J Rat-Emo Cognitive-Behav Ther (2026) 44:51
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10942-026-00684-8

Beyond the ABCs: A Neuroscience Perspective on Philosophical Belief Change in REBT

Michael E. Bernard[1,2]

Received: 6 July 2026 / Accepted: 31 July 2026

Abstract

Albert Ellis consistently maintained that the ultimate therapeutic goal of Rational Emotive Behaviour Therapy (REBT) extends beyond disputing situation-specific irrational beliefs to identifying and modifying the deeper philosophical beliefs from which they arise. This article re-examines Ellis's writings on the ABC model, irrational beliefs, and philosophical change, arguing that enduring philosophical belief change—not simply the restructuring of situation-specific beliefs— was the principal mechanism through which Ellis believed enduring improvements in emotional wellbeing, adaptive functioning across life situations, and overall life satisfaction and fulfilment were achieved. Ellis employed two main therapeutic pathways to achieve this goal: in some instances using the ABC model to move from situation-specific beliefs to their underlying philosophies, and in others identifying philosophical beliefs directly through systematic questioning. The article argues that contemporary neuroscience provides a plausible explanatory framework for these distinctive pathways. Current research suggests that deliberate cognitive reappraisal of situation-specific irrational beliefs primarily recruits executive control networks centred on the Prefrontal Cortex. By contrast, the broader philosophical beliefs through which people habitually interpret themselves, others, and life events are thought to exert their influence through processes within the Default Mode Network. These processes integrate autobiographical memory, self-knowledge, and enduring philosophical beliefs to construct the personal meaning assigned to experience. These interacting neurocognitive systems provide a contemporary rationale for distinguishing between therapeutic change achieved through restructuring situation-specific beliefs and broader, more enduring change resulting from philosophical belief modification. The article concludes by considering the implications of this perspective for REBT theory, clinical practice, therapist training, and future research.

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

Published online: 03 September 2026

Keywords Rational emotive behaviour therapy · REBT · Albert Ellis · Irrational beliefs · Philosophical change · Cognitive behavioural therapy · Neuroscience

Albert Ellis developed Rational Emotive Behaviour Therapy (REBT) as a philosophical system of psychotherapy whose principal objective was to help clients achieve enduring emotional change by modifying their underlying philosophy of life (Bernard, 2011; Ellis, 1962, 1994, 2001; Ellis & Joffe Ellis, 2019). He proposed that enduring emotional disturbance is generated by four core irrational philosophies—demandingness, awfulising, low frustration tolerance, and global self-rating—which therefore became the principal targets of REBT intervention. Although these philosophical beliefs are expressed through situation-specific irrational thinking, Ellis (e.g., consistently maintained that lasting therapeutic change depends on modifying the underlying philosophies rather than merely reducing distress associated with individual situations.

Over time, the ABC model has become the dominant organising framework for teaching and practising REBT (Dryden, 2002, 2005; Ellis & Dryden, 1997). Contemporary REBT training and clinical practice place considerable emphasis on using the ABC model to identify and dispute situation-specific irrational beliefs associated with emotionally disturbing events. This emphasis has undoubtedly contributed to the effectiveness and accessibility of REBT. However, because the ABC model is primarily designed to identify irrational thinking within specific situations, it does not, in itself, provide a systematic procedure for identifying the client's active core irrational philosophical beliefs or for determining when intervention should move beyond situation-specific disputation to philosophical belief change. In the author's clinical observation, this gap may lead some practitioners — particularly those whose training in REBT has been relatively brief, such as a single workshop, book, or training video — to focus predominantly on situation-specific assessment and intervention, rather than using a specific situation, as Ellis intended, as a route to identifying and modifying the client's broader philosophical beliefs. This pattern has not, to the author's knowledge, been documented in direct empirical research, and is presented here as a clinical impression rather than an established finding.

One purpose of this article is to invite readers to reflect on how they teach and apply the ABC model. In many cases, clients are helped to identify the **Activating event (A)**, the emotional and behavioural **Consequences (C)**, and the **Belief (B)** linking the two. Once this situational belief has been identified and restructured, clients often experience genuine relief from their presenting difficulties. The question raised here is whether the therapeutic process can be taken one step further: beyond restructuring the situational belief, to identifying and modifying the deeper philosophical belief from which it arises. To what extent does philosophical change remain an explicit therapeutic objective once symptom relief has been achieved? Or does symptom improvement sometimes become the de facto endpoint of therapy, even when this is not the therapist's stated intention? This is offered as a speculative observation rather than an empirically established conclusion. It points to the need for systematic research—for example, examining REBT training curricula, supervi-

sion practices, and therapy session content—to determine the extent to which philosophical restructuring remains a central focus of contemporary REBT practice.

Ellis' Two Roads for Uncovering Beliefs

Ellis's writings and clinical demonstrations (e.g., Ellis, 2003; Bernard, 2011) reveal two complementary methods for identifying core irrational beliefs. In some instances, he began with the ABC model, identifying situation-specific irrational beliefs and then generalising from these to the client's underlying philosophical beliefs. In others, he moved directly to identifying and disputing the client's core irrational philosophical beliefs without first conducting a formal ABC analysis. While the REBT literature provides extensive guidance on identifying situation-specific irrational beliefs through the ABC model, considerably less attention has been devoted to describing how therapists can systematically identify, question, and dispute the client's active core irrational philosophies, whether by generalising from the ABC model or through direct philosophical assessment.

Contemporary neuroscience suggests that the processes involved in evaluating and restructuring situation-specific appraisals differ, at least in part, from those involved in constructing self-referential meaning from enduring philosophical beliefs. These processes appear to rely on partially distinct functional brain systems. Deliberately examining and re-evaluating a situation-specific appraisal recruits executive control processes centred on lateral and dorsal prefrontal regions, which support cognitive reappraisal and flexible reasoning (Miller & Cohen, 2001; Ochsner & Gross, 2005). By contrast, interpreting the personal meaning of events depends more heavily on self-referential processing within the default mode network, particularly the medial prefrontal regions that integrate enduring beliefs, autobiographical memory, and self-related knowledge into coherent interpretations of experience (Buckner et al., 2008). From this perspective, cognitive reappraisal and philosophical belief change are related yet distinguishable processes.

This distinction provides a contemporary rationale for viewing REBT as operating at two complementary levels of intervention: disputing situation-specific irrational thinking and modifying the core irrational philosophies that organise personal meaning across situations.

Successful cognitive reappraisal of situation-specific irrational beliefs would not be expected to automatically modify the enduring philosophical beliefs through which personal meaning is interpreted. In contrast, modifying core irrational philosophies is likely to influence the generation of future appraisals across diverse situations, thereby providing a plausible explanation for Ellis's distinction between elegant and inelegant REBT (Ellis, 2001, 2003).

This article argues that philosophical belief change should be re-centred as the primary objective of REBT. Drawing on Ellis's writings, observations of his clinical practice, and contemporary neuroscience, it distinguishes between situation-specific and philosophical interventions, examines methods for identifying Ellis's core irrational philosophies, and discusses the implications of this perspective for contemporary REBT theory and practice.

REBT as Philosophical Change: Ellis's Original Intent

Any account of how REBT should be practised must begin with Ellis's conception of the therapy. His position was unequivocal: REBT was designed as a system for achieving philosophical change, not merely to correct situation-specific thoughts. "The main purpose of rational-emotive therapy is to help people achieve a profound and lasting philosophical change." (Ellis, 1962/1994).

This is one of the clearest statements of therapeutic intent in the psychotherapy literature. Ellis did not define successful therapy as symptom reduction or the modification of isolated cognitions, but as enduring philosophical change. He was equally explicit about the origin of emotional disturbance: "People largely disturb themselves by holding rigid and extreme philosophies about events, not by the events themselves" (Ellis, cited in Dryden, 2009).

Consistent with the Stoic tradition, particularly Epictetus's observation that people are disturbed not by events but by their views of them, Ellis regarded emotional disturbance as fundamentally philosophical. Irrational beliefs are not isolated cognitions to be corrected individually but coherent, self-defeating systems of meaning. As Ellis (2001) stated: "Irrational beliefs … constitute people's self-defeating philosophies of life."

This distinction has significant implications for clinical practice. Ellis argued that the irrational beliefs people express in specific situations reflect broader philosophical belief systems. Consequently, disputing a single, situation-specific irrational belief is like correcting one sentence in a flawed argument while leaving its underlying premises unchanged. The therapeutic task is therefore more fundamental than correcting individual cognitions. As Ellis (1994) explained: "The aim of REBT is to help clients internalize a rational philosophy of life."

The word *internalize* is central to Ellis's vision. It refers not to adopting a more helpful thought in a particular situation, but to restructuring the philosophical framework through which experience is interpreted.

Ellis also clarified the role of the ABC model within this broader therapeutic enterprise: "The A-B-C framework shows that it is not **Adverse/Activating Events (A)** that cause **Consequences (C)**, but **Beliefs (B)**" (Ellis, 1962). This statement explains the mechanism by which emotional disturbance develops; it does not define the ultimate goal of therapy. Ellis consistently extended the ABC sequence to **Disputation (D)** and **Effective New Philosophy (E)**. The endpoint of REBT is therefore not merely a more rational response to a single situation but the development of a more rational philosophy of life.

Ellis (1977) distinguished two modes of intervention within REBT practice. *Inelegant* solutions operate at the level of the activating event (A) — either the event itself or the client's inference about it — and produce relief by generating a more accurate or more helpful perception of the specific situation. *Elegant* solutions operate at the level of belief (B), disputing the client's underlying irrational and demanding philosophy and replacing it with a rational, non-demanding alternative. Because elegant work targets the belief system rather than the presenting situation, Ellis argued that it produces change that is more durable and more likely to generalize beyond the triggering event.

It is important to note that Ellis did not regard inelegant work as foreign to REBT, nor as the property of a rival CBT approach; he described himself as pragmatically willing to use inelegant methods where they suited a particular client, even while treating elegant, belief-level disputation as the preferred and more far-reaching intervention (Ellis, 1977, 1980, 1994). The distinction is therefore best understood as internal to REBT practice rather than as a boundary marking REBT off from other cognitive-behavioural therapies — although later CBT approaches did come to specialise more heavily in the kind of A-level, inference-focused work Ellis termed inelegant.

Nor is the elegant/inelegant distinction best treated as a strict binary. Dryden and David's (2008) reframing as *specific* (elegant) versus *general* (inelegant) REBT captures this more precisely: specific REBT focuses solely on belief change (B), whereas general REBT permits intervention at multiple levels — goals (G), the activating event (A), or consequences (C) — not exclusively at B. On this view, elegant and inelegant work sit on a continuum of depth and generality of disputation, ranging from situation-specific change to fully philosophical, belief-level change, rather than occupying two categorically separate boxes.

Ellis identified four core irrational philosophies as the primary sources of emotional disturbance (Ellis, 1994):

1. Demandingness: The belief that preferences must be fulfilled ("I must," "You must," "The world must").
2. Awfulising: The tendency to evaluate adversity as catastrophic or unbearable.
3. Low Frustration Tolerance (LFT): The belief that discomfort cannot be endured.
4. Global Rating: Evaluating oneself, others and life as entirely good or bad based on specific behaviours or outcomes.

He argued that demandingness (the absolutistic "must") is the primary or central irrational belief, and that awfulizing, LFT, and global rating are essentially derivatives of it rather than independent, free-standing irrational processes.

Ellis makes it clear that these four irrational beliefs are the principal targets of REBT. Interestingly, his clinical demonstrations suggest that he did not rely on a single method for identifying them. In some interviews, he began with an ABC analysis and progressively generalised from situation-specific irrational beliefs to the client's underlying philosophy. In others, he moved directly to identifying one or more of the four core irrational beliefs, with little or no reference to the ABC model. This observation raises an important clinical question: how should therapists systematically identify these core philosophical beliefs in everyday practice?

Ellis argued that the irrational beliefs expressed in emotionally disturbing situations reflect four underlying core irrational philosophies. Consequently, disputing a single situation-specific irrational belief is like correcting one sentence in a flawed argument while leaving its underlying premises unchanged. The ABC model is REBT's principal diagnostic and teaching framework. Ellis intended it not as an end in itself, but as a means of helping clients identify and modify the core irrational philosophies that shape their interpretation of life events, thereby developing a more rational and flexible philosophy of life.

The Brain and the Construction of Emotional Experience

Advances in our understanding of the neural systems involved in emotion regulation, self-referential processing, and cognitive reappraisal provide a plausible neurocognitive explanation for why beliefs influence emotional experience and why modifying enduring philosophical beliefs is likely to produce broader and more enduring emotional change than changing isolated situational cognitions (Buckner et al., 2008; Disner et al., 2011; Miller & Cohen, 2001; Ochsner & Gross, 2005; Raichle et al., 2001).

The Amygdala: The Brain's Threat Detector

Deep within the brain, the amygdala continuously scans the environment for potential threats. When danger is perceived—whether real or imagined—it rapidly triggers the body's fight-or-flight response, producing physiological changes such as increased heart rate and heightened arousal, as well as emotions such as fear, anger, or withdrawal (LeDoux, 1996). Because this response occurs largely outside conscious awareness, emotional reactions are often triggered before deliberate thought can evaluate the situation.

The more intensely the amygdala is activated, the more difficult it becomes for the Prefrontal Cortex (PFC)—the brain's executive control system—to regulate emotion and think clearly. Under high emotional arousal, reasoning may be compromised, thinking becomes rapid and automatic, making emotional reactions feel immediate, compelling, and unquestionable.

The Default Mode Network: The Brain's Meaning-Making System

The Default Mode Network (DMN) comprises interconnected brain regions that support self-referential thought, autobiographical memory, mental simulation, social cognition, and the construction of personal meaning (Andrews-Hanna, 2012; Buckner et al., 2008; Northhoff, et al., 2006; Raichle et al., 2001). When emotionally significant events occur, the DMN integrates memories of past experiences, knowledge about the self, current emotional and physiological arousal, and existing belief systems to construct an ongoing interpretation of what those events mean for oneself, other people, and the future.

These interpretations are not created in isolation. Contemporary neuroscience suggests that self-referential meaning-making is shaped by enduring belief systems and cognitive schemas that influence how experiences are understood and evaluated (Buckner et al., 2008; Disner et al., 2011). From an REBT perspective, Ellis's four core irrational philosophies provide a plausible psychological account of these enduring evaluative belief systems. Thus, individuals holding different philosophical beliefs may assign very different meanings to the same event. For example, a person whose philosophy is, *My worth depends on my performance*, is likely to interpret professional failure very differently from someone who holds the rational philosophy of unconditional self-acceptance.

This convergence between Ellis's theory and contemporary neuroscience is noteworthy. Ellis (1994, 2001) proposed that emotional disturbance arises primarily from enduring evaluative philosophies rather than from events themselves. Contemporary neuroscience similarly suggests that emotional experience depends on self-referential meaning-making processes that are influenced by enduring belief systems (Northoff et al., 2006; Buckner et al., 2008). Together, these perspectives provide a plausible theoretical foundation for understanding Ellis's emphasis on philosophical belief change within REBT.

The Prefrontal Cortex: Regulator and Evaluator

The Prefrontal Cortex (PFC) supports executive functions such as planning, decision-making, impulse control, and emotional regulation (Miller & Cohen, 2001; Ochsner & Gross, 2005). In REBT, disputation primarily engages these executive processes by prompting clients to evaluate the validity, logic, and usefulness of their beliefs.

However, the PFC can successfully dispute a situation-specific irrational belief without modifying the broader philosophical belief from which it arises. A client who learns to replace *I must not make mistakes in this presentation* with a more rational alternative may experience immediate relief. Yet if the underlying belief—*My worth depends on my performance*—remains unchanged, similar emotional disturbance is likely to emerge whenever future performance is evaluated. Situation-specific disputation may reduce distress associated with a particular event. More enduring change is likely when therapy identifies and disputes the core irrational philosophies that repeatedly generate similar patterns of interpretation across situations.

The regulatory functions of the Prefrontal Cortex described above are consistent with Kahneman's (2011) distinction between System 1 and System 2 thinking. System 1 operates rapidly, automatically, and intuitively, generating immediate interpretations and emotional reactions that reflect prior learning and experience. By contrast, System 2 is slower, deliberate, and reflective, enabling individuals to question automatic appraisals, evaluate evidence, and construct more rational interpretations. This distinction has a plausible, though more specific, neurobiological correlate: effortful cognitive reappraisal engages dorsomedial and dorsolateral prefrontal regions in concert with frontoparietal control networks, whereas more automatic, low-effort emotional processing is associated with the ventromedial prefrontal cortex, a core hub of the Default Mode Network (Ochsner & Gross, 2005; Zhou & Becker, 2025). We do not suggest that this literature was developed with REBT in mind, or that it independently confirms Ellis's distinction; rather, the two frameworks appear to describe compatible patterns of automatic versus effortful processing at different levels of analysis, offering suggestive rather than confirmatory support for REBT's account of elegant and inelegant change.

This neurobiological account should not be taken to imply that philosophical, elegant disputation is uniformly achievable or that inelegant, situation-specific work is merely a lesser substitute. The depth of disputation a client can sustain is likely constrained by their degree of psychological disturbance: more severely disturbed clients may be unable, in the short term, to engage in or maintain the kind of philosophical restructuring elegant disputation requires. For many clients, achieving and sustaining

an elegant solution is a long-term, ongoing process rather than a single therapeutic outcome, and situation-specific, inelegant work may serve as a necessary intermediate step, or, for some clients, the most durable outcome practically achievable (Ellis, 2001, 2003).

Two Levels of REBT Intervention

Ellis's writings (Ellis, 1994, 2001) make clear that the ultimate objective of REBT is not merely to dispute irrational thinking associated with individual situations but to identify and modify the four core irrational philosophical beliefs that repeatedly generate emotional disturbance. Contemporary neuroscience provides a plausible framework for understanding why REBT intervention may occur at two complementary levels. The first targets irrational thinking associated with a specific situation. The second targets the client's underlying philosophical beliefs through which situations acquire personal meaning. Although these two levels of intervention are closely related, they are not equivalent and are likely to differ in both the breadth and durability of therapeutic change they produce.

Situation-Specific Intervention

The ABC model remains one of psychotherapy's most enduring and influential clinical frameworks (Dryden, 2002, 2005). Its enduring strength lies in a simple yet powerful insight: emotional and behavioural consequences (C) arise not directly from activating events (A), but from the beliefs (B) people hold about those events. For many clients, understanding this relationship represents a profound shift in perspective. Rather than viewing emotions as something that simply happens to them, they begin to recognise the central role their own beliefs play in shaping emotional experience.

The addition of **Disputation (D)** teaches clients to examine the logical consistency, empirical support, and usefulness of irrational thinking and to replace it with more rational alternatives, thereby promoting **Effective New Philosophy (E)**. From a neuroscience perspective, this level of intervention primarily involves cognitive reappraisal of irrational thinking supported by the Prefrontal Cortex (PFC). By changing how a specific situation is evaluated, emotional intensity is often reduced, producing meaningful relief from the presenting problem.

Philosophical Intervention

Ellis regarded philosophical belief change as the defining feature of effective REBT (Ellis, 2001, 2003). Rather than focusing solely on irrational thinking associated with a particular situation, philosophical intervention seeks to identify and dispute the four core irrational philosophies—demandingness, awfulising, low frustration tolerance, and global self-rating—that organise emotional meaning across many situations.

Therapists may identify these core irrational philosophies in two complementary ways. One method begins with the ABC model. After identifying a situation-specific

irrational belief, the therapist explores whether that belief reflects one or more of Ellis's four core irrational philosophies. For example, the belief *"I must give this presentation perfectly"* may reveal the broader philosophy of global self-rating, in which personal worth is judged according to performance. Similarly, beliefs about unbearable discomfort may reflect low frustration tolerance, while catastrophic evaluations may reveal awfulising.

A second method involves direct philosophical assessment. Rather than beginning with a formal ABC analysis, the therapist identifies the client's core irrational philosophies from recurring themes in the client's language, beliefs, and philosophy of life. Ellis frequently demonstrated this approach in his live clinical work, rapidly identifying demandingness, awfulising, low frustration tolerance, or global self-rating without first conducting a formal ABC analysis.

Although these assessment methods differ, both converge on the same therapeutic objective: identifying and disputing Ellis's four core irrational philosophies. Contemporary neuroscience provides a plausible neurocognitive explanation for why intervention at this level is likely to produce broader and more enduring therapeutic change. Current evidence suggests that cognitive reappraisal of situation-specific irrational beliefs primarily engages executive functions of the Prefrontal Cortex, enabling individuals to evaluate and replace irrational thinking (Miller & Cohen, 2001; Ochsner & Gross, 2005). By contrast, the personal meaning assigned to experiences is thought to depend on self-referential meaning-making processes associated with the Default Mode Network, which integrate autobiographical memory, knowledge about the self, and enduring belief systems when interpreting emotionally significant events (Raichle et al., 2001; Buckner et al., 2008; Andrews-Hanna, 2012). Consequently, disputing a situation-specific irrational belief may reduce emotional distress by changing the appraisal of a particular event, but it does not automatically modify the enduring philosophical beliefs through which future experiences are interpreted. In contrast, modifying Ellis's four core irrational philosophies is hypothesised to influence these broader meaning-making processes, leading to more adaptive interpretations across diverse situations and, therefore, broader and more enduring therapeutic change.

DiGiuseppe and Neenan (2013) describes therapeutic work as involving movement up and down levels of abstraction in attitudes and beliefs: from concrete, situation-specific thoughts to broader attitudes and global philosophies, and back again. This "ladder" helps clients identify the underlying attitudes that drive specific irrational beliefs, dispute those higher-level attitudes, and then translate more realistic philosophies into concrete, adaptive thoughts for everyday situations. Moving up the ladder means: From a specific incident or thought, identifying the broader, core belief that underlies it; Asking: "What more general rule or beliefs does this concrete thought reflect?" This helps you see the structure of the problem, not just the surface content. Moving down the ladder means: From a high-level attitude ("I must be perfect") deriving how it operates in specific situations ("Because I must be perfect, this minor error means I'm a failure"); Testing the high-level belief against concrete evidence and real-life consequences; Generating more realistic, situation-specific beliefs that still respect the person's values but are less distorted. In DiGiuseppe's structured disputing, this up/down movement is central:

1. Identify the concrete irrational belief in a situation.
2. Ascend to the underlying attitude or philosophy.
3. Dispute that high-level attitude (evidence, logic, pragmatism).
4. Descend to formulate new, more adaptive concrete beliefs that fit the revised attitude.
5. Re-test in real situations, adjusting both levels as needed.

The distinction between these two levels of intervention has important implications for REBT practice. Situation-specific intervention provides valuable and often rapid relief from emotional distress associated with a particular event. Philosophical intervention seeks the broader objective that Ellis regarded as the hallmark of effective REBT: changing the client's philosophy of life. Together, these complementary levels of intervention provide a neuroscience-informed framework that clarifies why changing core irrational philosophies is likely to produce broader and more enduring therapeutic change than disputing situation-specific irrational thinking alone.

Pragmatic Disputing: A Common But Insufficient Strategy

A clinical practice that warrants particular attention is **pragmatic disputing**. Rather than examining whether a belief is logically valid, empirically supported, or philosophically sound, the therapist asks a more limited question: *Is this belief helpful? If not*, *what would be a more helpful belief?*

Although this approach resembles REBT disputation, it differs in an important respect. The emphasis shifts from assessing a belief's validity to assessing its usefulness. As a result, clients may replace one thought with another without examining the broader philosophical assumptions that underpin the original belief. Questions about why the belief developed, what deeper philosophy it reflects, and how it influences emotional functioning across situations may remain unexplored.

From an REBT perspective, pragmatic disputing can provide symptomatic relief without producing enduring philosophical change. A client who substitutes a more helpful thought may feel better in the immediate situation while retaining the core belief that produced the original irrational interpretation. Consequently, similar emotional disturbance is likely to recur whenever that core belief is activated.

Contemporary neuroscience offers a complementary explanation. If emotional meaning is organised around enduring belief systems, modifying a single, situation-specific interpretation is unlikely to alter the broader network of meanings through which future experiences are understood. Lasting emotional change is more likely when therapy helps clients identify, evaluate, and restructure the core philosophical beliefs that organise those interpretations.

This is not to suggest that pragmatic disputing lacks clinical value. It can be an effective starting point, particularly for clients unfamiliar with REBT or reluctant to engage in deeper philosophical work. However, when pragmatic disputing becomes the endpoint of therapy rather than the beginning of philosophical inquiry, it falls short of Ellis's original conception of REBT. Pragmatic usefulness should therefore be seen as the starting point for disputation, not its destination.

Implications for REBT Practice

The central implication of this article is that REBT practitioners should distinguish between two complementary levels of therapeutic intervention: situation-specific intervention and philosophical intervention. Both are consistent with Ellis's conception of REBT, but they differ in their therapeutic objectives, their breadth of impact, and the mechanisms through which enduring change is likely to occur.

First, Therapists Should Explicitly Determine the Intended Level of Intervention

In some circumstances, the immediate clinical objective is to reduce emotional distress associated with a particular situation. In others, the objective is to identify and modify the client's four core irrational philosophies. Clarifying this distinction from the outset helps ensure that therapeutic goals remain consistent with Ellis's original conception of REBT.

Second, the ABC Model Should Be Viewed as an Important Means of Identifying, Rather Than Merely Disputing, Irrational Beliefs

Situation-specific irrational beliefs frequently provide valuable clues to the client's underlying philosophical beliefs. Therapists should routinely consider whether beliefs elicited through the ABC model reflect demandingness, awfulising, low frustration tolerance, or global self-rating, and decide whether intervention should progress beyond the presenting situation to philosophical disputation.

Third, Practitioners Should Become Proficient in Direct Philosophical Assessment

Ellis frequently identified core irrational philosophies without first conducting a formal ABC analysis. Clients' habitual language, recurrent themes, and broader evaluations of themselves, other people, and life often reveal the philosophical beliefs organising emotional disturbance. Developing competence in recognising these patterns enables therapists to intervene directly at the philosophical level when clinically appropriate.

Fourth, Therapists Should Distinguish Between Changing Irrational Thinking Identified Using the ABC Framework and Changing Philosophical Beliefs

Cognitive reappraisal of situation-specific irrational thinking can produce rapid reductions in emotional intensity (e.g., Disner, et al. 2011) and is an important component of effective REBT. However, contemporary neuroscience (e.g., suggests that broader and more enduring therapeutic change is more likely when intervention also modifies the core irrational philosophies that organise personal meaning across situations (e.g., Kross et al. 2009).

Fifth, Treatment Planning Should Recognise That the Two Levels of Intervention May Operate Over Different Therapeutic Timescales

Situation-specific intervention may produce relatively rapid symptomatic improvement. In contrast, changing core irrational philosophies is likely to require repeated disputation, behavioural practice, rational-emotive imagery, and opportunities for clients to apply their developing philosophy across diverse life experiences. Lasting philosophical change is therefore best understood as an ongoing therapeutic process rather than a single cognitive event.

Finally, treatment outcomes should be evaluated not only by reductions in symptoms but also by evidence of philosophical change. Indicators include greater unconditional self-acceptance, increased frustration tolerance, more flexible preferences replacing rigid demands, reduced awfulising, and the consistent application of rational beliefs across diverse situations. These changes reflect the broader philosophical transformation that Ellis regarded as the defining objective of effective REBT.

An important question for future research concerns the relationship between treatment duration and level of intervention. Brief and single-session REBT may effectively reduce emotional distress through cognitive reappraisal of situation-specific irrational beliefs and may also initiate philosophical change. Whether comprehensive modification of Ellis's four core irrational philosophies typically requires repeated philosophical intervention remains an empirical question. Contemporary neuroscience suggests that enduring belief systems supporting self-referential meaning-making are unlikely to be reorganised through a single episode of cognitive disputation alone, although this hypothesis awaits direct empirical investigation.

Addressing Objections

A potential objection is that experienced REBT practitioners already distinguish between intervention directed at situation-specific irrational thinking and intervention directed at Ellis's four core irrational philosophies. This is undoubtedly true for many clinicians. The argument advanced here, however, is not that these distinctions are absent from REBT practice (see DiGiuseppe & Neenan, 2013), but that they have not been especially recently sufficiently articulated as an organising framework within the REBT literature. Ellis's clinical practice consistently demonstrated both levels of intervention. Contemporary neuroscience provides a plausible rationale for understanding why they differ in their therapeutic impact and reinforces Ellis's emphasis on changing core irrational philosophies as the primary objective of REBT.

A second objection is that emphasising philosophical intervention may undervalue the clinical importance of situation-specific disputation. This article argues the opposite. Situation-specific intervention remains an essential component of effective REBT because cognitive reappraisal of irrational thinking frequently produces rapid reductions in emotional distress. Philosophical intervention does not replace this process; rather, it extends it by identifying and modifying the enduring irrational philosophies that repeatedly generate emotional disturbance across diverse situations. The two levels of intervention are therefore complementary rather than competing.

A third objection concerns the interpretation of the neuroscience presented in this article. Contemporary neuroscience has not identified distinct neural pathways corresponding to Ellis's four core irrational philosophies, nor does it directly validate REBT. The present argument is more modest. Current understanding of large-scale brain systems involved in self-referential meaning-making and cognitive regulation provides a plausible explanatory framework for interpreting Ellis's distinction between situation-specific and philosophical intervention. The purpose of integrating neuroscience is therefore not to establish neuroscientific proof of REBT but to provide a contemporary theoretical rationale for Ellis's longstanding emphasis on philosophical belief change.

A fourth objection is that core irrational philosophies are complex, emotionally embedded systems of meaning that cannot be changed through cognitive disputation alone. This is an important consideration. Core irrational philosophies are not merely cognitive propositions; they are enduring, emotionally significant systems of personal meaning that develop through repeated experience. Consequently, changing them is unlikely to be a single cognitive event. It requires repeated philosophical disputation, behavioural practice, rational-emotive imagery, and emotionally meaningful experiences that reinforce more rational ways of interpreting oneself, other people, and the world (e.g., DiGiuseppe et al., 2014). The complexity of changing core irrational philosophies is therefore not an argument against philosophical intervention, but an argument for pursuing it with sufficient depth, persistence, and experiential engagement.

A Final Reflection: What Albert Ellis Wanted Us to Remember

Many years ago, I asked Albert Ellis, "Al, after presenting REBT to audiences around the world, across many different cultures, what do you think is the single most important idea people take away?" Without hesitation, he replied, "The ABCs."

Over the years, I have reflected on that answer. I believe Ellis recognised that the ABC model encapsulated one of the central insights of REBT: emotional and behavioural consequences (C) are determined not by activating events (A), but by the beliefs (B) people hold about those events.

Yet I also remember another recurring response from Ellis. During the Australian lecture tours on which I accompanied him, interviewers would often ask what he believed was the fundamental cause of emotional disturbance. His answer was equally immediate and consistent: "It's their shoulds—their absolutistic beliefs."

Taken together, these two observations summarise the central argument of this paper. The ABC model is REBT's most powerful framework for helping clients discover that beliefs, rather than events, create emotional consequences. But Ellis never intended the therapeutic journey to end with identifying situation-specific beliefs. His ultimate goal was to help clients identify and change the underlying philosophical beliefs—the demandingness, awfulising, low frustration tolerance, and global ratings—that repeatedly generate those beliefs across the many situations of life.

Conclusion

Albert Ellis conceived REBT as a therapy whose primary objective was not simply to reduce emotional distress but to bring about enduring emotional health and life satisfaction through philosophical change.

This article has argued that contemporary neuroscience provides a plausible explanatory framework for understanding two distinct levels of REBT practice. Situation-specific intervention primarily involves cognitive reappraisal of irrational thinking, whereas philosophical intervention targets the enduring belief systems through which people construct personal meaning. Although these complementary levels of intervention are closely interconnected, they are not equivalent. Situation-specific intervention frequently produces valuable reductions in emotional distress associated with a particular event. Philosophical intervention is more likely to produce broader and more enduring therapeutic change because it modifies the core irrational philosophies that shape the interpretation of future experiences.

The article has also argued that therapists may identify these core irrational philosophies either by generalising from situation-specific irrational beliefs identified through the ABC model or through direct philosophical assessment, both of which were evident in Ellis' clinical practice. Making these methods of philosophical assessment more explicit provides practitioners with a clearer pathway to achieving the deeper therapeutic change that Ellis regarded as the hallmark of REBT.

Contemporary neuroscience offers a coherent neurobiological rationale for Ellis's longstanding emphasis on philosophical belief change (e.g., Ellis, 1962). Viewed from this perspective, REBT can be understood as operating at two complementary levels of intervention, with philosophical intervention representing the primary pathway to broad, enduring emotional change. Re-centering REBT on this principle both restores Ellis's original therapeutic vision and provides a contemporary neuroscience-informed framework for guiding clinical practice and future research.

Acknowledgements Walter J. Matweychuk, Ph.D. Licensed Psychologist, Perelman School of MedicineOutpatient Psychiatry Department, University of Pennsylvania Health System.

Author Contributions sole author M.E. Bernard contributed 100%.

Data Availability No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Competing Interests The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Andrews-Hanna, J. R. (2012). The brain's default network and its adaptive role in internal mentation. *The Neuroscientist, 18*(3), 251–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858411403316

Bernard, M. E. (2011). *Rationality and the pursuit of happiness: The legacy of Albert Ellis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Buckner, R. L., Andrews-Hanna, J. R., & Schacter, D. L. (2008). The brain's default network: Anatomy, function, and relevance to disease. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1124*(1), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1440.011

DiGiuseppe, R., & Neenan, M. (2013). *A practitioner's guide to rational-emotive behavior therapy* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

DiGiuseppe, R., Doyle, K., Dryden, W., & Backx, W. (2014). *A practitioner's guide to rational emotive behavior therapy* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Disner, S. G., Beevers, C. G., Haigh, E. A. P., & Beck, A. T. (2011). Neural mechanisms of the cognitive model of depression. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 12*(8), 467–477. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3027

Dryden, W. (2002). *Fundamentals of rational emotive behaviour therapy: A training manual*. Wiley.

Dryden, W. (2005). *Rational emotive behaviour therapy in a nutshell*. Sage.

Dryden, W. (2009). *Rational emotive behaviour therapy: Distinctive features*. Routledge.

Dryden, W., & David, D. (2008). Rational emotive behavior therapy: Current status. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy, 22*(3), 195–209.

Ellis, A. (1962). *Reason and emotion in psychotherapy*. Lyle Stuart.

Ellis, A. (1977). Rejoinder: Elegant and inelegant RET. *The Counseling Psychologist, 7*(1), 46–49.

Ellis, A. (1980). Rational-emotive therapy and cognitive-behavior therapy: Similarities and differences. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4*(4), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01178210

Ellis, A. (1994). *Reason and emotion in psychotherapy* (Rev. and updated ed.). Birch Lane Press.

Ellis, A. (2001). *Overcoming destructive beliefs, feelings, and behaviors: New directions for rational emotive behavior therapy.* Prometheus Books.

Ellis, A. (2003). Early theories and practices of rational emotive behavior therapy and how they have been augmented and revised during the last three decades. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 21*(3–4), 219–243.

Ellis, A., & Dryden, W. (1997). *The practice of rational emotive behavior therapy* (2nd ed.). Springer.

Ellis, A., & Joffe Ellis, D. (2019). *Rational emotive behavior therapy* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kross, E., Davidson, M., Weber, J., & Ochsner, K. (2009). Coping with emotions past: The neural bases of regulating affect associated with negative autobiographical memories. *Biological Psychiatry, 65*(5), 361–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2008.10.019

LeDoux, J. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life.* Simon & Schuster.

Miller, E. K., & Cohen, J. D. (2001). An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Annual Review of Neuroscience, 24*(1), 167–202. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.24.1.167

Northoff, G., Heinzel, A., de Greck, M., Bermpohl, F., Dobrowolny, H., & Panksepp, J. (2006). Self-referential processing in our brain—A meta-analysis of imaging studies on the self. *NeuroImage, 31*(1), 440–457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.12.002

Ochsner, K. N., & Gross, J. J. (2005). The cognitive control of emotion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 9*(5), 242–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.03.010

Raichle, M. E., MacLeod, A. M., Snyder, A. Z., Powers, W. J., Gusnard, D. A., & Shulman, G. L. (2001). A default mode of brain function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 98*(2), 676–682. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.98.2.676

Zhou, F., & Becker, B. (2025). The default mode network and emotion — Dual roles of the medial prefrontal cortex in emotional experience and regulation. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2025.101613

Authors and Affiliations

Michael E. Bernard[1,2]

✉ Michael E. Bernard
michaelebernard@gmail.com

[1] California State University , Long Beach, USA

[2] The Bernard Group , Melbourne, VIC, Australia