

FROM THE EDITORS

In this issue we are pleased to publish two papers originally presented at the conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation, held at the University of Windsor, May 2001. The first is Richard H. Gaskins's keynote address to the conference, "Shaping the adversary culture." In this essay Professor Gaskins distinguishes evidence-based reasoning and reflexive reasoning. He observes that judicial reasoning is becoming more and more concerned with the latter, which depends on the logic of presumption, and he suggests that argumentation theory has a significant role to play in determining the future shape of legal discourse, provided it frees itself from static models.

The second is Jan Albert van Laar's study of the use of ambiguity in dialectics. His formal model of critical discussions distinguishes constitutive and regulative rules of argumentation and, accordingly, two kinds of fallacies. Although violations of the constitutive rules is prohibited, the formal model allows a way for the discussion of norm-fallacies rather than their total elimination. Van Laar's paper was awarded the J. Anthony Blair Prize at the 2001 conference, having been voted the best student essay at the conference by a panel of reviewers.

Bruce Waller's paper on analogies distinguishes several functions of analogies of which only one is their employment as arguments. Analogical arguments may be divided into inductive and deductive ones. Waller argues that—contrary to the claims of Govier and Sunstein—all a priori analogies are best understood as deductive arguments.

In "Dialogue games as dialogue models for interacting with, and via, computers," Nicolas Maudet and David Moore, after making an extensive survey of the existing literature, consider the adequacy of debate dialogue games as models for interactions between persons and computers. They go on to explore the issue for dialogue games which are not debate-oriented, and the possibilities of using dialogue games in multi-media environments.

We have two reviews, one of Douglas Walton's *Scare Tactics*, by Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, and another of Robert Abelson's *Statistics as Principled Argument*, by Peter McBurney. We welcome these contributors to our pages.

In the *Teaching Supplement* we continue our series of analyses of the Shell Advertorial, "Clear thinking in troubled times." In the last issue we printed contributions by Agnes van Rees and by Frans van Eemeren and Peter Houtlosser; in this issue Scott Jacobs and Ralph Johnson continue the discussion.

In the next issue (Vol. 22, No. 1) readers will see some changes to our Editorial Board, changes that we hope will encourage and support the evolution not only of this journal, but also of research in informal logic and argumentation theory.