

# From the Editors

Maurice Finocchiaro, drawing on his own research and that of David Perkins, describes two different methods of studying reasoning empirically, discusses their theoretical presuppositions, and proposes a method for improving reasoning.

Michael Burke questions the particular intersection of theoretical model and interpretive principle that results in verdicts of *denying the antecedent*. He argues that this verdict of fallacy relies on questionable assumptions, and that what would count in the final analysis as denying the antecedent is rarely found in published arguments.

Every instructor of critical thinking or informal logic who supplies the students with rules, strategies and criteria has experienced the urge to warn them, "But use your judgement!" In his article, Paul Healy discusses the grounds for that advice, and in addition, suggests ways to make it operational.

This journal has often published "Replies" to papers that have previously appeared in it, but this issue contains our first back-to-back-to-back Exchange. We invited Steve Fuller to submit a paper he

read at an Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking session at the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division meetings, since we see connections between informal logic and the field of social epistemology that Fuller has pioneered. We asked Miriam Solomon to reply, and then offered to Fuller space for a rejoinder.

Some hold that the bigness of the contemporary science industries puts today's science beyond the pale of the citizenry's critical scrutiny. This is the problem Fuller addresses, seeking first to diagnose the problem correctly, then to advance a solution. Solomon argues that size may not be as pivotal, nor as much of an epistemic factor, as Fuller thinks.

Three interesting books are reviewed in this number. One is a new textbook in the field, by Richard Feldman. The other two—the reviews of C. A. J. Coady's book on testimony, and of Frederick Schauer's book on the role of rules in (especially legal) decision-making—are monographs that have implications for informal logic and critical thinking.

