

from the editors

As *Informal Logic* is behind in its publication we thought the best way to make up ground quickly, as well as to save some binding and mailing costs, would be to publish the remaining two numbers of Volume VII together as a double issue. That explains this package, which contains all the articles and other material that would have appeared in two separate issues. The only difference to readers: just one cover and table of contents.

Volume VIII (1986) will be assembled and mailed out in the next six months—it too is completely booked—and by Winter 1987 we hope to recommence our regular Winter/Spring/Fall publishing schedule.

We are delighted to announce that **Dr. Perry Weddle** has agreed to join our Editorial Board. Professor Weddle, of the California State University at Sacramento, has been refereeing articles for this journal and advising the editors for many years. Many readers will know Professor Weddle as the founding editor of **CT NEWS**. His official listing on the Board corrects a long-standing oversight on our part.

The lead article in this issue, "Educating Reason" by Harvey Siegel is a continuation of an article the first part of which was published last fall in the APA Newsletter on Teaching Critical Thinking. Because of the importance of the issue he has raised—the justification of critical thinking as an educational ideal—we thought that all of our readers would appreciate the chance to read Siegel's paper, even those who have not read the first half.

In this combined issue, two themes receive special emphasis. First, there are three articles on the subject of missing premises—by David Hitchcock, James Gough and Christopher Tindale, and Michael Burke. Anyone who has experience teaching informal

logic or critical thinking knows how thorny an issue identifying missing premises is. Here you will find three different views which should enrich the discussion. The other topic is the role of and the need for theory in informal logic, different views of which can be found in the articles by Doss and Weddle. We also welcome the timely article by Gibbs surveying the empirical research that has been done on testing critical thinking, and the article by James Freeman "Dialectical Situations and Argument Analysis."

We continue in this issue with the publication of the papers delivered at the Second International Symposium on Informal Logic (June, 1983). In this issue, the SISIL papers are: "Enthymematic Arguments" by David Hitchcock, "'Missing' or 'Hidden' Premises" by James Gough and Christopher Tindale, "Three Steps Toward a Theory of Informal Logic" by Seale Doss, and "On Theory in Informal Logic" by Perry Weddle. For the record, it should be noted that the following articles published in Volume VII, No. 1 were also delivered at SISIL: "The Logic of Deep Disagreements" by Robert J. Fogelin, and "Background Logic, Critical Thinking and Irrational Language Games" by Richard Paul.

"book review" policy

We distinguish between the following five types of treatment of textbooks, anthologies and monographs.

1. List of Contents. Readers say it is helpful to have available the tables of contents of recent books as well as their titles. We will continue to publish these as space permits.

2. Book Review. Short and succinct, the sort of book review we want to publish supplies complete and accurate information about the contents of the book in question. The reader will come away from it knowing what ground

the book covers (and, if it's pertinent, what is left out), having an inkling of the main arguments or approaches its author uses, and in general will receive enough information to decide whether the book is of interest. The reviewer may pass judgement, but should do so with an eye to serving the informational needs of the reader.

3. Critical Notice. This is an article-length critical evaluation of a recent work which has been judged by the editors to merit a thorough appraisal by someone particularly qualified to examine it. Critical notices will be by invitation only, although the editors are open to applications or nominations.

4. Critical Review. The difference between a critical review and a critical notice is that critical review submissions are welcome, and the standard refereeing policy of the journal will apply to them. Here too we look for an article-length critique, subjecting the main theses and arguments of the work to a balanced appraisal.

5. Critical Discussion. Also a refereed, article-length piece, a critical discussion differs from a critical review because its intent is not a complete, overall critique of the work. It might discuss only one aspect or section of a book; it might use a book as a reference point for wide-ranging cogitations; it might compare two or three (or more) related books; it might return to a book long-ago published.

Yes, Ockham's razor should apply to classification schemes. Yet since interesting and important work in informal logic is to be found in textbooks as well as in monographs, we want to encourage scholarly discussions of it all. We intend our classification of types of "review" to encourage such discussions. By assuring refereed treatment, we hope to assist those who want to do the serious scholarship such treatments of texts and treatises entails by giving their work credibility

with Promotion and Tenure committees.

While no book reviews appear in Volume VII, we intend to run book reviews, critical notices, critical reviews, and critical discussions as regular features of future issues. As announced in Vol. VII, No. 1 in this column, **Dr. Seale Doss** of Ripon College (Ripon, Wisconsin 54971, U.S.A.) has taken on the newly-created post of **Associate Editor—Book Reviews**. Please write or call Seale Doss if you have written a book review, critical review or critical discussion, or would like to do so. Some have declared a reluctance to commit themselves to such essays for a journal that has been erratic in its publication schedule. We regret this consequence of our recent dilatory record, and hope those with critical reactions to texts and monographs in our field will submit their work as we resume a regular schedule.

* * *

Erratum

In Volume VII, Number 1 (Winter 1985), we inadvertently published the preliminary draft of Jonathan Adler's **Open Forum** piece, "Where are the limits to reconstruction?" instead of the revised version. We apologize abjectly to Dr. Adler. While most of the changes were stylistic, anyone who would like to take issue with or build upon Dr. Adler's question should work from the revised version. **Informal Logic** will supply **gratis** the revised version of Dr. Adler's paper to any and all who request it.

We also apologize for a typographical error in Dr. Adler's article: on page 61, in the paragraph in the right-hand column beginning, "So the poem..." the sixth sentence should end with the phrase, "...truth of a proposition?" □