

## From the Editors

This issue begins the second decade of publication of an organ on informal logic under our auspices as editors and publishers. The first five volumes (1978-82) were known as the *Informal Logic Newsletter*. The last five volumes (1983-88) have been known simply as the journal, *Informal Logic*. If refereeing by others besides the editors is a defining feature of a journal, then the journal of *Informal Logic* is entering its sixth year.

It is a fitting time, we think, to signal the geographical and disciplinary spread of interest in informal logic, as well as the interdisciplinary outreach of the field, by announcing the expansion of the journal's editorial board. We are honoured to welcome the following eleven outstanding scholars.

**Else M. Barth**, professor of philosophy at the University of Groningen and author of an important body of work on logic; **Sharon Ballin** from the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba and author of work on critical thinking in education, with a particular focus on creativity; **Georg Brutian**, member of the Academy of Armenia and professor at the University of Yerevan, author of work on logic and argumentation and longtime sponsor of research on argumentation within and beyond the Soviet Union; **Lorraine Code** from Canada's York University, the author of work in epistemology centring on epistemic responsibility; **Frans H. van Eemeren**, professor of speech communication at the University of Amsterdam, co-founder of the Amsterdam Research Group on Argumentation and co-author of a major body of work in argumentation; **Alec Fisher**, textbook author and sponsor of research in informal logic and critical thinking in England; **Rob Grootendorst** of the University of Amsterdam department of speech communication, co-founder of the Amsterdam Research Group on Argument-

ation and co-author of a major body of work on argumentation; **Lenore Langsdorf** of the department of speech communication at Southern Illinois University, a philosopher and author of work on the relevance of semiotics for informal logic and critical thinking; **Stephen P. Norris** of the department of educational research and development at the Memorial University of Newfoundland, author of theoretical and empirical work on the teaching and testing of critical thinking and informal logic; **Harvey Siegel** of the department of philosophy at the University of Miami, author of extensive publications in the philosophy of science and epistemology, and contributor to the development of the theory of critical thinking and informal logic; **Joseph P. Wenzel** of the speech communication department at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, past editor of the *Journal of the American Forensic Association* and author of work on the rhetorical dimension of argumentation.

Besides new editorial board members, we also inaugurate a subtitle. As other journals enter the field, and disciplinary boundaries are rearranged or blurred, we deemed it advisable to mark the scope of this journal's interests and reach by adding the subtitle, "Reasoning and argumentation in theory and practice." It remains our objective as editors to publish in these pages high quality research, theoretical or applied, conceptual or empirical, from scholars who base themselves in any field, but particularly from (though not restricted to) philosophy, speech, communication, rhetoric, and cognitive psychology—so long as it bears on reasoning and argumentation in theory and practice. To complete the changes as we enter our second decade, the journal's cover has been given a slightly different "look".

To celebrate ten years of publication, *Informal Logic* is going back to its roots

in argument analysis and running a contest!—with a cash prize!! A generous supporter has contributed US \$100 for the best critical analysis of an example of argumentation. See page 59 for details of the contest.

The articles in this issue cover a range of topics. Deborah Orr contributes some timely reflections on gender assumptions built into our conceptions of rationality, especially as these affect the teaching of informal logic. George Bowles discusses whether favourable relevance is a necessary condition of argument. James Freeman seeks to deepen the notion of “strong-

sense” critical thinking originated by Richard Paul by relating it to the concept of the human image system. And Peter Davson-Galle offers a reply to Jonathan Berg’s article (Vol. IX, No. 1), “Interpreting Arguments.” The issue is rounded out by publication of the abstracts of the papers presented at the Third International Symposium on Informal Logic, held at Windsor in June 1989. Our assumption is that readers will be interested to know more about the topics discussed at that conference. Finally, please do not forget to renew your subscription if you have not done so already. Does your library subscribe?

## IN MEMORIAM

### J. Frederick Little

J. Frederick Little died suddenly of a heart attack on the evening of February 27th, 1990. He received his Ph.D. from Princeton University and taught for 32 years at Wilfrid Laurier University. Though much of his time was spent in administrative work, he pursued active interests in informal logic and philosophy of religion. He introduced the first informal logic course into the philosophy curriculum at Wilfrid Laurier in 1974 and published his first text, *Critical Thinking and Decision Making*, with Butterworths in 1980. In 1989 he published *Good Reasoning Matters!* with McClelland & Stewart. Both in the classroom and in his writing he emphasized the importance of pedagogy, real life examples, and a general methodology which synthesized the disparate aspects of logical theory and logical thinking, making them readily accessible for practical application. He also exercised a healthy respect for the limits of logical analysis. He will be much missed by his friends and colleagues. As he wrote in the Preface to his first book, “There are... situations where logical analysis appears inappropriate... and there are experiences where logical principles seem not to apply (as in the simple experiences of falling in love or losing a relative or intimate friend).”