be a stretch to say that the dog or cat was committed, in an epistemic sense, to being affectionate.

Insofar as such prescriptions to act virtuously are interrogatives and therefore do not describe states of affairs or events, they are not true or false. Moreover, they can have exceptions. Thus, being empathetic may not always be the right thing to do. For example, a philosophical counselor should strive to be empathetic with clients, but in a situation where a client is about to kill himself or another, the appropriate thing to do may be to call the authorities. The virtues are also ideals, and, therefore, they are never fully realizable in this contingent, probabilistic universe. For example, no one is incapable of error; nor is there any promise that even the most prudent decisions will be successful.

Justification of Guiding Virtues

Nevertheless, there are strong practical reasons for embracing the Guiding Virtues in the context of philosophical (and psychological) counseling. In my clinical experience, clients who embrace the Guiding Virtues, especially the virtues they identify through an analysis of their own emotional and behavioral reasoning, tend to reduce their stress levels and self-defeating behavior, as well as find excitement and enjoyment in aspiring to live virtuously. So, while the prescriptions behind the Guiding Virtues are not true, aspiring to and practicing them is conducive to living more rewarding, relatively stress-free lives.

LBT&C's Definition of Happiness

This is the pragmatic justification that LBT&C offers for living according to the Guiding Virtues. But is there an intrinsic (non-instrumental) justification? Is there an *intrinsic* justification for being metaphysically secure, authentic, empathetic, courageous, respectful,

temperate, tolerant, patient, decisive, assertive, prudent, empowering, objective, foresighted, and scientific?

When confronted with this sort of question, Aristotle contended that he was offering an *essentialist* definition of eudaimonia, that is, of a happy or self-actualized human being. And, indeed, LBT&C's concept of happiness resembles Aristotle's eudaimonistic concept in a number of respects. Both incorporate elements of intellectual virtue such as prudence (phronesis) and an array of related moral virtues such as courage and self-control/temperance (Aristotle, *Ethics*, Book 1, ch. 13). Both approaches seek higher ground, Aristotle finding this in intuitive knowledge of the archai of philosophic wisdom; and LBT&C finding such higher ground in Metaphysical Security. Both seek insight into the nature of reality, and both realize that knowledge of reality (philosophic wisdom on the one hand and Metaphysical Security on the other) is an essential part of human happiness.⁴ These similarities are no accident because LBT&C, since its inception in 1985, has been highly influenced by Aristotle's ideas⁵ especially a number of those in his *Nicomachean Ethics*.

However, LBT&C does not commit itself to the theory that human beings have an essence; nor does it reject it. For example, as discussed later, it countenances nonessentialist views such as Sartre's idea of "Existence precedes essence" as well as essentialist views such as Aquinas' theological view as equally tenable philosophical perspectives for clients to embrace. Thus, in the end, LBT&C's definition of human happiness in terms of the Guiding Virtues is most appropriately viewed as stipulative, and worthy of embracing because of its therapeutic value. If it is a "true" definition, it can be so in the Jamesian sense of having the most "cash value."

THE EPISTEMIC STATUS OF CARDINAL FALLACIES

What about the Cardinal Fallacies? Do they have a truth value? Indeed, calling them “fallacies” suggests that they contain a falsehood, and this is the case once the definition of Happiness stipulated by LBT&C is embraced. This is because LBT&C defines fallacies *pragmatically* as ways of thinking or reasoning that have a proven track record of frustrating personal and interpersonal happiness.⁶ In effect, they provide an inventory of types of cognition that block attainment of human happiness as defined in terms of the Guiding Virtues. So, inasmuch as one who commits a cardinal fallacy assumes that his manner of thinking or acting will promote his happiness (as defined), he believes (or tends to believe) falsely. For example, one who lives inauthentically by blindly conforming to the wills of others is not likely to attain happiness as defined collectively in terms of the Guiding Virtues.

This is supported by LBT&C’s thesis that the Guiding Virtues “hang together” in a system of mutually supportive habits.⁷ Thus, in forging a habit of jumping on the bandwagon, not only does one fail to become authentic; this also impairs one’s ability to become courageous, prudent, foresighted, self-respecting, and so forth.

THE EPISTEMIC STATUS OF UPLIFTING PHILOSOPHIES

Uplifting philosophies, in turn, provide guidance in seeking the Guiding Virtues. Thus, Sartre’s “Existence precedes essence” frames a way to cope authentically with reality, instead of jumping on a bandwagon of blind conformity, by accepting responsibility for what and who one becomes. In contrast, Aquinas elevates a life of reason to that of seeking to be like God, albeit imperfectly as “imprints of the Divine light.” In embracing Aquinas, one thus seeks authenticity and avoids the social pressures of conformity by seeking to become more like God. For

LBT&C, the existential and Thomistic frames can *both* be acceptable ways to seek authenticity insofar as each involves autonomously and freely living according to one's own creative lights as opposed to losing oneself in a chorus of mindless, social conformity, or becoming a cog in an institution (corporation, government, etc.).

Amid such contradictory philosophies, LBT&C does not dictate which is the correct one, but instead encourages clients to choose a set of philosophies that resonates with them personally, and therefore lets them aspire to virtue in a manner that comports with their own belief systems. So, it's self-defeating to force an atheistic existential approach upon a devout Christian, and, conversely, to insist that an atheist aspire to be more like God. Such mismatches lead to stagnation and frustration rather than happiness. At the same time, the Cardinal Fallacies set broad limits on what can count as uplifting philosophies. For example, the "philosophical" perspective that preaches blind conformity not uncommon to cult-like leaders like the infamous Jim Jones who instructed his faithful follows to drink the Cool Aide, could not constitute an uplifting philosophy, according to LBT&C.

LBT&C's Marketplace of Free Expression

LBT&C has sometimes been accused of accepting inconsistent philosophies simultaneously. It is contradictory to embrace Aquinas who says to seek God, and at the same time, Nietzsche who proclaims that God is dead. However, the accusation is false, for it is not LBT&C that recommends that clients adopt inconsistent philosophies. It rather gives clients an opportunity to choose philosophies that resonate with them. Indeed, if a client were to adopt inconsistent philosophical ideas, it would be incumbent on the practitioner to counsel the client against so doing. For a client cannot aspire to a contradictory goal. LBT&C is much like a democratic government. *It countenances a marketplace of free expression of ideas.* Accusing

LBT&C of contradicting itself is like accusing a democracy of contradicting itself by permitting the free expression of ideas. Accordingly, the accusation against LBT&C is no less ill-founded than it would be against a democratic government. Like the democratic government, LBT&C provides a framework for rational discourse. Unlike an autocratic regime, it does not dictate its pet “philosophy.”

Philosophy’s Relation to Truth

Bertrand Russell once said that when philosophies are proven, they are taken out of the realm of philosophy and graduate to science. As such, philosophies are not themselves ever true.⁸

LBT&C agrees. For LBT&C, *philosophies are ways of framing reality in seeking human happiness*. Even very pessimistic philosophies such as Schopenhauer’s idea that the world is governed by a blind, insatiable impulse yields an antidote for dealing with human suffering. For example, it admonishes you that seeking happiness by attempting to make more and more money only leads to a bottomless pit in which your monetary desire is never quelled.

Regarding philosophy’s relation to truth, there are two aspects that need to be distinguished: (1) an interpretation of reality; and (2) a way to cope with reality, so interpreted. The first aspect is potentially true or false. The second is an instruction and hence not properly either true or false. For example, Epicurus’ interpretation of reality in terms of atoms (adopted with some changes from Democritus) sets an ancient precedent for current atomic theory; and this interpretation of reality, in turn, sets the basis for his ethical injunctions, such as the direction not to fear death since it involves the atomic dissolution of the soul, and therefore pain-free inexistence. Similarly, Buddhism holds that reality is, by its nature, impermanent, so human suffering can be avoided by not attempting to cling to things.

Because philosophy permits diverse perspectives from which to interpret reality, without necessarily believing falsely, it sets the stage for alternative, epistemically respectable philosophical frames from which to view life and its potential challenges. In this way, LBT&C encourages clients to pursue their own philosophies rather than attaching themselves to views dictated by others that don't fit their own philosophical predilections.

¹ See, for example, Elliot D. Cohen, *Logic-Based Therapy and Everyday Emotions* (Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, 2017).

² Ibid.

³ Elliot D. Cohen, *The New Rational Therapy* (Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield, 2006).

⁴ "...as health produces health; so does philosophic wisdom produce happiness; for, being a part of virtue entire, by being possessed and by actualizing itself it makes a man happy." Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Trans. W.D. Ross), Book 6, Ch. 12.

⁵ See, for example, *What Would Aristotle Do? Self-Control through the Power of Reason* (Prometheus Books, 2003).

⁶ Elliot D. Cohen, *Caution: Faulty Thinking Can Be Harmful to Your Happiness*, 2nd Edition (Fort Pierce, FL: Trace-Wlco, Inc., 2013).

⁷ Elliot D. Cohen "Logic-Based Therapy and its Virtues," in *Philosophy, Counseling, and Psychotherapy*, ed. Elliot D. Cohen and Samuel Zinaich (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2013).

⁸ Bertrand Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy* (London: Oxford U. Press, 1997).