Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation for Mentally Strong Women

Laura Newhart

Laura Newhart *is a Professor of Philosophy in the Department of History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies at Eastern Kentucky University. She is a Certified Logic-Based Therapy Consultant. Her areas of specialization are practical ethics, especially biomedical ethics, and social and political philosophy. Her current research interests include philosophy of mothering, philosophy for children, and philosophical counseling*. Email: Laura.Newhart@eku.edu

Abstract: This paper explores the intersections between Elliot D. Cohen's Logic-Based Therapy and Amy Morin's *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* (HarperCollins 2019) with a focus on the ways that they shed light on and mutually support each other. With its six-step method (including the identification of Cardinal Fallacies, the refutation of those fallacies, the reinforcement of their corresponding Guiding Virtues, the use of Uplifting Philosophies, and the implementation of plans of action), Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation provides a systematic rational framework for understanding how our interpretation of facts and our opinions/value judgments about those facts interact in order to form habits, i.e., patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behavior, that can lead to a fulfilling or a not-so-fulfilling life. For its part, *13 Things that Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* 1) helps us understand how these habits specifically affect women, 2) provides uplifting philosophies from a woman's perspective, and 3) contributes to plans of actions by suggesting practical exercises for implementing these plans, all in order to help us develop those good habits or virtuous patterns of thought, feelings, and behavior that allow us to live our best lives.

Introduction

This paper explores the intersections between Elliot D. Cohen's Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation and Amy Morin's *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* with an emphasis on the ways that they shed light on and mutually strengthen and support each other. Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation provides a systematic rational framework for understanding the content and organization of *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do*, while *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* allows for a version of Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation that applies specifically to women.

Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation

Deftly weaving together the logical method of philosophy with its theoretical content, Elliot Cohen's Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation identifies eleven **Cardinal Fallacies** (faulty arguments) that cause much of the misery of human existence in the form of unpleasant emotions and dysfunctional behavior. Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation teaches us how to refute these Cardinal Fallacies and replace them with their corresponding **LBT&C Guiding Virtues** which are meant not simply to *replace* their corresponding LBT&C Cardinal Fallacies but rather to *transcend* them by establishing more permanent character traits which have a greater tendency to express themselves in right thinking. It's important to note that no one ever completely masters or achieves these Guiding Virtues. Like Aristotle's virtues, pursuing the LBT&C Guiding Virtues is a life-long project. They get stronger and weaker in us depending on the amount and the effectiveness of our practice. Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation also provides **Uplifting Philosophies** with specific examples from the history of philosophy for each uplifting philosophy to help us in our efforts to attain those virtues.

The eleven LBT&C Cardinal Fallacies and their corresponding Guiding Virtues as listed in Cohen's *Logic-Based Therapy and Everyday Emotions* (2016) are: Dutiful Worrying (Prudence); Demanding Perfection (Metaphysical Security); Damnation of Self, Others, or the Universe (Respect for Self, Others, or the Universe); Awfulizing (Courage); The-World-Revolves-Around-Me Thinking (Empathy); Oversimplifying Reality (Objectivity); Distorting Probabilities (Foresightedness); Blind Conjecture (Scientificity); Cantstipation (Temperance or Self-Control); Bandwagon Thinking (Authenticity); and Manipulation (Empowerment of Others). (Cohen 2016 xvii).

The structural method of Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation consists of six simple steps. As Cohen tells us, "These six steps provide a rational framework for confronting problems of living" (Cohen 2016; xix):

1. Identify the emotional (or behavioral) reasoning

2. Check for Cardinal Fallacies in the premises

3. Refute any Cardinal Fallacy

4. Identify the Guiding Virtue for each fallacy

5. Find an uplifting philosophy that promotes the Guiding Virtue

6. Apply the philosophy by implementing a plan of action

Mentally Strong Women

In *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* (2019), Amy Morin provides a list of 13 emotional and behavioral no-no's that are remarkably similar to Elliot Cohen's eleven Cardinal Fallacies. Morin tells us that mentally strong women 1) do not compare themselves to other people; 2) do not insist on perfection; 3) do not see vulnerability as a weakness; 4) do not let self-doubt stop them from reaching their goals; 5) do not overthink everything; 6) do not avoid tough challenges; 7) do not fear breaking the rules; 8) do not put others down to lift themselves up; 9) do not let others limit their potential; 10) do not blame themselves when something goes wrong; 11) do not stay silent; 12) do not feel bad about reinventing themselves; and 13) do not downplay their success.

In addition to similarities in the content of Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation and *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do*, Cohen and Morin also share a similar foundation and approach. Morin also stresses the importance of habit. Echoing Aristotle, Morin compares

mental strength to physical strength. She reminds us that in order to be physically stronger, we must develop good habits like working out but we also must eliminate bad habits like eating too much junk food. The same, she tells us, is true of our mental muscles. We must develop good habits like gratitude but we also must eliminate bad habits like comparing ourselves to others or insisting on perfection. Morin, like Cohen, stresses that it is not a question of being either mentally weak or mentally strong but rather it is always a question of degree. No matter how mentally strong you might be, there is always room for improvement. Finally, as in Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation, Morin claims that there are three parts to mental strength: thoughts, feelings, and behavior. These three components are interrelated and can serve to reinforce each other leading us to get caught up in negative patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving. As Morin tells us, "(b)uilding mental strength disrupts (these) unhealthy cycles and helps you develop better habits so you can live a more fulfilling life" (Morin 6)

Each chapter in Morin's *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* is devoted to one of the thirteen dysfunctional emotional or behavioral patterns in the list above. After opening with an example of a person with the negative emotional or behavioral habit, each chapter contains 1) a self-test checklist for the reader to determine if she does in fact do this thing; 2) an explanation of "Why We Do It"; 3) a justification of "Why It's Bad" (which often serves as its refutation); 4) advice on "What To Do Instead" (which includes what we might think of in LBT&C terms as uplifting philosophies, i.e., healthier ways to think of these things, and a plan of action including practical exercises to reinforce the new healthier thought patterns); 5) descriptions of how the bad habit and it's correction might play itself out in the areas of career, family, and social life; 6) a description of what actually "Makes You Stronger" in this regard (a Guiding Virtue, if you will). And, each chapter ends with a section titled "Trouble-Shooting and

Common Traps" which often includes advice on how to avoid the extremes involved in these emotional and behavioral habits.

With its six-step method (including the identification of Cardinal Fallacies, their corresponding Guiding Virtues, the use of Uplifting Philosophies, and the implementation of plans of action), Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation provides a systematic rational framework for understanding how our interpretation of the facts and our opinions/value judgments about those facts interact in order to form habits, i.e., patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behavior, that can lead to a fulfilling or a not-so-fulfilling life. For its part, *13 Things that Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* can 1) help us understand how these habits specifically affect women, 2) provide uplifting philosophies from a woman's perspective, and 3) contribute to plans of actions by suggesting practical exercises for implementing these plans, all in order to help us develop those good habits or virtuous patterns of thought, feelings, and behavior that allow us to live our best lives.

Limitations on time and space do not allow a thorough and comprehensive account of the relationship between Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation and *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* for every LBT&C Cardinal Fallacy and every anti-habit of mentally strong women. Instead, we will explore one specific negative, dysfunctional, and unhealthy complex pattern of reasoning and its particularly insidious effects on women in order to show how it can be effectively resolved using Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation and *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* working together in a complementary manner. It might be helpful to think of what follows as an imaginary LBT&C counseling session.

The Complex Fallacious Pattern of Emotional and Behavioral Reasoning

On page 89 of *Logic-Based Therapy and Everyday Emotions: A Case-Based Approach*, Cohen presents the case of Stanley Stickle, a student who is expected to perform in a school play as Hamlet and is experiencing stage fright. Stanley constructs this argument in order to avoid performing in the play.

1. (Second Major Premise Rule) I must satisfy the expectations of others (in particular my teacher, my class mates and the audience).

2. (Bridging Premise) If I must satisfy the expectations of others, then if I let everyone down, then I will make a complete fool of myself.

3. (Conclusion/First Premise Rule) So, if I let everyone down then I will make a complete fool of myself.

4. (Minor Premise Report) If I make a mistake on stage then I will let everyone down.

5. (Primary Conclusion) So, if I make a mistake on stage then I will make a complete fool of myself.

6. (Bridging Premise) If I will make a complete fool of myself if I make a mistake on stage, then I can't do it.

7. (Conclusion/Behavioral Justification) So, I can't do it.

8. (Behavioral Rule) If I can't do it, then I should inform the teacher.

9. (Behavioral Conclusion) So, I should inform the teacher that I can't do it.

In Stanley's case, Cohen leads us to understand that this complex pattern of reasoning involves the LBT&C Cardinal Fallacies of Demanding Perfection (from the first premise); Self-Damnation (from premises 2-5); and Behavioral Cantstipation (the conclusion leading from

premises 6-8). The LBT&C Guiding Virtue that Cohen provides for Demanding Perfection is Metaphysical Security, for Self-Damnation it is Respect for Self, and for Behavioral Cantstipation it is Temperance or Self-Control. These will be discussed in more detail below.

For the purpose of our imaginary LBT&C session, we will revise this case to concern a situation more common for women. Rather than considering a male student performing in a play, we will consider a female employee asking for a promotion and/or raise. A shortened version of the negative, dysfunctional, and unhealthy complex pattern of emotional and behavioral reasoning of a woman considering asking for a promotion and/or raise might look something like this.

1. I must satisfy the expectations of others. I must not disappoint anyone. (Demanding Perfection)

2. If I ask for a promotion and/or raise, I will be violating/not living up to other people's gender-based expectations of me. AND, I probably won't get the promotion and/or raise anyway.

3. If I violate the gender-based expectations of others AND I don't get the promotion and/or raise anyway, I will make a complete fool of myself and be a failure to boot. (Self-Damnation)

4. Therefore, I won't ask for the promotion and/or raise especially because I don't want to feel bitter or resentful if (when) I don't get it. (Cantstipation)

We will consider in detail the specific ways in which women experience this negative, dysfunctional, and unhealthy complex pattern of emotional and behavioral reasoning in the next section. For now, it is important to briefly note two things: 1) this woman is going to feel like a

fool (and possibly a failure) whether she gets the promotion/raise or not because she has violated the expectations of others simply in asking for it, and 2) while Behavioral Cantstipation is the primary behavioral Cardinal Fallacy in this argument, there is also at least a touch of Emotional and Volitional Cantstipation here as well. In spite of the expectations of others, this woman really wants the promotion/raise and believes that she can't help but feel bad (bitter and resentful) if she doesn't get it and that she cannot (or will not) tolerate that feeling.

How Women Experience this Complex Fallacious Pattern of Reasoning

In his 2019 book *Making Peace with Imperfection*, Cohen identifies Demanding Perfection as the prime LBT&C Cardinal Fallacy and presents the remaining 10 Cardinal Fallacies as contributing to different types of Demanding Perfection. These include Achievement Perfectionism, Approval Perfectionism, Moral Perfectionism, Control Perfectionism, Expectation Perfectionism, Ego-Centered Perfectionism, Treatment Perfectionism, Existential Perfectionism, Neatness Perfectionism, and Certainty Perfectionism. Cohen divides these types of perfectionism into three categories depending on whether they are self-regarding, other-regarding, or world-regarding.

The LBT&C Guiding Virtue for Demanding Perfection is Metaphysical Security, which Cohen identifies as "the most basic human virtue," and he defines as "accepting and feeling comfortable with reality, notwithstanding its imperfections" (2019 7). Just as Demanding Perfection can be considered the prime LBT&C Cardinal Fallacy, Cohen understands Metaphysical Security as the LBT&C crowning virtue which is supported and promoted by several other interrelated LBT&C Guiding Virtues. In addition to Metaphysical Security, the most important Guiding Virtues for the complex fallacious reasoning pattern involving Demanding Perfection, Self-Damnation, and Cantstipation discussed above are Respect

(including unconditional acceptance of the world, self, life, and others), Authenticity, Courage, Self-Control (including Decisiveness, Tolerance and Patience, and Temperance), and Prudence (2019 28-33).

In Chapter 2 of Morin's *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* titled "They Don't Insist on Perfection" she describes in more general terms the complex fallacious pattern of emotional and behavioral reasoning involving Demanding Perfection, Self-Damnation, and Cantstipation:

> "*You idiot. You just embarrassed yourself. You messed up again. You're never going to reach your goals*. Being bombarded with this kind of negativity from anyone would take a toll on you. But when that criticism comes from your own brain, you'll never be able to get a break from it…Perfectionists never feel satisfied. They focus on mistakes, worry they could have done better, and evaluate improvements they need to keep making. Ironically, their feelings of never being good enough create a downward spiral that prevents them from becoming their best" (41).

Among the behavioral consequences of this toxic perfectionism that Morin lists are self-defeating behavior, high risk of burnout, fear of trying new things, and a lesser likelihood of being successful. (41-42).

Morin focuses exclusively on two kinds of perfectionism in women—Achievement Perfectionism and Approval Perfectionism—both of which Cohen classifies as self-regarding. Cohen defines Achievement Perfectionism as "demanding perfect or near-perfect performance at least in things that are important to you. You judge your self-worth according to this perfectionistic standard, measuring your worth as a person in terms of your achievements, or lack thereof" (2019 24). Approval Perfectionism Cohen defines as "demanding that you gain the

affections or approval of at least certain others. Approval perfectionists judge their self-worth based on whether or not they obtain such approval" (2019 24).

Morin claims that she focuses on women in her book because women in our society face different pressures and expectations that lead us to engage in certain patterns of emotional and behavioral reasoning more so than men. (Morin 4). Women face pressures and expectations in our society to present a perfect appearance as well as to be perfect housewives and mothers, as Morin describes it, "to do everything and to look good while doing it" (34). These disproportionately high standards flow over into the workplace (36). While these demands for perfection begin as external messages based on social expectations, women eventually internalize these demands for perfection into our own self-defeating internal dialogue or "self-talk" (34). Whether these pressures and expectations are external or internal, insisting on perfection is unhealthy; and, Morin cautions that women will not escape it until we learn to cut ourselves some slack and lower our expectations of ourselves (33).

Statistics concerning women in leadership roles both in business and government (as well as academia) support the existence of these disproportionately high standards for women. In May of 2019, the CEO's of just 33 of the Fortune 500 companies were women, and this was touted by CNBC as a record number. In the history of the United States there have been 1,305 U.S. Senators, only 56 of whom were women. Similarly, there have been 10,360 members of the U.S. House of Representatives, only 325 of whom were women. In academic philosophy, in the 2010's 28% of the Ph.D.'s were earned by women (which is surprisingly higher than business or government), a number which has barely changed since the 1990's.

Certain psychosocial phenomena concerning the performance of women and members of minority groups in academic and professional contexts shed light on why women might be more

apt to lapse into the fallacious pattern of emotional and behavioral reasoning that runs through Demanding Perfections, Self-Damnation, and Cantstipation. These phenomena include explicit and implicit bias, stereotype threat, and the imposter syndrome. Implicit bias occurs when people consciously deny being sexist, for example, but still harbor subconscious or implicit biased expectations about what is appropriate for men and women based on gender. Stereotype threat is a documented phenomenon where when women or members of minority groups are performing tasks that violate society's and/or their own stereotypes or implicit biases about their group they tend to perform worse simply by being even subconsciously reminded of these group-based stereotypes and their membership in the group. Thus, the stereotypes themselves become a kind of self-fulfilling prophesy. The imposter syndrome occurs when if women or members of minority groups are able to overcome the obstacles posed by explicit and implicit bias and stereotype threat and actually succeed academically or professionally in certain contexts, they tend to feel like they don't belong, that they don't deserve their success, that it is somehow based on a series of flukes; and, they live with the anxiety that they will be found out as an imposter at any moment (Cohen 2019 44-45; Morin 296-298).

We can see these psychosocial phenomena at work in a 2007 Washington Post article by Shankar Vedantam titled "Salary, Gender and the Social Cost of Haggling," an article on the role of gender in individuals' tendencies to negotiate or "haggle" for promotions and raises. The article cites several studies that show that women tend to negotiate less than men in such interactions—sometimes much less. Vedantam claims that the traditional explanation for this reluctance on the part of women has been that women are not as aggressive as men, and the remedy was thought to be assertiveness training for women to enable them to ask for more in these situations. However, Vedantam cites a series of experiments by Linda C. Babcock and

Hannah Riley Bowles where women in hiring or decision-making positions generally looked negatively on both men and women who haggled, whereas men in hiring or decision-making positions looked negatively on women who haggled but were indifferent about whether a man haggled or not. According to Vedantam, "Both men and women were more likely to subtly penalize women who asked for more—the perception was that women who asked for more were 'less nice' (Vedantam.) In other words, women's reluctance to ask for more is not a flaw in women that might be fixed with the proper training. It is actually based on "an entirely reasonable and accurate view of how they would be treated (the social cost of haggling for women) if they did." (Vedantam).

A similar point concerning women candidates and political fundraising is made by Jenavieve Hatch in a Huffington Post article titled "The Terrifying Experience of Trying to Fundraise as a Woman Candidate" from December 22, 2019. Hatch claims, "Women are less comfortable asking for money than men. They are perfectly comfortable asking for money for causes, for things they care about. But it's much harder when you have to ask for money for yourself," i.e., when you are the cause (Hatch). On a similar note, in a CNN news item from December 20, 2019, Kate Sullivan and Maeve Reston observe that at the last Democratic presidential debate in answer to the question of what gift each candidate would give to the others or what they ask would ask forgiveness for from them, only the two women on stage—Elizabeth Warren and Amy Klobuchar—answered that they would ask for forgiveness from the others. And, both of them claimed they would ask forgiveness "for getting really worked up" (Warren) or for being "blunt" (Klobuchar), both explaining that they express anger at times only because the issues are so important to them (Sullivan and Reston).

Among other reasons that a deep-seated sense of inadequacy can cause women to strive for perfection, Morin lists," the desire to be loved or accepted (If I can just be "good enough," somehow I'll be loved and accepted); biological disposition (perfectionism runs in families and there may be a genetic component); the way your parents raised you; the sensationalism of success (the 'going big or going home' mentality); and history of trauma (If I can be perfect, I won't be abused; If I can control everything all the time, I won't be abused again) (38).

The Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation Session

Step One: Identify the emotional (and/or behavioral) reasoning

We've established the complex emotional and behavioral reasoning pattern, which is as follows:

1. I must satisfy the expectations of others. I must not disappoint anyone. (Demanding Perfection)

2. If I ask for a promotion and/or raise, I will be violating/not living up to other people's gender-based expectations of me. AND, I probably won't get the promotion and/or raise anyway.

3. If I violate the gender-based expectations of others AND I don't get the promotion and/or raise anyway, I will make a complete fool of myself and be a failure to boot. (Self-Damnation)

4. Therefore, I won't ask for the promotion and/or raise because I don't want to feel bitter or resentful if (when) I don't get it. (Cantstipation)

Step Two: Check for Cardinal Fallacies in the premises

We have identified the LBT&C Cardinal Fallacies in this complex pattern of reasoning as Demanding Perfection generally (and Achievement and Approval Perfectionism more

specifically), Self-Damnation, and Cantstipation (primarily Behavioral but also, secondarily, Emotional and Volitional Cantstipation).

Step Three: Refute any Cardinal Fallacy

One way to refute the demand for perfection that is suggested by both Morin and Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation is to identify what it costs to be perfect. We've already considered some of the adverse behavioral outcomes from this fallacious pattern of reasoning based on fear of not meeting our own and others' demand for perfection, including the reluctance to try new things for fear that we might fail at them. Morin also points out that there are adverse health outcomes to demanding perfection as well, including a high risk of mental health problems, a greater risk of death, and a greater risk of suicide (41-42).

What is worse is that there are adverse behavioral and health problems even when we do succeed. As Morin claims, "Perfectionism is a double-edged sword." This is because the more we achieve, the more people expect of us, and the more anxious we become about disappointing them (34). Conversely, one might engage in self-sabotaging behavior, thereby guaranteeing failure, just to get off of this toxic, vicious merry-go-round (42-43). As Morin tells us, unlike people with high expectations who celebrate their successes, perfectionists are never satisfied. Failure, regret, and the fear of making mistakes can push them over the edge even to suicide. Cohen, for his part, characterizes the demand for perfection as a physical addiction. He tells us, "(T)here is a neurological basis to the discomfort of not having perfection when you are habitually disposed to demand it. Your brain and nervous system have been conditioned to demand perfection as a way of coping with stimuli from the outside world" (Cohen 2019 15-16).

Another strategy for refuting this fallacy (also endorsed by Morin and LBT&C) is to ask "What would it mean?" to not be perfect at a certain task of concern. Morin endorses this

strategy because it can help get to the core issue involved in the particular demand for perfection. Morin provides as an example a woman who is concerned that a business report she wrote is not good enough. Morin asks, "What would it mean if the report isn't good enough?" The woman replies that it will mean that her boss will think she's stupid and she'll never get a promotion. Morin asks, "What would it mean if you never get promoted?" and the woman responds, "It would mean that I'm incompetent" (44). Thus, as the woman's reasoning is clarified, the core issue is revealed as one of competence. In Cohen's terms, the kind of perfectionism at work here is Achievement Perfectionism. Morin provides another example of a woman who is concerned that she will not impress people with a party she is planning. When questioned, it is revealed that the woman believes that if people are not impressed with the party, they will think she doesn't fit in with them, and they won't want to associate with her, which will mean that she is unlikable. The core issue in her demand for perfection is likability. In Cohen's terms, the kind of perfectionism at work here is Approval Perfectionism. This strategy is also endorsed by Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation because not only can it reveal the core issue it can also allow for an evaluation of the reasoning behind the meaning that the person is ascribing to this specific task in demanding that it be perfect. To wit, it's irrational to conclude that one is incompetent or unlikable simply on the basis of one report or one party.

Step Four: Identify the Guiding Virtue for each fallacy

As Cohen tells us Metaphysical Security is the most basic human virtue and the crowning virtue for combatting perfectionism (Cohen 2019 7 & 19). However, especially for the fallacious pattern of emotional and behavioral reasoning that we are concerned with here, Metaphysical Security must be supported by other Guiding Virtues including Respect for Self (or Unconditional Self-Acceptance), Authenticity, Courage, and Self-Control. Morin sums these up

quite simply by stating, "A willingness to be imperfect makes you stronger" (50). Dropping the heavy burden of the lonely façade of perfection can allow us to focus on being real and also helping others love themselves for who they are.

Step 5: Find an uplifting philosophy that promotes the Guiding Virtue

Given the dearth of well-known female philosophers throughout the history of Western philosophy, it might be difficult for women to find uplifting philosophies that resonate with them. One source of such uplifting philosophies might be feminist philosophers. Or, ordinary (or in Morin's case not-so-ordinary) women might be seen as valid sources of uplifting philosophies. Morin cites the model Cindy Crawford as a source of the uplifting philosophy advocating that we should "own our flaws" because our flaws are what make each of us unique and memorable. As a child, Crawford saw her beauty mark as an ugly mole that she wanted to have removed. Now, Crawford claims, "It is the thing that made people remember me, and it made a lot of women who also have beauty marks identify with me. They set you apart" (45-46).

Cohen suggests Epictetus, the ancient Greek Stoic philosopher, as a source of an uplifting philosophy for promoting Metaphysical Security (Cohen 2019 7). Epictetus taught that it is foolish to get upset, or worry, about things that we cannot control. Morin also (at least implicitly) endorses this view as an uplifting philosophy insofar as she suggests distinguishing those flaws that we can control from those flaws that we can't.

Step Six: Apply the Philosophy by implementing a plan of action

In terms of Metaphysical Security, including its network of supporting Guiding Virtues of Authenticity, Courage, and Self-Control, Morin prescribes that we make an honest and courageous list of our flaws, dividing them into those that we can control and those that we can't. She believes that it's often the case that those that we can't control are more superficial qualities

like our height or our shoe size anyway. Morin suggests that we practice accepting or even embracing the things that we can't control so that we can focus on working on those that we can control. Moreover, Morin suggests that we share our list with someone we trust. This, she claims, can be empowering in terms of breaking through the loneliness of our external façade of perfection and our self-damning internal dialogue, and it can help to foster empathy with others.

In terms of Respect for Self, and especially Unconditional Self-Acceptance, Morin suggests that we practice self-compassion in order to compete with the external expectations and the internal dialogue of perfectionism. Just as we would show compassion to others who might be struggling to meet external and internal expectations of perfection in the face of our all too human flaws, we should also have compassion for ourselves (46-47). One way to begin such a practice of self-compassion, according to Morin, is to write yourself a kind letter expressing understanding and encouragement. She suggests hanging this letter where you will see it on a regular basis and reading it often, especially when you're having a hard time (46-47).

Conclusion

Logic-Based Therapy and Consultation provides the systematic rational framework. *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do* provides the women's perspective. Working together, these very similar but significantly different approaches can resolve at least this issue more effectively than either could do alone.

Works Cited

Cohen, Elliot D. *Logic-Based Therapy and Everyday Emotions: A Case-Based Approach*.

Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2016. Print.

Cohen, Elliot D. *Making Peace with Imperfection*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger, 2019. Print.

Connley, Courtney. "The number of women running Fortune 500 companies is at a record high."

CNBC, 16 May 2019, https://www.cnbc.com/2019/05/16/the-number-of-women-running-fortune-500-companies-is-at-a-record-high.html

Hatch, Jenavieve. "The Terrifying Experience of Trying to Fundraise As a Woman Candidate."

HUFFPOST, 22 Dec. 2019, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/the-terrifying-experience-of-trying-to-fundraise-as-a-woman-candidate_n_5df15fc0e4b01e0f29595e70?ncid=APPLENEWS00001

Morin, Amy. *13 Things Mentally Strong Women Don't Do*. New York, NY: HarperCollins,

2019. Print.

Schwitzgebel, Eric. "Percentages of Doctorates in Philosophy Given to Women and to

Minorities." *Daily Nous*, 13 Jan. 2016, http://dailynous.com/2016/01/13/percentages-of-u-s-doctorates-in-philosophy-given-to-women-and-to-minorities-1973-2014-guest-post-by-eric-schwitzgebel/

Sullivan, Kate and Maeve Reston. "Only the women ask for forgiveness at the Democratic

presidential debate." *CNN*, 20 Dec. 2019.

https://www.cnn.com/2019/12/20/politics/women-apologize-democratic-debate/index.htmlhttps://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-Publications/WIC/Historical-Data/Historical-Data---Nav/

United States House of Representatives. "Women in Congress: Historical Data." *History, Art,*

and Archives, accessed 31 Dec. 2019, https://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-

Publications/WIC/Historical-Data/Historical-Data---Nav/

Vedantam, Shankar. "Salary, Gender and the Social Cost of Haggling." *Washington Post*, 30

July 2007.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-yn/content/article/2007/07/29/AR2007072900827.html