

From the Editors

Bienvenue

Readers may have noticed that our Masthead has been slightly redesigned for this first issue of Volume XIII. It contains more information than before and, more important, it lists at the top some new names.

We have created the post of Associate Editor for our colleague Robert C. Pinto. Bob helps us by writing computer programs to improve the ease and efficiency of our operation. He also serves as a trusted advisor, a third editor, and an all-round extra mind and body. We are delighted to formalize his relationship with the journal.

Our new Assistant to the Editors is Mark Letteri (Ph.D., Waterloo). It is our good fortune that Mark was interested in taking over from Hans Hansen, in addition to the teaching he does in the Windsor Philosophy Department. Mark has been running the day-to-day operations of the journal since last December. Also, with the help of Bob's computer program, he carries out the managing editor tasks of handling subscriptions and fulfillment. We are grateful to the University of Windsor for continuing to provide the funding for Mark's part-time position.

Last, but far from least, we have prevailed upon Hans Hansen (Ph.D., Wayne State) to maintain a semi-formal relationship with the journal, although he has moved a few hundred kilometres away to St. Catharines, Ontario. "Consulting Editor" is a crisper title than "Assistant to the Editors, Emeritus," plus it allows us to continue to call on Hans's experience and good judgement.

We welcome Bob, Mark and Hans to their new positions. Any journal relies heavily on the people who help out the editors, and we are fortunate indeed to have this experienced, wise, and enthusiastic trio backing us up.

This Issue

By what standard(s) is the relationship between the premises and conclusion of an argument to be assessed? The first two

papers in this issue address this question. In "Evaluating Arguments: The Premise-Conclusion Relation," George Bowles considers what might be called the "relevance" side, and in "Quantifying Support," John Black looks at what might be called the "completeness" side.

Valid and reliable tests of critical thinking have proven extremely difficult to formulate. When it comes to assessing such tricky-to-measure proficiencies as fair-mindedness, emphasized as a critical thinking value by Richard Paul and others, the difficulties are compounded. In "Testing Fairmindedness," Alec Fisher takes a critical but sympathetic look at such a test currently under development.

Rolf George and David Hitchcock's "Reply" is a rejoinder to Roger Smook's 1988 critique of their work, which appeared under the title, "Logical and extralogical constants," in these pages in Volume X, 1988.

In his "Teaching Note," Leonard Berkowitz offers a welcome suggestion about how to find arguments that students will be genuinely interested in tackling to practice their skills at argument interpretation and evaluation.

We are happy to be able to provide extended reviews of three recent books of interest: the collection of papers from the 1988 Utrecht conference on *Norms in Argumentation*, edited by Robert Maier (reviewed by Josina Makau); coincidentally, Josina Makau's book on *Reasoning and Communication* (reviewed by Robert Rowland); and Sharon Bailin's monograph on creativity, *Achieving Extraordinary Ends* (reviewed by Donald Hatcher).

* * * *

Our printer ran into problems that have delayed the appearance of this issue by a couple of months, but even so we are now almost on our intended schedule of appearing in the Winter, Spring, and Fall of each year. And this 1991 volume is appearing... in 1991! □