

From the Editors

We have found that sometimes the articles in a given number of this journal arrange themselves into a theme; but equally often, as in this issue, they illustrate the range of assorted interests the journal serves.

The question of when one proposition is relevant to another as a premise supporting a conclusion is as vexing as it is central to the analysis and assessment of arguments. Even the judgement that a text of discourse contains an argument seems to presuppose a judgment of propositional relevance, and relevance is a norm of argument appraisal. Yet the analysis of such relevance has been elusive. George Bowles tackles this challenge in his paper, "Propositional Relevance."

We have long maintained a distinction between the subject of informal logic—focused primarily on norms of argument analysis and appraisal (see Bowles's article)—and the activity of critical thinking—understood as the exercise of a moral and intellectual virtue. The two come together in the classroom, but not always to the satisfaction of instructors who want to teach critical thinking. In "A Problem Solving Interpretation of Argument Analysis," David Bernstein gives a critical thinking spin to a traditional unit in the informal logic curriculum.

Douglas Walton is one of the best known and respected scholars in argumentation and fallacy theory, so we are pleased to publish James B. Freeman's critical review of Walton's recent book, *Informal Logic: A Handbook for Critical Argumentation* (1989).

Our experience—which might be untypical—is that instructors trained in the humanities are more cavalier about testing than those with a background in a empirical research methods. When large classes force

us to turn to multiple-choice tests, we rush in where angels fear to tread. Peter A. Facione, who has chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on Testing Critical Thinking for the American Philosophical Association's Committee on PreCollege Philosophy, offers us all a helping hand in his Teaching Note, "Thirty Great Ways to Mess Up a Critical Thinking Test."

In *Critical Thinking: Evaluating Claims and Arguments in Everyday Life*, Brooke Moore and Richard Parker's innovation was to treat in a central way the analysis and evaluation of unargued claims and persuasion. J. E. Parks-Clifford reviews the second edition of Moore and Parker's text. Moving to a quite different region of informal logic's interdisciplinary domain, Claude Gratton reviews a posthumous collection of Professor Chaim Perelman's essays, published in their original French, titled *Rhétorique*.

New Rates

As we have noted in this column on other occasions, this journal is funded almost entirely by its subscribers, and published at cost. With Volume XIII we must (with regret) raise our rates. By the way, for individual subscriptions this will actually be only a return to the Volume IX price. It is no longer possible for us to finance the journal at the lower rate at which we published (with difficulty) Volumes X, XI and XII. We would add the supplication: please, please remit when you are billed. It's vital that we maintain our cash flow in order to pay typesetter, printer, and post office, all of whom insist on cash on the barrelhead. Subscribers who have already paid for Volume XIII at the old rate will not be charged the difference. □