

From the Editors

The first three articles in this issue all deal in one way or another with a basic interest of informal logic: argument analysis.

One of the basic problems faced by informal logicians when they abandoned the doctrine of logical form was to devise alternative ways of portraying the structure of arguments. One method that has emerged involves the distinction between a linked argument (where the premises work together) and a convergent one (where the premises work separately). In his paper, Mark Vorobej develops a novel way of making this distinction which preserves the widely held intuition that a linked argument is especially vulnerable to local criticism regarding premise acceptability. He calls this the TRUE Test: Type Reduction Upon Elimination.

The traditional distinction between deduction and induction has not been entirely abandoned. In his paper, George Bowles reviews five ways of making this distinction and concludes that the best one is the one that defines a deductive argument as one in which conclusive favorable relevance to its conclusion is attributed to its premises; and an inductive argument is one that is not deductive.

The problem of missing premises is the subject of Wayne Grennan's article. He is taking off from Ennis's idea of a missing premise as a gap filler. Grennan argues that unstated premises are not properly construed as gap fillers; rather they support a part of the argument that is already given implicitly – "the inference claim: If the premises are true then the conclusion is true."

The remaining two articles deal with the challenge of postmodernist thought to critical thinking. In his paper, Don Hatcher argues that any critical discussion of a subject must assume specific principles of rationality and he discusses five such principles. In her response to Hatcher, Sharon Bailin reviews Hatcher's position from the perspective of Rorty, arguing that Rorty would partly agree and partly disagree.

There are three books reviewed in this issue: *Argumentation Theory and the Rhetoric of Assent* (1990) by David Cratis Williams and Michael David Hazen; *Burdens of Proof in Modern Discourse* (1992) by Richard Gaskins; and *Can't We Make Moral Judgements?* (1991) by Mary Midgley.

