

From the Editors

John Woods and Douglas Walton have produced, in tandem and individually, a large and important body of literature on various individual informal fallacies. Yet they have not yet attempted to formulate a theory of fallacy, at least not a single, unified theory of the informal fallacies. Such a theory is exactly what the founders of the Amsterdam pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation, Frans van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst, have attempted to provide, both in the 1984 elaboration of their theory and also in their 1992 book focusing primarily on fallacies. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst have explicitly criticized Woods and Walton (among others) for failing to produce a unified theory of the fallacies. John Woods' paper opening this issue is a reply to that challenge.

Back in 1989 this journal sponsored an "Argument Evaluation Contest," in which readers were presented with the text of an actual extended argument and invited to evaluate it. In 1991 (Vol. XIII, No. 3, Fall) we published the four entries, the judges' reports, and the editors' ruling, in which we declared a four-way draw. At that time we also invited readers' inferences or lessons to be drawn from the exercise. Don S. Levi's article gives us his reflections on the results.

The feminist critique has found its way to informal logic, and this journal has published several papers articulating or responding to that discussion. Michael Gilbert's article is a further contribution to that particular conversation. This dialectic is especially interesting when it proposes a conceptual revision of the enterprise, as Gilbert does in his recommendation for a rethinking of critical reasoning.

The editorial policy of this journal makes it clear that interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary contributions are wel-

come. In "What is an Assumption?" Delin, Chittleborough and Delin supply a read on assumptions from the point of view of psychology — or more precisely, not to generalize hastily, of three psychologists.

In 1988 the Wadsworth Publishing Company issued *Selected Issues in Logic and Communication*, a group of papers in the general area of informal logic, collected, organized and introduced by Trudy Govier, and intended as a set of readings for courses in communications, critical thinking or informal logic. One of the chapters is an interview conducted by Dennis Rohatyn of the University of San Diego with Dr. Uve Binad, "the world's foremost authority on propaganda and the director of the Ministry of Truth." In his discussion of that interview, Stanley Cunningham, a propaganda theorist, takes issue with Rohatyn's contention that propaganda theorists are themselves unavoidably propagandists.

Books reviewed in this issue include *Thinking in Education* (1991), Matthew Lipman's theoretical account of the role of his famous Philosophy for Children program in the teaching of thinking and critical thinking; Steven Stich's general theoretical work on the theory of cognitive evaluation, *The Fragmentation of Reason* (1990); and a textbook by William Hughes, *Critical Thinking: An Introduction to the Basic Skills* (1992).

Readers will be receiving with this issue a promotional flyer for *New Essays in Informal Logic*, a collection edited by Johnson and Blair and published by this journal. We hope you will order a copy: as you can see the articles in the book are highly relevant to this journal's mandate. (By the way, enclosing the flyer does not add to the journal's postage, and the book is being sold at a price pegged to recover costs. There are no royalties.)

