

from the editors

Editorial Board Addition

We are honoured to welcome Professor Merrilee H. Salmon from the program in History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Pittsburgh, and author of *Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1984) to the editorial board of this journal.

Subscription Increase

Subscribers will be receiving renewal notices with this issue, and will find that we have had to raise the rate for Vol. IX to \$25.00. That is quite a jump above past rates. We owe an explanation. **Informal Logic** is almost completely supported by subscribers. We do receive a yearly subvention from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Windsor and we also receive donations from friends of the journal. For these we are grateful. (By the way, such donations, with written instructions earmarking them for **Informal Logic**, and made out to the University of Windsor, are tax deductible in Canada). But the bulk of our revenue comes from subscribers—mostly individuals. Our costs have risen significantly. Each copy of the journal now costs us about \$9.00 altogether for typesetting, paste-up, printing, mailing, etc. At three issues a year, that means each subscription costs us \$27.00. We cannot afford to maintain the current difference between our costs and subscription rates.

We hope soon to become a “desktop” operation, and that our costs will then drop. We are also seeking a subsidy from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. And if we can increase the number of subscribers, the per-copy cost will decrease. Should costs go down and income go up, we will make history and **reduce** our rates for future volumes. In the meantime we ask for your continued support in this next year as we seek to maintain standards and cut costs.

Standards

In papers submitted for publication in this journal, as well as in articles published in other philosophy journals, we have noticed the occurrence of problematic undocumented empirical claims. (We cannot document this claim without embarrassing individuals or journals.) We have in mind claims which run like this: “most informal logic texts,” “the critical thinking movement,” or “the standard treatments of this fallacy.” We have no objection to such claims as long as they are backed up by citations—and citations sufficiently exact to permit readers (not to mention editors and referees) readily to verify for themselves the truth of the claim. Contributors are forewarned that this journal will continue to insist on documentation for such empirical claims, and we invite readers to draw our attention to any which slip past our scrutiny.

Another problem we want to call to our potential contributors’ attention is papers which do not make reference to the appropriate literature on the topics they address. Particularly on fallacies, but increasingly on all topics in the field, there is a body of respectable work already published, in this journal and elsewhere. We remind contributors that it is the standing editorial policy of this journal that to be accepted for publication papers must make reference to the literature on their topics, including but not limited to papers published in this journal.

In this Issue

In this issue three new contributors appear on these pages. Richard Miller’s article deals with a timely topic—the problem of defining and testing thinking skills. Wayne Grennan presents a scheme for assessing the plausibility of two-premise arguments. Brian Kirby presents an argument that amounts to a plea for accepting the argument form known as “affirming the consequent.” John Hoaglund, whose work has appeared previously, provides some ideas about how to handle conditional propositions. □